

# Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting: ESSA Committee of Practitioners

Date & Time: Thursday, February 10, 2022; 10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. Location: In-Person & Virtual (Zoom)

Meeting Leads: Laura Gorman and Amy Beruan (Elected Co-Chairs) Shannon Wilson and Tammy Giessinger (CDE Leads)

Objective: To allow the Colorado Department of Education the opportunity to provide updates to and elicit recommendations from the Colorado Committee of Practitioners regarding relevant and timely issues related to CDE’s responsibilities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESSA).

Agreed Upon Norms:

* Be present and engage fully.
* Let everyone have a voice and be heard! Don’t talk over each other.
* When not talking, turn off mic on your computer/phone to minimize background noise.
* Begin and end meetings on time. Stick to times allotted for topics, to the extent possible, or develop next steps for moving the work forward if running out of time.
* Use time productively.
* Assume positive intent and ask for clarification when something lands wrong.
* Come prepared.
* The chair of the meeting should enforce the norms.

Attendees: Clint Allison, Zuben Bastani, Cassandra Berry, Amy Beruan, Shineth Cunanan- Gonzales, Megan Eikleberry, Rochelle Garcia-Gomez, Sandy Gecewicz, Ed. D., Laura Gorman, Ryan Hartgerink, Mindy Heller, Stephanie Hund, Kyla Kepson, John McKay, Andrew Miller, Christy Sinner, Mitzi Swiatkowski, Marjorie Wickham, Joey Willett, Christina

..Wirth-Hawkins



# Agenda Items and Next Steps

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Headline Time Presenters** | **Agenda Item Prep (if needed)** | **Summary/Notes** |
| **Welcome Committee Business 10:00-10:15**  *Laura, Amy, Shannon, & Tammy* | * CoP members will vote on the approval of the minutes from the previous meeting and review the agenda for the meeting. * Revisit norms to ensure on track with expectations / commitments | The November 18th Meeting Minutes are approved. |
| **Consolidated Application Updates and Enrollment data for Method Serving 10:15-10:30**  *DeLilah Collins and Michelle Prael* | CDE will provide an update on the status of the Consolidated Application, provide an update on data funding years that will be available in the application and answer any questions that members have regarding the application. | Presentation Highlights:   * The 2022-23 Consolidated Application is in year three of the application cycle. The application will be launched in the Spring, an updated paper application will be posted to CDEs website. * Minor changes have been made to the 2022-23 application including an update to funding year designations and Title IV Carryover content category calculations. * The Non-public Consultation form and School Improvement of Funds form are due on May 31st. * The April Regional Network Meeting will be focused on the Consolidated Application. |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | CoP Feedback:   * Does CDE have an idea of preliminary allocations?   + CDE Response: Allocations have not yet been released, we anticipate they will be available in March. * Will there be any questions added or changes in assurances?   + CDE Response: A new progressive disclosure assurance has been added for Equitable Distribution of Teachers. If districts have their own data that meets requirements, they can check the assurance opting out of writing a narrative. |
| **Accountability Updates 10:30-11:00**  *Lisa Medler* | Updates on 2022 transitional accountability, including growth model, impact of missing data and the State Board of Education’s resolutions. | Presentation Highlights:   * An accountability audit (2022) is underway. Report is due by November 15, 2022; made public by December 2022. * CDE anticipates the full state assessment schedule will resume Spring 2022, along with performance frameworks in Fall 2022 and ESEA identification process will resume in Fall 2022. * Most data elements to calculate frameworks will be available, however growth data will be limited. CDE will |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | not be able to offer 3-year frameworks.   * Most schools and districts will have enough data to calculate a performance framework. More than usual will not. The available data stands in for missing data fairly well. * Data was presented to the State Board in December 2021.   CoP Feedback:   * Districts & schools will only receive 1 year only frameworks -- in the past it was sometimes 3 year frameworks that kept schools out of Priority Improvement or Turnaround--so what is the transitional plan to address that?   + CDE Response: We project numbers for the elementary, middle and high would go up, however the state can assign insufficient state data ratings. * Is there any consideration to the weighting of growth based on the lack of data?   + CDE Response: Thus far, there hasn’t been any discussion of weighting growth differently. |
|  |  | * What is the next time that the State Board will weigh in on this -- what does the timeline look like for their further input? |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | * CDE Response: It is dependent on when legislation is introduced. Once rules are noticed, there will be a formal process to provide input. * In the performance framework the demographic data for Eligible points includes 1. English Learners, 2. Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible, 3. Minorities Students in each assessment. At my school these are typically all the same kids. This seems to be a triple penalty on the framework for each assessment. Is this being looked at?   + CDE Response: CDE submitted a proposal to the state board years back to create a supersub group to count students once; the state board did not move forward with the proposal. To mitigate the overlap, the disaggregated groups are weighted considerably less than the all student group. * At the previous meeting, there was talk about providing meaningful methodology outside of the assessment. Using something other than one test on Literacy and Math only. Is there discussion about using other measurements like SEL? |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | * CDE Response: We are hoping that the Request to Reconsider process will be able to consider local assessments, but they will need to be nationally normed, so SEL measures are not likely. * How would 100% opt out be reflected? * Is there discussion about using an adaptive assessment that identifies more accurately where students above/below level are performing? Or is this a potential move from CMAS to local measures? I know the state moved away from PARCC but CMAS is the same company and looks pretty much the same…   + CDE Response: At this point, there is no conversation about changing the state assessments. The problem with computer adaptive assessments as our state test is that you can't ensure every student will take the full set of grade-level appropriate items that are aligned to the state standards. Which is a basic requirement of the assessment statute. The |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Request to Reconsider process allows for more flexibility in looking at supplemental data, so local measures (including adaptive assessments) can be considered.   * The previous participation target was 95% -- correct -- so is this move to 90% just for the transition or is this being considered to be for future years or is that unknown at this time?   + CDE Response: There was not previously a participation requirement to do a request to reconsider, so this 90% is new and is not intended to set long term precedent. The 95% requirement for Accountability Participation is still in place, but we are assuming that parent opt-outs and student absences due to COVID won't count against the 95% for state accountability. * Regarding growth, there are concerns around newly identified schools. At the elementary level we have the lion share based on growth data for elementary schools. That's always been based on 2 subject assessments |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | across 2 grade levels to determine the majority of the health of a school system. This year, newly identified schools will have 1 content area across a grade level, and a different content area for a different grade level. We should be applying the assurance of representative data. It sounds like we are saying one thing for people to come off, but are not saying the same thing for people to come on.  Language “fairly well” does not hold up.   * CDE Response: If what the board has put out as resolution goes into play, our interpretation is that newly identified schools would not be on the clock immediately. The 2 years to exit the clock does not go into play until schools have been on the clock for at least 2 years. |
| **ESSA Identification for Fall 2022**  **11:00-11:25**  *Nazie* | Update on USDE Guidance and its impact on Colorado’s implementation. Need feedback on plans for fall identification and any needed communication plans. | Presentation Highlights:   * In Fall 2022, CDE is required to identify schools for support and improvement under ESSA. We have the option to request one-year changes to the methodology due to missing data/state assessments. |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | * ESSA requires:   + Identification of schools based on performance of student groups, high schools based on graduation rates, schools that serve only K-2 students, and schools with low state assessment participation (no option of using “*insufficient state data*”)   + Based on 3-years of data (up to 5-years for smaller systems that would otherwise fall out of identification) * State identification allows for insufficient State data, can include 1- or 3-year frameworks and includes all schools in the state (with sufficient data to get a rating). Federal identification requires that for academic achievement, CDE must apply the lowest possible score to non-participants, and must include as many years of data needed for all schools to get a rating. * CDE proposes the following one-year changes to identification indicators:   + Graduation rate (high schools only): Recommended to use 3 years of 4- and 7-year adjusted cohort rates   + Progress in achieving English language proficiency (ELs only): Recommended to use |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | 2022 median growth percentiles and percentage of students on track to fluency, but request for a reduction in the weighing of the on-track metric and a reset of the cut scores   * SQSS: Recommended to request to only use dropout rates for high schools for 2022 only; for elementary and middle re-defining chronic absenteeism to only include unexcused absences. * Academic growth in English language arts and math: Recommended to use 2022 median growth percentiles * Academic achievement in English language arts and math: Options include to request to use 1 year of data - 2022, request to skip 2022, & 2021 & use 3 years of data - 2018, 2019 & 2022, or request to skip 2020 & 2021 & use 2 years - 2019 & 2022   CoP Feedback:  Agreement with requesting a reduction in the weighting of on-track metric for ELs. In support of not using chronic absenteeism data.   * For academic achievement, in favor of option #2 (longitudinal data) as it's a |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | better signal of overall health of schools and systems. Why not use option 2 or 3 for academic growth as well? Utilizing only 2022 data for schools is such a small amount of data.   * Science participation is a concern for the SQSS indicator. Science is a class that middle and high school students do not take.   + CDE Response: What if we only used the science SQSS indicator for elementary and middle, not highschool?     - CoP Response: Chronic absenteeism may be more representative than science participation (as it relates only to unexcused absenteeism). * What does the drop out data look like? * Science assessment is only administered in one grade level (11th grade), which may negatively impact schools if we are using a different metric across 4 grades vs when looking at science we are assessing one grade level. * Request for CDE to share anticipated calculations and differences in data. Members would like to share data with district colleagues for feedback. |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | * Several years ago, the two different measures of accountability used to lead to a lot of confusion and frustration. What are the lessons we learned from that and why are we looking at going back to that? * Emphasize on the public scale that this is only for 1 year, 2022 identification only. * If the identification methodology changes to option 1, are schools identified for CS for 3 years?   + CDE Response: If we change the identification methodology, we also have the ability to change the exit methodology. * Based on majority rule, members vote on option 1 - ESSA identification be the same as state accountability – only use 2022, even if that may result in over identification of schools if their participation rates are low or their performance has significantly dropped due to the pandemic.   + CDE Response: CDE to post recordings explaining the proposed changes, and provide an opportunity to share further feedback through a survey. |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ESSER and ESEA**  **Monitoring Updates 11:25-11:45**  *CDE Monitoring Team* | Updates on best practices for monitoring. Share revised Report Templates and discuss feedback. | CDE Highlights:   * In 2022, CDE is monitoring 47   ESSER-only districts, 2 ESEA & ESSER districts, and 2 ESEA-only districts.   * CDE is currently reviewing evidence submitted (35 of 51 districts submitted initial evidence) and reaching out for additional documentation. * In an effort to streamline the process and be as clear as possible on evidence needed, Grants Fiscal has created a Monitoring Questionnaire and Document Request list for LEAs to complete. * CoP feedback is requested on the Monitoring Questionnaire and Document Request list by February 23rd. * Based on majority rule, members prefer option A of the monitoring report (Condensed tab with compliance status).   CoP Feedback:  Monitoring Questionnaire and Document Request:   * Recommendation to add boxes under each question for LEAs to select ESSER I, ESSER II, ESSER III and ESEA, as applies. * Define capital and non-capital equipment, cite EDGAR. Include object codes. |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | * Recommendation to list examples of evidence. Reference ESEA monitoring report for examples of evidence. * Consider adding a comparison to the single audit for context. * Omit question #4 inquiring about other audits the district has undergone. Reword question #5 to include check boxes for districts to select if they have received other federal grants, have had an audit, and if so, any substantial findings. * Add a question inquiring if the district has ever performed a single audit. * Include certification at bottom of document.   Monitoring Report:   * Recommendation to update yes/no language to partial/in-progress, with a fraction representing compliance.   + CDE Response: CDE will proceed with tracking partial compliance as a fraction, included in the narrative section. |
| **Lunch 11:45-12:15** |  |  |
| **Federal Programs Updates**  **12:15-12:45**  *Nazie and DeLilah* |  | Presentation Highlights:   * At the April CoP meeting, CDE will revisit Schoolwide plans - Where should they live, how should they be structured, and how can CDE best streamline the process? How can CDE |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | provide feedback that is meaningful and helpful?   * CDE is considering utilizing an EDT alternative calculator for districts to review a more granular analysis of small, medium or large gaps. * If the EDT alternative calculator demonstrates compliance, districts can check an assurance in the 2022-23 Consolidated Application stating they are in compliance and opt out of providing a narrative. * Based on CoP feedback, CDE will move forward with developing an EDT alternative calculator.   CoP Feedback: Schoolwide Plans:   * Bring schoolwide accountability and federal programs together at the table. Develop a plan that works for both sides. * Request for CDE to provide examples and exemplar UIPs. * Curious how many districts use the UIP as needs assessment vs districts that do an extra needs assessment document? Trying to determine scope   - how many districts ( 2 or 95 districts). If just 2, maybe just constructive convo with districts vs a big change.   * Any additional support around needs assessment would be helpful.   EDT: |



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | * EDT is based on HR data submission which often is not a full data set. The EDT calculator gives districts an opportunity to add data into the mix and run a true calculation. * Consider timing of releasing THE alternative calculator - May take time to create, provide training, and for districts to collect data. |
| **Open Discussion/ Q&A**  **12:45-1:15**  *Laura, Amy, Shannon, & Tammy* | Time will be provided for CoP members to reflect on the updates provided and to ask questions as needed. | N/A |
| **Closing 1:15-1:30**  *Laura, Amy, Shannon, & Tammy* | The CoP leads will share final thoughts and provide a reminder for the next meeting. | Our next meeting is scheduled Apr 28, 2022 . |

*Feel free to share your agenda topic submissions through the* [*submission request form*](https://app.smartsheet.com/b/form/80d4a142008c43ef9fd51be7e7e25346)*. Please let us know if you have any questions.*