

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Listening Tour

Denver, CO – May 23, 2016

Standards, Assessments, and Accountability

Discussion Question #1: How should we measure student progress toward meeting the standards?

- **Feedback Notes:**

- Define purpose of testing. Time to get results – doesn't match up. Multiple measures – multiple times. Holistic measure. Performance based assessments. Tie assessment to student grades. Transition with PARCC – it wasn't given enough time to be successful. Chart assessment for schools and parents. Opting-out is an issue.
- Formative testing allowed. Growth model. No timed tests – can't show the growth. One summative in combination with formative. Give teachers back their power. Fully train teachers in assessments and let them use their data to inform instruction. Need immediate results. Portfolio, holistic assessment with trained teachers.
- Don't tie student assessment to teacher effectiveness. Model from state's doing better in assessment (MA).
- Have tests that are derived from the standards. Shorter tests or no time limit on tests.
- In the least disruptive way possible focus on data collection that is a) NOT repetitive, b) usable for formative feedback during the year, and c) match instruction as opposed to changing instruction for this test.
- Let standards be primary.
- Measurements need to be scored in a timely manner so that teachers receive data in time to make instructional decisions.
- Matrix-sampling of tests or of content within tests. The purpose is around school accountability.
- Performance tasks that are more connected to instruction would be more impactful for guiding instructional practice and personalizing education for students. Assessments should better reflect the complexity of real world tasks that we want to prepare students to succeed in. Both academic summative assessments and performance assessments (the latter to be created in each district and approved by CDE). I support PARCC.
- All students assessed (without opt-out option) in shorter, [interim] periods for growth. Smaller sampling (random, with appropriate sub-group representation) for summative assessments.
- Status measures are not enough. AYG measures need to exist independently from MGP measures. AYG measures need to be attainable (targets). Look at growth over time, such as a growth indicator (at schools). Score on a super-subgroup? Recommend not scoring at a super subgroup.
- AYG targets should be attainable for all kids, regardless of where they start (at, above or below). Measure whether schools are getting better over time as an indicator of growth. No super-subgroups for measuring growth.
- Assessment measures with timely data. Make sure we are really measuring individual student progress. Random sample of student testing. Student demonstration of



- competency of standards. Align benchmarking and progress monitoring to standards. Build on what is being done. Test results back in more training manner.
- Consider a module approach whereby there's a core so that all schools are assessing the same thing and then perhaps districts can add so that it considers the local context.
 - Standardized. Aligned. Balance use of results/purpose with the amount of time taken to administer and meaning to students. Do we do this currently at individual student level? Punitive? Focused on growth? Needs?
 - Standardized assessment with results to schools/teachers early instead of end of year. In aggregate. An assessment that had more instructional information. How can we get student buy in for these measures?
 - CDE or LEA? We as state could/should consider a combination of assessment data and performance based assessment results as an option for students to demonstrate competency in meeting the standards. It could be a menu of options and pathways.
 - Common assessment over the concepts within the state standards all content to be added to questions on test. Common middle school assessments for all schools within the school system assessing some material might be at different levels (6th, 7th, 8th). Assessment – multiple forms. Top down theory (finished project) complete the whole picture. First – break it down. Rubric check off sheet. Videotapes. IPad. Develop a sample. Student accountability. Parent accountability.
 - Knowing kids well enough to be able to determine what they know and what they need to know.
 - Ensure all content is covered in an “assessment,” i.e. comp health and PE included. Pre/post assessment – beginning of year and end of year. Performance based/portfolio type assessments whenever possible.
 - In a way that impacts students and teachers, schools less. Need to change UIP to allow for more real time assessments – district or state. Need more flexibility. Real time results that can truly GUIDE instruction. No 9th grade PARCC – go to PSAT. Continue to look at growth and achievement.
 - Measure less, increase academic time – decrease testing time. Opt-out rate is high in some districts. Usability of data is important to truly inform students, educators, and parents. Concern with delay in schools receiving test scores. Students have moved onto another grade. Get rid of 9th grade PARCC. Need to measure growth.
 - More timely so you can incorporate results. Look at overall picture of students as whole person – portfolio.
 - Assessments need to be meaningful and relevant; tied to real life after high school. Reports that go to parents are understandable and make sense. Do a parent focus group and have them explain what they see and understand. Multiple assessments.
 - Connection to Higher Education and CTE. Should it be tied to student grade? Moving from one grade to another required. Assessment results need to be shared before the following school year. Don't make language a barrier, allow students to show what they know.
 - Portfolio – for pre K-2. Standard measure with rubric.
 - Content should be measured in a language that students understand. We need tests that are in students' native language(s).



- Positive > common measures (mastery) – diploma/method to standards. Local assessments for formative use. Focus – student outcomes. Helpful – define test purpose. State tests = faster turnaround would be helpful. Equity as priority.
- Interim assessments – need more robust menu to choose from.
- Portfolio – authentic assessment – capstones. Formative vs. (incomplete response). Learning vs. accountability.
- End of single shot high stakes tests. Standard/competency based performance assessments over time. Mixture of assessments – holistic. Align report cards to measuring standard acquisition assessments in students’ home languages.
- Multiple ways at multiple times. Communicate with parents – coordinate district/school/state assessment so student not taking multiple tests that measure same thing. Push toward standards based grading so we can use grades as a measure of proficiency toward standards.
- Body of evidence – school accountability measures and look at percentage of growth and grade level or proficiency level.
- Growth assessments needed that provide feedback during the year so get data to guide instruction.
- There needs to be a more holistic way to measure mastery of standards. One test cannot show the effectiveness of instruction and learning. This isn’t a standards based system.
- Need to shorten the time required to accomplish the testing. Needs to be used in supporting/driving student instruction. Should only be used to measure grade competency not above “above and beyond.” Have to strongly protect student VII data.
- ELL’s should be allowed to demonstrate language proficiency first before tackling PARCC/CMAS, etc.
- Make the targets attainable particularly with the students below grade level. The growth needs to be equally/equitably challenged the higher poverty districts vs. lower poverty. Not in favor of super, sub-group particularly with EL’s and SPED. Would like to continue to have them scored separately.
- Currently, like common measure, like having a common standard. Don’t like the current rigidity of the assessments, does not like opt-out. Anxiety around PARCC. So many opt-outs make the test less effective (75% Manitou Springs).
- Measure both status and growth. Growth should have rigorous targets but achievable. Not based on AYP as this masks where student growth but below AYP. Keep disaggregation of all groups to be able to hold accountable of measure and student progress and proficiency of all students.
- Portfolios of work and interim assessments to supplement annual/periodic standardized tests. Especially for ELP assessments, performance-based assessments should also be incorporated. Assessments should be available in students’ home language and/or language of instruction for students EL classified.
- Not testing every year – sampling of grades each year but not everyone, less testing but does it single out some students (during the ‘short stick’)? Culturally designed? Data privacy? Not used for teachers evaluation – MAP instead? Lowering the hours needed. PARCC scores – small percentage actually proficient – maybe get a different test that meets need of more kids. Adaptive testing? Meaningful for students? – no stake in



scores, data back quickly – but what does it contribute to learning, instruction, as just growth?

- School tests, teacher tests.
 - Assessments - multiple times a year. Show progress for a student over time (e.g. MAPS assessments).
 - Portfolio that looks at multiple standards.
 - Meaningful to state, as well as to student and parents (improvement over time).
 - Day to day evaluations by teachers and staff/testing on a smaller scale/shorter, a variety of question types/portfolio of ongoing tests and grades that follow the child.
 - Set achievement level on the state tests.
 - Choice on how to show meet or exceed.
 - More competency options return to more complete state menu for all tested areas, not just ELA and math.
 - Allow multiple measures (not just statewide assessments).
 - Use benchmark tests that districts are already required to use.
 - Multiple measures.
 - How could benchmark testing and classroom assessments be used to inform progress?
 - Current system.
 - Timely – scores more quickly.
 - Student buy-in – kids need to care about and have a stake.
 - Appropriate lists for ELL/SPED.
 - Greater weight on achievement in high school.
 - Continue to measure social studies.
 - Ways to measure well rounded subjects (arts, languages, etc.) without substantial burden, (looking for district level assessments) – report what percentage or students “passed” in other subject areas.
 - Looking at number of students engaged in courses/well rounded activities.
 - Exposure to the content areas.
 - Set a baseline – allow students to develop, discover, hone their skills.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Not testing every student every year in math and language arts, sampling. Take a group of students, and see if the randomized data will show the progress of a school as a whole. Potential negatives: kids being pulled out of school. There is a way to balance it. Duration of assessments should be less. More like 3 to 5 hours in the year, instead of 10-12, something I hear often. Something more attainable: on PARCC the amount of kids who can actually be proficient are small, so it is discouraging. A smarter balance than PARCC. An assessment more like MAPS, adaptive exams are valuable. More precise about where skills lie. If you got the results back quickly, and show the student what they need to work in as well as what the teachers will gather about what they want to work on. Important to note the differences in output especially with affluent and not so affluent neighborhoods.
 - Not a student stake in the assessment. Something more meaningful for students. The most relevant to them is ACT, seems separate from what they are learning in school. Instead of having to stop the curriculum to take a separate exam. Exams can tell students where they are, blend instruction. It needs to be untangled from everything it's



tied to. MAPS should be more realistic. If we need an exam to show us how we measure to other states, we should make it short and sweet to get right to the point. Everyone got through the exam within an hour, even though there is a 2 hour time limit. They put less effort into it. Is there any cultural competency into the exam?

- Feels like spends most of the time teaching standards. Values the assessments for EL because they help understand what the kids are able to do and the things they should be able to do. Spends so much time doing assessments, feels limited in her time doing instruction. But doesn't even get the results back until the next year. And by that time, the student is not in her class. Would rather do portfolios, while she recognizes how hard it would be. Students would be better served by taking access test before taking the PARCC test.
- Different systems – taking short tests with students taking different content areas. Recognition of how parents receive results. Performance based work. Interest in a broad level. Considering the principals.
- Concerned about how assessments are driving the standards. It starts with the standards. When exams are written away from districts, we should trust teacher discretion. Not sure that the PARCC and CMAs test represent their standards. Standards should be primary and we should design tests around that.
- School and teacher tests. Assess reading skills, and gives scores by grade levels. The advantage of having students and parents know about success before they transition to a new teacher.
- Have accountability at all levels. Our current system is very horizontal. Having a maintenance log. Their individual learning plan. Moves based on their standards of success. There should be some sort of growth.
- Parents are much less skeptical of exams administered at multiple schools. Demonstrating accountability as not just a punishment. But as awards for improvements. Not just teaching the test. Finding ways to encourage exams.
- Exams have no value because they are not connected. With MAPS testing, you can monitor growth over the years. It's more valuable to see if my child is progressing. I care more about his own demonstrated proof rather than how he adds up to other students. Not a lot of test anxiety. Not immediate feedback. The trend is more telling. Kids develop in spurts. And you can see that across a couple of different subjects. Seeing where they made big jumps cognitively.
- We need more direction from CDE around all standards not just Lang Arts and Math.
- Multiple pathways to show progress is not an adequate measure. Allow teachers to have more ways of showing outcomes not just a state test.
- So if the state already has benchmark testing/measures why not use the same system to assess meeting the standards, especially with the READ act.
- Is a test really the right measure of student success?
- Testing takes too much time from learning.
- I'm from CEA and listen as well.
- Want to make sure ESSA is what's best for our students and schools
- Direction of teacher education program – integrate more formative assessments during the year. Integrate what we're already doing in formative assessments. This has more meaningful information for students and teachers. Assessment becomes a seamless course of business rather than an end of the year test.



- The only legitimate way to capture all of the diverse groups is something other than an end of the year snapshot. Formative assessments should be informative assessments.
- Assessments need to be something that students have buy-in for. Needs to be administered in a way the students can take the test age appropriately.
- The same way you teach is how you should test.
- Formative assessments would increase the participation rate issue.
- The challenge is the articulation of the standards and how districts articulate that. Should have a consistent way to articulate the standards across the state.
- Don't need to test everything under the sun. – Reading and math
- Doesn't have to be every student every year. Sampling – dipstick to see how students are doing.
- Don't use the assessments to evaluate the teachers.
- Define what the purpose of the assessment is.
- Teacher spends 80% of the time assessing standards – for ELs there are two sets of standards. The EL standards are useful but the ability to access what is required in PARCC is difficult.
- Too much time assessing so little time to instruct.
- Perfect world we'd like to use portfolios. Students would be better served if they took the ACCESS test prior to taking the PARCC test.
- Different systems – short cycled assessments that may not lead to a comparable score. Parents are used to school level scores.
- What is it we're trying to accomplish through the assessment?
- Concerned that the assessments are driving the standards. We are teaching to the standards – we should trust our teachers enough to know if their students are meeting the standards. I'm not confident that the test is getting at the standards.
- Jeffco has a lot of redundancy in assessments. Measure progress in a way that guides teachers in placement decisions and instructional decision-making. We don't get PARCC scores in time to drive instruction.
- MAPS is far better than Acuity, considers variety of learners. For-profit publishers should not be involved in test making.
- Closer alignment between assessment and instruction. Standards need to come first, assessment reflects standards.
- Wants cap for taking assessments. Time it takes to prep, set up, and administer, etc. is intensive. Many more hours in addition to actual time the tests take.
- Not confident PARCC and CMAS tests fairly represent our standards.
- Assessments should progress over time, have menu of options of tests.
- Let schools choose READ Act assessments, MAPS, etc.
- Should it be a test or could we be part of the [incomplete response].
- Can we track performance without a test?
- Difficulty of having multiple good measures.
- Costs for the assessments is phenomenal. Paying almost as much as testing as for teachers. Could teacher keep track of students' progress on standards over the year?
- Need to measure. Good that we have something that can help us see where we are. Is the amount of time necessary? Assessments programs are too long (e.g., nurses test for a few hours once every 4 years, 3rd graders test x amount of hours).



- Using PARCC we can look at the students vs. different states. Comparable data is important. Teachers want to show that what they are teaching is shown.
- Adding on modules, measure things within the district. A core concept but then adding on modules that make sense within individual districts.
- Make the assessments more authentic and valid.
- No immediate instructional feedback. With no feedback it takes away the validity on the student level. Low motivation to take the test by students.
- Amount of time taken on the test. There should be a message around this, or at least a better message.
- Not a fan of the sampling of the social studies tests. Again, the validity. Look at a different sampling method. Measure the state or district results instead of the individual student results.
- Need a good interim benchmark assessment that shows what can be used instead of the statewide assessment. Why do we have to have it? As long as the benchmarks are quality and approved by the state?
- Tell is taken by teachers, what about with students too?
- It would be important to have greater weight on achievement in the high school accountability than growth.
- I would like them to continue measuring social studies. I would love for there to be a non-intrusive way to look at the holistic standard that wouldn't be overbearing.
- Not sure how they will be able to measure growth between the 9th grade CMAS to the 10th grade PSAT.
- Districts, standards grading in the classroom. This way their grades would be a reflection of the standards learned.
- This is a single point in time, rather than choosing progress.
- Report card (Standard based grading).
- Parent education component.
- Giving districts that option.
- If Colorado is one of 7 states participating in the pilot assessment option, why don't give districts the option and opportunity for creative assessments?
- Parent – my kids have to do district assessment and state assessment - too much.
- Collaboration with state assessment and districts tests.
- A snapshot of different times.
- Is it fair to test students in social studies if they haven't seen this in 3 years?
- Interim assessments (students came in here, where are they now)?
- Mixture of things are needed.
- Movement toward competency based grading.
- Better guidance for teachers.
- Performance based assessment.
- Portfolio ideas.
- Standardize rubrics.
- Observation.
- Assessments in student's home language.
- Cumulative, adding up rather than one time deal across time.
- There is no starting read if you take the test at the end of the year.
- If you don't have the starting point, you test kids at the end they might be off.



- Portfolio system as a supplemental option.
- Pilot assessment: worry that there are kids that don't get benefits of the pilot.
- Certain students might have issues with the one-time assessment.
- Portfolio and more holistic approach.
- Students would be better served taking the ACCESS test before the PARCC tests.
- Performance based.
- Teacher: concern about how much the tests drive the standards. Make sure that the standards drive the test. Districts aren't allowed to look at the exam.
- Teachers should be allowed to look at the tests to make sure they are in alignment.
- Teacher feels that CMAS is not in alignment.
- All the academic standards need to be more holistic with multiple measures.
- Portfolio that allows kids to move across school districts.
- Having something that follows the students from place to place.
- Making it easier for students that move easier to transfer from a different district.
- Mobility of assessments.
- One of the real frustrations for us is how the test data is used. We were in a school where we had been for many years and student performance had improved, but when the school went green, the funding was pulled (we are an out of school time provider). Sometimes the testing data is pulled out of the context of what got kids there. If students in poverty don't have access to a quality summer program, they will always start the next school year 3 months behind. It's cumulative across grades as well (5th grade =15 months behind).
- One day high stakes tests aren't the best measure. We use on-going local assessments to inform our instruction.
- I think a lot of the routine measurement going on in the classrooms is very important. It's important to use continuous measurement.
- How districts measure student growth to determine a teacher's evaluation is important. We are finding that teachers who we might deem ineffective in the professional practices are getting an overall rating of effective because of the impact of scores.
- We have some teachers not wanting to take on student teachers because they don't want their evaluation to be impacted by that student teacher's instruction of their students.
- A D11 teacher at our table teaches mostly ELs, and she spends most of her time assessing whether they've met the academic standards. However, her students have two sets of standards. She values the assessments for ELs because it measures what they are able to do, but she has concerns about their ability to access what's being asked of them in PARRC. She is also concerned about the decreasing amount of time she has for instruction. Her students are also very mobile and often the students have moved on by the time she gets assessment results.
- Students would be better served if they could demonstrate their English language proficiency through ACCESS before taking PARRC.
- We discussed different systems. One was students taking different short tests to focus accountability at the school level. Parents have become accustomed to getting an annual report on their school's progress. There is interest in more performance based work, even though that comes with technical challenges. I wouldn't say that we came to one recommended system.



- I have become concerned about how much the assessments seem to drive the standards instead of the other way around. It's problematic when we have these assessments that are created outside of our district and we aren't allowed to see questions, etc. beforehand. I am not confident that the CMAS, etc. tests that we've been given fairly represent the standards. We need to focus on the standards coming first and then writing the tests to match that.
- Like that there are common measurements across multiple states. Good that PARCC is a consortium and can provide an indicator of where students fall within a larger sample size.
- Assessment that is transferable is preferable, but additional methods of collecting data to supplement the big picture test would be beneficial.
- If there is a local assessment – who is vetting that assessment and making sure that it is measuring what it is supposed to? Differing amounts of rigor amongst local assessments is problematic.
- Pitfall of local assessments is the n-size. How do you make sure that it is robust enough that students aren't taking the same tests each year (prevent answers from being shared/forwarded)?
- Short tests that are matrix sampled – not always the same content areas. However, parents have gotten used to receiving a yearly report that gives the overall snapshot of their children's performance.
- Concern that assessments drive standards instead of the other way around. We should trust our teachers enough to ensure that the curriculum is fairly reflected in the assessments. Focus on making the standards primary and developing assessments around that.
- Questions regarding how opt-outs will reflect on validity of data. Especially seniors in high school will not take the tests.
- Would like to develop assessments state-wide for physical education.
- How do you ask what is in PARCC in a meaningful way? Teachers feel limited in time to teach. Access results don't come back until next year, and with students being mobile it is hard to implement results. Ideally, would like to use a portfolio as an assessment. Would like kids to take the ACCESS test before PARCC and CMAS.
- Interest in a broad level of possibilities for testing. What are we trying to accomplish?
- Concerned over the last several years how assessments are driving standards, not the other way around. When tests are written outside the district, teachers don't know what types of reading content or math problems are on the test. The curriculum should be reflected on the test, but it does not seem to fairly represent the standards on the PARCC or CMAS. The test should be written to match curriculum.
- Agree with the need to align state and federal requirements. Too many layers of testing with PARCC and CMAS, there was non-stop spring testing. Kids get test fatigued, teachers have trouble maintaining a testing environment that long. Multiple choice, constructive response. A variety would be nice but it would be hard to consistently implement and reliably assess. Should have the same assessments in different districts. Need to make sure that assessments are used for the correct purpose. Not just using Dibels to measure all 2nd grade reading.
- More timely results. By the time they get feedback the kids are gone.
- Need to figure out how to tie into teacher evaluations in a meaningful way.



- Would be better for the lower grades to have something that is all one test, especially in the lower grades. The subjects taken at the end the kids aren't paying attention by then.
- To have the test as the basis for proficiency creates too many problems. Too much, and too weighted and tied to money and school success. The kids don't have any reason to care about the test, but it is tied to teacher grading. There is no other way to gather data about which kids could be in which academic programs. Doesn't seem to be a middle ground between the college track, vo-tech track and ones that haven't decided yet. Very stressful for kids that they have to be in IB or nothing else. Things are too high stakes for kids. There isn't a way for them to have balance.
- Making sure there is choice in how the students are doing testing. Opt-outs shouldn't hurt the school and give a 0 score.
- Looking at student progress that is meaningful, not just in numbers to the state, but to students and parents. Looking at trends and progress over time is helpful to students.
- Summative assessments are more for accountability purposes than student learning. Would like for assessments that are focused on student learning.
- Trade off would be the amount of time spent on testing, if do several interims throughout the year. It all depends how long the test would take, and when would get results back and whether it will be timely enough to use for adjusting instruction.
- How would we align what the pacing of instruction with the testing if we use statewide interims? That would be hard. It's already hard enough do that with the district interim measures.
- Current assessments are not measuring student progress on an individual basis. Intended to be used in aggregate.
- Need to make sure there is alignment between purpose of the assessment and how it's used.
- No accountability for students on their own performance – the assessment results need to be meaningful for students and provided to them in a timely manner.
- Use a more holistic approach to measuring student performance progress (e.g., portfolio).
- Teacher – teaches EL spends about 70% of time assessing student's knowledge of CAS and CELP. Has concerns about ELs' ability to access PARCC content in a meaningful way. Also concerned about how much time is lost for assessment. Timely return of test results to be used for instruction.
- Portfolios instead of assessment.
- Very different systems.
- Short tests.
- Various content areas – not comparable score. Accountability at school level.
- Recognition that annual assessments provide parents with info on how their children's school is doing.
- What is we are trying to accomplish? Should be clarified before we can finalize this conversation and really lead to [incomplete response].
- Teacher – assessments are driving our standards. It should be the other way around. We should trust our teachers enough to let them decide if the test is a good measure of our standards.
- PARCC and CMAS do not fairly represent our standards.



- Lower grades – attendance.
- Higher grades – engagement.
- Look at the whole child.
- College career course/access.
- Looking at what is already being done. School climate, students in school, and attendance/engagement. Adams 12 is looking for root causes.
- Equity issue.
- Looking at developmental education – ACCUPLacer and other college assessment.
- Measuring teacher satisfaction and growth in satisfaction.
- Leadership growth measure.
- Student perception.
- Look at electives that students take to address well-rounded education.
- Looking at outcomes that we care about for students and then talk about how to measure them.
- Not adding more. Can we use dropout measure work for high school and then we only need middle school and elementary school.
- Improvement Planning – having to use an external vendor to come into the school – happened to know the person who could be used so anticipated.
- Feedback/survey maybe – prior to working with the school to prepare them for working with the vendor and then give feedback at the end as to how.
- Personally will be hard to move away from PARCC because if you do the pieces will overlap, if we get an assessment pilot that would be a way to look at things differently. How do we adjust our assessment at the high school level then it isn't a growth, it is a statement level of where we are. Our lowest opt-out rates are at ACT, because kids understand the importance of the test. Once the state board opened Pandora's Box with the opt-out piece how do you measure goals across the state? So if opt-out exists how are we going to be able to compare across the different areas.
- Whole piece around the standards are going to be reviewed. Accountability is in flux, state is going to review its standards.
- Big problems, no school performance frameworks last year, move the cheese, how do we do comparable data.
- Opt-out rates from last year, 862 this year much higher at high school.
- Ideally continue with the use of PARCC testing and use it so everyone can use the data to drive instruction with the use of the data. Then to have mid-year scope and sequence have to follow the testing and test throughout the year to follow.
- Should be more than content, based exactly around academic success. Standards should incorporate more emotional and social development to build a stronger student character to achieve. Physical health is also an issue for students to learn academically. Can we build that also into it? Building a more interactive classroom.
- It is difficult to find a product to measure student progress at the secondary level.
- What will happen during the SAT, ACT transition? The interim assessment.
- Think about growth and achievement and how they play together, interplay.
- Interim assessments - the state should offer more of a menu to choose from!
- How about capstone projects? Can they be used for graduation?
- What are the assessments used for? Formative vs. summative. Formative in the district and the summative at the state level.



- Rural vs. urban districts – access to broadband, access to technology, knowledge of technology usage.
- With electronics- what are we assessing? The knowledge of how to use a computer or the content?
- More local control over the testing accommodations at schools for kids.
- Use a model based on matrix sampling that would mean students are not completing the same items. This focuses on providing information about performance at the school level.
- Still ensure that parents and students receive individual student performance data.
- Find a balance between the amount of time and value of information returned.
- Use better items to capture the critical thinking we care about -- performance-based tasks.
- The constraints of a standardized testing system seem to create problems for measuring the things we care about.
- If we just fixed grading then that would provide the information parents need.
- Still need information as an external “check” in students’ grades.
- How do you reconcile parents wanting student level results with the high level of parent refusals?
- Well-developed district level system tied to curriculum coupled with external sampling as a check.
- District/classroom level assessment has an advantage of improving instruction.
- Whatever system we build/adjust, it needs to be based on some clear principles and then we should figure out a structure that meets those principles.
- Need to measure. Good that we have something that can help us see where we are. Is the amount of time necessary? Assessments programs are too long (e.g., nurses test for a few hours once every 4 years, 3rd graders test x amount of hours).
- Using PARCC we can look at the students vs. different states. Comparable data is important. Teachers want to show that what they are teaching is shown.
- Adding on modules, measure things within the district. A core concept but then adding on modules that make sense within individual districts.
- Make the assessments more authentic and valid.
- No immediate instructional feedback. With no feedback it takes away the validity on the student level. Low motivation to take the test by students.
- Amount of time taken on the test. There should be a message around this, or at least a better message.
- Not a fan of the sampling of the social studies tests. Again, the validity. Look at a different sampling method. Measure the state or district results instead of the individual student results.
- Need a good interim benchmark assessment that shows what can be used instead of the statewide assessment. Why do we have to have it? As long as the benchmarks are quality and approved by the state.
- Tell is taken by teachers, what about with students, too?
- It would be important to have greater weight on achievement in high school accountability than growth.
- Continue measuring social studies. I would love for there to be a non-intrusive way to look at the holistic standard that wouldn’t be overbearing.



- Not sure how they will be able to measure growth between the 9th grade CMAS to the 10th grade PSAT.

Discussion Question #2: What measures of school quality or student success should be included in the school accountability system?

- **Feedback Forms:**

- The atmosphere of a “well-rounded” education (arts, electives, CTE, etc.) percentage of students in activities/sports. Culture of the school. Awards received by teachers, publications, community involvement. Not only a world of academia. Attendance at lower age, engagement at high school level. Increase state funding for schools.
- Safety – to student, parents. Should measure school-wide engagement with different classes to student, teachers, parents, admin. Teacher retention. Social-emotional learning. Tracking of behavior referrals – disaggregated. Exposure to the arts, PE, music – is this equal across the schools? What are kids exposed to?
- Health and well-being. Healthy kids CO survey (asks safety, bullying, school engagement as well as healthy behavior and unhealthy). Behavioral referrals. Safety. Let schools choose different menu options. Absenteeism. Teacher engagement/growth.
- Student and teacher engagement surveys. Safety of students and staff. Attendance for lower grade levels.
- Student aggregate survey. Teacher aggregate survey. Admin aggregate survey. Moving college exams down to 10th or 11th grade level.
- Whole student. Access to full day Kindergarten. Access to PE, music, digital teacher learning, foreign language, CTE, STAFFING! Access to quality evaluation. Specialized/support professionals re: counselors, social workers, nurses, etc. Quality of craft – % of staff that leave in 3 years. Quality of professional development. Mentor and indicators.
- Add attendance and engagement (how would you measure). College readiness (access to).
- Cap time spent on state testing. Access to PE, art, music, technology, libraries, paraprofessional support, full-day kindergarten. Teacher satisfaction and teacher/staff directed professional development.
- As few as possible. Using a measure for accountability corrupts a measure and makes it less likely to be of value to schools.
- Weight academic growth over academic achievement. Consider measures of social-emotional well-being, but be very cautious about adding to an accountability system. Less is more. If you can slim it down – reading at k-5, math 6-8, graduation 9-12.
- Attendance (percent of chronically absent). For elementary schools – improvement over the course of K-2 on READ tests (students identified as having significant reading deficiencies in K/1st grade improving by 3rd grade).
- College and career readiness (enrollment in technical, vocational, 2-4 year college). Achievement/growth results from sample summative assessments.
- Attendance would be a measure that schools consistently called currently and wouldn’t require significant changes to parent forms and collection databases. High school-engagement (i.e., Clubs, sports, etc.). Would want the flexibility to add our own measures.



- Most reliable indicators would be attendance and behavior (could be harder due to local control). Measure student engagement for hours? Whole child-physical/mental health.
- Student growth progress in other areas. Engagement? Can we use something we already do or replace something instead of something new?
- Attendance – but counted across the state consistently. Parent engagement survey – consistent across the state “valid and reliable” across the state that would disaggregate. Early literacy measures.
- School health policy and practice (e.g. CO schools smart source). School climate data. Social-emotional data. Health behavior data (HKCS).
- Existing data - use what we have. For what purpose? Must be purpose driven!!! Attendance, student engagement, health? Student surveys re: climate culture SPS.
- Whatever it is, it can't be something new. Many schools/district are already doing climate surveys with students. Parent, staff, etc. Could we just get credit for doing that and addressing it in our UIP?
- LEA's could also consider including student and staff survey results which could address culture and climate, engagement, etc. Districts could collect data from students, families, community and staff on how diverse and varied course offerings have an impact on student success in the pK-12 environment and beyond. This would be in addition – only add what we feel is missing to see (whole child)!
- Growth of students – through the concepts. Rating scale, attendance, chronic absence, climate survey. Whole child. Reading, writing and math question related to middle school (core) concepts but directed toward elective content consistent to back – state testing.
- School climate (student and teacher measures). Would need to define “success,” lower subjectivity. Chronic absenteeism. Healthy kids Colorado survey (grade 6-12). Smart source. Perception surveys (students and teacher measures). Grit, resiliency, etc.
- Achievement, growth, post-secondary readiness (no matriculation). Can we just assess reading and not ELA? School climate.
- Achievement, growth. Graduation. Highly qualified highly effective teachers. Healthy kids survey. Health measures for students. Safety plans. Financial sustainability. Climate and culture. Social/emotional wellness and curriculum, mindfulness, character building. Insurance (health) of students (access to healthcare). Attendance. Access to health to student (nurses, counselors).
- Engagement in school? Attendance, pb at small rural districts.
- Need to look at whole child enrichment rather than just academia. Students and staff are constantly showing growth. Offer arts, music, other area of interest for students above and beyond.
- School/parents look beyond core and consider other activities: yoga, dance, theater. Access to the arts.
- Well established pre-K to 20 systems. Engagement measures. Teacher growth in professional development. Support the whole child.
- A measure of equity. Teacher qualification and teacher experience.
- Ultimately student outcomes. Transition from elementary – middle school]/ Ind#14: PSWR. Possibly – TELL and climate surveys/attendance. Calibrate – come to consensus/operationalize/ possibly: resilience and persistence (executive functioning).



- Retention at the post-secondary level. Remediation rates at post-secondary level. How does this affect elementary and middle school levels. SPF tools need to consider schools that deal with different issues (attendance rates, culture, climate, college access, safety, etc.) serve different markets.
- Number of students who more into a career focus post-graduation – percentage attendance. Kentucky school improvement rubric.
- Begin notion of accountability with focus on how high-need communities get more funding and human resources. Engagement, attendance, access to college/career readiness. School climate culture. Community perceptions.
- Child health. Planning, [periodization], time management and possibly study skills and if students have these skills – standardized test scores will improve.
- Psychological safety – although more with a bonus lens as there is not currently a good consistent measure.
- Valid, reliable. Include PE considerations, career and college readiness, social emotional.
- How do we measure college/career readiness, “soft” skills? Physical education/health. Shouldn’t we measure schools for their true mission and not if we can provide everything to everybody? I wonder how safety, health, collaboration, culture can be evaluated without a survey? Whole child? What is over role? Do we do it all? Testing sets values.
- Climate – teacher satisfaction in professional growth based on their input given during evaluations. Teacher retention and growth. A quality standard for principals that measures teacher satisfaction in professional growth.
- Attendance seems to be an easy way to track for all grades, but concerned that at high school attendance may not be appropriate and may want to consider engagement through activities and programs.
- Matriculation, employment, indicator 14. Need to look at post-secondary workforce outcomes. Transition between levels could be measured. School climate at state level for kids. Attendance. Healthy children. Teacher satisfaction with administrator.
- Could you share more about the correlation of measures like attendance and behavior state-wide? This is correlated to student success in our district but not sure what that looks like statewide. Avoid measures like school culture, re-enrollment (targets). That can be defined so differently across different communities. Allow districts ability to add their own measures.
- Elementary – (T) engagement (surveys of feeling supported, empowered), (T) retention, (S) engagement (attendance, satisfaction/climate surveys). Secondary: disaggregated access to college readiness courses (AP/IB), (S) engagement, (T) engagement. Regardless of chosen measures, approach should be to support struggling schools rather than punitive.
- College prep. School climate. Chronic absenteeism. Electives.
- BRFS question: Percentage of students that feel forced to have sex when they don’t want to.
- Climates that don’t protect children from sexual assault, sexual harassment (kids who don’t feel safe, can’t learn).
- CO TELL survey.
- Multiple.
- School quality, should include measures of school climate.



- Emphasis on growth and advancement (vs. proficiency) tracking individual growth.
- Valid and reliable student surveys – similar to the TELL survey.
- Think about use of TELL (something we already do).
- Student surveys (national ones that are already valid and reliable).
- Look at opportunities for access – access to programs, after school services like mental health etc.
- Community engagement.
- Mental health growth.
- Concurrent enrollment at high school.
- Perceptual surveys (TELL or student).
- Measuring the ten extra “Colorado areas of standards” with a focus on arts.
- Time spent or exposure emphasizing whole child and exposure over complete focus on core content areas.
- Recess/PE/activity in elementary; middle.
- Exposure to programs (high).
- Family and community exposure.
- Advancement (graduation from grade to grade). Transit rate. Advancement of student (years’ worth of growth).
- Bonus points for extra offerings, IB, AP, arts, PE, humanities, social studies.
- Student engagement – to help us understand what programs are working, school attendance.
- Number of students taking “well rounded” courses, involvement in clubs include environmental education in well-rounded subjects.
- Credentials/quality of teachers.
- Give schools the opportunity to do really well in some areas and not as high in others (courses offered, opportunities etc.).
- Retention – looking at student retention - match a school to student. Did school meet the needs? Why do students choice out? Transition – success at next school k-6 to 7-9?
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Something that you can measure statewide, a lot of things go into that that are hard to quantify. Should look at attendance.
 - Hard to fit all schools in (GVA, studio schools). Their results will look different. What was congress thinking? Do they not have a measure for nationwide system?
 - Measuring IB and AP tests in rural schools would be really difficult. Should be some way to give well performing schools some credit. School accountability committees. We don’t have a measure. If you are trying to get beyond standardized test, what does the classroom look like? Do your kids want to go to school? If you’re able to provide resources like Boulder, there will be a difference. Like with field trips.
 - Start seeing trends in middle and high school, the parents start to check out maybe and that doesn’t necessarily mean the school isn’t performing well.
 - Very hard to operationalize in places like rural Colorado.
 - Adding attendance into the lower levels, and engagement in higher ones like high schools.
 - Look at the whole child. Looking at the health of our children. We should measure that in our schools.



- Secondary level, have some way to learn college readiness skills and access to (not outcomes from).
- See what is already being done, focused on school climate focus on what is out there. Chronic absenteeism.
- Equity across the state is really hard. State education funding levels. More wealthy districts can offer more opportunities.
- Looking at development of education, looking for what they are paying. Accuplacer – moving that down to the junior year of high school. Measure teacher satisfaction and growth.
- Student surveys – student perception vs. teacher. Look at electives and the number that students are expecting.
- Maybe we should look at outcomes for the learners that we care about. Broadening the outcomes, without corrupting it in a broader framework. Might only want to think about what we can measure in elementary and middle schools that go beyond content learning.
- Some of the things mentioned such as attendance and behavior are interesting but once made a measure then how do you measure? Things are measured differently at the state vs. Indian ED.
- Really do think that attendance is a huge thing.
- It would have to be something unique to each school in my district such as IB. It would be hard to come up with a single measure since what makes them good is the “special” things they are doing.
- We can have more than one, the law only says one.
- Teacher turn-over is tricky in our district especially with regards to EL instruction. We spend time in training teachers then they leave and we have to start all over again the next year.
- Behavior such as expulsion and suspension. The hard thing about that is that you don’t want there to be a benefit to “low suspension” rates so it doesn’t reflect poorly on us. Climate and culture of a school is important. How can that be measured so that it doesn’t hurt?
- A parent engagement measure would be good.
- It is good to look at the whole child, we need to measure this in our schools.
- Secondary level, college courses—access to not outcomes towards.
- Trying to see what is already being done, focused on school climate.
- Finding underlying causes of behavior.
- Looking at equity as an issue to consider when finding a measure, especially with low funding and rural district resources.
- Looking at developmental education. Take a look at what is happening in higher ED. Find a way to assess school administration and look at teacher success under these administrators.
- Challenged by Equity issue - look at student surveys as a measure. How can we look at electives as a measure of “well rounded”?
- Let’s start with the outcomes we want for our students and then figure out how to measure. Could our existing “drop out.”
- How do we measure student success? The whole child needs to be paid attention to. Want to advocate for how we can incorporate other benchmarks for defining



benchmarks such as citizenship. Other ways to ensure we are measuring success such as mental health. Are we including those kinds of measures when we look at student success?

- The interesting thing with this one is that it has to be statewide. How can we incorporate the TELL survey? Can we look at something similar from the student perspective? Challenge will be “disaggregation”. We can look at things like # of students taking certain assessments or # of school counselors in a school; attendance.
- Other opportunities as well, for those kids who are not making it in traditional systems. What are alternatives/options for students? Concurrent enrollment.
- What other school activities do students have access to?
- Community opportunities for students.
- Boys and Girls Clubs—how does a student demonstrate citizenship?
- Going beyond standards and thinking about the whole child—have standards for social emotional, going for a uniquely local measures.
- Physical health should be included.
- Consider the idea of bonus points for schools that offer IB, AP, and other co-curricular areas that are not currently tested.
- School Quality- I always got great feedback when I did anonymous surveys of teachers. Teachers should be able to provide feedback regarding school quality from a teacher perspective. (Tell surveys are not required so that’s an issue).
- Teacher feedback is critical. However, who will be accountable for the results?
- Facilities vary across the state. Some public school facilities are deplorable.
- We should evaluate the quality of the physical plant – if it’s important it should be measured.
- Where does poverty play into this? It seems like all the schools that have poor ratings have high poverty. How can that come into consideration?
- At what point do we hold the parents accountable?
- Is school quality different than student success? Can you use teacher qualifications as a measure? Can you use the number of students enrolled in AP or upper level course work?
- Needs to be a holistic approach.
- Can you use parent satisfaction surveys?
- How do you measure student success collectively across the whole state? Use one of the standard assessments ACT / SAT to measure student success.
- We’re economically committed to PARCC but it is not meeting our needs.
- Can you use uniform benchmarks rather than a [in complete response].
- Elementary grades use attendance.
- High school use some measure of engagement.
- Look at the whole child – we must measure the health of our children.
- Student access to college readiness courses – access to, not outcomes from.
- Focus on school climate, chronic absenteeism.
- It’s hard to find something that can be used equitably across the state.
- Assess school administrators.
- Start with the outcomes we care about for our learners and how can we measure that?
- Don’t add more.
- Could the existing drop out measure work for high school?



- Student retention and family retention with an exit interview for those who leave.
- Could we do something that any district could measure?
- Well-rounded education standards for each school – number of hours of PE, art etc.
- Is it a measure of what the schools offer or how many hours each student participates?
- Opportunity for us to consider tracking data in meeting needs to whole students, access to arts, music, career/tech ed., how schools are able to access staffing (psychologists, media specialists, etc.), class size, improving student growth, quality in professional develop in district or building.
- Look at other things affecting learning, not so much outcome based.
- Measures that look at “Access to” and not “outcomes from.”
- Hard to nail down one measure across the state because of resources, rural vs. urban, etc.
- School quality is an amorphous definition. The ability to do it comprehensively is a huge challenge.
- How do you get the majority of the subgroups incorporated into the TELL survey?
- Definition of what “quality” entails in the school? It’s too broad.
- Surveys. One person that gathers all the data which would make it less burdensome.
- CDE only has 7 indicators, would argue that there would need to be more.
- Nothing is going to be helpful, it is only going to be imposed on the districts.
- Decrease the burden.
- How do you get around the bias?
- I love the idea of being able to measure the level of engagement of students.
- Not sure how they can do that with a survey and be able to disaggregate it.
- Communities need to provide input and participation of how funds are used.
- Is UIP a state or a federal requirement?
- State.
- Written by the school.
- Challenge: making sure kids have access to resources.
- There’s a punitive approach rather than offering access and resources.
- Schools are part of a larger economic system.
- Accountability means where the proportion of the funds are distributed in a way that’s equal.
- State funding model, where certain areas receive more than others.
- Non-cognitive.
- Teacher retention.
- Access to college readiness courses.
- Climate survey.
- School quality and high student success, retention and teacher engagement.
- Attendance, engagement factor, one of the ways.
- Attendance is a measure of quality, it’s not necessarily an indicator of high performance.
- As a principal of a turnaround school, there was high expulsion, but the goal was trying to clean up the school.
- This doesn’t mean the school is not improving.
- Satisfaction survey for parents and teachers and kids.
- School being held accountable, based on performance on every child. Lots of issue with property, refugee students.



- Accountability should take into account different resources and context.
- Look at the whole child.
- Look at the health of the student.
- Trying to see what's already being done, what are you already doing.
- School Climate.
- Equity across the state, resources.
- Taking accuplacer.
- Measuring teacher satisfaction.
- Equity issue: student surveys, student perception and teacher performance.
- Look at electives and how many students take.
- Focus on growth and not just proficiency and advancement.
- Don't just look at the last snapshot of the year, but see longitudinal growth.
- Renewed emphasis on growth.
- Use Tell survey data.
- Measure around learning environment.
- Access to technology and clean water.
- Broaden definition of school success, especially for rural districts.
- What large districts can accomplish is not the same for rural districts.
- There's a concern with Growth, but what do we really want?
- What happens to the 12th grader that is below grade level?
- The graduation requirements are an issue here with grad rates impacting accountability because some districts, like ours, have higher standards (requiring more credits) for graduation where others have lower but we are all measured by grad rate. This also makes it tough for students who move between districts.
- If we require something additional, who pays for it?
- The 21st Century graduation requirements will further complicate this because we are preparing different sets of kids for different sets of requirements.
- Trying to find a measure that equally fits Delta and Denver is a challenge. How do you set one regulation that truly fits every single district? When these new rules come out from CDE, our large districts can usually handle it, but these small districts where the Superintendent is also many other positions, it's hard for them. Are there ways that districts can provide information to the State about what they're doing every day? This would be helpful to smaller districts. For example, student data privacy is going to kill these smaller districts.
- Is there something the State could provide, such as online parent education to ease the burden on these districts?
- Student engagement would be an appropriate measure for high school students.
- Looking at the health and well-being of our students is imperative in measuring school quality.
- It's important for schools to have an opportunity to report college readiness and access to higher education (not outcomes).
- Talked about trying to see what is already being done, getting feedback on schools and districts on what they are already doing to measure school climate, chronic absenteeism, etc.



- We didn't really come up with a solution because we kept bumping into equity across the state. What might work for one district, won't necessarily work for another. Some of your wealthier districts may be able to offer more opportunities.
- Looking at developmental education and the millions of dollars students are spending to take placement assessments. We also talked about measuring teacher satisfaction.
- Challenged by the equity issue. We did talk some about student surveys and also combatting the NCLB focus on math/science by looking at access to electives.
- Maybe we should start by asking what outcomes we value for our learners and then figuring out how to measure those from there. We also talked about not adding more and could our existing drop-out measure meet the requirement for high school?
- Do not want schools/districts to be required to keep track of postsecondary measures – matriculation, etc. Students who go on to CTE aren't counted. Schools/districts can't intervene to make sure that students go where they say they will go.
- Expand the measures of health and wellness to include school climate. There is a need to find valid tools that will make these results valuable. Potential surrounding a tool recently released by USDE.
- Potentially use attendance as a measure.
- If attendance is used, consider complementary measures.
- Adding attendance into lower grades as a measurement, and engagement into high school.
- Important to look at the whole health of the child.
- Focus on school climate and already available assessments..
- Equity across the state could be problematic. Measurements may not be scalable throughout all Colorado districts. If you measure engagement/opportunities, bigger/wealthier districts will naturally be able to provide more for their students.
- Measure teacher satisfaction/career growth. Measures for school administrators.
- There is research showing increased correlation between student performance and teacher satisfaction. Maybe also look at the number of electives that students are participating in.
- What measures are already available which show the outcomes that we want to measure?
- Health of students in the school, and physical education, recess, playground, etc. Depends by school how much time that kids will get to spend on this.
- Arts should also be measured.
- Social-emotional health.
- How do you include special education kids without pulling down scores?
- How do you create a measure for this type of indicator?
- How do you assess the "whole child" and career and college readiness? Need to show value for the whole child and pick up on strengths for all kids. To have dignity in the school environment. Get past the desk.
- Idea of "bonus points" or incentive for creating a new indicator. Would like to have more flexibility than with NCLB as far as assessments.
- How can you measure "soft skills" without using testing. Things like college/career readiness, being on time, etc. What do we value? What we test is what we value, it is important to be aware of that. Are math standards really the most important thing we value, since we test that so much?



- Working with kids who have special needs, or deficits in planning skills, executive planning skills. Would project-based learning help?
- How do you create a system that isn't going to weight different factors too strongly to bring school ratings down.
- Attendance from lower grades. Engagement for upper grades.
- At secondary level, report college readiness and access to IB or AP classes.
- See what is already being done and get feedback from schools. Use school climate, and chronic absenteeism.
- Equity across the state – what will work in one area won't work in others because of access. Especially what rural districts have access to. Some wealthier districts will have access to more opportunities.
- Development education. What can be done to use accuplacer or compass in the Junior year of high school, to put some of the things to be ready for college? Teacher satisfaction and growth. Assess school administrators, teacher happiness and success to evaluate administrators.
- Student surveys – correlation between student perception and teacher performance. Look at electives, the number of elective classes that students take.
- What outcomes do we care about for our learners, and then talk about how we can measure them. Go beyond content learning then make sure we are not corrupting the thing we want to measure by trying to put into an accountability system.
- Could the existing drop out measure meet this standard for high school?
- Instead of being weighted, but being bonus points for IB, AP, music programs and co-curricular areas that aren't tested.
- Is a test the right way to measure performance? Would the alternative assessment program be helpful because the root cause is lack of participation and engagement from the type of testing?
- People seem to be opting-out because of the many uses of the testing, as well as the time that it takes to do all the testing.
- Attendance and/or student engagement.
- Adams County Youth Initiative – survey about culture and climate used countywide in Adams. But concerned about using something like that for accountability purpose.
- Bonus points for culture/climate.
- Cannot/should not add another thing that is new for schools to administer. It absolutely cannot add another burden on the schools/district. Use something existing and repurpose what we are already collecting.
- TELL data.
- Testing alone does not address the needs of students. Need to focus on improving the supports and instruction to students.
- Difficult to choose which measure because by choosing them do we have people not expel kids because we use expulsions as a measure. Same with the pieces of truancy and across the different sub-groups within the demographics areas.
- Could we use AP classes, but that causes issues with small rural districts that have to offer those pieces through an online pieces.
- How about parent satisfaction for those pieces of surveys?



- Trying to think broadly that what would work for all schools. Everyone thinks their school is the best. I do think surveys for student climates are interesting. I recommend a broad literature view of what other states are using.
- Bring that back to Colorado.
- Outside agency – they would like to help support educators. Student engagement and how would that look and indicators for that. Students that may need additional supports and do not fall into a sub-group. Looking at a holistic measure, from not only the child perspective but to the community and the parents. Looking at a system approach of measures. Using observational data from a teacher evaluation. What does an engaged child look like for a student? What do skills and collaboration look like? What are the observational pieces you see and what does that look like?
- Retention rates at the secondary level.
- Remediation rates at the secondary.
- Grit survey with students.
- More of a focus on growth.
- School community involvement.
- School leadership effectiveness.
- Welcoming communities survey.
- Should take in to account the market that the school serves- EL, poverty, migrant.
- More student surveys - are you supported? Are you challenged?
- Number of electives that kids take during the year to try and promote a well-rounded education.
- Whole child!
- Rather start with the question of what “construct” do we want to measure?
- Still care about academic performance.
- What is the place for non-academic student outcomes? Social/emotional outcomes.
- Could we use attendance?
- Parents care about the degree to which their students are working at school, but measuring that is difficult.
- Social emotional outcomes matter - a shift towards the whole child. We need to develop a generation of well-developed future citizens that can be successful in this world. For lack of a better term, those soft skills are important. But do we want to create another beast of measurement?
- I don't know that I would want that to be an accountability measure.
- Need to balance our interest in a broader set of outcomes for learners with not wanting to corrupt measures by putting them into the accountability system.
- School climate does matter - a school ought to be able to point towards their positive climate as a way in which to show their effectiveness especially if they are a school serving a diverse set of students with challenges related to academic performance.
- Who wouldn't want to know if their students want to go to school?
- This feeds multiple measures.
- A big struggle with all of this is what happens to a measure once it gets used for accountability. The higher stakes you put on a measure, the more it gets distorted and misrepresents performance of a school.
- Even in measuring attendance, we might not want to shoot for 100%. Would we want students to come to school sick?



- Would like to measure the things that are most critical predictors of student success - 3rd grade literacy, 8th grade algebraic thinking.
- If we start with the measure rather than the “what” we want to measure, we skip the most important question.
- Our current drop-out measure might meet the requirement for high school so we may be able to only add measures for elementary and middle.
- Do we want to add more to the accountability frameworks?
- May be important to keep this new indicator parallel with the existing indicators that are part of, and/or must be included in our accountability system. That would mean the focus is a student-level outcome that is aggregated to a school-level measure.
- Surveys. One person that gathers all the data which would make it less burdensome.
- CDE only has 7 indicators, would argue that there would need to be more.
- Nothing is going to be helpful, it is only going to be imposed on the districts.
- Decrease the burden.
- How do you get around the bias?
- I love the idea of being able to measure the level of engagement of students.
- Not sure how they can do that with a survey and be able to disaggregate it.

Discussion Question #3: How should the state consider the 95% assessment participation requirement?

- **Feedback Forms:**

- Allow/encourage English test score to be in school grade. Test scores should be reflective in course grades. Graduation requirement. Drives license requirement. Increase state funding for education.
- If stigma of high achieving HA stokes best AWD and looks to embed testing into school. Did this problem solve itself?
- Please do not count parent opt-outs against districts or schools.
- I wish we could count only those whose parents did not opt them out.
- How do we place any value on assessment data with less than this? We should not allow opt-out. (if we do, we might as well not assess for use beyond individual students).
- We are already meeting this requirement.
- I think the state’s current approach is good, if it’s allowable, it seems like it’s a good compromise. In the end, it’s more likely that more affluent students will be opted which impacts districts’ overall percentages, as it is also likely the more affluent students will have higher achievements.
- Provide an incentive for those that do meet the 95%.
- Not as much of a concern at elementary level.
- Consider rewarding higher than 95% participation and be sure to keep taking out parent refusals.
- Parents accountable/students need to be accountable! Attachment to move from grade level to next. No accountability - don’t do or care.
- School value/use in the data. Tie school quality and student success to data collection systems schools are already participating in - HKCS, smart source, climate/perception surveys, and then providing training and professional development on how to use the data.



- This is problematic. With high opt-out rates. Need this to be equitable for all.
- The data should be tied to a standard. Miss secondary assessment to better determine how students are progressing.
- Parent opt-out not a part of participation requirement.
- 95% of those eligible to test.
- In what fashion? District vs. state compliance.
- The highest opt-out is higher SES. We should require testing only if it is a single body of evidence. If we don't then the data is useless. If it is not 95% required the state must figure out how to ignore the test data.
- With a well-balanced testing philosophy, efficient/timely/used in student growth you'll have less opt-out. Increase student data privacy. Licensure.
- 95% should include ELL's taking ACCESS until ready for PARCC/CMAS.
- Spending more energy on fixing concerns from question #1 which will likely decrease opt-outs vs. hammering home the 95% rule.
- Consider the parent opt-outs to ensure they do not hurt schools.
- Re-evaluate the parent "opt-out" criteria.
- Current "scale" is a one-level lowering of plan type (but not being held to it yet).
- If schools are getting "hurt" by opt-out scores, then the penalty needs to match schools also.
- Look at participation on district assessments. For example, if a student participates in all district assessments, that should count.
- If a parent opts-out their child of state assessments, should not count as zero. Should just be noted within their participation – number who took the test, number who opted out.
- Competitive grant for a school who needs to improve seems counterintuitive.
- Perhaps different criteria for different kinds of districts.
- It is going to be very difficult to change the momentum of parent opt-outs. I would make sure that this does as little to punish districts and schools as possible.
- 95% of students not opted-out. Huge teaching/outreach to parents and students.
- Need participation rates that don't undermine the accountability system.
- Both. Schools should have some flexibility to use funds to implement strategies that meet greatest needs, but there may be specific initiatives that need to be pushed statewide that would allocate a portion of the funds in competitive ways.
- Pro-active and education to parents and students. Informed decisions on choice out.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - If we address the issues on the front end about the purpose, stake and relevance for kids, making it more adaptive, then I don't think the 95% will be an issue. About 700 kids opted out in 3-9, more in middle and high schools for Adams.
 - Data privacy is important to consider as well.
 - Better understanding of purpose and focus. Our energy shouldn't be spent on championing the 95% rule, instead of fixing the other problems that exist with exams. Maybe more leniency in high school than in middle schools?
 - We have schools with 40% - it was almost a sense of discouragement to kids participating.
 - Some parents don't understand the purpose of testing especially for ELs.



- It is not representative of the school. Our highest achievers are not participating.
- As all the opt-out was happening—the only ding to a schools is a lowering of identification, but no consequences at the moment.
- If you have 100% of kids participating with all the opt-out definitions taking place.
- There needs to be consistent way to “consider” opt- out, meshing of opt out and the 95% required.
- If students have been participating in MAPS—then why can’t this be counted overall—body of evidence?
- Make sure all systems are working together for 95% rate.
- You need to have kids and parents buy into the test in order to get to 95%.
- The test has to have a purpose.
- No large group response other than the test has to be meaningful.
- Hard to put quantitative measure on it.
- Higher-performing students are more likely to opt-out. 1/7 students were opted-out. Need to create a more considerate test so opt-out wouldn’t be an issue.
- 95% takes care of itself. If we move away from tests that are viewed by parents etc. that are high-stakes and not valuable.
- Benefit our families for a process of refusal for federal tests.
- 95% of those who want to take the test, or who do take the test—not of total student population.
- Are tests actually measuring standards and are tests the best answer? So many parents, teachers, etc. are against the assessments because they don’t really measure student progress.
- Opt-out is really about meaningful assessments.
- Is opt-out caused by assessment itself and/or the use of the assessment? Crowd says both, more so the latter.
- It makes no sense to have an accountability section if we don’t have participation in the accountability section.
- How is participation monitored at the charter school level?
- State doesn’t include data for private schools. State is not required to measure participation for different schools. This is a problem.
- This is a huge problem for us because State law and the State Board motion totally contradict the federal requirement. We have a huge phenomenon of high performing student opt-out. If these students have to be considered non-proficient under ESSA, how will this impact our district? There is no way we will ever get 95% ever again.
- I was talking to a superintendent that has a district with very high poverty and English learners and everybody takes the assessment. It’s wrong that they have everyone taking the assessment and they will be low performing yet our district will still be seen as shining when nobody is testing.
- If, instead of the one-day test, we used the on-going classroom-based assessments, we might see less opt-outs.
- District was upset that they were dinged for participation in a previous year, but the year when they met participation requirements, districts who did not meet requirements were not penalized.
- Parents feel like their students are over-tested.



- If students were needing to choose between different tests, parents would likely push them to focus on AP (or similar classes) rather than the state assessment.
- Provide incentives for schools/districts that are above 95% participation rate. Some schools are really working hard to promote student participation and should be rewarded for that.
- One thought is a given, if a district falls below. Is there a way for them to provide MAP data or something else? Use of a supplemental testing piece. We still need accurate data to help with instruction. We need something that is representative useful.
- Or have a two tiered system, like we had the state accountability and the district pieces.
- It seems no sense to have an accountability section if we don't have participation in the accountability section.

Discussion Question #4: Should school improvement funds be awarded as formula or competitive grants?

- **Feedback Forms:**

- Formula – competitive relies too heavily on the talents of the application writers. Hybrid – state has checks and balances on use of funds. Don't just give without checking on how they use it.
- Formula that makes grants accessible to rural schools and low income schools. Get outside evaluator to help pinpoint the issues so the school has a viable plan.
- Formula – definitely not competitive. Provide TA to schools with help to develop plan and write grants.
- Formula.*
- Formula – grants reward the process of application not the work.
- State should identify evidence-based strategies for what works.
- Formulaic grants seem more equitable.
- Competitive, if I am trying to advantage my district. Formula, if I am trying to benefit schools more equitably. So, formula is more appropriate.
- Formula – but consider revising the formula to ensure that isolated rural districts are not excluded or disadvantaged.
- Formula! – Schools that are struggling should not have to write a grant application.
- Formula would allow for equity and flexibility. Sustainability planning would be easier and more successful. Targeted support could be emphasized. School districts can fund preventative measures to prevent turn around and performance issues. The funding would be allocated to the school district.
- Formula – provides more stability and allows for long-term planning and more robust support. Allow use of funds in preventative supports – stop schools from sliding into yellow, or orange. Allow for a phase out process to enhance improvement which is sustainable. Ensure that funds are awarded to district not direct to schools.
- Hybrid. Competitive grants allow for CDE to monitor districts' plans/strategies. Formula allows for all Title I students to benefit somewhat.
- Neither is questionable.
- Formula; smaller school districts don't always have staff/capacity to write for competitive grants. Ensure geographic and size of district is accounted for.
- TA if competitive grants.



- Formula – small district perspective. Competitive grants require intense district time and resources to create, monitor, report out on.
- Competitive would be much more of a burden on the schools and districts (need a grant writer, program evaluation, etc.).
- Percentage – competitive with accountability measures (could also consider a percentage of 7% to be retained by for emergencies). Therefore a hybrid.
- Funding for schools that actually get the funds for their programs. Needs to be available for all subject areas. Grants are great if all subjects can apply for them. Formula is great if all subjects get a portion of the funds. Also for more competitive need. Equitable, for all state.
- Formula. Competitive would pit haves against have nots. Instead formula would be at least telling you how all do against a static measure. However, could they have a committee look at those awarded funds through formula and who have needs?
- Mix. Formula first to identify who has need, then an invited RFP-type process. Provide TA to write. RFP/”plans” on how funds will be used. Allocate resources based on needs. ID needs through data. Worry competitive grants would not be equitable to rural districts or any districts without grant writers. Do not have FRL as only metric.
- Formula with accountability. Grant writing is too intense and time consuming and smaller districts are at a disadvantage because they don’t have grant writers.
- Competitive – concerns with large district grant writers, time writing grant. Formula with accountability demonstrating growth is preferred.
- Morph of both.
- Hybrid – some districts don’t have the resources for competitive grants, or it belongs to 1 person only. Formula allows for more equity, but all plans would need to be thoughtful.
- Formula grants then districts make these dollars competitive and hybrid model. Districts create criteria.
- Hybrid of both.
- Table choice is – formula. (Eliminates imbalance of size differences as some districts may have grant writers +/- Mis- use of funds). Formula with accountability attached and monitoring to meet outcomes/expectations.
- Combination.
- Formula – based on Title I.
- A mix.
- Formula yields more. Consistency in timelines, budgeting, planning.
- Formula so all get percentage of funds for help.
- Formula is definitely how it should be distributed.
- Formula seems fairer – not all districts have good grant writers.
- First the core values need to be fleshed out. We tend to value what we test and the money follows it. What really do we value from public education? Math content? Competitive will be inequitable unless the whole system changes.
- Hybrid – formula with a plan.
- Both means should be used. Formula for a money base. Competitive grants to subsidize ideas and programs that have the potential to create a path of change.



- Formula – I would prefer a required set-aside calculated by a school x PPA from state and then distributed to schools by district managed. I also would like recently out of status or rapidly declining to be considered.
- Formula based. Smaller school districts struggle with writing a specific grant. Feels like there is more accountability with formula monitoring to meet outcomes and accountability.
- Formula based (with plan development and monitoring). This gives districts predictability of funding support more equitable funding across eligible schools, allows district to have lots of sigma and plan for sustainability. Ability to use funds to target schools with significant declines to provide preventative supports.
- Hybrid model – some formula funding is necessary recognizing the overlap in high need student populations and low performance on accountability measures, but also some competitive funding to ensure there is a second plan for improvement.
- Competition could be an equity issue. CDE initiated cohorts of like-schools.
- Competitive.
- Funds need to be awarded in an equal manner – small school districts suffer greatly with lack of capacity.
- Formula to level the playing field for our rural and smaller districts.
- Competitive grants – by creating bar of application, forces schools to think critically about how they would use funds. Should/could help direct funds in more productive way.
- Competitive creates competition between schools, which may not be productive.
- Formula – competitive just feels bad when you are talking about school improvements.
- Both – a formula could leave out many schools that don't qualify because of tax-base.
- A grant system could go unevenly to wealthier districts because they have people to write grants.
- Formula.
- Competitive – with support from CDE.
- Formula.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Comes back to equity. If you have someone who is really good at writing grants, it's biased. Maybe some hybrid form.
 - Like the formula approach. Some are better writers and give more details and that makes a world of difference. The competition piece.
 - Formula. CDE providing the turnaround network support seems more balanced.
 - Support formula based. Help with predictability and what sustainability needs to look like and align with core budget analysis. Work on preventative measures, so we can invest in schools before they need turnaround.
 - Having someone come in that is telling, more listening is hard. A key part of support should be collaborative.
 - Hybrid is the best approach. Should be a plan for how formula will be implemented. Not as comprehensive as a competitive grant. Have someone come in and measure and monitor the following of the plan.
 - If CDE does distribute by formula perhaps there could be a menu of options describing researched based options. Most of it should be formula and hold a percentage back for



- competitive. It is not always feasible for all schools to have a grant writer; many schools are doing multiple things so having to write a grant as well could be too much.
- Why not come up with an intersession for ELs? Use stipends to hire teachers for three weeks and focus on literacy for ELs and make this a grant.
 - Formula based so that all schools are eligible. It would help with predictability in planning and sustainability. Address schools that are declining before too long.
 - There should be a hybrid approach, so that there is a plan in place.
 - Competitive seems strange—when talking about school improvement, perhaps only competitive for additional funds.
 - A more formulaic system should be considered especially for rural schools.
 - Perhaps use a portfolio in order to have a better picture of student success.
 - Formula with guidelines/parameters.
 - Formula or competitive – whichever allows more schools.
 - Hybrid approach for distribution. Formula and direct services to provide a uniform support system.
 - Competitive. Too many formula grants are treated as additional funds and little ownership to the funds. If they have to compete for them it could lead to better results.
 - The state department is limited to what they can offer through direct services – would not encourage that.
 - Competitive: keep in mind rural districts that have small offices and little capacity to write grants- the grant becomes metrocentric.
 - Not competitive - rewards districts who write the best.
 - Formula, get funds where we need them.
 - What are the evidence-based intervention strategies? What are the lessons learned?
 - Hybrid – formula with plan.
 - Formula. Don't have grant writers or the time it takes to do it.
 - Advantage to the competitive grant, there is quality control to it. Disadvantage is some students do not receive money.
 - Challenge is dedicating the time and energy to apply for the grant.
 - Can CDE have a dedicated person to assist in the process?
 - If larger “wealthy” districts should be able to divert more local funds to the problem, the most needy districts will not necessarily receive the money.
 - Mix of both.
 - Formula will be the better option.
 - There should be a way the distribution of funds should be approved to provide equity.
 - Hybrid form of the improvement funds.
 - Making the language consistent, with state and federal.
 - Multiple year progress, in year three you should see improvement.
 - Formula based was supported, help with predictability with planning.
 - Hybrid is best approach of both formula and competitive grants.
 - Equalized formula.
 - It should be formula so that it's fair.
 - If you set the formula as a percentage, could rural districts still get access to more funding? This could potentially level the playing field. We do this with our staffing plans to make FTE ratios more fair.



- We support formula based because it promotes equity and predictability of funding. This would help us align it with our core budgeting processes. We would also want to see these funds be available for schools experiencing significant decline rather than waiting to be identified in these categories.
- Hybrid of formula and competitive. There should be a plan and buy-in.
- A hybrid would be best. Some grants need to have some strategy/buy-in behind the funding, but some grants (i.e., ELG) should be formulaic. If nearly the same thing is happening with all of the funding, then just give it to everyone.
- Needs to be a measure of accountability. If there is formula funding, at least make sure that those funds are being spent wisely. You've qualified for this formula funding, now show your plan for funds.
- Can accountability for formula grants be part of UIP? Why can't everything be encompassed inside the UIP?
- Give districts their negative factor money so there isn't such a shortfall. Sustainability will always be an issue with short term funding opportunities.
- We support formula based. It is an equity issue. Allows better access to funding, as well as improves planning/budgeting. Would like some ability to use funds to address schools in decline in a preventative way, before they are in need of intensive supports.
- Monitoring of formula grants and requiring buy-in is crucial.
- It would be more equitable to distribute the School Improvement funds through a formula basis. Many of the small districts do not have grant writers, so this would help make things fair. District staff feel strongly about this.
- Would allow more help for middle class schools. Put the money where you need it, and help more kids. Kids in the middle don't get the extra funds, and they don't have a PTO, so they actually struggle more.
- Formula based – this is an equity issue. Not all schools that are eligible can get funds. This would also allow for better budgeting and planning. Would like to have ability to address schools with a decline in a preventative way.
- Hybrid is the best approach to award funds. Should have a plan in place to award funds. Buy-in is crucial.
- Formula is preferred so that we don't have to pay for grant writing. Will also help with planning for the future.
- Competitive does force people to think through the plan – in theory. However, effective implementation that pulls you off of PITA, then causes you to lose money.
- Need a gradual release plan for removing the funding to ensure sustainability. Need better guidance on what it means to have an effective sustainability plan.
- If go competitive, then need to improve application process to allow smaller schools/districts to also compete for funds.
- TIG for example – even in those schools that got money did not have as much progress as you would think for the funds that they received.
- Writing a grant is very extensive process, which takes admins away from the schools and their needs in terms of instructional time and overview.
- Some of the requirements within competitive grants (e.g., having a full plan, data collections/reporting, program evaluation, sustainability, etc.) are a heavy lift for smaller districts and those that don't have the resources to do that work. Recommend having an easier application process if keeping it competitive and lessen the burden on the



schools/districts in their application and provide supports so that they can succeed in submitting grants. Even when they hire an outside vendor to write the grant, it is not reflective of what is actually happening in school/district and too boiler plate to be competitive.

- Support for formula base – predictability, equity, help align with core budgeting, ability to address needs in a more preventative way by addressing needs of schools that are declining as opposed of those already low in performance.
- Collaborative approach is most effective. Someone coming in from outside and telling the school what to do will work better. Need to address
- Hybrid – plan in place using formula. Not as comprehensive as competitive.
- Issues with formula numbers is that money going to be good use of causing change. Is there a state assessment on how those items address that the money has shown impact and the type of funding source that is receiving the funding?
- Rural formula and urban competitive.
- More time up front to create a relationship with the CDE managers.
- Formula based - look at all of the schools are eligible. Will help with planning for the future.
- Formula. Don't have grant writers or the time it takes to do it.
- Advantage to the comp grant - there is quality control to it. Disadvantage is some students do not receive money.
- Challenge is dedicating the time and energy to apply for the grant.
- Can CDE have a dedicated person to assist in the process?
- If larger “wealthy” districts should be able to divert more local funds to the problem, the most needy districts will not necessarily receive the money.
- Mix of both.

Discussion Question #5: What supports and services can CDE provide that would be helpful to districts with schools on improvement?

● **Feedback Forms:**

- Alternative methods to instruction/improvement using the electives.
- Grant writers! Monetary incentives to get good teachers to these schools. Get an outside evaluator to evaluate the school before they get grant money. Implementation coach.
- Outside evaluator (who is objective and neutral). Technical assistance for developing improvement plans. Support for non-academic measures (HKCS, smart and source, etc.). Not a one size fits all rural vs. urban vs. suburban vs. rich vs. poor. Prevention vs. reaction.
- Outside objective reviews of grant proposals.
- How to bring all stakeholders to table to discuss community led solutions not top down changes to schools.
- Stakeholder involvement needs to be assured.
- Avoid “supports” that add more red tape to teachers’ plates. The time I spend documenting ILPs/IEPs and other student needs cuts into time I should be spending on meaningful lesson-planning and formative assessments/student feedback.



- Analysis of their processes. Advice on how to get more parent/family engagement. Provide an implementation coach.
- We will email additional feedback.
- Continue providing evaluations and supports.
- Actual support/resources that can help improve student achievement.
- CDE can assist with performing root cause analysis at the district/schools with data analysis, help with writing UIP's and what data is allowable and how to analyze various data sets. Multi-year UIPs, how to modify, update.
- What are proven school improvement strategies? Are there any? If so, let's go for those high leverage changes, thinking of Hattie's Meta-Analysis Studies and guiding schools and the state to get really focused and good at a few high leverage things instead of everyone running around doing a million different small things.
- Continued guidance around programs/interventions with proven track records of success. Implementation coach to help with implementation fidelity.
- CDE personal go to a school and work with staff (articulation day).
- Frankly, stay out. When CDE comes into a district (Aurora) and pushes an innovation school (Central High) they have really exceeded their authority. Teachers and association had a plan developed to begin changing Central, had it not been for CDE.
- Professional development on school climate, teacher retention. Identify student (smart source) needs and empower youth voice. HKCS healthy kids CO survey.
- Need CDE to be part of the team – practitioner and collaborator. Not an auditor. Consistent support and resources. Help with interpreting data – short cycle feedback loop. Understand trends – not make assumptions.
- Collaboration in schools working with team as a sounding board and provide tech assistance. Consistent resources and location on website. Connection between data and what is happening in the classroom. Short cycle data would be helpful.
- Walk in the schools. Consistent resources.
- Nice that CDE is vetting supports on district behalf.
- Identify schools where it is working. Create model schools.
- Collaborative approach.
- Leadership development – value and leading change. Cognitive] development. Sometimes in rural districts – access to quality professional development and instructional practices. Consistent “systems” guidance. Induction program (not mentor model) just align to university.
- Allow leaders to give feedback about effectiveness of the consultant list providers. Allow some time for schools to build relationships with providers.
- List of resources – consultants, workshops, and input.
- Technical assistance in bringing community, parents, techs, and students together to talk about solutions and plan strategically for change.
- Technical assistance as identified by schools. Research based intervention resource.
- Professional development. Intervention services.
- Have a point person at CDE who is the main contact for those schools and works directly with the district.
- Connect for success support group.
- Allow schools to choose their focus from a menu of key priorities, but narrow the menu to a selection of high leverage area/strategies. Implementation coaches – love this idea!



- Collaboration support, consistent resources.
 - Centralized training for “targeted” districts/schools/ consultation – based on areas of expertise. “Model program” replication? Creating district position for person to help implement grants.
 - Leadership change. Issue with the idea that everything is optional from CDE and provide induction. Support systems change, including developing an understanding for coaches and implementation coach.
 - Best practice sharing. High quality professional development for turnaround educators. Program evaluation to identify what works at similar schools but design this collaboratively so not overly-intrusive to the school. Make the list of improvement practices more flexible-they don’t always watch the needs/expertise needed in schools.
 - Technical assistance for administrators to organize/improve schools. Professional development for teachers to improve effectiveness with particular areas/student subgroups.
 - Provide support to districts in applying for competitive grants.
 - Measure of student accountability – if this doesn’t build back to students and families then nothing will change and change will be forced and not taken into account/bought into the educational approach.
 - We need to create a solid lattice for outstanding principal leadership and teacher leadership to truly affect positive change.
 - Information/support from successful improvement schools.
 - Resource information.
 - Example – specific examples of what works.
 - Root cause analysis.
 - Targeted consultations.
 - Provide a team to assess school conditions offer report/feedback – 3rd party, neutral assessment.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Have CDE identify schools that serve students to high levels of achievement and have other schools and districts come and see them and decide how they can replicate that success. CDE can say “this school has made progress and stayed there, and you should try to replicate it”. Hears the most feedback about the leaders meeting. Resources are tremendously different. If you have more locally connected schools, they can relate.
 - Build cohorts at other schools. Have leadership at schools get together quarterly, and it could inspire friendly competition instead of just having people compete for dollars
 - You can learn from each other by having the different leadership meet every once in a while, and CDE can play a good role in having a platform for that.
 - Comprehensive school wide reviews have been helpful.
 - Support schools in aligning all accountability system, which makes requirements more meaningful so if it is required please make sure we are asking for the right things.
 - Expertise from within the school should be listened to. More collaborative system to support schools.
 - Connect for Success—coach has been fantastic, it is someone who is present helping schools refine what they are already doing.
 - CDE should provide a list of successful programs that districts can have access to.



- Why are Relay and UVA the go to supports for Colorado? They are expensive and we're not sure if they are effective. We fire weak principals and teachers. Should we be using providers with no track record of success?
- What does the state already offer? What is the available to schools and districts?
- CDE should be more proactive with the schools early on the clock.
- Everything gets piled on the schools.
- Make sure we have real involvement of practitioners. Look at Adams 14 support/involvement.
- Connect for Success, implementation coach, etc.
- Longevity of the programming. Maybe a better way of looking at something targeted.
- If the supports are not instructional coaching it might not be as helpful. Needs to be ongoing and consistent. Needs to build capacity.
- Teams of people that have a lot of insight
- Have someone else come in and help organize
- Help at that point in time
- Professional development
- Work of going to the site and identify what they need and holding them accountable
- Supports & services: connect for success recipient
- Not everyone is going to have the expertise to help support
- There needs to be some relationship building
- Survey from leadership about the process
- Don't give us more paperwork. Often "supports" really means additional reports and documentation.
- Less hoops.
- This hit home because I was just awarded an improvement planning grant. We were giving a list of consultants to choose from. I knew a few years ago I would be in this situation, so I had already identified a person that would sub-contract. If you have developed trust and relationships with the staff prior, it shouldn't take more than a year to improve.
- There should be feedback from school leadership on those consultants, maybe a survey. You can use this to find out if they did effective things like building relationships prior to beginning the work.
- We thought the collaborative approach of working in a team is most effective. It's difficult to have someone come in from the outside and do more telling than listening.
- Our Connect for Success implementation coach has been fantastic. It's someone who can be there with the school and monitor the implementation of the plan.
- School that received an implementation coach this year - has been so helpful.
- Better to have supports from CDE in the form of teamwork. A collaborative approach.
- Implementation coach that was provided by the Connect for Success grant has been invaluable.
- Collaborative approach working in a team is the most effective. Don't want to have someone come in that is telling instead of listening because people within the districts know root causes, etc.
- Implementation coach from connect for success is great to support work that is already happening in the building.



- There are benefits to having supports provided by CDE but have to be able to meet local context.
- Connect For Success implementation coach has been fantastic and supports the work that is already happening in the school.
- Need tangible outcomes to grants pieces, if they are not effective, then what is the outcome to that? Seen benefits in both the turnaround leadership and the turnaround academy.
- How does CDE make sure that the consultants are high quality that work in turnaround?
- Create a way for schools to meet the turnaround partner prior to choosing.
- Longevity of the programming. Maybe a better way of looking at something targeted.
- If the supports are not instructional coaching it might not be as helpful. Needs to be ongoing and consistent. Needs to build capacity.

Discussion Question #6: What is an appropriate length of time before more intensive interventions should be required for “consistently underperforming” schools/subgroups?

- **Feedback Forms:**

- Months – not years.
- Need to find out why school is underperforming with objective outside evaluator. Provide money to school to implement a plan. Step by step. 2-3 years to show growth.
- 3-5 years with yearly assessments/prelims for trends/ID improvement but clearly defining “consistently underperforming” to address what is within/outside school/district control.
- How would an arbitrary year be equitable to all schools statewide?
- Individualized plans based on area, why, underperforming, etc. 2-3 years for turnaround.
- Wrong focus – not time but work to engage the community and the practitioners.
- Shouldn't equity be addressed first? How can a school with 50% EL's and 90% FR Lunch compete with an Academy 20?
- 5 years.*
- 3 years before measuring effects of their improvement plans, then 2 more years before a requirement for more intervention.
- 3 – 4 years depending on the areas of most need.
- Depends on grade band. Research (or at least experience!) tells us that you see growth earlier (in a shorter amount of time - than middle/high school. I would give an extra year to secondary, maybe 2 years elementary and 3 years secondary? Longevity of program should be looked at not 5 initiatives in 5 years for example.
- Not more than two years.
- 2-3 years consecutive years of underperforming. However, keep in mind that is 2-3 years of a student's education that may be lacking – what does that do to that learning?
- 5 years to turn them around (same plan). Takes time. Put the best admin team together to build it up.
- This is an impossible question. A school that has high teachers, poor leadership, a struggling climate, and is not attended to by Central Admin, would indicate that the “school” isn't the issue so suggesting a clock implies knowledge of the source of the problem.



- This is hard. Need a systemic approach. Tie climate/"improvement" strategies to positions vs. people. Mobility rates of students and staff transitions need to be considered. Use data!! ID needs and create action plan. That way it is a part of what is happening in building/"part of what we do." Also part of hiring process so new staff know upfront what needs to be done and continue.
- 3 years. Need time to stay the course.
- 3 years.***
- 3 years for time to put in and see effect focus on support.
- We already know which school has "consistently underperformed" so to create a sense of urgency, progress monitor throughout the year. Put schools on notice mid-year. Provide menu of options based on data results. Year two: mid-year monitoring, etc.
- 90-day check-ins for short term goals. 3 year long range.
- 3 years unless there is an intentional change in leadership when that happens the cycle needs to "reset" to extend the time 2 more years. This can happen multiple times.
- Look at the schools trajectory – if going up then give them longer. If after 3 years, there is no growth then more intense intervention.
- ASAP. "Kids don't have to wait" – there's been demonstration of lacking, do something now.
- 18 months.*
- Warning signs - gates of change – joint constructed plans (buy-in).
- 3-5 years.**
- 3 years. 3 years to starts the discussion about what's working to what's not but it may take 5- it should be a very layered level of support.
- 3 years minimum – 2 years possible.
- This is tough, it takes 3-5 years for lasting change to show results but if we wait 3 years we are sacrificing 3 years of students. 3 years with ongoing formative assessment of a structured plan. Once every 3 years is too infrequent.
- As soon as possible.
- 3 years – long enough for changes to hold, short enough for students not to be shuffled through a failing high school.
- 7 years to allow time for students to get through the "whole" system.
- 5-7 years to train, grow, learn, reflect and develop.
- Shorter than 5 years – by the time five years goes by an entire cohort of students have gone through, potentially, without experiencing any improvement.
- Have a series of steps from 3-7 years – becomes more intensive over longer period of time.
- Schools need at least 3 years to implement a plan effectively, and then more time to gather data.
- Enough time for all of the programs that are dumped on schools to work. Right now, it's just layer after layer of programs and you have no idea of what is or is not working.
- What should growth look like for underperforming? Does "consistently underperforming" really mean only the school is involved can control the solution?
- 5-7 years, with 2 year reviews.
- No more time outs! Not fair students to be stuck in a poor system for more than 4 years.



- **General Discussion Notes:**

- Not a timeframe, it's allowing the changes you make to have some time to work and be iterative. The measure of turnaround should be the kids who come from the feeder schools or more universal? What are we doing for kids longitudinally that speaks more to their long term achievement? What and when we measure.
- It's hard to set one standard for all schools. Some things will work for some and not work for others. Need to have stability and time to see changes work. Measuring growth targets.
- You have to establish a culture of trust with your staff. It should take only one year to fix. Knowing which subcontracted person to bring in, but not everyone has that luxury. Maybe there should be some feedback and consultants that come in before the feedback process and leaders can give suggestions on effectiveness.
- Combine funds to provide more comprehensive services.
- Why not come up with an intersession for ELs? Use stipends to hire teachers for three weeks and focus on literacy for ELs and make this a grant.
- Should be some feedback between consultants and building leadership.
- Survey school around leadership.
- 3 years is an appropriate length of time.
- 18 months should be a good length of time.
- No less than five years to give system time to ripple through all the changes.
- Question of equity across state's characteristics. Bar is upper-middle class, white homogenous student population in schools.
- Not just about time, it's resources, funding, etc.
- Three years.*
- 18 months.*
- 7 years – takes x amount of years to make any kind of realistic changes.
- Can see the growth earlier in elementary. Shorter amount of time there.
- Longer amount of time for high school.
- We have had too much time for improvement. But I don't know what the magic number is.
- Competitive grants available. DPS example last year they had funds to create Turnaround leaders.
- The supports of what is in place is an improvement from the past.
- What are some things that are working well, partner with the school to understand what is being done?
- Give them an option to apply the funding.
- Three-year cycle, you can't have a low performing school turn around in less than 3 years.
- Different measures that indicate process.
- In places where you have a clean slate and start turnaround, this is very difficult
- Get your system in place .
- It depends on what model the school is in, is it complete turnaround?
- When you see a low performance school it's hard to attract talent.
- When UIP was first introduced it was very difficult.
- One year to fix, this person had the resources of subcontractor to do a lot of the work.



- No less than 5 years.
- How does this interact with the current 5 year clock?
- Improvement Planning grant – district was able to bring in a subcontractor to build the culture before the intensive intervention began. Believes that one year should be enough to turnaround a school.
- Eighteen months is an appropriate amount of time.
- 3-5 years for any lasting change to manifest. Should give 3 years, but with regular check-in's to make sure it is working. Depending on circumstances, it can be year 5 that you are finally figuring out what works. Struggle with students coming through in the meantime.
- Depends on turnover in staff. Shouldn't matter with the right system in place. But can also depend on school culture, veteran teachers, strong leader in place. Sometimes the first year can just be convincing them that they have to change. Could be an assessment in year 3, and then in year 4 or 5 have an exit. That would give the school an opportunity to see how things are going. Can sometimes see dramatic improvements as soon as the 2nd year if there is an intense effort and focus on improvement. A level of intensity is important.
- Teachers and administrators all have to be in line with the improvement process. Is there the ability to release staff that aren't on board? Varies by district, and is under SB191. It is a process over time.
- Districts are given a list of consultants to choose from. Choose someone to subcontract 2 years ahead of time. Need to establish a culture of trust with the staff. With the relationships already in place it should take only 1 year to improve from that point. However not everyone will have those relationships already in place to bring someone in as a consultant.
- 3 years is appropriate amount of time.
- 18 months. Connect for success uses this timeline.
- 18 months – for time frame. Based on the Connect For Success timeline.
- Targeted – the 5 year clock is out there. Simplicity trumps. Which sub group is underperforming in a resource poor environment? Five years initially, but this is a tougher question than is needed. Supports and engagement in the community. You will have different changes through the demographics in small changes.
- If you ratcheted the time down too much all you get is reactive and reactive to the actual pieces that were targeted.
- One year - you should be able to see changes and improvement. Show improvement.
- Formula based grants make more sense because we should NOT be required to compete to serve our neediest schools.
- Competitive grants are difficult for the small districts. It advantages our larger districts who don't need the support as much necessarily.
- Can the "formula based" approach be tweaked, could geographical isolation be weighted?
- How often is this driven by SES - schools that may have a smaller number of students with low SES don't even get identified? It seems there are lots of schools that slide by on the performance of high performing students and low-performing slide by on their own.



- A question about the first slide - high schools with graduation rates of lower than 67% . . . is that disaggregated? How do different disaggregated groups get counted?
- We also have alternative education campuses designed to serve students that are not graduating in 4 years, so how does this get incorporated into calculation.
- Could we think differently about “rating” schools? Could we provide more descriptive accountability reports without rolling up points to an overall rating?
- Then identify “schools in need of support” that will actually receive support.
- How effective are these labels in getting performance to improve?
- We don’t have the performance measures right, aren’t including demographic factors.
- Do competitive grants have more oversight? Are the strategies schools using actually effective? How are we accounting for this?
- In some schools the \$\$ they get through Title I doesn’t even scratch the surface and they would need to address the barriers their students are facing.
- We need to invest in evaluating the strategies being used.
- 7 years – takes x amount of years to make any kind of realistic changes.

Other comments about standards, assessments, and accountability:

- **Feedback Forms:**

- Months – not years.
- Health is incredibly important to academic achievement!
- 1) Apply for alternative assessment pilot program. 2) Set certain time for standardized tests. 3) Focus on whole student measures.
- Consider working with Bill Pavel at CU-Boulder on building performance tasks in science.
- Need to ensure that districts and schools have a written family engagement policy (can add this to the UIP reporting document) and adequate number (and types) of parents on their accountability committees.
- Somewhere there has to be a piece added where the student is held accountable for taking their tests.
- What is “ratcheted” up interventions? How do we truly support districts – not on judging.
- Students who have barriers to health have a significant difficulty achieving. Health needs more attention.
- We are trying to do too much with too little. As hard as it is, CDE needs to identify priorities and help districts focus.
- I appreciate and support efforts to make federal and state requirements coherent.
- Colorado should consider assessment pilot.
- Wonder if a single test as an accurate measure for testing – is a portfolio a better way to measure students?
- Bring teachers to the table for discussion in the implementation process for ESSA. Not one or two, multiple.
- We need to be open to what needs to change in current law – there is a lot about our assessment and accountability systems that need to change.
- Why are we looking at conforming to current law (for alignment) rather than thinking about what is best for students?



- No more tests/time spent on testing – better tests. Portfolios would be great – but not timely or easy to access.
- Incorporate more NGSS in science standards.
- Schools need to work together with CDE to better prepare parents to be productive SAC members and school volunteers.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Pedagogical best practices, assessments tied to high stakes with data that is not valid. Degree to which data overlaps.
 - Wants CDE to consider ESSA’s allowance on caps on assessments. Wants a hard line cap.
 - How do we get rid of duplication in system (i.e. Dibels, GOLD, DRA, etc.)?
 - How do we make sure assessment is integrated into classroom instruction?
 - How does CDE build systematic partnerships with students, parents, educators, in addition to the prescribed Committee of Practitioners?
 - How will you go about communicating changes in the timeline?
 - Is it in law that districts need to adopt Colorado Academic Standards in their curriculum?
 - Has there been a conversation why social studies and humanity are not included in ESSA?
 - Does Colorado have consistency in what they require to be an elementary and middle school? No.
 - Does ESSA provide a timeline of having states provide validity and reliability? No.
 - What happens if the state doesn’t meet the 95% participation requirement?
 - Going beyond the academic standards and seeing the whole child with a local control.
 - How long the system should be allowed? No less than five years, identify problems and systems to be adopted.
 - I wonder if we could have some sort of bonus point system. Maybe it’s the quality of the teacher and credentials they have. Make it some sort of ranking.
 - You wouldn’t want to penalize a district for having inexperienced teachers because that is who they attract. Maybe you would want to incentivize teachers to stay in those districts. Maybe through a bonus point system. What you want in an accountability system is to identify people who need help, but also to have the public know what is happening in the schools.



Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Listening Tour

Quality Instruction & Leadership and Supports for Student Success

Discussion Question #1: What supports should CDE provide to help teachers, schools, and districts provide effective instruction to students with specific learning needs?

- **Feedback Forms:**

- Professional development with incentives – time off, stipends.
- Units of study – that rural schools can translate to lesson plans.
- Create a plan for SPED teachers for content knowledge.
- Reduce real time and paperwork in order to allow for focus on the work with students.
- Not sure if this is “falling down” in teacher prep programs. Effective teaching strategies provided (for free) in local regions that address differentiation (Tier 1). Would need less Tiers 2+3 interventions if this were addressed.
- Not sure what supports CDE currently provides for this. Continue with formula.
- Funds for equipment needed for those students.
- Attached information through IEP. Use support staff more.
- Not aware of any.
- Money and access to resources. Access to a point person at CDE who has expertise in supporting students with learning needs. Professional development for support personnel.
- Work collectively to identify resources and trainings already being provided (either at the district level or by other organizations) and help schools connect with these resources.
- Be the central place to guide and promote materials, (i.e., library resource, consultants in content areas).
- Funding and resources according to student population needs. Access to personnel that have experience in specific areas. This person needs current experience in schools.
- Provide menu options of best practices, interventions based on MTSS/needs of students.
- Early childhood education birth to grade 3 supports. There does not seem to be a one size fits all. Understand the unique makeup of districts.
- Multicultural education for all teachers. Native language instructional strategies. English language acquisition.
- MTSS model.**
- CDE share some best practices/frameworks but districts need to lead on this.
- I believe that lower class sizes would help. Specific teacher training on specific learning needs.
- Professional development online (all teachers unlicensed in a specific area take) – 1 to 2 years certain in specific subject that can be prioritized based on what specific content will be taught by the teacher first.
- MTSS. More collaboration between CDE and higher education to provide teacher training – professional development that is reasonable for a teacher who is already balancing the teaching and all the additional functions that are based on.
- MTSS. Multi-tiered system support-good.



- A modular professional learning option in cooperation with higher education to allow teachers to get the content and/or differentiation strategies towards endorsement, without a specific degree.
- Professional learning opportunities for key stakeholders. Continue professional learner of MTSS for all learners.
- Input of needs per district – all districts are not the same – client driven.
- Consider Educator Effectiveness Rubrics as have indicators across.
- Better recruitment for quality teachers – salary in early education and teaching is an issue and would be a draw for more people.
- Funding for specific interventions.
- Training opportunities and resources.
- Reduce the amount of detailed work for IEP, GT and 504 (and other) plans.
- Funding for training; districts need to provide time for the training – too much is expected to happen outside of the work day.
- Support teachers/case managers needs to be funded for positions which are overloaded with too many students. More professional development for general education teachers who are not able to/or want to expand their skills (but also time to plan for) serving these students.
- Generalist vs. specialists.
- Help schools with paid professional.
- Consultations on how to succeed.
- Assessment evaluation.
- Parent satisfaction.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - What does CDE do now to provide supports?
 - The structure of MTSS could really help all of us. If we talked more about that model, we could monitor and see how it's comprehensive and supports the whole child. We can see what teachers are doing to impact all students.
 - Everything I think of costs money: more paraprofessionals for special education departments, smaller classroom sizes, language supports and more efforts for parent involvement, better before/after care opportunities for working parents, full-day kindergarten for working communities.
 - Reduction of red tape, reduce the workload and paperwork that is necessary (IEP, 504, literacy plan), etc. to do jobs. Decide whether service providers are educators or are in different role, as far as accountability/evaluation is concerned.
 - Amount of time it takes me to document and progress monitor takes up time I can plan for students, communicate with families, etc. but nobody looks at all data for each kid at other grade levels.
 - MTSS in a large district for teachers with a ton of students takes a lot of time.
 - Consideration looking at districts that have a downward trend. What do we need to do to reverse that trend before they get into priority improvement?
 - The supports need to be ongoing, capacity building.
 - More support in implementing the MTSS model. If we all were on the same page with this, we would see improvement.



- Implementation coach is working wonderfully. Work is connected to the UIP and the plan is monitored to move forward. Also good that teachers are hearing from someone else. Need more training on MTSS. Having a robust MTSS model in place in schools/districts is very beneficial.
- MTSS is a proactive model instead of reactive. Having building leaders and teachers understand that this model can transform a school proactively instead of reactively helps tremendously. If five components can be actively monitored, then you have an accurate picture of where the school is at any point.
- MTSS is looked at as an add-on instead of being foundational.
- CDE should help schools/districts implement MTSS model. Monitoring Tier I before schools ever hit priority improvement. Model is comprehensive and supports the whole child. Not just addressing students once they are failing.
- MTSS – supports/training on monitoring Tier I before hitting intervention.
- Helping teachers understand the difference in the sub groups that are needed. Trauma informed care for teachers.
- One of the things I'd like to see CDE do is provide guidance to Higher ED around the instruction for Title I schools especially for instruction to students in poverty, especially when working with families in poverty.
- Many teachers are clueless when it comes to “students in poverty”.
- So many school requirements for students in poverty and this causes lots of stress for family. Not saying teachers should get into the “rescue” mentality.
- Need to understand when you send notes home for materials it causes a lot of stress for families. When you reach out to families—it should be verbally, such as phone calls such for refugee families who do not read in their native language.
- We need to show teachers how to develop relationships with families.
- Need more multi-cultural trainings for educators.
- Perhaps this needs to be a requirement from CDE—multicultural knowledge.
- Needs to remain a local decision.
- MTSS model—the structure of this system could help all of us. This system supports the whole child and also addresses what teachers are doing in the classroom.
- Need to provide adequate support for teachers who are serving a dual role for SPED students. Find a way to support how to manage the work load for those teachers. Provide more professional development for general education teachers, as well as time to plan for using their new skills to ensure SPED students are being served well—“highly qualified” for all students. There is a disconnect between what teachers receive via professional development and how they are allowed to implement - would also apply to gifted and talented.
- Training and time to implement and plan, continuous follow up (i.e., restorative justice).
- Online and distance education being a real possible option.
- Invest in making this resource better, and increase quality.
- Generational issue.
- Performance test measure, testing experience
- Higher Education learning commission, new provision anyone teaching concurrent enrollment has to have 18 credits and teaching experience.
- Districts could have credit hours or testing experience.
- Many of the requirements need review.



- Districts required teachers to demonstrate content knowledge and have license.
- Demonstration that teachers have content knowledge.
- Critical thinking should also be important.
- The answer to remediation can't be to pull them.
- State is lacking early childhood education.
- Parents are spending more on preschool than a mortgage payment.
- Success being defined by test scores needs to stop.
- Kids need to have physical and creative activities.
- Create more partnerships with other agencies to support the needs in the communities. Mental health for example. How can CDE broker other services to support the districts? CDE can provide resources for the specific learning needs of the varied areas.
- MTSS model- not RTI. Use this model more!
- This is a group that isn't being served particularly well across the state.
- There may be a disconnect in some programs between where students are/what they need and how to provide those services. IEPs aren't very much used/useful for inclusion models. It may not help general education teachers meet the needs of the students. So the state should be doing more . . . helping teachers do a better job for students who are included in regular classrooms and what is in their IEP. Provide supports for IEPs to be written with grade-level standards specifically addressed in the student learning targets. We need more support for teachers to understand what students with specific learning needs can do.
- Simplify the compliance pieces and focus more on serving the students better. The compliance seems to get in the way. Current special education, specific professional development is more focused on compliance than on instruction.
- Well intended but insufficient capacity to meet the level of detail required.

Discussion Question #2: In addition to holding a license, should teachers be required to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach?

● **Feedback Forms:**

- Yes. Provide professional development – especially for teachers in rural areas. Give good teachers access to the content and incentivize these teachers. Provide the content for free. Provide content instruction to teachers where there are shortages.
- As long as they have the degree – they have demonstrated the knowledge. How do you assess a good teacher? Just because you have a license to teach, doesn't mean you can teach.
- Incentives for good teachers for professional development and pay increase for filling vacant more specialized jobs. # Elementary teachers getting support to teach high school math. State pays rather than out of teacher's pocket.
- Content level knowledge is relatively same but also tie in SB191 data.
- Yes! How else would the state ensure that students are receiving instruction from a qualified teacher who understands the subject? This should be done for all subjects. This should be done statewide for all school types (public/charter/ and private). The



state should require this. The state should provide support to help teachers gain knowledge.

- Don't ignore pedagogy for educators need to focus on skills of classroom management lesson/unit/assessments.
- Teachers in the best of all worlds should demonstrate both content and pedagogic knowledge.
- No.
- No – keep it flexible.
- Yes.***
- The state should have a model/benchmark for districts to meet with the flexibility to meet those and their own internal standards. Impact of SB-191. Effectiveness of teachers vs. licensures. For elementary schools, choose one test.
- Yes – teachers need to show competency in the subject/grade areas where they are teaching. The state should set the benchmark and districts should (could be more difficult for smaller districts) have flexibility on how they implement.
- Yes, but how? Current methods are bureaucratic and create barriers.
- Yes, but other skills should be measured as well.
- Competency – Or content knowledge? Differences? Yes, teachers should be required to know the content they are teaching.
- Competency vs. content knowledge? How would we measure either? A test? College credits?
- Teachers need to be hired that hold a degree in their subject area. Not just taking a place test and passing it. This is a disservice to students in the classroom. (Causing problems in the classroom as well). LACK OF TRAINING! No extra testing is needed for teachers!
- Need multiple pathways for “HQ” equivalent. Must show content mastery – an exam. Need content or discipline expertise. Can be enrolled in program. Like alternative licensure. State should require - we want multiple pathways to demonstrate content knowledge.
- Yes. What support can be provided to small/rural districts to attract and retain licensed staff? Getting rid of “highly qualified” will greatly affect them.
- Yes, but this could be education, testing, demonstration to expert. Need to assure staff and system are capable of rolling out and monitoring – sounds monumental if through CDE – time, money, resources. We are heading into a teacher shortage, so have to get creative to recruit and retain.
- Content knowledge: yes content is important. The state should require it.
- Required to show competency use a teacher competency rubric to determine competency.
- Highly competent teachers in content pedagogy. No need for additional measures.
- More important than showing competency in content is the ability to engage and teach.
- Allow flexibility for districts to set their own requirements for competency. Perhaps CDE could provide an example model schools could consider.



- SB 191 – meets the requirements, competence. Not requiring both licensure through one or the other PLACE/PRAXIS and degree. Focus on effectiveness.
- Concerning ELL teachers I fully agree that they should have to demonstrate competence with a test.
- Yes – multitude of ways to become competent in a subject through on-line content and in person – modules inside a subject should be able to be completed by priority to allow a teacher to teach a portion or module even prior to full subject certification.
- Yes they should have to demonstrate it through their licensure of endorsements – makes it cleaner for districts.
- Yes! Teachers must understand the foundational content in order to teach it well. Use the PLACE or PRAXIS content tests for an endorsement. Help rural districts get their teachers endorsed properly.
- Yes – but think there multiple appropriate ways to demonstrate this – PLACE/PRAXIS not appropriate for all – especially problematic for rural areas. Think about tested experience as a possibility.
- Yes. Teachers should have multiple pathways to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach (i.e. coursework, test results, on job experience). We also feel that it would be beneficial to assess pedagogical beliefs and practices too.
- To what level? Current best practices – content knowledge – grade appropriate.
- Yes – required by LEA, demonstrate through coursework on endorsement, or practicum experience (student teaching in other similar concepts).
- Yes – CDE/SEA requirement, teacher prep programs (all IHE's) to be accredited. As demonstrated by performance (i.e. portfolio) and artifacts. Possibly: multiyear induction? (or at least a year=meaningful – observations and or team of support with stakeholders from LEA and IHE. Instruction for: CLD, SWD, Gifted Title III, Title VII.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - A strange question. If you are effective, does it matter if you have competency in your subject area? If you don't have the content area knowledge, but your kids are high performing. It doesn't matter. Like the TA models in college.
 - If you know how to manage a classroom, and grade, and do math, I don't know if you need to have content specialists. Do you have the skills to provide critical thinking options? Or maybe students are coming to class with information from the internet. Even though people don't enjoy probationary system, it might be beneficial. Teachers raising their profession.
 - For example, there are a lot of people who can do calculus, but can't teach calculus.
 - Some people with teaching degrees don't even necessarily graduate having taken a course in the topic they teach. Maybe we should have a blended model. Both content area and skills in the classroom. Is this provision built to be a confirmation to parents? Competency and content knowledge are two different things. Maybe you should have an exam on content area to demonstrate knowledge.
 - Concerned about being focused on content area and not pedagogical practice.



- Goes back to equity, like some teachers provide 6 preps. Should they be required to show knowledge in all even if they might get new ones they following year?
- Worried about massive opportunity for lax qualifications for teachers who have nothing more than content knowledge. Focusing on content knowledge only is dangerous.
- If state maintains HQ concept/standards, state could ensure quality of teaching profession in maintained. Current/previous CDE requirements.
- Need both content knowledge and ability to teach.
- Biggest instructional problems result from teachers who have good content knowledge (science, math) and have worked in the field but they don't work well with kids and don't have pedagogical skills, classroom management, creating lesson plans around content knowledge, etc.
- Concern of being overly focused on content knowledge over teaching practice. Concern that we are not tracking anything other than content knowledge.
- As long as you have content knowledge (college courses, etc.) and present your coursework. School districts have refined hiring practices above the baseline of what's required at state level. Evaluation systems take care of competency.
- For hiring practices and ensuring we are hiring qualified teachers we need evidence.
- Proactive steps from OCR perspective is, "Are your teachers endorsed"?
- Keep same standards for teaching if taking out HQ. Training for evaluators for teacher evaluations.
- Rural districts, districts hurting to find talent, shown you've taken classes and/or have content knowledge.
- Alternative license.
- The requirements are not a value. It adds a barrier. Too much of a barrier.
- Since the institution of HQ was the trend of achievement. Has it made that big of a difference?
- Should this be an issue more at the higher education level as well?
- There is a lot more that goes into it then just being HQ.
- No comparison of effective teachers with HQ teachers.
- Need to do a better job of assessing teachers - effective would have a much better meaning.
- Yes. They should be able to demonstrate this. Middle school is a challenge. Having the middle school content endorsements would help.
- Could this be applied only to core content areas?
- This is a challenge for rural districts when they have one teacher teaching 5-6 content areas. HOUSSE was helpful for this.
- It should come back to the districts making sound hiring judgments.
- In terms of content knowledge demonstration, maintaining some level of what CDE has done already with highly qualified might work. We also talked about a concern with being overly concerned with content knowledge and not pedagogical knowledge. This might open the flood gates too much for alternative preparation.



- In the context of a small district we discussed whether you have a SPED teacher and they needed to teach math, could there be an online course that you could take as they move through the content?
- The program needed to get a Superintendent's license is a lesser program than what she's already completed. Why would her principal's license and administrative experience not be considered?
- Requirements are inconsistent in Colorado. Moved here from Illinois and is highly qualified, experienced, accomplished in the classroom. However, if she wanted to be a principal here in CO, she would practically need to get another license. Reciprocity is incredibly lacking.
- Doesn't seem right that in certain positions you can hire whomever you want, without the candidate needing to show competency.
- There should be some kind of credentialing review – if an out-of-state teacher/administrator has all those qualifications. Why wouldn't there be a way for those to transfer to Colorado licensure.
- Competency should be required, but offer alternate pathways to demonstrate competency.
- Tough to ask beginning teachers to accrue additional hours for certifications considering the cost/time/current rate of pay.
- In terms of content knowledge demonstration, maintaining something along the lines of what CDE is already doing regarding Highly Qualified might work. Need some sort of measure in terms of pedagogy.
- In the context of a small district, if you have a special education teacher that may need to teach algebra, could there be an online course that they could take first to be able to teach algebra and then finish their SPED certification later on.
- What is the purpose of difference between the question on the form and the question on the slide – one says demonstrate content knowledge and one says demonstrate competency. Which one do you want feedback on? Team at table was very confused about this requirement/wording/change in law. Why are we asking this question? It seems an obvious answer to say yes.
- It is reasonable to expect that teachers demonstrate grade level competency in the subject area that they are teaching. If it's not a federal requirement, then it should be a state requirement. How it should be measured is up for debate. Do you have an MA or take some test to demonstrate competency?
- Excessive attention to content knowledge. You can be brilliant at calculus and not necessarily be able to effectively teach it.
- Overly focused on content knowledge and not focused enough pedagogy.
- Equity for smaller districts. Have 6 preps.
- SPED teacher that needs to teach algebra, can there be an online course to take to help smaller districts?
- Sits on both sides of the fence on this, they need to have content knowledge. That doesn't really need an endorsement. For the highly qualified, we would look for a math



endorse person, we have a science teacher that had to cover and he had some content knowledge. Has to be demonstrated in some way, preferable having to pass a content knowledge base. Some teachers with the knowledge cannot convey that knowledge to the students. The ability at the district or school level, to determine the qualifications for a teacher who may be able to teach that content knowledge. Local guideline for selecting characteristics that show a highly qualified teacher to teach other content areas.

- In our technology driven area, the content knowledge is already out there. They need an engaging level of teacher. For an area if limited area of teachers. We need to have teachers that are in the content area.
- Level of trust in the HR departments to put quality people in the classrooms.
- We had conversations on 2 threads, one is the teacher in front of my student should have the content knowledge to teach them the content.
- The other thread is the limited number of some teachers to encourage them to continue in the education field and to encourage them to stay teachers.
- Teachers should be endorsed in the subject they are teaching. In the case of a hard to fill area, but teachers are actively working towards endorsement then the state could give a waiver.
- There should be a requirement under content knowledge as well.
- Not opposed to PLACE—we cannot have unqualified teachers, especially in secondary math.
- It becomes an equity issue so that ELs don't have access to "qualified" teachers.
- Perhaps the state can offer "incentives" for the hardest to reach/serve schools.
- Provide some kind of monetary incentive—especially new teachers.
- Inform teachers about "loan forgiveness" programs for teaching in high needs schools.
- In terms of content knowledge--maintain what CDE has already done. Don't focus only on content knowledge (alternative licensure) but also find a way to include pedagogy.
- Go back to "equity" especially for rural schools who have more needs.
- Whether a special education teacher could teach math—rural schools.
- Double edge sword. In an ideal world you should be required to demonstrate competency but rural districts have a challenge with this.
- Teacher shortage –is about availability of teachers not licensure.
- We have teacher/educator effectiveness that requires teacher competency;
- We do believe that our educator evaluation system has checks and balances already.
- Is it about pedagogical knowledge or content knowledge?
- Yes, we already do this through 191, through rubric that checks on whether or not an educator is doing their job in the classroom.
- The teacher in front of my kid should have content knowledge.
- With teacher shortage should we sacrifice quality for recruitment purposes?
- Who needs to define this—if left up to state we are limiting our options, should trust that those hiring are doing what they should to put quality teachers in front of kids.



- Teachers should be required to have content knowledge, yes, but the only way to measure is the placement exam.
- Highly qualified: one of the best teachers in a school showed up as non-qualified.
- Have a qualified teacher or don't have a teacher at all.
- Teacher shortages, the more rigid rules we have, we're going to make it impossible.
- High need communities should receive same level of teachers.
- What was the purpose of adding to licenses all the endorsements?
- Need to focus on coloring, playing, and having fun.
- Consult with the experts.
- Teachers should be required to demonstrate competency in the area in which they teach. Should be required to take the assessment. PRAXIS or PLACE. It is an easy way to show subject matter certification. This could be the way to get the endorsement. Would make it easier for districts in placing people.
- Rural districts have hard time finding people that are qualified to teach the subject. May need an appeal process. Need to figure out how to make it work for the kids. How can we help the person put into a position even if they don't start out being qualified – profession development, team teaching? Sometimes schools that don't have correct teachers just put anybody in there. This happens across all areas - could be a 4th grade teacher teaching physical education.
- Endorsements are more important for secondary schools than elementary. Special Education teachers need competency as well, since sometimes that is the only teacher that the student will have for their content.
- Budget issues can contribute to this as well. Programs need to be in place to help the teachers. Plan where the state and district split the professional development. Or CDE could have a "math endorsement class" or use collaboration with Higher Education. Classes that could be taken over the course of 1-2 years for a teacher to get their endorsement. Can use online classes also, could be similar to alternative licensure. Need to start taking the classes right away, but create a balance with not overwhelming the teacher. Could have modules that allow them to take the content that they need to teach first. Could also focus on teaching strategies within the content area.
- Need to work with universities to make sure that this happens. Tests, professional development, allowing teachers time to go to conferences. Time and money are issues.
- Content knowledge demonstration, maintaining some CDE regulations for highly qualified. Need to focus on pedagogical knowledge as well as just content knowledge. Lesson planning, classroom management, etc.
- Equity with small districts – would a teacher be responsible for content knowledge in 6 different subjects?
- In the context of a small district, and there is a special education teacher teaching math, could there be an online course for them to teach - take the algebra section first if that is what they are teaching then go back and take the rest.
- If anyone is teaching out of field, they could have a requirement to accrue the 24 hours of coursework to get coursework, but the problem is that the out of field teachers are



going to be rural. This is a recipe for disaster, where people don't have the options. Changing state law would hurt rural districts even more, but allowing the teachers to teach kids without expertise hurts the kids. Could rely on distance learning more.

- In specialty areas, potentially the state plan should say that if you are teaching out of field, at some point you should have to get the experience through coursework or testing within a certain time frame. Don't want to break standards through lack of personnel.
- Would like stronger requirements for licensure for librarians, and a librarian in every school, not just a media consultant. It is important to have a teaching background and qualifications; not just having the library run by paras. Also paras should not be teaching classes. Qualified librarians make a huge difference in a school.
- Some universities mentor their teachers for a year after they graduate.
- 1996 there was a portfolio for teachers to show competency.
- The whole teacher shortage really affects how much you can push the requirements. We don't have enough teachers now.
- We would like to see a national movement on this issue so that Colorado is not an outlier in the national conversation.
- How can Colorado entice teachers to come here to Colorado?
- How about charters? They have a little more flexibility in hiring.
- Keep highly qualified.
- Content vs. pedagogy.
- Equity of small districts compared to large districts. Six preps in rural and only 1 prep in urban, is this fair?
- Teachers need to have knowledge in the subject area either through highly qualified status, effectiveness (through evaluation) a PLACE or PRAXIS exam.
- Yes! Every job in the private sector must be required to demonstrate competency – public sector should be the same thing teachers without competency set students up for failure! This should be state law.
- Yes through some type of measure – whether a test, coursework or experience.
- Also – education effectiveness address this.
- They always do this via education effectiveness – it is evaluated through standards. We don't need to go beyond this – many years were put into developing the education effectiveness system and we need to stick with this, not add on more to teachers.
- Already exists in the educator effectiveness/evaluation system.
- I would leave this up to district and schools to define. With such a wide range of school sizes and locations you must trust that those in charge of hiring at those levels have the capabilities.
- That is a great ideal – but the compensation issue will lead this in rural areas.
- Qualified vs. teacher shortage.
- Quality and quantity.
- Not through state law.



- There is benefit to keeping this open. Districts are held to accountability that encourages them to only have the best (even if that means hiring with expectation to show competency).
- Yes – state level proof/test: Contingency/time to prove.
- No – this is better handled at the local (district) level.
- Consider assessing schools on teacher quality/credentials as “bonus points” in school quality to encourage higher quality teachers but not tie hands of rural districts who have high need for teachers.
- The PLACE test is the measure that we have, but it seems insufficient.
- This is a different issue in some areas of the state - rural districts are struggling to get teachers to fill some positions.
- Rural districts also may require individual teachers to teach in a number of content areas.
- A single measure doesn’t seem appropriate to determine teacher content knowledge.
- Teacher shortages are causing increase in alternative pathways to teaching. But we need to still have requirements related to quality.
- Higher Education isn’t a paragon of producing excellent teaching.
- Would making it more rigorous to be a teacher cause more people to want to become teachers? Is it a challenging intellectual pursuit to become a teacher? Do they realize how engaging being an educator actually can be because we don’t present ourselves as a profession and as a profession of intellectuals and rigorous teachers?
- We don’t recognize the range of expertise that teachers actually have. Compare this to the medical model.
- Strict measures of content knowledge don’t necessarily measure good teaching. Knowing the content is not enough. I’d be hesitant to put that kind of restriction on there.
- Maybe require content knowledge, but not in isolation.
- I also wonder if adding more rigor to teacher preparation would help retention.
- I actually think the field does a good job of getting rid of teachers that aren’t doing well.
- Often what causes someone to leave the field isn’t about good teaching. A lot of it is about the stress and navigating classroom management.
- There is not distinction in the system - a newly minted first year teacher is expected to perform the same as a 15 year veteran. I was introduced to a model in California which escalates the time devoted to teaching and building capacity over time.
- One year of teacher prep doesn’t get them all the way there.
- There is an intellectual rigor to being a classroom teacher that isn’t taught in taking 3 years of calculus. It is different.
- It means we need to get tighter in the pedagogical content connection. They have to have foundations of content, but also how students learn content.
- No - let the system sort out who needs to stay.
- We do need a higher quality bar for licensure though.



Discussion Question #3: How should CDE modify current EL Identification, Re-designation, and Exit guidance to meet the ESSA state plan requirements? What additional criteria should be considered?

• **Feedback Forms:**

- No idea.
- Keep measurement of growth and use research for more common designation of language level.
- Don't put effort here. Criteria aren't the issue.
- It would be great if students had the opportunity to be re-designated at multiple points during the year.
- BOE – WAPT, ACCESS.
- Access scores as a base of evidence. Need ability to determine if issues are language or content issues.
- EL testing. Moving from district to district-retake tests – use information from 1 district to another. Some ID for students to succeed.
- Exit criteria needs to loosen for students with disabilities. Missing data complicates re-designation and exit. Over-tested population – exit needs to be easier.
- Consider mobility and translation between schools and districts.
- Need to consider more criteria to show ability to exit (i.e., IEP SLP id student – will never pass on current criteria).
- Exit criteria needs to change due to low cognition or other verbal disabilities – some students will never pass all criteria, yet are English proficient. Need 100% to pass – this leads to change. Also there are missing data components for some students. Definition of EL is very high.
- Language and academic proficiency. Systemic practices of criteria. LEP.
- Yes – need to reexamine all criteria and current guidance – expert group.
- Align to federal OCR and definition of ELL guidelines. Focus on accurate identification. Make sure exit criteria is not linguistically, geographically and culturally biased. Able to be successful on stake standard as well. TSEL standards should be applied in criteria. Focus on tier 1 and not over or under representation. *Don't put exit burden on the student, put it on the teacher.
- Need to know more – host this conversation again when more info is known.
- I believe that more research needs to be done in the area of dually diagnosed students. Also, the W-APT when applied to incoming kindergarten students or special needs students can “err” on the side of qualifying them. A better qualifier is needed.
- Support district coming up with shared understanding or when is best to keep student in EL and when to transition. Pair with Special Education data.
- Research on ELL's with IEP's: criteria for and support for equality across state. Research on identified ELLs vs. support in district and impact on achievement proficiency. The criteria could be adjusted based on needs. Regardless, need professional development for reliability of criteria implemented.
- How have current practices provided improvement? Change comes from lack of positive results.



- Identification: should be a way for students identified as EL to be exited early on if misidentified, given how hard it is to exit through academic and ACCESS measures later on. Re-designation: should have “ever-EL” category (see Oregon’s new model) to follow EL students throughout trajectory. Exit criteria: research needed to determine effects of being EL-classified across districts before deciding whether common criteria makes sense. Reclassification should be based on multiple measures of linguistic criteria (not academic).
- CDE should mirror OCR EL ID, re-designation and exit criteria. Attention to bias - choose assessments looking to avoid linguistically, geographically, culturally biased. Exit: burden should not be on student. Accurate ID needed: gifted and disability. ID. for – Consider Disproportionally Re: focus on Tier 1 and not over/under represent.
- Stop requiring such a high “test-out” level as many students would not meet that level, even having learned only English.
- How does WIDA play into this already?
- Are EL and FR double impacted students taken into consideration for these kids or does this mix pots of money?
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - It is really important. Haven’t heard staff complain about it being too hard. What does it mean to be ELL? Just because they speak another language, it doesn’t mean they necessarily need supports.
 - Have heard a lot of people say that they don’t want to spend money on enabling people who don’t know English (just one end of the spectrum). Don’t just keep kids in the program just to have a program. Should encourage them.
 - You should get credit for moving your students in ELL if you have been successful. The system should show growth. If you don’t get any movement, that should show too. We should ask, ‘Are you doing it well?’ Some students say the ELL classes are too easy. We should let them move into the area they need, and we should get credit for that. You shouldn’t be penalized for success.
 - Would be frightened if measure went away totally. Not that our students have grown adequately. If you stop measuring it, it will become more of an issue. Don’t push Title 3 into Title 1. Not sure it will get the attention it deserves.
 - With common state wide criteria, discuss the impact of being ELA in different districts. May be beneficial to exit earlier.
 - If we don’t have AMAOs, what are we going to use other than standardized tests? Problem with AMAOs: those who need to make AMAOs have not been able to make improvements. Don’t want AMAOs because they don’t seem to be working but still need a structure in place to make sure students aren’t lost/ignored.
 - Like going up to 4 years. Problem comes from where kids could make a certain level on WIDA and they don’t grow or move forward in English language.
 - Concern of focus on acquisition of language and not content knowledge.
 - Immense concern of stopping the measurement of growth for English learners. Concern with Title III not getting importance it needs because it’s being lumped in with Title I.



- Like SPED, should there be a process to opt-out EL students. Parents don't have the right to decline identification but has the right to refuse services.
- Loves that CO has re-designation criteria, wants guidance on multi-designated students who are proficient with learning disability but don't get proficient scores.
- Opportunity to EL alternate assessment, i.e. alternate pathway other than ACCESS?
- Identification process for preschool does not exist, would like some.
- Needs to be more easily understood. Lots of confusion because there is high mobility with some of the EL students. Test is given in January 9 months prior to the counting of the students. You cannot re-designate at the end of the year. Needs to be after the EOY report.
- Need timely usable data. Too many layers that goes along with it.
- Students that verbally were ok but couldn't exit because of reading and writing.
- Hard for teachers in the field to keep up with the requirements to provide services as well as the paperwork.
- Each LEA can decide what the body of evidence is for each student.
- I would be really frightened if the measurement went away totally. I'd hate to see it just disappear. Most districts over 20% EL don't make adequate growth. It's hard enough to see Title III pushed into Title I. Now I'm not sure it will get quite the importance it needs.
- I think we do need to take a look at current guidance. It does not address students who are identified as emerging bilingual and having a learning disability.
- We discussed the possibility of having common statewide criteria. There is a need for having a research based method of identifying students. That research needs to be conducted before common criteria is established.
- It would be frightening if the measurement went away completely, and schools/districts were not accountable for their EL students.
- Current guidance does not address students who are dually identified. How will this impact exit criteria?
- Need for research – is it sometimes better to be exited earlier, or to extend those supports for a greater amount of time?
- Current guidance works very well locally. Allows for districts to use a BOE to ensure that students really are ready for exit.
- Need to revisit identification and re-designation because it does not take into account bilingual.
- Cannot stop measuring performance of EL
- Common statewide criteria – need to conduct research to drive this decision.
- We have a pretty rigorous system already.
- We might be identifying kids using the screener who should not be EL.
- Allow for a body of evidence but the timelines don't meet the needs for a student that is new to a school.
- Re-designation process—is good for some kids but not for all high school kids. Perhaps a committee that could look at “poor performance” rather than one teacher decision.



- Exit should only be done if the student is ready.
- CO should ensure that all requirements for ELs are aligned to Federal standards.
- What should be done for the exited ELs if they are still not achieving?
- We need to keep the accountability for our ELs. If you stop measuring outcomes then they will not be important.
- We do need to look at current ID and designation---current system does not address students who are dually identified/designated such as EL and SPED.
- There is a need for research on the current needs of ELs within districts before deciding on common criteria.
- The level that kids have to reach in order to exit are impossible to reach.
- It is very hard to get out of EL designation—yet the test is reading and writing which are the hardest areas to master.
- Kids in ELL ended up with the less qualified teachers.
- Title 1, ECS has been a mess to administer.
- The first year when the state had to review vendors. State has tried to hold district more accountable. This helps districts to choose a provider.
- Like the idea that the state can hold the 3% so that principal can make a more informed decision.
- Secondary schools to start thinking about the use of these funds, and what you do with the 6th grader that can't read.
- Using these funds for secondary schools.
- Does the state measure how many students are classified as EL.
- It's better to over-identified to under-identify.
- Making sure you get the re-designation right.
- ESSA gives the option to having some common criteria.
- This would help students be identified, for example, as an ELL student.
- Common criteria are important, what's the effect of being ELL in different students.
- It's important to follow students even after they are out of a certain category. This provides a better picture of how students are doing.
- Cultural knowledge.
- There's a challenge of resources in the state.
- Challenging ourselves to step away from English and Math.
- Not specialized in this area. Need to make sure kids don't exit too soon to keep them from failing on other tests.
- It would be bad for the testing just to disappear. If you stop measuring progress, the problem becomes even a greater problem. Unsure if this will get the attention it needs being pushed into Title I.
- Need to take a look at identification. Exit guidance. It doesn't address immersing bilingual and learning disabled. Should look at how this overlaps to form new guidance.
- Possibility of common statewide re-classification. Need to look at classification in different districts and what services are received. May be beneficial to either exit earlier or stay in a supportive environment longer depending on what services are provided.



- Body of evidence.
- Big list of criteria to verify language proficiency and academic proficiency.
- What could be adjusted in the reliability across districts not the criteria?
- More systemic practices throughout the state and district to district.
- I'm concerned about the students we have had since Kindergarten and are in high school and are still identified as EL.
- Schools just need to actually re-designate - some incentive to keep them as EL identified to retain Title III funds.
- Don't modify current EL identification.
- Don't add more criteria.

Discussion Question #4: What does well-rounded and healthy students mean to you?

● **Feedback Forms:**

- Exposure to all content areas and the arts, movement, access to healthy food, social-emotional learning is emphasized and students feel safe.
- Students who have the opportunity to explore their passions in all areas of interest. Arts – PE – Business – Language.
- Safe, empowered, engaged and have access to academic and non-academic skills: PE, health education, positive youth development programs. All voices are heard.
- Educating and funding the entire child from ensuring breakfast lunch is served to funding for all classes and programs they are in.
- One that feels safe at school, gets PE every day and has the opportunity to take music and art.
- Physically fit, agency, resilience, hopefulness, self-regulation, empathy, access to learning opportunities in creative arts, engineering career internships, etc.
- Providing equitable and inclusive environments (how to measure):
 - 1) Socially and emotionally intelligent.
 - 2) Physically and emotionally safe.
 - 3) Challenged academically and prepared for success in college and career.
 - 4) Engaged in learning and connected to community.
 - 5) Supported by qualified, caring adults.
 - 6) Learning about and practicing healthy lifestyles.
- Students who are healthy physically, mentally and socially. Many students don't have access to adequate care/supports in these areas. I think it definitely is an impact to student success. Also, students who are engaged in learning and who are well prepared for success after graduation.
- No elimination of PE, access to arts, PA/PE, consistently throughout large districts. In mountains, participate in the mountain activities, implementation of whole child (social/emotional, physical, safety). Strong wellness policy being implemented.
- Kids having the skills to make healthy decisions.
- Joy, the ability to make good choices.



- Well rounded and healthy students need to be surrounded by healthy and well-rounded teachers.
- Safe, socially and emotionally well, physically healthy, well-rounded education including subjects of interest to them. Skills to make healthy choices. Environments that support healthy students.
- Healthy: An opportunity to incorporate mental health (social emotional aspects) components that are often missing.
- The term “well-rounded” is a very culturally specific term – does it mean the same for all our families? If we define this do we have to measure it? Will this go on an accountability report?
- Students should be well rounded in all subject area. Students need to have PE, health center class around mental, physical and emotional development. Students need to be moving [increase] brain production through process blood flow, allows more connection to talk, place in brain – allows learning to take place.
- A student that is the product of plenty of resources that have exposed the child to art, science, music, foreign, PE, math, English, drama etc. Until we have more resources over kids are limited by the extent we can fulfill our dreams.
- Health and wellness includes staff! “All students are able and motivated to learn.” Considering the physical (physical activity, nutrition, health services), mental, social, emotional and behavioral health of students. CDC has the WSCC model and there are a ton of experts and organizations that already work with districts across the state in this area. This is EQUITY, health needs of students and disproportionate allocation of resources to districts across state.
- Social emotional supports available from Pre-K on arts, music, physical movement, stress reduction methods from Pre-K on. Recess before lunch, nutritious accessible food. PE supported all levels, move every day. Accessible dental help/screening/care.
- Access to a school nurse every day/all day. Social emotional supports PK-HS (comprehensive). Access to arts – music. PE every day! Students are happy, attending school, up to date immunizations dental care and wellness exams.
- Options, choices.
- Social/emotional, physical, academic, financial, provide lots of opportunities to help develop passions.
- Basic command of literacy and math. Variety of educational experiences. (Core content/electives/arts). Prepared to take their chosen next step. Multi-cultural awareness (physical/mental health). Global minded. Self-advocate – access resources responsibly/wisely.
- Well-rounded and healthy adults. Looking at the whole student and all aspects. Mental, physical, access to opportunities and experiences and work experiences, exposure expanding VOC, create a skill center. Problem solving skills, skills to make healthy choices, hospitable, environment.



- Socially and emotionally intelligent/supported. Safe. Challenging academically. Engaged. Healthy. Culturally proficient. Districts should define or engage in deep collaborative process for a state definition.
- This means that students have opportunities to participate in social, academic, and artistic programs. Healthy means that the students have access to health services, counseling, etc. also teachers need to be healthy and well-rounded.
- Yes – like leadership and vetting of programs that might be ignored (secondary, etc.). Out of the box. Using to determine “community” supports like health and wellness.
- A student that can take classes (choice) in their fields of interest – pull interests across curriculum. Healthy food. Movement. Mindfulness. Counseling – mental health. Choice of learning modality. Arts and music. Brain breaks.
- Strong psychological safety, healthy students – not only physical but psychological.
- Social/emotional component.
- Address student aptitudes when designing educational opportunities. Individualization is key.
- Students who are engaged, happy and positive about life’s opportunities.
- Social emotional, physical, mentally healthy – students who are able to pursue their interests and strengths and don’t have to conform to a cookie cutter education. This should be driving/first level questions that frames all the rest.
- What are the parameters and the funding ties to this?
- ASCD – whole child.
- “Able to make healthy choices.” (Hospitable environments to enable). Every aspect=whole student – includes: Mental Health, Physical. Health, Access to opportunities an experiences and peers. Exec. functioning and resilience. Post-secondary options. Transferable skills. Problem solving skills. (“Able to apply” and adapt).
- Students, teachers, and parents that are educated on how to prevent child sexual abuse and sexual assault and sexual harassment including healthy sexual development in children.
- State needs to help educate districts that this is a new option for their funds.
- True knowledge of a healthy, lifestyle and how to incorporate exercise into a regular life – example: recess/physical activity.
- Access to a variety of activities (academic, athletic and creative) and outlets for expression.
- Encouraging competency and accountability.
- Creative play in early education.
- More than just academics.
- Hands-on learning experiences.
- Social-emotional needs.
- Access and opportunity no matter your zip code.
- No just learning from sitting in a desk – more opportunity for hands on, experiential learning. The pendulum needs to swing back.



- Well-rounded – experiential learning, maintaining reasonable requirements for students to demonstrate mastery.
- Mental health services.
- A student needs to be exposed to a wide range of co-curricular/art areas at a younger level so that students have choice and understanding to stay involved. More depth can be reached after exposure and choice.
- Mental health – activities or daily living, curriculum.
- Exposure to diverse experiences extra curriculums. In and out of school experiences.
- Students should generally have classes to challenge, engagement, and support within a safe environment. Families should be brought into their child’s education (especially traditionally “uninvolved” populations). Don’t get rid of recess (or require it).
- Includes arts, PE, outdoor activities including sports. Also technology and information literacy, which requires libraries and librarians to aid in the use of funds (see crs.org).
- Students are engaged.
- Students have opportunities for civic involvement in their school and community opportunities for outdoor learning.
- Students are engaged in maintaining environmental, physical and mental health.
- Includes environmental education.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Some of the frustration with testing is that it doesn’t get to what a fully rounded healthy student is. The robust mental health services came up on parent surveys. “My school needs a counselor. Feedback on facility and funding needs.”
 - Healthy includes mental health needs. Problematic to provide true mental health services. There needs to be a more robust system.
 - Schools with school based health clinics see a decrease in chronic absenteeism. Need supports for mental health in terms of substance abuse, and what that means. Choices and opportunities to participate with what interests you (while keeping in mind nutrition, how important sleep is, arts). Part of the reason we have the schedule is because of transportation and not student’s learning schedules. Should get recess because it is important. A lot of it comes down to funding. Doesn’t tie to academic achievement. Stress management is important. We came up with an accountability system but we are still not measuring the things we want to be. How do we measure students’ health? We are wealthy enough to fund it as a state, we just don’t.
 - Having them have a healthy self-esteem (bullying, culture of the school, having empathy and telling them what they can give back to society. Everybody has a role. It doesn’t work in people that don’t participate. Kids are hearing about how important exams are and it results in an added level of stress.
 - Concern that expanding school choice has the danger of diminishing standards, professional development, training, licensure, and teachers for charter schools.
 - Students should not be inundated solely with testable content K-12. Measuring the whole child and aligning that with accountability/assessment shouldn’t be the focus.
 - Exposure to electives, especially at secondary level.



- Ability to have meaningful career readiness.
- Students' basic needs are met.
- Kids who want to come to school, don't want to be constantly measured and don't want to be there. Students need to be engaged and inspired.
- Charity that fulfill student's non-academic needs, how can we make that sustainable?
- Focus should not just be on nutrition and PE. Space for social, emotional needs, mental and behavior health.
- Speaks to the growing interest in addressing the whole child. Having a wide variety of experiences to draw from. Not just on math reading writing. Finding interest in other things.
- Rural districts would be at a disadvantage for some of the other/extra programs. Online, there may be some work-around for this.
- Student ownership. Student voice and having the student at the table.
- What kind of skills do these students need when they graduate? How do we use the student communications to their advantage?
- Parents understanding their role in the process of helping the student's education.
- Social-emotional, the whole child, mental health supports.
- I think well-rounded means that all the things that feed into academic success, such as physical well-being, mental health, etc. It's very valuable to give teachers mental health training because they are already experts in their content areas. Out-of-school time programs are key in providing these supports that can't be supported during the school day.
- Non-academic competencies.
- Access to arts and music, students that are happy, access to dental care and wellness exams.
- Cultural proficiency.
- There are some districts with substantial resources who have done some deep work on this already. It would be great to get access to what they have learned. We need to get clear on what we mean by this and how we will measure it. And how do we protect student data privacy while we do all this.
- Students having the skills to make healthy decisions.
- We talked about a lot of things that indicate well-rounded students, like joy, the ability to make good choices. One of the things we thought was important was to be surrounded by well-rounded and healthy teachers. I don't know what CDE can do about that.
- Part of the concern is when we look at what our system is asking for its students who do really well in English and in Math. To me it seems we have a fundamental challenge of funding. Part of it is challenging ourselves to step away from English and Math as the two drivers. I think about all of these discussions and wonder if this is really what makes the best sense for students who want to have a fun childhood. Part of the narrative has to be about coming together to get around or change the limitation of our resources. Right now it seems we can only dream inside a box of existing funding sources.



- Comprehensive health – mental, not just physical – social emotional, etc. Whole School, Whole Child – Coordinated School model. Building safety, staff well-being are key components. Using climate surveys, student surveys to collect health-specific data. Healthy students are more likely to succeed in school. We have the standards, but there is not the associated monitoring/accountability in order to ensure that these standards are followed.
- Access to a school nurse, all day, every day. Access to arts and music, PE classes every day. Vaccinations, dental, and medical care.
- Would be great to have access to the results/data of districts who have already done substantial work in this area.
- Students having the ability to make healthy choices, and an environment that encourages them to do so.
- A well-rounded and healthy student has to be surrounded by well-rounded and healthy teachers that understand self-care and social emotional well-being.
- System is asking for students who are doing well in English and well in Math, but we need to challenge ourselves to step away from that emphasis. What are the resources we don't have? What are the ways we can think outside of the constraints we've been given?
- Enrichment – not in the curriculum/not tested.
- Participation in clubs, sport,; engagement in school, students that can advocate for selves based on their own perception of needs, etc. - the possibilities are endless. However, concerned that defining it might mean have to measure, collect data, report it, and assess progress towards well-rounded.
- Indicators will include things that are out of control of schools (e.g., sleep, happiness).
- Should be focused on desired outcomes. Resiliency.
- Very culturally-based terms that mean something different to every single family.
- Access to health nurse every day. Access to arts, PE, nutrition.
- Up to date immunization.
- Happy.
- Larger summative statement – get access to the information/research from some districts that have done that.
- Not included in accountability.
- Students having skills to make healthy choices and having the options available in their environments to make good choices.
- Our current system is focused on students that excel at RWM. Limited resources to implement the other. So problem-solving/discussions need to think outside the box.
- Whole school whole community whole child model is what Adams 12 is currently using. Outside of nutritional work, we look for access to healthcare social/emotional care and a very pretty picture. Knowing that students need those types of access, we need to have them there so they can come to school ready to learn. Student center based with outside supports to access learning.
- Healthy, outside more.



- Mental health support for students.
- Kids mental health is more important than their grades—sometimes kids are stressed out because of their grades. It can be overwhelming especially for high school kids. There is much more stress for kids than in the past. If kids approached the testing as a “snapshot” not a big deal. High stakes testing is not a good thing for kids.
- When we look at our ELs within graduation requirements—we need to see them as a student with a language gift, all languages should be honored-students with a second language are gifted not behind.
- We need to use the language of “giftedness” not as deficits.
- Use a good screener for ELs that are gifted and don’t punish kids for knowing a second language.
- Looking at a child’s strengths and honoring these strengths and talents.
- Speaks to the non-academic measure if our kids are well-rounded they are not chronically absent. For those who are—what is missing how are their needs not being met.
- Think about how are kids under stress to perform.
- Culture of competition is not helping kids.
- Healthy student means an access to a school nurse, art, PE, wellness, school psychologist.
- Cultural proficiency.
- It would be good to have access to the resources other students have created so we can benefit from all the work being done. How will this be measured?
- Students having the skills to make healthy choices and opportunity to do this.
- Joy, the ability to make good choices, a well-rounded student has to be surrounded by well-rounded teachers who know how to self-care.
- Well-rounded means—access and opportunity no matter where you live.
- These opportunities impact kids. We have gone so far with testing, that we have done away with field trips because it is not related to the test.
- We have taken away all the fun of learning.
- It is also about maintaining reasonable requirements at the mastery level instead of proficiency, takes into account mastery rather than testing.
- It allows for more meaningful learning for kids, more experiential learning.
- Why is seat time still so important?
- Are we funding past the minimum level?
- Never heard of kids graduating early because other systems are based on mastery not competency.
- Feel strongly that districts need more help with determining what this means. We need more information on how to apply for these \$, rather than districts doing what they’ve always done, need more guidance on what is included.
- We need mental health supports for students.
- Research shows that getting kids outdoors and more physical activity improves mental health.



- Dream Act, there is an in-state tuition. The act passed, students need to meet certain criteria. Students that are in this situation can get financial aid.
- If we need healthy and well-rounded kids we need well-rounded teachers and administrators.
- How does this affect mutual consent in the contracts?
- PE and Arts program, extended programs.
- We are turning out students that aren't educated and we need to turn the focus.
- There needs to be a balance.
- Students are showing higher performance in the areas of the arts.
- Districts have to make a choice, and not all stakeholders are at the table to make decisions.
- Kids that are involved in more activities become better students.
- Have the funds go to the district instead of the state.
- Healthy students: physically and psychologically, lost a lot of that when Title IV was previously lost. Engaged – diversifying to meet kid's needs and aptitudes. Getting kids to like school and want to be there. Some kids that come from families that don't encourage them, could be good at an activity like music or art but they don't take it, could require all kids to take at least one activity class. Healthy schools are talking about food, allowing people to get up and move, and not allowing big companies to dictate what is in vending machines. Having time for the arts, physical education, health education, access to psychological counseling. All the things that used to be there that are the body of the whole child that have gotten neglected with too much emphasis on academics.
- Taken out science and health in elementary school and taken out the fun and the important part of who they are. Healthy student is given the majority of their instruction in the way that they learn best. Kids sitting on exercise balls, or riding on bikes in the classroom. Technology has rewired their brains, and we aren't meeting the needs of the kids as individuals. Multi-sensory learning is really helpful for kids to learn and concentrate. Important to put emphasis on the whole child. Eating breakfast, eating good quality food helps kids to concentrate, maybe having cooking classes. Teaching kids in ways that they are interested in.
- Well-rounded and healthy are defined within the 12 standards that we already have. They are important but not already stated. This is the importance of academic enrichment grants. Feel strongly that districts need help in understanding these types of grant programs. Important for districts to feel empowered in applying for new grants. Would like the state to give guidance to districts on how to apply for things.
- Healthy students can be outdoors and active, as well as better mental health.
- Have options and choices yoga and golf, things that are life-long.
- Bringing a focus at the state level of programs like PE and art because they are going to be the first one to be cut. Research showed that kids excel with exercise.
- Develop passion in kids, whatever that passion could be.
- Have opportunities for safe time to exercise in the school area.



- Model after a preschool - the different centers in the classroom. They get to choose for over an hour.
- Include all parts of the child- social, emotional, mental.
- 21st century skills.
- Perseverance from the student.
- Parents look for those schools with many different options for the kids.
- Support teachers to be healthy.
- Why didn't we ask this question before now to measure it?
- Let's take a more collective look at what districts have done.
- Access to the arts, PE, engineering, career focused, non-traditional opportunities like internships, capstone projects.
- We want resilience, aspiring, empathy, physical fitness, not sick, culturally and actively engaged.
- See purpose in school.
- School is providing meaningful opportunities relevant to them.
- Seeking out new understanding.
- Engaged students have little choice which naturally leads to disagreement.
- Let's have an individual statewide and accessible conversation about how to measure what could be used for accountability and how to protect student privacy consistent with state law.
- What shouldn't be?

Discussion Question #5: Should CDE reserve 3% of Title I, Part A funds for direct student services grants?

- **Feedback Forms:**
 - Grants should be open to organizations that work with schools and students, not only to schools. Pick organizations that have a proven track record.
 - Perhaps, to address equity issues for students of color, lower income students, LGBTQ students.
 - NO – funds should stay with schools.
 - NO. The state so poorly funds schools as it is. Why should they pick and choose who gets more or less vs. if you are eligible you should receive them.
 - NO.**
 - No. Prefer to be able to have the funds as a set aside or DMA for the Direct Student Services. Grants are not always in line with the school year, budget cycle and planning. Local control. Sustainability.
 - No, allow districts to use the funds as described, but do not remove from formula allocation.
 - Yes! Only if the student beneficiaries are impacted students. These options all seem to be increasing rigor for secondary students, which is shown to increase student growth achievement (increasing access to AP and IB concurrent enrollment etc. is good for kids).



- If you have a good formula for distributing the funds is there a need to hold 3% back to distribute again? Can the initial monies be used for “district student services?” Push this money out to the districts without a secondary process.
- Yes! As long as all subjects can apply for grants.
- Yes for all schools in all areas in the state.
- No. Grants take time and expertise – we say flow this money to districts.
- Yes. Schools need more support for direct student services, especially nurses, counselors, mental health providers. Colorado has nursing and other school health professionals and the basic needs of students are not being met and schools need more resources.
- In addition to 7%, there is a concern with less money out to field. Concern that money to secondary is too late to lead to change.
- Lots of questions on this question. Concern with 3% reducing assistance in schools and great process as a barrier to schools decisions.
- No. 7% is already coming off the top and if 1% of the 3% goes to admin. Not worth it.
- No, keep it local. That 3% would be eaten up by admin costs.
- Grant funding is important.
- No. Districts can better target needs.
- No. I would prefer that districts utilize these funds as a traditional DMA as needed in districts.
- I think that 3% should be reserved for direct student services.
- Yes. Different forms of internal and outsourced program.
- No, this should not be done at the expense of all districts taking a cut in Title I.
- Could be formula or competitive grants.
- No. Put the money with the kids and don’t make schools fight for it. Not competitive grants based Title I funds on poverty. This lowers all allocations. But allow districts to use allocations for these things.
- Distribute 100%.
- Yes – special case grants.
- Can’t offer an informed opinion without knowing how LEAs would use targeted funds and what impact would be of removing that 3% from what schools could expect - predictability.
- Depends on the amount. Could help to do something different. Money to pilot or something new, as grants, could give some direction. What is direct student service?
- Do not reserve the additional 3%.
- Yes! Especially for high school AP and career and tech training! These courses can set a high schooler in the right direction on the path to adulthood and can save money on college education.
- Probably – I don’t know enough yet.
- Depends on how much it will come back to districts – I like what the bullet on slide 23 says it can be used for.
- Why a grant and not just pushing this to schools? Additional money especially for direct student use to access and for fees.
- Yes, CDE can identify areas that can make a specific difference and allocates more funds to the most at-risk areas can really make a difference.



- Yes – for schools within the consistently under improving area. (I think –still a bit unclear).
- Yes.
- Yes – competitive grants to encourage new uses and increased opportunities for higher level students.
- **General Discussion Notes:**
 - Should the money go to state or district? You would write another grant to get the funding. Then you should just give it to schools and let them do whatever they want.
 - Similar to turnaround network funding. Do some districts rely a lot on states? Maybe we should just answer for our district.
 - Some schools may have a specific need that might be grant orientated.
 - It may be more valuable to let them accumulate and then let schools have larger pots of money up for grabs.
 - Access to school nurse (all day), access to arts, music, PE, up to date with dentist and health exams.
 - Cultural proficiency.
 - Districts with substantial research, and we should have statewide access to their learnings. What we mean by well rounded, how we measure, and what should not include in accountability.
 - Part of the concern is that if we look at what the system is asking, we have a challenge of resources in the state. We have opportunities with ESSA. We need to go away from looking at English and math being the drivers. Does this make sense for kids who want to have fun and a vigorous life?
 - Could be a good idea. Formula funds are great but with rural schools/small Title I population, it's such a small number. Consider hybrid of formula and competitive.
 - Should reserve the 3% if that money is impacting those students. Paying for the AP exams for needy students is one way for the funds to be used.
 - Is it enough money to make it matter for some of the things the district would want to do?
 - Keep it in the Title I formula.
 - Do schools feel like they're getting enough Title I money in the first place? If not, why take more off the top of that?
 - These are the kinds of things that maybe should remain local control because of the individual needs of each district and 3% is not very much money.
 - Depends on how funds will be distributed. If it means 3% less than what they would receive otherwise, then no. If it is funding in addition to what districts would normally receive, then yes.
 - 3% is not very much money. Seems like it would be eaten up by administrative costs. Keep the money local.
 - No – should be part of the formula distribution to districts. (5/6 said no and one was not sure it would be helpful but she did not know for sure).
 - Direct services should remain under local control. 3% is not very much money and can be eaten up by admin costs.
 - Table agrees that additional 3% should be for direct student services. Concern that some schools/districts just seem to throw away funding and they do not use it in



intentional ways. Could some of that money be used for a sound evaluation of the grant funding?

- Bottom line needs to go to the districts.
- Districts need help in understanding those grant opportunities more, more money so districts feel empowered to really understand what the grants entail and how to implement them and not fall into what they did before.
- Will the state use the same formula for Title I funds as they know that as of now it will look similar to the title I allocations? This could change.
- This seems like a lot on top of the 7%. Title I money provides the biggest impact the closer it is to students.
- Schools are doing well with their funds so they do a good job with spending their money.
- Need to leave the \$ in local hands.
- It would hurt districts. We don't have enough money, we need to direct funds to where it will impact kids.
- Budget constraints.
- This becomes an equity issue.
- Doesn't like the list of how the funds will be used.
- First distributions of funds.
- If we assume that we really need everyone's help, community organizations to be involved in schools.
- Instead of being supplemental instructions.
- Only 3% of part A.
- To provide technical assistance if funds are held by the state this can be added value.
- A mandate on the problem, you shouldn't have ECS if things that should be happening for kids are not happening.
- Likes the use of funds on transportation to have students go to a higher performing school.
- Most parents won't opt for choice.
- Mixed feeling about retaining the funds and whether it's going to yield results.
- Funds should remain in the district and local control.
- MTSS model, and support that can really help everyone.
- Support the whole child.
- What teachers are doing in the classroom to impact all students.
- Doesn't really understand what the 3% would be used for.
- Maybe this should remain at the district level – keep it local.
- MTSS model, not RtI. The structure and system could really help everyone, using PLC's to monitor tier I. It is comprehensive to help the whole child, not just a particular academic subject. Talks about what teachers are doing with all children.
- It could be helpful to level the playing field for rural schools, based on numbers and how money flows. Can address some disparity in funding.
- Reserving the funds should not be done during time of budget cuts. It should be given at the district level.
- Keep it local.



Other comments about quality instruction & leadership and supports for student success:

- **Feedback Forms:**

- Consider implementing different levels of recognition for mastery of teaching and leading.
- Professional development for staff on: social emotional learning and promoting positive school climate.
- Mentors for each subject area that need support due to poor performance on 191-etc.
- Help with lessons, units, and assessments.
- Support group for new teachers.
- Please ensure health and wellness is included in the plan so that districts and schools can meet the unique needs of their students.
- I think that teachers should be given a voice in their evaluations about their feelings on their professional growth and satisfaction that principals should have quality standards that address the same focus.
- Can Title III funds be used to set up a monitoring system within the district to be sure reclassification is done correctly? Ask students.
- ASCD – whole child. Kentucky school improvement rubric. Affective education.
- Teachers should have CLDE endorsements statewide.
- All answers MTSS!!
- Concern – if parents must be notified of teachers who need certification on licensure, this must be explained as to why. Example – there is an alternative licensure candidate teaching at my school, working towards licensure.
- I would like to see CDE offer training (education) on Title dollars and their uses to teachers. Too often districts just say this is how the dollars are used and teachers have no idea. Often teachers know best and are their students' best advocate. Do we need to know the potential uses of these dollars in order to advocate for our students?
- Supporting districts to expand opportunities. Professional development that with process for UIP.
- Professional development is critical. Give teachers access/time for a wide score of professional development that they are interested in as well as areas they need to improve.
- Include environmental education as an opportunity in the Title IV 21st century learning centers grants.
- Ensure district Title IV funds include environmental education as an option.

- **General Discussion Notes:**

- Consider implementing satellite offices for CDE around the state. May increase collaborative efforts with outlying schools and districts.
- Rural Colorado: high need in terms of getting teachers that have licenses in their field and getting them qualified. Example - If you want a 6th grade teacher to teach math they need to pass math license test but they will never teach Calculus.
- Mid-level exam for teachers that are teaching content level, for mid-level competency.
- Work experience: what's comparable for teachers?



- Science teachers: physical science teacher might end up teaching this and not have experience.
- Online schools have mixed reviews.
- If you do online school it's not comparable to in classroom. Technology is an issue at the rural level.
- We need to measure this at the beginning of the year.
- It's interesting that charter schools are targeting this type of student and kids.
- We turned everything into a machine and took away the personal touch of learning.
- This is not yielding results.
- Ignore the pacing guide.
- The actual leaning in the classroom is different to district pacing guide.
- There are studies that are showing that there's a lot of stress on young kids.
- Accelerated learning and improving achievement.
- It is different learning and different level of achievements.
- Contextualize and relevant.
- All the focus on measuring the student and parents worry about the students but there's no actual improvement.
- We measure but there are not better results.
- Standardized.
- We want personalized learning but use a cookie cutter tests.
- If you reserve this question in Title IV, you need to have this question throughout all education.
- Parent: maybe they will opt-out.
- Overly focused on content knowledge.
- We're not tracking pedagogical practice.
- Small district that have teachers that have 6 preps.
- Small district, SED teacher, could there be an online course that you can take to shift focus to algebra or something else a precursor.



ESSA Listening Tour – Event Feedback

How can we strengthen our process to involve parents, educators, and other stakeholders in developing our state plan for ESSA?

- I do not know how parents and students were made aware of the events but I think the communication to educators was fine and the two-prong way you collected feedback was effective.
- Circulate drafts early in the process, getting specific feedback from organized groups that represent stakeholders.
- Draft the roll-out and ask for further feedback to streamline the systems.
- By using regional superintendent councils more effectively to recruit expert opinions.
- Allow people to submit an application to serve on the Hub Committee or one of the Subcommittees.
- Reach out to school PTA/PTO organizations. Is there any way someone in your organization could speak at their state conference, as I'm sure many parents don't know anything about ESSA.
- Publish more info about sub-committees.
- Create a recorded webinar of the presentation and allow people to comment online.
- Have you reached out to educators nominated for teacher of the year in the past few years? These teachers would be a great resource and have deep networks. This might be useful in engaging teachers in the process.
- Need to provide more times for input informally like the listening tour. In addition, what outreach is CDE doing to organizations that represent the large stakeholder groups? CASE, CASB, CO PTA, CEA?
- Use other communication channels (like Chalkbeat) to push out opportunities for feedback. Offer more metro area events due to the large population.
- Schedule a large # of ESSA mini-sessions at key meetings that are already taking place -- so that engaged Colorado leaders and families can have inputs.
- It looks like you are doing great job with this. I can't think of anything else you could do to improve it.
- Need to have more teachers at these meetings. They are the ones in the trenches every day. Decisions being made with out of touch individuals that have no clue what goes on in the classroom.
- Partner with PTAs and school boards to get the word out for upcoming meetings and or provide a link on your website that could be shared which would connect to a survey.
- There is a fairly negative culture around federal legislation. I think NCLB damaged educators' idea that they can have an influence on the direction of legislation. So, it may take some



personal actions to encourage more people to get involved. Some ideas include: attend a PTA meeting or send a video message to people in a database you have access to.

- Continue with the meetings. Make sure the questions asked are meaningful to the various stakeholders you are trying to engage.
- I think that school districts should be contacted and asked if they can bring a representative team: parents, students, teachers, administrators, ESP, etc.
- Communication: calendar working against certain groups participating. Classroom folks needed at end of year.
- Brainstorm a list of people that are interested in and passionate about education. For instance, I am a graduate student working on my doctorate in educational leadership and policy studies. It would be so interesting for CDE to access the expertise and bright minds of those currently enrolled in and doing graduate work in the Denver area. Tap into these people, reach out, extend an invitation, and conduct focus groups. WHAT WOULD BE REALLY GREAT is if you gathered doc students and parents and get them together in the same room for brainstorming creative solutions.
- Have more meetings in the Denver metro area.
- Ask districts to invite parents and educators at mini-sessions.
- More advertising.
- N/A. I feel that having these types of meetings is the best way to involve stakeholders.
- The in-person meetings are great, but a big ask in regards to several hours of time at a very limited set of sites. It would be nice to have input from parents and teachers at each school. I would also break out elementary schools as a specific focus since quite a number of people would reply differently in regards to elementary students in a number of the questions.
- Offer more online versions in the late afternoon.
- This was a good forum platform as is.
- The main problem I see is that even when parents were involved, I do not see any buy-in currently from students. To me, they should be the biggest stakeholder. Finding a way to solicit the student response seems to be highly needed and not a current priority.
- I think you are already doing a lot. Perhaps PSAs, publicizing your town hall meetings in English and Spanish during newscasts.
- Not sure. The hand raising in the beginning of the meeting to see who was present was scary. Only 4 teachers in the room, 2 principals, and 1 superintendent.
- We need more parents involved. More information should be available through schools and local newspapers.
- This was overwhelming for someone not very familiar with education laws. It would have been helpful to have more targeted presentations.
- Connect with school districts and ask for their assistance in recruiting their communities. This can occur through PTO/PTA groups and student government groups already established at school sites.



What additional opportunities should we create for stakeholders to provide input?

- Could you have an online survey accessible from your website or in the invitation email that people could answer the same questions?
- Train volunteers/people who attended your sessions to go back to their schools/communities and host round tables about ESSA and gather additional feedback in a very informal/casual way- create a quick ESSA Bootcamp to train facilitators who attended these sessions and send them out to do small roundtables at their schools or in their SAC/PTA meetings to keep the conversations happening. Avoid over reliance on web-based forms that will not yield representative data.
- Surveys, roundtables.
- Have more input sessions - geared to particular audiences. Broaden the outreach to stakeholders beyond the "usual suspects" (CASE, CASB, CEA).
- Keep reaching out with informational meetings to school districts, not just administrators but teachers.
- More webinars and check in's with community as drafts are completed.
- Create a recorded webinar of the presentation and allow people to comment online.
- Could there be an online forum?
- Meaningful deep planning and development of state plan with groups that represent key stakeholders. More afternoon, evening meetings in large population centers. Consider events co-hosted by groups like CEA, CO PTA, CASE, CASB, etc.
- More face to face events, webinars, surveys, etc. Direct feedback as the plan develops.
- Online forums with Survey Monkey type queries for people. Give them some structure to respond, and not too many questions per survey.
- A Survey Monkey like this, but with the same questions you asked the live audience to consider at the listening tour events. The survey link could be on the CDE website and set up to allow only one response per IP Address.
- Provide meetings in districts for teachers to attend.
- Please offer more listening tours in the metro area.
- The same questions sent out and gathered electronically.
- Same as above or tailored meetings to specific stakeholder groups based on their knowledge and expertise.
- How are people made aware of the need for input? Districts need to contact staff, parents and students.
- Focus groups. Brainstorming sessions.
- I think a survey is a great idea.
- Online, additional meetings.
- Have locals get the feedback and put it in with what has already been gathered.
- None. I think that CDE has done a great job.



- Online input forms. More people would provide information in an online forum options. You could structure it either as an electronic form or a question/answer format.
- Access community health professionals to build the healthy student profile.
- Episodic updates on the progress would be helpful.
- Continue to provide information to those as far as how they can get involved with various committees and working groups.
- Host some just for teachers. Host some just for Higher Ed.
- Adams 14 would be happy to host you at one of our DAAC meetings next year.
- Webinars, live chats, after hours networking.
- Perhaps provide information for schools to hand out on Back to School Night.
- More background information.
- Webinars/phone, input/online, public comment window.

How do you plan to involve parents and other stakeholders in local ESSA planning decisions?

- N/A.****
- I am going to try and do this at a Fall PTA meeting and talk to my Principal about integrating the content into a Fall SAC meeting
- To be determined. Planning is different from giving input to CDE.
- DAC, SAC, BOE, etc.
- Parents will have little desire to participate in this.
- By informing them about the various provisions that apply to them and about the Hub and subcommittee meetings.
- Providing them resources you provide and sending that info out through emails to our membership.
- Share meeting information with them or by sending out specific information to parents on issues where you would like their input.
- I will be a participant in the discussions not a leader.
- Brainstorming for these communications-- in progress....
- I don't work in a position that allows this.
- Spreading news to staff members within building.
- Sharing links and reporting to colleagues.
- I plan to share the information I learned with colleagues and ask them to give input as well.
- This question assumes someone is on staff in a district...?
- Try to get them involved.
- NA. I am a special education teacher so it will be our DAC's responsibility to share this information.
- Set a goal of input from a thousand parents. Ask parents to sign up and poll and survey them as needed. Ditto for students. Is it possible to [incomplete response].
- Community Leader activities.
- Continue to meet within the district on the efforts.



- As a teacher of US Government, I plan to bring in ESSA and state implementation into my classroom as a method for high school students to engage with the structure of federalism as well as something practical and applicable to their lives.
- DAAC (DAC) and BAAC (SAC).
- I will be hosting a meeting with your group at my office, specifically designed for the Arts sector.
- We plan to have town halls and lay out presentations.
- Recruiting via avenues and groups that are already in existence. Relying on advocacy groups within our community including our school wellness teams, the district health advisory committee, and district leadership involved in ESSA subject matter.

What aspects of the ESSA Listening Tour session do you feel were particularly successful?

- The first half was very helpful. The second half was not presented well and we spent too much time on the title funds, which most of us had no opinion on.
- Explained well so that even a person who has no experience with NCLB or ESSA can feel included. I feared being left out because I was trumped by others who would know more than me, but I felt included and appreciated.
- It's not bad as a way of orienting stakeholders to the regulatory decisions that need to be made.
- Having CDE reps at each table listening and taking diligent notes.
- The format of presenting and soliciting feedback in the rotating manner in which it occurred.
- The general overview of the aspects of the law.
- It was very well organized. You had a clear direction and having a person at the table from CDE was awesome.
- The discussions with peers at the tables.
- The information in the presentation was very useful to understanding the new law.
- Small group discussion with share outs was so helpful.
- Table talk and share out on ideas and concerns.
- Finding out some more specifics of ESSA and how Colorado is already meeting most of the law.
- So many elements well thought out. Thank you!
- Getting to meet and interact with stakeholders with different interests and perspectives than my own.
- I do not feel that teachers input is being addressed at all. These meetings are held when most teachers are teaching and very few teachers are given the opportunity to attend.
- I appreciated the table talk time and being able to write down thoughts to share.
- The information shared by CDE in a clear, succinct way.
- Group processing exercises.
- Everything was highly organized and I felt very welcomed. It was great to have an expert from CDE at my table.
- Table info gathering.
- It was nice to feel welcomed, I appreciated the quick breaks in the presentation for table discussion, and the handouts were great.
- The information provided. I liked the small group discussions. Would have loved more time!
- Dialogue at the tables.
- I thought it was all very enlightening.
- I liked the table top discussion and then having CDE people in attendance so that they can take our discussion back to CDE.



- I was very happy with the forum and session process.
- The opportunity to have table top discussions of the issues.
- Small discussions and hearing others input.
- I appreciated the wide variety of people that were at the listening tour. Even at just my table, there were people from different non-profits, from CDE, from different districts, and early childhood education.
- Holding the event.
- I enjoyed the more focused discussions regarding specific decisions that we need to make as a state. For example, whether an additional 3% of Title money should be held for grants and whether the 7% should be through grants or through a formula.
- Discussion around the table, revealed many agendas.
- Great deal of information concisely presented.
- The time talking at the tables with a CDE staff member there.
- Discussion with various groups within the table and hearing different perspectives from other tables. Mixing of large and small districts to ensure continuity with decisions made.

What can CDE do to improve the ESSA Listening Tour?

- Is there a better way to do the second half of the presentation?
- Focus on asking the right questions up front. It was more useful to ask about areas that should be measured than about what measures should be used. Also, budget time according to the complexity of the task. Yes/no questions got equal time or more time than more complex ones.
- MTSS would streamline the ESSA implementation. Doing work in silos is not effective.
- Allow for more general discussion and input, not just focused on the particular areas that were predetermined. Some of the areas I was most interested in were not addressed at all.
- Continue to provide them around the state. Make sure you have 1 minute organized movement breaks at least every hour and healthy snacks, to promote healthy living and help brain function. Model what we teach!
- I think it was nicely orchestrated and look forward to more meetings and listening tours.
- Provide slightly more time for comments and feedback.
- Please stop telling your audience that "it's complicated"! Trust us to ask questions when we don't understand.
- Add more sessions and focus on the table talk time to capture ideas and concerns.
- Give groups more time to have a discussion - the evening session was really rushed due to the shorter time frame This was a quick snapshot of information from both CDE and the participants.
- Macro perspectives: make sure people know that ESSA has replaced No Child Left Behind - that the transfer should be smooth - but with priority to be rapid. Inputs now to be innovative, yet practical.
- Consider electronic polling to show live, relative audience support for various considerations discussed. www.polleverywhere.com.
- Include teachers, not just administrators!!!!
- Condensing the 3 hour to 2 hour session definitely limited time for discussion - wondering if information could be shared prior to discussions and instead of full presentation, there could be a webinar to view before attending then the discussion is the focus of the tour... along with Q/A for clarification.



- I understand the intention of having all stakeholders talk, however, in my experience, I didn't get a lot from the discussion because there was only a parent at my table and she wanted to discuss her student and their school rather than ESSA. So, I would have liked a process for ensuring there is a balanced conversation (assigned seats, like titles, walking around the room for a group that fits your interest...)
- I was hoping for more information on health and wellness.
- We need more time to process information/ideas and give input.
- Disseminate some focus points prior to attending.
- For a listening tour, it was great. I think at the CDE you could have each staff member provide a list of 10 great people they know that work in education, study education, promote policy for education, or have kids in schools ... put all these names in a data base and invite people to brainstorming sessions. This would be great for the CDE for a couple reasons: 1) people love to be asked for their ideas and opinions, especially when a colleague or peer offered their name as someone with an open mind that can be a design thinker and bring a new perspective, and 2) the CDE will get a ton of new, creative, and innovative ideas from this collaborative group activity.
- More time to discuss questions. Some of the background information was a bit unclear for those that aren't school administrators. Are there ways to make some of it more understandable?
- You did a nice job..
- More, more, more publicity.
- Nothing that I can think of.
- A summary of responses from all venues would be helpful. Provide several opportunities for online webinars with electronic responses in the next few weeks. Maybe one set dedicated to teachers only.
- Involve SSP - special service providers as well as teachers, administrator, parents, and students. Consider Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child framework.
<http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/wsc/>.
- Continue to offer multiple opportunities for discussion, as was offered in our session.
- It seemed more like we were the ones listening.
- Try to identify more of those items where decisions need to be made.
- Not sure, but it needs to have more teacher input. Maybe work with CEA?
- More strategic seating with different groups intermixed and not cloistered together.
- Great Job.

