



Vision

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in society, the workforce, and life.

Goals

Every student, every step of the way



Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting:	ESSA Hub Committee				
Date:	November 7, 2016	Time:	12:00pm-4:00pm	Location:	201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203 - Board Room
Meeting Lead:	Nina Lopez (HUB co-facilitator), Katy Anthes (HUB co-facilitator),				
Meeting Participants: <i>(Who most needs to attend?)</i>	<p>CDE Representatives: Leanne Emm, Patrick Chapman, Lynn Bamberry, Melissa Colman, Karol Gates, Gina Herrera, Tanni Anthony, Lourdes Buck, Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson, Anna Young, Alyssa Pearson, Peter Sherman, Judy Martinez, Brad Bylsma, Jennifer Simons, Robert Hawkins, David Schneiderman, Tomas Mejia, Morgan Cox, Jessica Hollingshead, Barbara Hickman, Rachael Lovendahl</p> <p>Members of HUB Committee: Steve Durham, Rep. Jim Wilson, Evy Valencia, Ross Izard, Luke Ragland, Kirk Banghart, Dan Schaller, Ken DeLay, Lisa Escarcega, Don Anderson, Linda Barker, Diane Duffy, Jesus Escarcega, Sean Bradley, Linda Barker, Jeani Frickey Saito, Ernest House, Jr., Carolyn Gery</p> <p>Hub Members Not Present: Angelika Schroeder, Rep. Brittany Pettersen, & Jim Earley</p>				
Meeting Objectives: <i>(Is a meeting necessary to accomplish the objectives?)</i>	<p>ESSA – 4th Hub Committee Meeting</p> <p>Updates on ESSA progress, Closer Look at Assessment and Effective Instruction & Leadership in ESSA state plan development</p>				

Agenda Items and Next Steps

Time	Agenda Item	Notes & Next Steps <i>(be sure to include communication to those not at the meeting who need to know the results)</i>
12:00pm	Lunch	<p>Working Lunch</p> <p>Opening Welcome and Comments:</p> <p>CDE Representative: Dr. Katy Anthes, Interim Commissioner, CDE</p> <p>Thank you to everyone serving on the Hub and other committees – a lot of time and input has been critical so far.</p> <p>Today going to cover: 1) Standards: recommendations and 2) Title Programs: overview of key decision points</p> <p>CDE Facilitator: Nina Lopez – went over processes for the day</p> <p>Refer to two handouts – note catcher and feedback form</p>

		Use Survey Monkey Link to retrieve handouts – for Hub members only
12:25pm	ESSA State Plan Development Requirements and Decision Points: Standards	<p>Presentation Lead: Melissa Colman, Ph.D., CDE The Standards Spoke Committee has first complete draft completed.</p> <p>Agenda:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Spoke Committee and draft process 2) ESSA requirements and decision points 3) Background of Colorado Standards – federal v. state requirements 4) Overview of the three Standards sections within ESSA and provide specifics of each requirement 5) Provide evidence that shows how Colorado already fulfills federal requirements <p>(34:21 on recording)</p> <p>Standards Spoke Committee Composition of Standards Spoke Committee – pie chart – PowerPoint Slide 5 Spoke Committee Representation All Spoke Committee meetings were held virtually Committee received an empty outline to fill out what they felt was important to emphasize in terms of the requirements in Colorado’s State Plan Outline was used to draft plan</p> <p>Standards Decision Points Unlike the other sections, related to Standards, there are no decision points and there are very few requirements. There are quite a few restrictions placed on the U.S. Department of Education related to past experiences of U.S. Department of Education. There are three pieces where states need to provide assurances in relation to Standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) States need to provide assurance that they are providing challenging statewide standards in Math, Reading or Language Arts, and Science. There is no definition provided for “challenging.” 2) The state can also adopt what are called “alternative achievement standards” for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. These are students who cannot be served in a typical classroom – this is the 1% population that would qualify for an alternative assessment. 3) States also need to adopt standards for English language proficiency <p>Spoiler Alert: Existing Colorado law related to Colorado Standards meets and exceeds what the federal government already requires. In Standards section of the state plan, you will see the description of existing Colorado state law with the notion that because we already implementing Colorado state law that exceeds federal law that we are already in compliance with ESSA in relation to Standards.</p>

		<p>Regarding the minimal requirements in relation to Standards within ESSA, there are specific prohibitions or restrictions put in place around what the Secretary of Education can do in relation to state standards – taken directly from ESSA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) States cannot be required to submit our standards to the Secretary of Education for review – there is a specific prohibition against that 2) There is also a specific restriction place on what the Secretary can do in relation to the state standards – taken directly from ESSA – the Secretary shall not have the authority to mandate, direct, control, coerce, or exercise any direction or supervision over any of the challenging state academic standards adopted or implemented by the state. There is a sense that local control is being given to states for their standards. <p>Key Conversations of Spoke Committee in Relation to ESSA Requirements</p> <p>Overview of the existing work in Colorado in relation to Standards – day to day work going on right now</p> <p>Distinctions between different levels of requirements and policies: federal government > state government > local district/community</p> <p>Discussion regarding changes to Colorado Standards – which level to referring to?</p> <p>Federal v. State Requirements</p> <p>ESSA puts tight parameters around federal requirements, however in Colorado, the primary authority for Standards rests with the Colorado State Board of Education. At the local level districts are required to adopt standards that meet or exceed the State standards.</p> <p>Which level of conversation are we at? Make sure to distinguish between the different levels of requirements.</p> <p>Standards are broad goals that articulate what students should know, understand, and be able to do over a given time period. Its different from curriculum, which is an organized set of instruction or sequence of instructional units, which is then different from instruction which is learning experiences designed to meet the needs of students. The reason why it is important to distinguish between these is because the control over these different pieces rests at different places.</p> <p>Standards for Colorado rests at the state level and curriculum and instruction is at the local district level.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Standards were initiated back in 1993 under HB-1313, which required standards in specific content areas. At the same time, the Colorado student assessment program was initiated with these notions of what the purpose of standards are 1) to ensure that we have clarity on outcomes for kids at each grade level; 2) that we ensure equity between students by being clear of what we want students to know,</p>
--	--	---

		<p>understand, and be able to do; 3) from HB-1313, the notion that standards can reinforce school and district accountability.</p> <p>Forward to 2008, passage of CAP4K – Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids - SB-212 – officially called The Preschool to Postsecondary Education Alignment Act – the gift that keeps on giving because lots of rolling timelines within CAP4K.</p> <p>Timeline of implementation is articulated within the Standards section of the ESSA state plan. Our premise is that we already meet all of the federal requirements related to Standards by implementing this law. Spent time discussing what this state law requires and verifying that we are implementing that state law as it has been written. That is why you will see lots of attention paid towards that in that particular section.</p> <p>Regarding the timeline, one piece that will be a cause of confusion regarding the ESSA process and the State’s Standards Revision process because by July 1, 2018 we need to review and revise our existing state law standards. This is outside of ESSA. This is state driven process not a federally driven process. Any changes to the state standards do not affect our current submission for our ESSA state plan. Two separate and distinct processes.</p> <p>CAP4K – some of the provisions related to the content within the Colorado Academic Standards</p> <p>Key pieces:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Colorado state law requires that we have standards in a number of content areas beyond what ESSA requires. ESSA requires standards in Math, Reading or Language Arts, and Science. Colorado requires standards in ten content areas and just added an optional set of standards in Computer Science to be adopted by July of 2018. Our content exceeds what ESSA requires. 2) Our standards must be comparable in scope, relevance, and rigor to the highest national and international standards. So we go through a benchmarking process to ensure the rigor of Colorado Academic Standards. Because ESSA does not have a definition for “challenging,” we are saying our state law has that provision within it that we are defining challenging by being comparable in scope, relevance, and rigor. 3) Our standards also, state law requires a lot of other skills be included in our standards. State law requires those be aligned with career, technical education standards, and be aligned with the state’s postsecondary workforce description and lead to postsecondary and workforce readiness. <p>So the state law regarding Colorado Academic Standards is quite robust and meets and exceeds what the federal government requires.</p> <p>Requirements</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Looking at draft of plan:</p> <p>1) First section - Challenging Academic Standards (pages 1-12 in draft document)</p> <p>Four main requirements regarding challenging academic standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The assurances that the state has adopted these challenging standards – CAP4K required that the State Board adopt these standards – which they did 2) That these standards apply to all schools. Colorado Academic Standards do apply to all schools and every local provider needs to meet or exceed those standards. In some circumstances, districts develop their own standards and provide assurance to the state that they meet or exceed state law. In many cases, districts adopt state standards and put own energy in developing curriculum. 3) Standards must include these three subject areas: Math, Reading or Language Arts, and Science and that these align with credit-bearing coursework, and state career and technical standards, which is part of CAP4K. <p>The section of the draft explains how the state is in compliance with ESSA.</p> <p>Opportunity for Questions (51:40 on recording):</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Do you know why the first revision was set so close against the full implementation here, verses after that it is 6 years out – where here we really 3 or 4?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Two areas – ESSA and one is State. We are only in State portion right now. When CAP4K was originally passed, the standards needed to be adopted by 2009. The first revision cycle was really going to be set to occur by December of 2015 – which would have been 6 years from the first passage of the standards. From my understanding, in 2012, as it was very clear we didn't just revise the entire content model in 2009, we had completely new standards in place that had to be implemented. There was such a heavy lift by districts that there was a change in statute that pushed implementation out two more years.</p> <p>2) Second section - Alternative Achievement Standards (Presented by CDE Representative – Gina Herrera on behalf of Tanni Anthony – 54:17 on recording) (pages 12-15 in draft document)</p> <p>Important Points: This is optional for states and that these standards apply only to those students who have significant cognitive disability – about 1% of the population.</p> <p>There are five components in ESSA that we have to look at for students who are receiving their instruction on Alternative Achievement Standards. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which was reauthorized in 2004 already laid out some of this for us.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Have to be aligned with State Academic Standards – that is how they were developed. Look at these standards then brought to a level where these students have access.
--	--	---

		<p>2) It's important that these standards promote access to the general education curriculum no matter the setting – inclusive program or center-based program – in their enrolled grade level.</p> <p>3) Reflect professional judgment – high expectations for academics, not just life skills Spent time creating a process that identifies which kids should be on Alternative Achievement Standards Extended evidence outcomes</p> <p>4) State law – Exceptional Children's Education Act which aligns with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act</p> <p>5) We have Alternative Achievement Standards in four content areas: Math, English/Language Arts, Science, and Social Studies. Really hope on path towards postsecondary and workforce readiness.</p> <p>3) Third section – English Language Proficiency Standards (Presented by CDE Representative Lourdes Buck – 57:52 on recording) (pages 15 - in draft document) ESSA requires three major elements for the English Language Proficiency Standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The standards must be derived from the four recognized domains of language through reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Through CAP4K, requires us to adopt the English Language Proficiency Standards. In 2009, we became members of the WIDA consortium, along with 39 other states. Through that support, we recognize the four domains. 2) Addressing the different proficiency levels of the English Language Proficiency. So the Colorado English Language Proficiency Standard has exceeded this by providing detail of the six levels of English Proficiency through a scale of 1-6: 1 - entering the language; 2 - emerging language; 3 - developing language; 4 - expanding; 5 - bridging; 6 – incorporation of all elements 3) That English Proficiency Standards are aligned with Challenging Academic Standards. English learners are not only provided with social and instructional language necessary for our students to compete with their peers, but that they have access to the grade level academic content standards. <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Question deals with Assessments - Where are we in alignment with the State and Federal in relation to assessments for the EL population?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Continue the annual assessment of English Language Proficiency through the access exam.</p> <p>Melissa Colman (1:00:43 on recording) Concluding remarks and summary/recap of presentation</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Nina Lopez, CDE Facilitator – any clarifying questions from the HUB Committee before forwarded to State Board?</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Process question – noticed an intersect with Title Programs for English Learners – for example, the entrance and exit standards – is that something that WIDA already covers? Is that covered somewhere else in the state plan?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Morgan Cox, CDE Representative will address that - WIDA has not set criteria for exit – will dig into this more when approach Title III in presentation. Believe will get pressure from states for data.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: So then would be covered by the plan?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Yes, this will be covered in the plan, but not in Standards section.</p> <p>Nina Lopez, CDE Facilitator: Refer back to handouts, asks HUB Committee to fill out. Will be time for more HUB and public input of this draft. The Standards Committee would like to move forward with their recommendation to the State Board. Anyone uncomfortable with that decision?</p> <p>Decision Point: HUB Committee in consensus with first draft of state plan for Standards sections within ESSA for Colorado.</p> <p>Move into Title Section</p> <p>BREAK: 1:50pm</p>
1:05pm	ESSA State Plan Development Requirements and Decision Points: Title Programs and Assurances	<p>Presentation Lead: Pat Chapman, CDE (1:06:39 on recording)</p> <p>Goal of today is to get a sense of Title Spoke Committee and the work of the Spoke Committee largely, Title programs that are apart of ESSA, and funding administration. Want HUB to point Spoke in right direction as Spoke continues to work – what are the areas you are particularly interested in that Spoke can report back to HUB more thoroughly.</p> <p>Context</p> <p>Two parts to ESSA: 1) Broad policies requirements so that states will adopt challenging academic standards; all students grades 3-8 will be tested annually in reading and math; school accountability that rates and ranks schools against their progress and performance towards the standards as measured by assessment; requirement that we identify schools who are low performing and intervene when necessary; and, address teacher quality and teacher effectiveness 2) Title programs: funding, grant programs that provide funding to states and local districts to meet requirements; raise student achievement; close achievement gaps</p>

Spoke Committee

Plan Implementation - Committee of Practitioners – Membership
Main focus of Spoke Committee: How do we get money out the door?
For examples: RFPs, applications, reporting requirements, fiscal management, monitoring – all administration tied to Title programs

Putting together the state plan there are lots of questions that need to be answered for title programs and grant administration. We have pulled out two of the bigger ones that overarch the more specific questions:

- 1) How will we, together with school districts, use these funds to ensure that all children have the same significant opportunities to meet challenging academic standards, career and technical educational standards, and maintain at a minimum a regular high school diploma?
- 2) Asking to describe our system of grants management – grants performance management – how we collect and review applications; how we collect data; how we will monitor; the implementation of local plans; how will we leverage these funds towards continuous improvement; and what technical assistance will be provided to the BOCES, districts, and schools that receive the funding.

Overarching Goals of Grants Performance Management:

- 1) Maximize the impact of the grants for students, parents, and tax payers
- 2) Minimize the administrative burden on BOCES, districts, and schools that serve the students
- 3) Be efficient, effective, and frugal with funds so that money is not wasted
- 4) Help everyone be informed consumers of the funding – so that they not only understand the requirements of the grants, but really what are the opportunities afforded by these grants to improve student services – make sure competent when audited
- 5) All students should be able to benefit from these funds

Any Questions from the HUB Committee?

Question from HUB Committee Member: What are your general reflections on that second to last bullet there...do you truly see more flexibility in using these funds?

Response from CDE Representative: There are three types of grants that we make available – competitive grants, state administered grants, and formula grants (biggest pot). All of the grants, regardless of type, have key components – allocation, award, agree to certain assurances - aware of conditions of accepting the award, make sure stakeholder consultation occurs at the local level, needs assessment requirement, application planning/proposal, reporting, budgeting, program evaluation requirements. The state monitors implementation of local plans. The local process mirrors the state process.

		<p>Questions from Hub Committee Member: When you say all of these grants, that is for competitive, formula, and state administered?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Yeah, they all have these fundamental components that make up that grants performance management or grants administration process – fiscal controls, reporting requirements, applications, and release of funds.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Are the reporting requirements and program evaluation required for formula versus competitive grants – or are they similar?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Yes, they are similar. Built into the competitive process you have a program evaluation at the end. Both need to produce and end-of-year financial report and report regarding the implementation of the plan and its success.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Are those different documents or different submissions? Can they file the same document or reporting requirement for formula and competitive or two separate?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Two separate.</p> <p>Comment from State Board Member: What if schools districts do not have the resources or people to really work on the proposals? I am concerned that there may be districts who need it, but who just don't have the resources and the time to devote to respond this audit piece.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: We recognize this and will be responding to this in a couple of slides, relative to the competitive grants process. Recognizing that the amount of funds received under formula really vary dramatically – from a relative small amount of money to a relative large amount of money. We try to make the funds received worth it by providing more support to the small, rural districts that need it to help them meet the requirements of these funds. Also, for the small rural districts, level the playing field so that the students in their small rural district have equitable opportunity to benefit from these funds. So it really is all about the students ensuring that they get the benefit of the availability of these funds. We will get at this more.</p> <p>(1:19:00 on recording)</p> <p>Finally, in many cases, these may have been allowable activities under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), but they really are pulled out as themes under ESSA. One of the tasks that we want to do or make sure of is that these themes of - early learning, career and technical education, healthy students, well-rounded education, supports for teachers, and supports for students - are built into the application material so that those who are applying for the funds are aware of how you can use these funds in support of these themes. Going back to helping everyone be informed consumers of these grants so they not only know the requirements, but how they can maximize the funds and integrate the use of these funds in a way that they support these themes prevalent throughout ESSA.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Competitive Grant Process (Presented by CDE Representative Anna Young) (1:20:10 on recording)</p> <p>There are number of different ways that school districts, and ultimately students, can get funding. We wanted to go through this process because it is different from the formula process.</p> <p>Application Process:</p> <p>Plan and Development Phase for competitive grants CDE works with program managers in developing funding rules, eligibility, and application requirements. So reviewing what might be written into state law for instance – as far as how the grant program needs to be administered.</p> <p>We also create a scoring rubric and timeline for the grant. Release and publicize the grant – release call for application in The Scope – weekly newsletter from CDE. Then the program works really hard to make sure the most people are aware of these funding opportunities so reach out directly to them through email and other communication.</p> <p>CDE works with program managers to provide technical assistance. What that looks like for each grant is that we provide specific grant webinars that walks through the actual application requirements so that people are well aware of what is required both as they are writing the grant, but also if they receive the grant funds. Also, posts Q&As to the CDE website and answering questions via phone calls with grantees and potential grantees over the grant process.</p> <p>Review Process:</p> <p>Again, this looks different from formula grant review process. So we look at the application and check for eligibility and to make sure the potential grantee submitted everything properly.</p> <p>Peer Review Process:</p> <p>This is a really important process and really the corner stone of the competitive funding process. CDE recruits peer reviewers to individually read and score applications. Then the peer reviewers come together as a team and come into consensus and reconcile scoring and comments. CDE provides comments back to each applicant so that they know where they really excelled in the application or provided more information. The peer review team provides funding recommendations to CDE to the grant program managers. At that point, we review the feedback and the budget. Once everything has been reviewed, CDE sends out funding letters for those competitive awards.</p> <p>(01:23:10 on recording)</p> <p>Guiding Principles used for Competitive Grant Management Process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Strive to create an equitable and defensible process for administering these grants. They are supplemental funds and a lot of times these funds are used for supplemental services for students so we really work with schools and districts to be
--	--	--

		<p>able to leverage resources and funding to maximize the impact for positive student outcomes ultimately.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Regarding program implementation, working with program managers to create efficiency for that grant management process. 3) Minimize administrative burden for districts who actually end up receiving the funds. 4) Seek to ensure federal compliance and also state compliance as well. Following eligibility requirements, rules, and what is requested of the State Board. 5) Provide evaluation to ensure quality programs that result in student success. This happens at the end of the grant. CDE circles around to see how funds are being used and how those funds impact student success. <p>In order to make sure we being equitable and maximizing funds across the state, CDE provides technical support and assistance. Besides the webinars, CDE provides grant writing workshops and trainings. Focus on how to write CDE grants and how to leverage those funds and potentially leverage competitive funds with formula funds.</p> <p>On CDE website, a grants forecast is provided to notify districts of funding opportunities that are approaching so that districts can strategize and plan ahead for those funds they want to go after.</p> <p>Landscape of Competitive Funds Across Colorado Tracking success rates of those who apply for a grant. Across the state, if you apply for a grant, more often than not, you actually do receive an award. We pulled out statistics for rural districts, and found that rural districts have a higher success rate at receiving funds than average. For the 100% success rate, those applicants apply for at least one grant and get the award or apply for six grants and get one award.</p> <p>Looking at average applicants per grant, thinking if there is a broader eligibility in every school district or BOCES who can apply for a grant – there are actually not a lot of grantees who go after these awards.</p> <p>Slide shows median award amounts for both large and small grants.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Looking at this data, do you have any data about the relative proportion of grant funds that go to rural districts versus large metro districts? For example is rural consists of 10%, do they only receive 10%? Does it work out that way?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: We did do that, but haven't done that in like 4 or 5 years, but we can pull that out.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Question regarding the peer review process, so who are they? Are they internal at CDE or external from the Department?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: They are mostly external. On the CDE website, CDE recruits from across the state from a wide variety of industries, subject matter experts, educators, school health professionals, so it is a mixture. CDE also reaches out to those who have become a part of the reviewer pool and ask if they are available to review for a particular grant based on their interest that they provided. We truly try to make it a peer review process. For each of the review teams, we try to have a mixture of expertise.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: For the competitive grants, do schools ever have direct access to the competitive grant process or do they have to go through an LEA?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: They do have to go through an LEA to receive funding. Often times we see schools write the grant, but they do need buy in from the district, BOCES, or CSI.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Do you ever see where there tends to be a barrier or schools aren't able to work through their LEA. Do you see schools who want to do this, but can't go through or have difficulty going through their LEA?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: I really don't think so. If it has, it's really rare.</p> <p>Regarding grants administration, decision points may not jump out at you. Take this opportunity to revisit these administrative procedures to make sure they work for each entity we have in the state – charter, online, BOCES, and so on. Need to be as effective and efficient as possible.</p> <p>21st Century Community Learning Center Grant (21st CCLC) - Title IV – Part B (Presented by CDE Representative, Judy Martinez) (1:30:18 on recording) 21st CCLC funds after school programs. Focused on raising student achievement and closing the achievement gap. This grant focuses on serving schools that are considered low performing and high poverty. The idea is really supporting low-income students by closing the opportunity gap. The way we do that with this particular grant program is supporting academic enrichment activities and programs. The types of activities that occur outside of regular school hours and during times when school is not in session – during the winter and summer breaks for example. For example, activities/programs include: STEM, arts and music, and physical education. Those are some of the key areas supported. Something that is also complimentary to other federal programs is that it also has an element that supports family engagement. So with this particular grant program, families of the participating students</p>
--	---

		<p>have opportunities to receive support to work towards their educational goals, as well as, promoting their involvement and active engagement in their children’s education.</p> <p>Colorado context – what does this grant look like at the state or local level? Currently, CDE has around \$11.5 million to allocate for fiscal year 2016-2017. These grants are a five-year cohort grant. Run on a cohort model. Currently, there are two cohorts that represent 55 grantees that represent 105 centers. So the way this particular grant program supports those activities is through the creation of these centers. The average grant size is just over \$192,000 a year. In ESSA, there is a set limit in terms of the minimum grant award, which is \$50,000. In terms of what are the benefits, our teacher surveys that occur at the end of each program year found that, from the participants, there is higher rate of academic performance, improvement in participation in class, higher levels of turning in homework, and homework completed done to satisfaction. There is additional information in the evaluation report on the website and also in fact sheet with HUB materials.</p> <p>New with the 21st Century Program under ESSA: Elements are tied to well-rounded education concept. Information in state plan will address how CCLC will support that. Increase in the amount of dollars available out of the grant for state activities. Went from a cap of 3% of funding level to a 5% to support state activities. Why this is important is because overall the authorization for this particular grant program did see a decrease in ESSA. Examples of state activities are around capacity building, and when we talk about capacity building like technical assistance, its really about that north star in supporting quality after school time programs and having those programs aimed at academic achievement and closing the achievement gap for low-income students compared to their higher-income peers.</p> <p>In terms of the stakeholder engagement components, the grant program has an advisory group made up of advisees across the state. They have received information on ESSA and have provided input and feedback, as well as Colorado After School Partner also known as CAP. Reauthorization training has also been provided for grantees in the field.</p> <p>The most frequently asked questions regarding this particular grant program as it relates to ESSA are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) When is the next RFP coming out?2) How much funding is anticipated? For 2018-2019 we are looking at around the next time funds are distributed. <p>(First recording cut off)</p> <p>Title IV – Part B (Second Recording 00:19)</p>
--	--	---

Question from HUB Committee Member: Understanding funding for Title IV, that it didn't get appropriated at this point by the Fed's near as much as we wanted to –

Response from CDE Representative: That is another Title IV program – a formula grant that we will be talking about in formula grants.

Comment from HUB Committee Member: That is a piece of it? I see one that has a 3-5% increase for state activities.

Response from CDE Representative: State activities

Question from HUB Committee Member: Does that mean that 3-5% more can go out? Or is this for the State to run activities?

Response from CDE Representative: For the State to run activities.

The over authorization for funds for the grant program as a whole actually decreased and as part of that decrease, some of the advocacy around it was to increase state activities around capacity building because if there are fewer awards that are made then what kind of supports can the State provide to help with that capacity building to ensure high-quality programs. Thank you for allowing that clarification.

Homeless Education and McKinney-Vento Overview - Title IX – Part A

National Homeless Youth Awareness Month – November

Context

In Colorado, the number of students experiencing homelessness is close to 25,000 over the last 11 years. That represents a 200% increase in the number of students who have been identified under McKinney-Vento as homeless. In terms of homeless, it refers to the lack of fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residency. And then when we talk about unaccompanied homeless youth, we have seen in the last few years a 55% increase in the number of students who would be identified as unaccompanied homeless youth. In this particular context, that refers to meeting the same definition as being homeless, but they are not in physical custody of their parents.

This is now a part of Title IX – Part A in ESSA.

McKinney-Vento Act as part of ESSA that refers to the federal educational rights for students who are experiencing homelessness.

Here McKinney-Vento is interesting in terms of a competitive grant program because primarily what it is, is an approach to ensuring that we are closing the achievement gap of students who are experiencing homelessness by addressing the barriers and making sure there are opportunities and closing that opportunity gap for those students. So with McKinney-Vento there are universal requirements. All school districts need to have a homeless education liaison to ensure the barriers are reduced and that supports are put in place in supporting the students be successful. It also ensures that there is an identification process for those students who are eligible for certain services because of their lack of housing that they receive them.

		<p>The states obligation underneath that is to really support that identification process, increase awareness, and create understanding of best practices. In addition, there are some who receive funding through a competitive grant program. But keep in mind, that is not the universal part of the McKinney-Vento Act, it's just a supplement. The grants are supplemental. At a universal level, it is important to note that there are Title set-asides that districts need to claim for supports for students who are experiencing homelessness.</p> <p>In terms of the grant program, currently we have close to \$700,000 that is eligible for the grant program. And they apply through the competitive grant process. There are also a variety of state activities similar to 21st CCLC where activities are centered on professional development, technical assistance, and some evaluation. Currently we have 14 grantees and two BOCES who are supported by the grant, and as with the 21st CCLC if you remember is a 5-year cohort, but with this particular grant, it is a 3-year cohort. Anticipate the next round of funding to go out in 2019-2020.</p> <p>In terms of ESSA, the McKinney-Vento homeless component also fits with the "well-rounded" education and does require the development of a state application that really focuses on the professional development to support the locally assigned education liaison. Also, this supports a clearer pre-school provision. The area that we have received the most questions is around addressing the barriers that are tied credit accrual, college readiness, and assistance procedures. That is something that talked to with the stakeholder engagement component. That was a number one question – how does that happen?</p> <p>In terms of that stakeholder engagement, there have been several trainings that involve the liaisons, as well as special advisory groups that address homelessness in Colorado that have received information on ESSA.</p> <p>Key Areas for Discussion:</p> <p>21st CCLC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What supports should CDE provide to ensure high-quality programs? 2) What state priorities related to high poverty and low performing schools should the state consider in the next funding cycle? <p>McKinney-Vento:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What supports should CDE provide to improve the skills of LEA Homeless Education Liaisons in identification and engagement of students experiencing homelessness? 2) What supports are needed to ensure McKinney-Vento students receive appropriate full or partial credit upon transfer or transition to a new school?
--	--	---

Migrant Education Program – Title I, Part C (Presented by CDE Representative Tomas Mejia) (09:21 on recording)

We have six purposes for our Migrant Education Program – Title I – Part C – PPT slide 52.

How this money comes to CDE and what CDE does with it: There is a federal allocation formula and Colorado allocates that based on the number of students Colorado has. This was all under NCLB and now will be changed under ESSA to include number of students, how much the state provides for per pupil, operating revenue, as well as how much the state serves their students in the summer.

This is a state allocation so the state receives it and has the obligation or requirement how to figure out it is best going to serve all of the kids in the state. Colorado has opted for a 5 region set up where we have three school districts, one institution of higher education, and one CO BOCES who all five sub-grantees.

PowerPoint Slide 54 – Regional Approach

The important things we are trying to reach the government Performance Results Act – its aligned and connected with a lot of other things we have been talking about: the assessment in grades 3-8 in reading and math; how many kids are moving and being promoted from one grade to another from 6-12th grade; how many of the migrant kids are getting enough credit to move; how many kids have received Algebra by 11th grade? Those are some of the overarching goals always trying to reach.

Migrant Program Planning Process – PowerPoint Slide 56

Migrant Office provides direct services – PowerPoint Slide 57

Demographics:

About 5,000 migrant students in Colorado.

Greeley Weld-6 is largest district per number of migrant students.

Largest district per percentage is Center.

2:00pm - **BREAK** – 10 minutes (17:25 on recording)

Resume from break at 2:20pm

Formula Title Programs (Presented by CDE Representative Jennifer Simons) (30:26 on recording)

Title I Part A

Purpose: To provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high quality education and to close achievement

		<p>gaps – we will talk about these roles when talking about administering this program.</p> <p>Discussing only how LEAs distribute funds among the schools right now. LEAs choose a measure of poverty – free lunch, free and reduced lunch, TANF, or community eligibility provision (CEP). They then assign those funds in rank order by poverty percentage to ensure that the greater amount of funds per pupil is going to the school with the highest concentrations of poverty. There are two programs that can be run in a Title I program 1) schoolwide program or 2) targeted assistance program (PowerPoint Slide 61).</p> <p>There is a requirement that LEAs have a plan on file with the state education agency (SEA) to implement a Title I program.</p> <p>There are requirements for informing parents. These are overall very much the same as they were under NCLB – only a few minor changes. Intention will remain the same, but language will change referring to “highly qualified.” Notify if taught by teacher that does not meet applicable state certification or licensure requirements.</p> <p>New: Policy regarding student participation in statewide assessments – post information on each assessment.</p> <p>Was under NCLB, but moved location: Inform parents of ELs of the reason their child was identified as EL and the services for which they are eligible.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: That third bullet (PPT slide 63) will that ultimately defer to if we come up with our definitions of in-field versus out-of-field, will it ultimately defer to that when we finalize those definitions?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: So that will only refer to what is in state law, so that licensure piece is in state law – not necessarily connected to those terms of in-field or out-of-field.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: So it doesn’t necessarily notify them if taught by a certified or licensed teacher – that is what ESSA says, but notify what your state law says?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Yes, ESSA says that you would notify the parents if the child’s teacher does not meet state licensure requirements and so in Colorado that means if they don’t hold a license and their school does not hold an approved waiver for licensure requirements.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Will there be guidance issued to the districts to help LEAs inform what the parent notification might look like or what the acceptable forms of communication are – a letter? Website?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Yes, absolutely. CDE has provided sample letters and templates for these types of notifications. We post those on the CDE website and will update them so that language is reflective of what is in ESSA.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Changes in ESSA for Specific Title Programs</p> <p>Title I, Part A: PowerPoint Slides 64-65 Preserved rank order – must serve 75% of higher</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New flexibility for high schools – 50% <p>No changes to Targeted Assistance Programs in ESSA New requirements for Schoolwide – offers new flexibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CDE created a planning toolkit to help with this process - May choose to transition early (Example – Connect for Success Grant) <p>Supplemental Education Services Requirement went away with ESSA as far as a requirement (tutoring services, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - However, there are options to provide those services if districts choose too <p>Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent Program: PowerPoint Slide 66</p> <p>Title II, Part A PowerPoint Slide 67 Some language changes, but spirit remains much the same Focuses on approving student achievement through improving the quality and effectiveness of educators, and also, increasing the quantity of effective educators. Additionally, now adds language regarding low-income and minority students not be taught by a disproportionate rate by inexperienced, out-of-field teachers was always in Title I, but silent in Title II – so could have used funds to address those equity gaps, but now it is a requirement that if any gaps exist – Title II funds must be used to address those gaps. Changes are highlighted in PowerPoint Slide 68 A Decision Point that needs to be discussed: State Level Activities – opportunities</p> <p>Title III: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Student (Presented by CDE Representative Morgan Cox) (42:31 on recording) There are many provisions and statutorily requirements related to English learners that are not in Title III. Spirit of Title III did not change. The main purpose is to provide resources to schools and districts to implement, develop, and sustain English development programs. Also, to provide resources to assist schools and districts to prepare educators and non-educators including instructional and non-instructional staff, administrators, and community liaisons. Promotes family and community engagement as well for those students.</p> <p>Changes within ESSA: EL definition – no longer call an English learner limited English proficient student.</p>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highlighted areas of the definition because one of the main points of decision making that we need to make really does relate to this definition which is “an individual who, among other things, has difficulties in <i>speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language</i> that may be sufficient to deny him or her the <i>ability to meet challenging state academic standards.</i>” <p>Title III required activities: Went from two to three</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide <i>effective</i> language instruction educational programs - Provide effective professional development - Include parent, family, and community engagement activities <p>Major Decision Point: States will “establish and implement, with timely and meaningful consultation with local educational agencies representing the geographic diversity of the State, standardized, statewide [EL] entrance and exit procedures.</p> <p>Specific requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Standardized statewide EL entrance and exit procedures must include uniform criteria applied statewide - Prohibits a “‘local option,’ which cannot be standardized and under which LEAs could have widely varying criteria” - Exit procedures must include objective, valid, and reliable criteria, including a score of proficient on the State’s annual ELP assessment - Scores on <i>content assessments cannot be included as exit criteria</i> (not valid and reliable measures of ELP, may result in prolonged EL status, civil rights violations) - Exit criteria must be applied to both Title I EL subgroup and Title III services (exit EL status for both Title I and Title III purposes) <p>Consensus is that everyone would like an additional year to implement plan given that assessment transitions has its own unique challenges, but also so that additional data is available and reliable to make a decision, such as the exiting criteria.</p> <p>Will final regulations allow for local control like we have had in previous years? – Waiting on</p> <p>Additional requirements under Title III for data submissions - PowerPoint Slide 75 Current data will have to be changed to get at these new requirements. <i>New: Must be reported in the aggregate and disaggregated, at a minimum, by English learners with a disability</i></p> <p>Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants (Presented by CDE Representative Jennifer Simons) (50:44 on recording) Brand new formula grant. Its purpose is to build state, district, and school capacity to provide students with access to a well-rounded education (broad definition), improve the use of technology in order</p>
--	--	---

		<p>to improve student achievement, and improve conditions (safe and healthy) for student learning. Definition of well-rounded education: starts early, goes through the entire continuum of education, and that students have access to opportunities in all the various subject areas.</p> <p>In the statute, \$1.6 billion is authorized nationally. But recently, only \$300 million will be appropriated according to recent discussions. It's a proposed bill so not finalized.</p> <p>(52:20 on recording) Question from HUB Committee Member: So is there a rule of thumb of what Colorado's share is? Response from CDE Representative: Not sure, something less than 3%.</p> <p>For LEAs, receiving \$30,000 or more, need to fund activities in each of these categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well-Rounded (at least 20% of funds), which include AP and IB test fee reimbursement, STEM, Arts and Computer Science. - Healthy Students (at least 20% of funds), which includes bullying and drug abuse prevention. - Technology (at least one activity, and no more than 15% can go toward the purchase of technology infrastructure). <p>Title V, Part B: Rural and Low-Income School Program (Presented by CDE Representative Jennifer Simons) (53:39 on recording) Not a new program, but located in a new title (used to be in Title VI) Supplemental funds for rural districts – additional funds for those districts</p> <p>ESEA Programs: Grants Performance Management (Presented by CDE Representative Jennifer Simons) (54:09 on recording) Not only focusing on building capacity on program requirements and monitoring those program requirements, but also to help LEAs identify opportunities and flexibilities that exist under the new law – we will help identify those in each of these activities.</p> <p>Model Overview – PowerPoint Slides 79-85 First build capacity within each of these programs. All programs are in consolidated application that CDE sends out. Conduct universal support and monitoring activities. ESSA provides an opportunity to do risk-based intensive program reviews.</p> <p>BREAK: GROUP WORK SESSION Discussion Questions: PowerPoint Slide 86 Want Input and Recommendations from the Hub (1:02:30 on recording) Nina Lopez, CDE facilitator, reviews procedures for break-out session to Hub. Spoke would like indicators of key issues that Hub Committee</p>
--	--	--

		<p>would like emphasized or expect to see when Spoke presents again. Narrow in areas of focus. Hand out Note-catcher and work for 15 minutes – go until 2:45pm</p> <p>Resume Back (01:17:34 on recording)</p> <p>Title Program Allocations and Fiscal Issues (Presented by CDE Representative David Schneiderman) (01:18:08 on recording) Presentation regarding Title I, II, III, and Title VI (Title V in ESSA)</p> <p>Chart on PowerPoint Slide 89 What pie chart will like applying ESSA rules Pie Chart represents how CDE receives allocation from federal government. It is not determined per student – completed by US Census Bureau</p> <p>Title I – Four different grants Each one has different criteria that LEA has to meet to receive funds – why such a wide range in allocations. Four components: Basic, Concentrated, Targeted, Education Finance Incentive Grant Formula Children Counts: 6500 or 15% of formula students in LEA CDE receives two spreadsheets from federal government that detail specific information: 1) population 2) allocation Formula children are determined by: Poverty count from census data (3 years in arrears) based on geographic boundaries of LEA. Awards range From \$852 - \$29,622,309 - Average \$794,119 Special LEA: A special LEA is one that is not listed by the Census Bureau Reallocations to Special LEAs – PowerPoint Slide 102 Question from HUB Committee Member: So it's done once a year? Response from CDE Representative: No, it can be done up to 5 times. Comment from HUB Committee Member: These student numbers change in the course of the year? Response from CDE Representative: Student numbers stay the same, use prior year's count. But have to do it each time we get new population and allocation data.</p> <p>Multi-district online pilot – in third year, two school participating</p> <p>Two required set-asides: 1) Title I-D Delinquent and 2) School Improvement - each done differently Title I-D treated as a LEA, so run through provisions School Improvement – large change from NCLB to ESSA because it is moving to 7%. Since it is moving to 7%, it's a large piece, that will not be normally distributed under the Title I allocations. We cannot change the 7%, it will stay at 7% for the first year. We may hold an additional 3% for direct student services, which is about \$4.5 million. The majority of this money has to be distributed using a different grant. If decide not to use these funds, the funds will be distributed into Title I-A total distribution.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Hold-Harmless In order for the state and feds to not completely take away and do damage to LEAs, there are hold-harmless provisions in place. There are either 85%, 90%, or 95% dependent on the percentage of poverty of formula children. The LEAs who give into this pot of funds, are the LEAs who have more. Extra money goes to other districts. If a district qualifies for Hold-Harmless one year and not then not the following year, they are still guaranteed to remain Hold-Harmless for four consecutive years.</p> <p>Alternative Methodology for Small and Rural LEAs Common question - What is the flexibility with Title I? Unfortunately, flexibility is minimal. CDE is told what to do. CDE may use alternative data for small LEAs with a population under 20,000. Rural pool. Pool the rural money and re-distribute. Larger districts are not affected. Rural LEAs moving to other rural LEAs. There would be winners and losers because same pool of money – just moved around the rural districts.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Are we currently doing this?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: CDE is not currently doing this, but it is an option for us to look into.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: What is the benefit of doing this?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: That would be a question for this committee. What is the benefit of doing this? It's moving money away from other rural districts to give to other rural districts. Larger districts are not affected by doing this.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: So you take all the small rural districts and take all their money then come up with a formula to give it back out. Why would that result in less?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: It would be a different allocation process for each rural district. Not using the feds way of allocating money. Would use different criteria that CDE comes up with. Some districts would lose half. PowerPoint slide 112.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: So the criteria that the feds uses, is the criteria used for all districts, this would be if we want to create specific rural criteria?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: That is correct.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Are there guardrails around what the criteria would like there if left up to the state?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: No guardrail to speak, but would have to be approved by the feds. But that is what it comes down to – Moffat benefits – other districts don't.</p> <p>Comments/Questions from HUB Committee Member (1:40:10 on recording): I am just trying to figure out what misallocation issue are you trying to correct by doing this? In other words, just for sake of discussion, I could say well the current allocation is arbitrary and if you were to say this allocation would not be arbitrary because of this and this, then it would make sense to me. But if it turned out that this</p>
--	--	---

		<p>was arbitrary and this is arbitrary in a different way, then I am trying to figure out what is the advantage. So I guess my question is why would we do this? Why can't you reallocate some of that big district money in rural?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: To answer one of those questions at least, CDE is in the position to do what they are told. And the allocations for Title I are pretty strict in statute. The flexibility is this rural part. The benefit would have to be discussed among you. But no, as of right now can't do anything with the larger districts.</p> <p>Comments/Questions from HUB Committee Member: Still trying to figure out what problem are you solving with current allocation if we were to go down this road. Hard for me to make a judgment if no distinction between the two approaches. Are you benefiting small districts with 200 kids at the expense of districts with 300 kids, are you benefiting districts who are isolated at the detriment of districts who are closer? What would you be accomplishing? What would be the change in priorities of distribution?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: I think those are the exact things that you could decide. If you wanted to create criteria that would reallocate resources for certain types of variables, that certain rural districts are facing, that would be one reason to go down this path. That would be a pretty robust conversation around what those criteria would be and what could we agree on when some would get more that takes away from others. I think that is a perennial discussion in the state.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: I just think that CDE was asked to investigate what flexibility might there be in making allocations to school districts and so this is one of the few provisions that seems to have flexibility tied to it. Once we looked at it, CDE realized that this is just small rural districts just feeding on themselves. But it merits closer scrutiny because it would allow CDE to determine what the criteria is that CDE would use to allocate that pot of money to the smaller rural districts. There may be more cons than pros tied to it, but CDE feels for full transparency, that this needs to be made available to see if this is an opportunity worth pursuing.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Which portion of the Title pie are we talking about? Is this all of it or specific slice?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Good question. This would be all of it. All four components for those rural districts.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Pat, you mentioned areas of flexibility, maybe I am mistaken, but I thought one of the areas of flexibility was taking that 7% and looking at whether that could be competitively distributed or formula based? Is that not something still on the table?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: That is the School Improvement Spoke Committee who is looking at that. Those are school improvement funds. There is an option to award those funds either on a competitive or formula basis.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Is this another alternative to the Hold-Harmless that we currently use or is this just allocation of funds to rural districts? Another question, are you referring to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>community populations of 20,000 or school populations under 20,000.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Both very good questions. It is the census numbers under geographic population. The feds check mark this for CDE. This is not a part of Hold-Harmless. It would be prior to Hold-Harmless that CDE pools all of the funds from those under 20,000 and then make the decision on how to reallocate those rural funds to rural districts.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: Back to Ken’s question, I still don’t know what the problem is.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: There might not be a problem. We just wanted to share with you any additional flexibility that was given. You do not have to go down this path – we are not going down this path now. We just wanted to be transparent with the flexibility that was given to us under the law.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: One final thing, the U.S. Department of Education has conducted its own listening tour and hitting a lot of the rural areas in Colorado, so there is a representative in the U.S. Department of Education who is talking about the state deciding how to allocate the funds – CDE was trying to figuring out what he meant because that is not true – they write the allocations. So CDE has been thinking it might be this 20,000 rural issue, so CDE wants to look into that more carefully because it did seem of interest to those attending those tours.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: So we do have rural folks in the room, I am just curious if there is a sense that the current formula needs to be reconfigured for any reason?</p> <p>Comment from HUB Committee Member: To tackle what Pat had said, part of what we heard discussion from rural districts is from what the member from the federal DOE said that there is state flexibility. A lot of districts, appreciate David’s presentation, but still do not understand why we see it go up and down every year, but that is the question that most small rural districts are asking to this federal employee and his answer back was that the state makes that decision. So we did, as rural, asked Pat to investigate into that to better understand what that was. From a rural perspective, what we got back is that this answer about taking funds and reallocate them with the small is not something that we all believe is in the best interest of small rural districts across the state. Not viable to help with the variability from year to year.</p> <p>Comment from HUB Committee Member: I concur with what Kirk just said. Probably not the way we want to move forward.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: CDE fields calls after the release of the allocation, especially from smaller districts about why did their allocation go up or why did it go down. In the past few years, we do a variance report over the allocations and try to contact the districts before the allocations come out to try to give them a good understanding for why they went up or down. There is a variety of reasons for that.</p> <p>Title II – Allocation: PowerPoint Slide 114 (1:50:12 on recording)</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Title II changes very significantly, Title I allocation does not. How the feds distribute the dollars to us is a graduated formula that goes from the percentage of formula children to total population on census reports. Next year will be immediate change to 80% by formula children and 20% population. Important for LEAs. Changes reflected on PowerPoint Slide 116 from NCLB to ESSA.</p> <p>Title III No changes, but want to point that use October count. Use CDE numbers for. Percentage of ELL students per district. Set-aside for Title III – 5% average over two year. Not everyone receives this</p> <p>Title V – previously Title VI under NCLB Use average daily attendance from prior year.</p> <p>Nina Lopez, CDE facilitator, to review discussion questions on PowerPoint Slide 122:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should we retain 3% of Colorado’s Title I funds for competitive Direct Student Services grants? Pros and Cons: Watered down, less impact on schools Opportunity for low performing school to get access to direct services Less funds for Title I schools More funds would support high school Comment from HUB Committee Member: Districts currently under the law could choose to service their high schools if wanted, but chose not to. But they could without this 3%. Response from CDE Representative: Yeah. Threshold has dropped to 50%. Question from HUB Committee Member: Would the state’s role to be to determine a menu of options for which this grant program would be operated? Or would it be open for the LEAs to determine what they need for direct services? Response from CDE Representative: Lists out allowable activities Question from HUB Committee Member: How much leeway does the state have in determining what is allowed? AP for example – is that to hire teachers who teach AP, AP fees, etc. If the state decided to just put it in just after school programs and use competitive grant for that – is that allowed? Response from CDE Representative: Not quite sure. Idea is for funds to benefit individual kids – like AP fee. But not 100% certain? Question from HUB Committee Member: That \$4.5 million – if that was thrown back into the big pot, what per pupil would that increase?
--	--	--

		<p>Response from CDE Representative: Varies by district. Need clarification from USDE if can use 3% first year and if will negatively impact districts.</p> <p>Question from HUB Committee Member: How many students total, piece of pie serves x number of students, can you give me a rough number?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Colorado has 214,482 Title I students - 93 high schools (12 targeted)</p> <p>Comment from HUB Committee Member: So that is \$21 per student lost on set-aside if math is correct?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should we further explore the under 20,000 student enrollment Title I allocation option with the Title Programs Spoke Committee? <p>BREAK: GROUP WORK SESSION</p> <p>Discussion Questions: PowerPoint Slide 122 Want Input and Recommendations from the Hub (02:05:33 on recording) Roughly 10 minutes</p> <p>Resume from break 02:15:41 on recording Come back together at 3:45pm</p>
3:45pm	<p>Updates and Concluding Remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hub Member Updates - Review and Approval of Minutes from October Meeting - Timeline - Confirmation of Meeting Dates/Times - Concluding Remarks and Next Steps Follow Up Items 	<p>Wrap up from Nina Lopez, CDE facilitator.</p> <p>Recommendations around timeline and extended meeting times. Times okay and confirmed by HUB Committee.</p> <p>December meeting will be extended, added a meeting in January, and changed time in February.</p> <p>Minutes are confirmed as correct from October’s meeting.</p> <p>No updates from HUB Committee outside of Spoke work.</p> <p>Feedback will be sent out and shared.</p> <p>Will keep note catcher open electronically for a week – for HUB Members only.</p>
3:45pm	Concluding Remarks	<p>Comment from HUB Committee Member: Stakeholder consultation – extending the plan date for submission – is their adequate time to receive feedback?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative: Decision lies with State Board. We could possibly submit in April. Need to think about legislative session.</p>
4:00pm	Meeting Ended	Thank you for your commitment - Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm