

COLORADO STATE COMMITTEE OF PRACTITIONERS

April 26th, 2004 Meeting Notes

Purpose: the State Committee of Practitioners serves to advise the State in carrying out its responsibilities under Title I

Members Present:

Larry Romine, Sheryl Hutter, Melanie Jones, Paige Grubb, Jan Johnston, Jane Toothaker (by teleconference), Evelyn Jacobi, and Robert Finkle. Ex-officio members: Trish Boland & Alyssa Pearson

Members Not Present:

Carol Harris, Mary Ann Saffer, Karen Benner, Tammy Williams, Barb Rhine, and Kevin Patterson

- I. Meeting notes from the March 5th, 2004, reviewed for accuracy. No changes required. These notes will be posted on the Committee's website.
- II. The committee requested that Trish Boland determine the advisory capacity of the committee with respect to the various sections of Title I (i.e., Title IA, IB, etc.). The committee members also agreed to serve as a point of contact and communication to colleagues in their respective regions. Members were encouraged to identify an alternate who could attend the scheduled meetings when necessary.
- III. No nomination forms received.
- IV. Discussion Items:
 - a. SAR/AYP Questions:

The committee received a draft of questions that might be included with the SAR. This emanated from legislation that would include AYP information on the SAR and a desire by legislators that more information for parents be included. These questions were designed as suggestions for the kinds of information that parents might ask of schools regarding school ratings and adequate yearly progress. After substantial discussion, the committee recommended the following:

 - Include an explanation on the SAR about this rating and the purpose of it versus AYP
 - Questions should be directed to parents and how they can be involved

There was much debate on the worthiness of many of the questions. The committee voted to request a meeting with those responsible in the Governor's office for this revision to the SAR. Co-Chair Larry Romine will initiate this contact and communicate further with the rest of the committee. The purpose of this meeting would be to express the committee's advice concerning the proposed questions.
 - b. School Improvement Grant Update:

Laura Hensinger provided information concerning a revised approach to the use of school improvement funds. In the past, a competitive process distributed funds to schools identified for improvement. To better assure that schools with

the greatest need receive assistance, a revised process has been developed. This revised process tiers all the schools identified for improvement as follows:

- Tier 1: Schools that participated in an SST review
- Tier 2: Schools that are in their second year of school improvement and did not receive a School Improvement Grant last year
- Tier 3: Schools that are in their second year of school improvement and received a School Improvement Grant last year

Due to limited funds, the department only may be able to grant funds to Tier I and II schools. Depending on the response from interested districts, some Tier III schools may be eligible. Eligible districts will be notified by late April to determine interest.

In order to receive funds, eligible schools and districts must commit to an external review by one of CDE's school support teams and must develop a school improvement plan that incorporates the major areas of need as determined by the external review.

The funding for this grant will be disseminated in two parts. An initial amount will be granted to each school in June. The funding is to be used to support a School Support Team, which will conduct a review of the school based on a set of nine standards. Any remaining funds can be spent on costs associated with this external review or on early intervention strategies. An additional amount will be granted to each school in April, 2005. Prior to the release of these funds, a school improvement plan that incorporates research-based strategies for improving the major identified needs from the external review must be submitted and approved by CDE.

The Committee of Practitioners unanimously supported this process for use of funds, noting that removing the competitive process leveled the playing field. The committee made several recommendations:

1. It might be useful for districts to see the tool used by the SSTs, receive training, and receive a notice about eligibility.
2. The committee requested a list of the schools that will be eligible.
3. The committee asked to be kept informed with respect to any additional ranking that needs to occur and about schools that choose not to participate.

c. District Program Improvement

The committee had requested an update on the status of district program improvement. A copy of an email sent to the department from the US Department of Education demonstrated that aspects of the law related to program improvement are still under consideration. Notably, there is no guidance as to how the 10% set aside for professional development in districts identified for improvement may be spent; whether these dollars can be spent with nonTitle I staff or not. The committee recommended that until guidance is provided, the Colorado unit should not require districts to use this professional development set aside for staff in nonTitle I schools.

V. Trish provided additional information with respect to AYP, including new guidance from the US DOE and a timeline for AYP determinations for '04.

VI. Tentative 2004-2005 meeting dates:

- August 27th, 2004
- November 19th, 2004
- February 25th, 2005
- April 29th, 2005