

Committee of Practitioners Meeting Notes

February 11, 2010

Charter School Institute, 1580 Logan Street, Denver

Members Attending: Kirk Banghart; Christy Bloomquist; Holly Brilliant; Anita Burns; Parke Covarrubias; Jesus Escarcega; Mary Ellen Good; Jennifer Guy; Anne Hausler; Melanie Jones; Bridgette Muse; Elizar Pagan; Mark Rangal; Keri Simonich; Molly Stevens; Jane Toothaker; Christine Vidal; Paula Niemi

Housekeeping

- Approved last meeting's minutes
Christina moved and Jennifer seconds, motion carries
- Kathryn suggest we review bylaws regarding dropping people if they don't attend meetings; Christy will contact those to see why not attending
- If Clara Algiene gets your rsvp email she will reply to you; if you don't hear from her, follow up

Title IV – Kathryn Smukler (reordered agenda)

- Update on Title IV funding (Handout 2)
 - Re: elimination of the formula Safe Drug-Free
- Application for continued funding of Even Start
 - Limited to only those already participating
 - Is a four year grant based on performance (Handout 2)
 - Looks like the 10/11 may be last year; it's last year funded unless Congress decides to re-fund
 - Rumor of consolidation with other literacy programs
 - Closed community of groups & hard for districts to achieve
 - Members reviewed form for comments...form will go to EDAC in March so need to comment now if want changes...no changes after form through EDAC: Give comments to Kathryn Smukler
 - Federal evaluation tool called "PART;" government uses for programs...Did not have unique evaluation tool for Even Start so used PART & program didn't do too well...Too bad because program is actually quite successful...Relevant data show significant improvements though no longitudinal data, at least in CO

BREAK

Review of School Improvement Grant – Trish Boland

- (No handout)
- 1003 G Funds; directly from USDE; beyond Title \$\$;
- \$36,000,000 over 3 years to target lowest performing schools (as determined by CSAP, AYP, etc) in state
 - Two tiers: 5% lowest performing Title I schools and high schools that are eligible for Title I but don't receive Title\$ and are in lowest 5%...At first didn't include alternative schools so now have to play catch up
- Not enough guidance from Feds initially; so now CDE working feverishly
- Fortunately Feds pushing deadlines back
- Lots of Fed \$\$ is moving to competitive funding in current budget; for example IIA is no longer going to be formulary
- Some states lack resources to compete for these funds
- Title III-G application in email soon; didn't ask us for review since there is no option but what they required

Waiver for Choice Letter – Trish Boland

- One of last Margaret Spellings initiatives: 14 days notice requirement
- Timing of school starts is uneven and data not available so..
- CDE sending letter for waiver (Handout 3)
- Trish would like comments on letter, if any

Title I A Policy Updates

- Some schools pay lowest paid teachers with these funds, then those people change which raises specter of supplant not supplement; ethical question
- Should have school wide plan in place first, then fund. Instead, it seems to be budget driven.
- Develop plan first, then fund it instead of other way around...
- No more flip flopping who gets paid via Title I funds each year

- Title I not effective in CO according to evaluation results over 50 years, especially school-wide programs
- Some districts are diluting allocations and under-serving kids (see 2nd page of Title I policy update handout)
- School wide and targeted don't change anything to help avoid the suggestion of supplant v supplement; school wide consolidation does. Single budget, saves a lot of principals' time...
- Mary Ellen Q: How's it going with OIG auditors? A: Not so good, says Trish, because time and effort probs are showing up (supplement/supplant); CDE has a law firm negotiating with the Feds regarding OIG findings
- Conceivable state would have to pay back Fed \$ due to failure of state to fund its own programs leading to use of fed funds to supplant state funded program \$

Changes to Application – Brad Bylsma

- No sense big changes to application with reauthorization around corner. Minor changes underway.
- Also working on maintenance system regarding communication, email alerts, etc.
- Goal is to launch application on April 1st
- Allocations accuracy drives the timing of application going live
- Will make announcements re: training, etc., when go live; probably beginning in April
- Webinars in April followed by regional workshops by invitation to guarantee certain districts participate using live data on laptops...typically districts that have had some difficulty. Non-targeted districts can participate, too.
- Working to smooth out:
 - locking/unlocking issue
 - ARAC (?) form: question box re: carrying over of funds and a way to open boxes
 - “D” will be added right in to form so no need for separate series of apps
 - If district <1000 or only one/two Title schools, you will be able to replace narrative with school wide improvement plans, etc.

- To fix problems matching actual schools with method they chose to serve schools...will gray out ineligible schools to make easier
- Per pupil amount will be there to compare
- Minor text changes to help accuracy
- September 30, (targeted) final approval date (say Brad & Trish)
- Q; Any chance reauthorization fast tracked for this year? A: No. But will probably be considered in spring rather than fall...so speeded up slightly

SES – (Supplemental Education Services) Evaluation Protocol – Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson

- Need to evaluate approved providers (Handouts sent by email last week)
- She would like feedback on the documents since she and her colleagues are so familiar they might miss something we would see...
- The docs she sent reflected changes from January 29th meeting of providers and users
- First goal is that data accurate and complete 95% of the time (see protocol/decision tree handout) Nazie would prefer 98% or higher. NO negotiating below 95%. Inaccuracies and inconsistencies pop out so very easy to catch.
- Consequence: Once these criteria are approved, non-compliant providers will be dropped. There will be a one year warning period, and if they continue to fall short, they will be dropped.
- There will be some room for negotiation so a monitoring visit will occur to determine other variables
- See data sheet showing growth: % of students who showed growth vs control group
- Q: Where do schools fall into this? How will schools know? A: CDE will do monitoring visits and ask at schools...communication kicks in. CDE will also look at impediments in schools that may effect SES providers
- Q: Can CDE provide criteria/characteristics for selecting an effective provider? Would help to educate parents to be responsible consumers...A: Would like to have 3 years of data and then will provide such info. Will start publishing evaluation results.
- Districts' responsibility to provide achievement goals agreements to providers...They are in best position to know.

- Nazie would like to see district/provider agreements strengthened. Many are currently too basic.
- Parents are the ones who can terminate agreements. Parents need more to be better at info/selection support. Many most impacted parents are not necessarily equipped to make choices despite the power they have.
- Issues related to being compared to controls (see handout Nazie mailed)
 - Must be positive student doesn't have any other services
 - Are also measuring the effect of having transportation access. Are students without access to transportation at a disadvantage?
- (Monitoring indicators handout she sent last week) Any feedback for Nazie on indicators?
- Word on the street is that district should be monitoring its providers. They are using Title dollars to enable their students to do better on CSAP. Period. If not working, do something.

Standards Revision and Implementation: Content Specialists – Barry Cartwright and Karol Gates

- 5 consultants, one for each content areas
- Big picture of standards change PowerPoint presentation
 - “My Standards, My Future” Colorado’s standards for all
 - Raced through in one year due to feedback that biz, higher ed, and military were doing too much remediation. Thus, SB 212
 - Did a backward design beginning with what the “ready” student looks like, content area by area, i.e., 10 “big ideas” of science
 - Begin with “prepared graduate” competencies and work backwards grade by grade to ensure, then set out learning progressions
 - Committees tried to write standards that supported best practices teaching
 - Designed to shift thinking about education, from old to new thinking such as student is an active participant not passive learner
 - Background on process of devising standards
 - Research-based; inclusive; transparent
 - 85 hours per person of volunteer time, 186,2598 miles traveled by members, 220 meetings, etc, etc...

- Stakeholders group set parameters and selected standards committees from applications
 - Meeting results posted online and visitors welcome as observers at meeting,
- One side of equation is standards, the other is assessments
 - System not just “test;” readiness and departure tests as bookends with formative in between
 - Aug 2009 – March 2010; currently on hold pending Joint Budget Committee; Race to the Top; common core standards nationally; multi-state consortiums
 - Must choose new assessment provider by Dec 2010
- Notable changes
 - Pre-K included
 - Grade level expectations included
 - Evidence, outcomes and application are explicit
 - 21st century skills and post-secondary workforce readiness skills have been embedded throughout
 - Assessment will be embedded not a separate document
 - 21st Century Skills = the big 5 need to be taught explicitly throughout the system to EVERY student
 - Critical thinking & reasoning
 - Info literacy
 - Collaboration
 - Self-direction
 - Invention
 - Q: Picture the classroom – what does it look sound & feel like?
 - Taking ‘big 5’ and unpacking. Conversation held P-20. (see handout - Postsecondary & Workforce Ready flow diagram)
 - Used same level of diligence for standards not tested, ie, music, etc;

- Doing standards at once allowed great deal of coherence
- Expectations written for mastery written
 - Curriculum scaffolds learning
 - Grade level expectation mastery articulated in standards
 - Curriculum reinforces learning
- Notable changes by area
 - World Languages
 - name changed from foreign languages
 - Proficiency levels for different ranges
 - Comp Health and PE
 - Health education
 - Integration of health and PE
 - Intentional differentiation, too
 - Science
 - Scientific process and nature of science stds embedded into content
 - Evidence outcomes that are designed toward active engagement of students with materials
 - Social Studies
 - One coherent document
 - Four interconnected standards
 - Personal financial literacy integrated into econ
 - Reading, writing, and communicating
 - 4 standards
 - Grade level expectations articulated preK – 12
 - Greater specificity
 - Math

- 4 standards, down from 6
- Integration of personal financial literacy
- Grade level expectations written as concepts and skills
- Arts: lots of connections between disciplines
 - Visual, drama, dance, music
 - GLEs include concepts and skills
 - Relevancy and interdisciplinary connections of arts and society
 - Performing arts have 2 pathways in high school = generalist and extended
- Personal Financial Literacy, not business
 - HB 1168 has 6 criteria
- Expanded Benchmarks
 - Math, science, reading writing communication
- WIDA=World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (Language Proficiency Standards)
- What support can the field expect from CDE?
 - Transition by Dec 2011 to stds that meet or exceed state stds
 - Recommend doing by fall of 2011, not Dec
 - Spring of 2012 new assessment system; only two more years of CSAP
 - Awareness; tools and resources; implementation support; district adoption, beginning with leadership level then moving to support classroom teachers
 - Multi-Dimensional Support from CDE
 - Tools (like online searchable standards on school view)
 - Communication and Collaboration

- Professional Development
 - “Standards Crosswalk Document” comparing what’s same and what’s eliminated or new available searchable & online in a month or so
 - FAQ document on CDE website, mainly geared to leaders
 - Will expand with specifics over next couple of months
 - More higher level Bloom’s Taxonomy in new standards
 - Elementary Content Connections Document delineating themes to support content integration
 - Personal Financial Literacy Summit April 8, 2010 (sign up is live on CDE website)
 - Guiding Questions: Small group work during meeting
 - Ask yourself what are the implications for my work?
 - How do the new standards support your work?
 - What additional needs?
 - TO GET REVISED STANDARDS GO TO HOMEPAGE TOWARDS BOTTOM: NEWLY ADOPTED STATE STANDARDS
 - How to partner with CDE:
 - Online office hours (CDE website)
 - Collaborate on dev of materials
 - Share your work with CDE
 - Utilize online tools and resources as developed
 - Teaching and learning consultants for regional meetings
- **Next meeting: April 8...respectfully submitted 2/11/10 Anne Hausler**