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

**Start strong**

**Read by**

**third grade**

**Meet or**

**exceed standards**

**Graduate**

**Ready**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Meeting:**  | **ESSA Hub Committee** |
| **Date:**  | December 12, 2016 | **Time:**  | 10:00am-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:***(Who most needs to attend?)* | **CDE Representatives:** Joyce Zurkowski, Leanne Emm, Patrick Chapman, Lynn Bamberry, Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson, Alyssa Pearson, Peter Sherman, Lisa Medler, Brad Bylsma, Jennifer Simons, Jessica Hollingshead, Barbara Hickman, Rachael Lovendahl, Colleen O’Neil**Members of the HUB Committee:** Steve Durham, 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, Angelika Schroeder, Rep. Brittany Pettersen, & Jim Earley **Hub Committee Member Not Present:** Representative Jim Wilson |
| **Meeting Objectives:***(Is a meeting necessary to accomplish the objectives?)* | ESSA – 5th Hub Committee Meeting Updates on ESSA progress, Closer Look at Assessment, Accountability, School Improvement, and Effective Instruction & Leadership in ESSA state plan development  |

Agenda Items and Next Steps

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Agenda Item** | **Notes & Next Steps** *(be sure to include communication to those not at the meeting who need to know the results)* |
| 10:00am | **Welcome and Overview*** Review agenda and objectives
* ESSA regulations update
* Introduce state plan template
 | (starts on 08:43 on recording) Nina Lopez and Katy Anthes start with opening comments and thoughts. Went over agenda and expectations for the day. Feedback received: too much presentation and not enough time for discussion.Pay attention to the intentionality of topics and decision points that are discussed and the order that they are presented.  |
| 10:15am  | **ESSA State Plan: Assessment** * Consider for adoption Spoke Committee recommendations
 | Presentation lead by CDE Representative: Joyce Zurkowski(starts on 12:50 on recording) Federal department released the final template for the state plans a couple weeks ago. For the assessment area, went from 7 areas down to 2 areas covered in the draft. 1. Advanced Math coursework
2. Languages other than English

**Advanced Math Coursework** State plan template for advanced math coursework asks two questions: 1. Does the state administer end-of-course mathematics assessments to high school students in order to meet the requirements under section 1111(b)(2)(B)(v)(I)(bb) of the ESEA? – Yes
2. Does the state use the exception for students in eighth grade to take such assessments under section 1111(b)(2)(C) of the ESEA? – Yes

So if go back in time, states that had end-of-course assessments were required to give their advanced middle school students (8th grade students in algebra) take both the 8th grade test and the algebra test. Under our waiver, we requested not to double test students and say rather than having our 8th grade students who are taking an algebra test and the 8th grade test, let them just take the algebra test. Notice the question is confined to 8th grade. So again, under Colorado’s waiver we also apply that flexibility to 7th grade. They are not asking us about that and to be very honest with you for this year, we plan on continuing that flexibility. I don’t think anyone is thinking it is a good idea to suddenly look at our kidos and say more testing. Not thinking that will apply very well. So the suggestion from the Spoke Committee is we stick to the question being asked and stop there. So when we are looking at decision points, hoping this will be a relative easy decision point for you:* **Decision Point:**  Will the State continue to use the exception for advanced mathematics students in eighth grade to take end-of-course high school mathematics assessments?
* **Spoke Recommendation:** Yes, and to continue with those assessments that are currently an option in 8th grade (Algebra I, Geometry, Integrated I & Integrated II)

At tables, have this conversation – Should Colorado continue the flexibility that allows advanced math students to take the assessment that matches their test and says they don’t have to take the 8th grade test. **Questions from Hub Committee Member** (15:54 on recording): What are the consequences of a different result? Are you talking about double testing? Or are you talking about being tested at a level below which should be their competency given the courses they are taking? **Response from CDE Member:** So if the Hub Committee and later the State Board would say you know what we don’t want to continue with this flexibility and the answer is no, you would have a decision at that point cause you can go in any direction which is double test the students so they take both the test which matches their instruction plus the grade level test. Or you can say the students will only take the grade level test and they will not take the end-of-course assessment. So it’s a two tiered question. **Questions from Hub Committee Member:** So assuming we say yes to continue what we are doing, what is the consequence in terms of the information that we give to the public about our students in 8th grade? What effect does that have? **Response from CDE Member:** So I might have to throw this answer at Alyssa – from an accountability point of view – what we are doing right now is counting those 8th grade students who are taking the algebra test, we are counting their performance on the algebra test for purposes of the SPF and DPF, that’s what’s currently happening. You may recall, and I can pull the information for you again from conversations in August, in terms of results, our students who are advanced math students are doing relatively well in this advanced coursework. So there was some fear initially that perhaps that schools and districts who were encouraging their students to move forward more quickly could be penalized under the system. Students who are advanced in math are advanced in math. **Questions from Hub Committee Member:** So it’s not having a negative effect?**Response from CDE Member:** For students who are taking the assessment early because they are taking advanced coursework, like Joyce said, it’s because they are doing well, it’s not penalizing schools. There are conversations sometimes around holding those high school tests until students get into high school, but we are not doing that. When the kids test because it’s a reflection of what the school there are in is doing so we include those results where they are at right then. **Response from CDE Member:** I should mention that there was a lot of conversation in the Spoke committee about looking more deeply into who are these students and so for our advanced math students if they are enrolled in algebra – are all students taking the algebra test or are some schools and districts choosing to make them take the 8th grade test and looking more deeply at that. They had made a recommendation that we try to do some kind of pilot analysis. We dove more deeply and we don’t think we need to get permission to do any more additional data collection. Other questions?**Back to tables to answer question:** Will the state continue flexibility for our students who are advanced in math to take the assessment that matches their instruction and NOT have to take the grade level assessment? **Break for Table Discussions** (20:15 on recording) Convene back at 22:06 on recording **So question to the group is:** Are we in a position to move forward with the recommendation that would say for our advanced mathematic students they can take the assessment, which matches their instruction (algebra, geometry, integrated I and integrated II) and not have to take the grade level assessment? Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator steps in to moderate decision point. Invites those who do not feel comfortable moving forward with recommendation to share thoughts and why. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Comfortable with decision, but at some point think there needs to be a discussion about the reporting because there seems to be some confusion when the PARCC results are reported and whether it does or does not include the advanced takers, etc. I think that undermines the public reporting. **Response from CDE Representative:** So in future conversations, we do need to think about how we do our public reporting, and going to assume that is both the public reporting that comes out of assessment as well as making sure folks are clear what’s happening from accountability’s point of view. Any other objections or cautions with moving forward with this recommendation?**Decision of Hub Committee:** All members of the Hub committee are in consensus and will move forward with this recommendation for the following decision point: Will the state continue flexibility for our students who are advanced in math to take the assessment that matches their instruction and NOT have to take the grade level assessment? **YES**So if we say yes, the SEA must provide their strategies to provide all students in the state the opportunity to be prepared for to take the advanced mathematics work in middle school. As I mentioned earlier, this was part of our waiver, so we had to provide language under our waiver. The Spoke Committee recommendation is to resubmit that same language. Obviously in Colorado we need to be very careful at a state level interfering with scope, sequence and curriculum instructions, which are local, and that language does that. I believe you all got that language in your packets. Going to let you have some time at your tables to look over that language and identify any areas of concern. What we are hoping to do is get to the point where we can post draft language for public comment so you are not at this point in time saying that we are settled on this language but do want you to be sure that you are comfortable with this language in general to post for public comment. **Break for Table Discussions and Review** (25:29 on recording)Convene back at 31:41 on recordingIs the group okay to move forward in this direction? Is the current language appropriate to put out for public comment? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So on the first page, you talk about non-academic barriers, so can you guys give a couple examples of non-academic barriers? Are we talking about transportation needs, homeless students, what are we referring to? Roman numeral - IV: guidelines for preventing non-academic barriers to the use of acceleration as an education intervention. So can you give an example of what non-academic barriers we are referring to? **Response from CDE Representative:** So you are absolutely right in terms of how do we get around issues like transportation, how to get around issues for rural districts – how are we as a district going to make sure we are ready to provide the appropriate instruction?**Question from Hub Committee Member:** Second question, one of the sections talks about local school boards, educations duty to adopt policies to require each school of the district. Do you know where I am at? It includes charters, but how does that include CSI schools? So schools who are not authorized by a specific school district? **Response from CDE Representative:** We may need to do some checking on that. I believe that CSI essentially functions in some ways as the district for those schools who are under them. And so the same rules would apply. Other thoughts? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** This is more of general question, so in these cases where we need to provide the pieces of evidence of how we are going to do something – can you help me understand to what extent does the U.S. Department of Education can actually control what we say here or are we just checking a box? I am just interested how seriously this will be taken. **Response from CDE Representative:** I am looking out into the audience, someone can add on to what I say or add for clarification – so I think it is fair to say that historically the Dept. of Education has taken their role in doing state plans seriously. They have come back with some rather detailed comments historically and have asked us to address areas of concern. I think it is fair to say with the new administration none of us are in a position to predict what the review process will look like and whether there will be continuity with past practice or whether there will be some changes. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So I guess my motivation for asking that is – when I read through this it is just a description of what we do, which I think is great. However, are there any issues that CDE sees in here that might come up as a red flag that we should know about or no? **Response from CDE Representative:** So this is language that we have provided in the past. It is based in state law and exists in state practice so there is nothing new. We have been careful of making sure that as we address the question, we don’t overstep and get into district and school responsibility. But most of that language says is the districts have this responsibility and yes they need to have a plan. But what that plan is, is left to the district. Alright, if there are no concerns then our next step is going to be post the language. Our plan is to the post the language at the beginning of January assuming that nobody wants to deal with ESSA language over the winter break. **Language Other Than English** (36:20 on recording)The second piece – there are several sub pieces underneath this. But what we need to have from Hub Committee as a recommendation to the State Board is a definition that we would use for languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population and identify the specific languages that cover that definition. We had an initial conversation with the Spoke Committee, and then went and met with educators of English learners – EL Stakeholder group - English Learner Educators Stakeholder group. We had a conversation with them and went into a fair amount of detail with them in terms of what our current practice is. You received that PowerPoint so if you want to take a look at the current accommodations that are available to native languages as well as additional support, if you want to see the numbers of students by language category by grade – that was all included. We then took their recommendation back to the Spoke Committee and now we are bringing you the Spoke Committee recommendation. But we wanted you to be aware that we have gone to one of more significant stakeholder groups to have this conversation. **Decision Point:** Develop a state definition for “languages other than English that are present to a significant extent in the participating student population.” We looked at some past precedent and we know that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) and the U.S. Department of Justice’s (DOJ) Title VI regulations at 49 CFR Part 21 talk about this. What has been referenced is 5% or 1,000 persons, whichever is less, of the LEP population eligible to be served or likely to be affected [by a particular service or product]. And in our case what we are talking about is grade specific tests. What are English Learner stakeholder group wanted us to be sure to keep in mind is not only do we need to be looking at just the number of students, but what is happening instructionally with those students. So they were adamant that the test should match what is happening in the classroom on a daily basis. Spoke recommendation consistent with the English Learner stakeholder recommendation was to lower those percentages and that number to 2.5% and or 500 persons, whichever is less of the state grade level LEP population eligible to be served or affected by a particular service or product. And then in the explanation again, making sure to emphasize that we need to look at what is happening instructionally. Implications of adopting that definition are in the state of Colorado. We have one language group that meets that and that is Spanish. Again, in your packet, starting on slide 22ish through 28ish from that meeting we had in November you can see each of the grade levels and the number of students. We also looked at what currently is being used as accommodations. So we do have outside a fully translated test, options for a word-to-word glossary that can be used, translated directions that can be used, we do currently have an oral script that will be translated locally. When we looked at the language groups utilizing those three different types of L1 accommodations, outside of Spanish those numbers are very low. So when we look at the translated directions, there is no language group across all grades that are more than 16 students who utilized those translated directions. When we look at the word-to-word glossary, there are 3 groups who have more than 16 students across all grades. There are 32 students who utilize the word-to-word glossary in Vietnamese, 31 in Nepali, 18 in Mandarin. Folks who are interested in the Mandarin numbers, because we have a couple schools in the state that have bi-lingual immersion programs in Mandarin, but when we look at what folks are currently using they are testing those kids overall in English. Also for our Mandarin programs, there are a lot of native English speakers who are engaged in those – those students are not eligible. This is an accommodation issue for English learners only. We also looked at first year in the U.S. numbers to make sure that we weren’t missing a group of kidos. There was only one group that approached 16 at one grade level and that was Arabic in 4th grade, but even that was under 16. So the Spoke Committee at this point felt pretty confident in moving forward with this definition and moving forward with our current practices in terms of accommodations and then just making sure that we on the lookout and are prepared in case there is some influx for a particular language group and then again encouraged us to pay attention what is happening instructionally. It doesn’t make sense to have a student population take a science test in Nepali if they never had Science instruction in Nepali, right? They won’t know what that photosynthesis word is. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Quick question before we move on, is the number of students currently using the accommodation the right way to measure those students and the number of the students using it? So there might be many more students who have those needs but for whatever reason are not using the accommodation? Seems like a strange way to measure and help me understand the consequences of it if we use this definition with those accommodations will that ability go away? **Response from CDE Representative:** Two different pieces, so when you look at that bigger packet, what you have are just the overall numbers regardless of what accommodations they use. So you can see the raw number that starts on slide 22. So that is where we started. The next question was – well what is current practice? There was some belief that our students who are currently utilizing either the translated directions, word-to-word glossary or oral script, would be more than likely the pool of students who would then want to take a fully translated assessment. Right, so we would be essentially limiting them with what we currently had and they would want more. So that is why we looked at those numbers and saw very few utilizing those. In terms of the accommodation, there is no plan to reduce the current accommodations that are available. And again, you have information in that packet. Going to do a little backtracking here – we do have a fully translated Spanish versions in math, science, social studies. We do allow clarification of directions in native language. We want to make sure that students understand what they are supposed to do. We don’t want them to be confused by that. That will continue. We have those word-to-word glossaries that I mentioned earlier. Those will continue. And we will continue to provide those oral scripts for on-site translation. Those are utilized for both English learners as well as our student who are deaf or hard of hearing who need to have sign language interpretation. So there is no plan to restrict what we have currently had. We just needed to know whether or not to move forward beyond Spanish translation. Also, you do have numbers for our Spanish translations. Again, that is our biggest language group with about 80% of our English learners are Spanish speaking and then we drop down to about 1.4%. For math we have 761 students who use the Spanish translated assessment in 3rd grade. In 4th grade, that number dropped to 274, 5th grade 117, 6th grade 81. It does jump a little bit after that to 107. But when you consider that’s in 80% of our EL population go ahead and take 1.4% of that –we don’t have a lot of students who would be ready to access those assessments in those languages, which was the determination of the Spoke Committee. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** The practical fact of the Spoke Committee recommendation, there is no practice at the present time that would potential increase cost and increase the obligation of the state?**Response from CDE Representative:** So from a state practical point of view, if we moved forward with the Spoke Committee recommendation, there is no change in current practice in the foreseeable future. But it does open the door to if suddenly Colorado had a large influx of a particular language group and it was matching instruction, that we would have to consider providing those translations and then yes, there are costs associated with that. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** If this is not in the federal requirements, why would the state obligate itself beyond the federal requirement? **Response from CDE Representative:** So there is no federal requirement under our Education law. They say each state has to come up with its own definition. We don’t have a current definition – this is new. So what we have looked at this and considered this from a very practical point of view. We have had to make these decisions. We have looked for documentation that provides us with what they are thinking is. This again was a reference point, that we could find out there existing as some kind of precedent. It’s never been tied to this use before. We were just looking for some kind of guidance as what possibly could be utilized and reasonable and that is how that came forward. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** On the practical effect though, when you are looking at the numbers and the percentages of the students, you are looking at it over the grades levels. So if we were to see a swell in one particular language group in two or three grades, for this to kick in, it would have to be prevalent across all grade levels, right?**Response from CDE Representative:** So if we are going to utilize this as a guiding point that may or may not be reasonable, then it would be grade level specific. So, for example, if we suddenly had an increase in 7th and 8th grade who spoke Russian, then we would look at applying either the 5% or 1000 or the 2.5% or 500 to those grade levels. Again, looking at instruction then we would make the decision. So it does not have to be consistent across grade levels. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Perfect. For what is it worth, I actually think this is incredibly reasonable, especially if it tends to match the practical effect of what we are doing now. And I think that while we can talk about this in a small group. I like the idea that it is grade specific rather than waiting for the entire – that could take a decade for an entire cohort of kids to get the services that they need. **Response from CDE Representative:** Okay, thank you. So in terms what I would like you all to talk about at your tables is the reasonableness of moving forward with this language as Colorado’s definition for purposes of getting feedback. Not looking for commitment, just to put out for public comment. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Keeping in mind that the federal piece that you used a reference point is not actually a requirement, I am still not clear how we got to putting that at 50% of that reference point. Just don’t understand the logic there. **Response from CDE Representative:** So again, you can find this reference resolution to OCR complaints in things like that. The English learner stakeholder group felt that as advocates for their students and as Colorado being a leader in making sure that all students have access to a strong education, and can access the assessments, they were recommending being more restrictive than what we have seen in some resolution to OCR complaints. The Spoke Committee agreed, I think in part because the practical impact isn’t there. But it was making a statement that Colorado will respect other language groups. Nina Lopez, CDE Co-Facilitator, steps in to moderate decision point. Just a clarifying question – So our hope is to have the Hub Committee adopt this recommendation around this so that it will go out for public comment and if the public comment calls into question the reasonableness of recommendation that then it would back. I just wanted to clarify that if the Hub Committee does adopt this as what gets included, that we don’t currently plan to come back to the Hub Committee. Just wanted to clarify that and make sure. Is that right?**Response from CDE Representative:** Yes, we would love to get there. At your tables, please discuss the reasonableness of this as a definition for Colorado. As Nina pointed out, we would love to be able to have this be the Hub Committee recommendation for public comment. Once public comment is supportive, we won’t need to come back. Not sure if we will land there, but would love land there. **Break for Table Discussions** (53:20 on recording)Convene back at 1:02:40 on recordingSo a couple additional clarifications. We sent you this information, PowerPoint and draft language last Tuesday. We met with our technical advisory group after that. They did have a recommendation that right within this definition we provide this clarification that when we are talking about students who are eligible, that we are talking about students with a language background receiving instruction in that language within the last year. And that is consistent with our past practice with what we have done. But again, the task was recognizing the English learners stakeholder group belief that we always need to take this back to instruction. So when we look at practical implications down the road, with the 2.5% or 5%, essentially we would need that number of students coming in with a year and they received instruction a different language in the prior year or we would have to start bilingual programs in those languages. So I do not believe that we are looking at increased expense any time in the near future based on those criteria. Keep in mind we must have a definition or the other one. We can come up with a third definition, but we do have to have a definition submitted in our state plan. So keep continuing the conversations at your table. Keep in mind we are talking about students whose first language is that target language so some of those immersion programs are native English speakers who are now going in to learn Spanish, French, or Mandarin and those students would still be expected to take a test in English. This is for those strictly identified as English learners. **Impressions from Hub Committee Members:** So our table was split. We have half supporting the Spoke Committee recommendation. The other is concerned with when we are looking at and studying a standard based on something, what was the research data on a Department of Justice basis? Why would we extend what we already have based on rules from other departments?Could not hear members of Hub Committee as going around tables – not speaking in microphones from 1:03:00 to 1:09:23 on recording**Summary of Hub Thoughts:** Essentially within our response is we would have two targets. One would be this lower target that says once we hit this, we need to start looking very carefully and evaluate the need based on what we are experiencing and I think the English learner group had some thoughts on this as well. And then say but when we hit our hard point of 5% or 1000 persons, then we are going to start providing those assessments in that native language provided by the state. Does that seem like a reasonable compromise? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** As long as we are not extending ourselves more than what we are required to. Are there any objections moving forward with that compromise in terms of what the Hub Committee’s recommendation is? **Recommendation from the Hub Committee:** Once the state hits 5% or 1000 persons of a particular language group, then the state will provide translations of relative assessments in that native language. When the state hits 2.5% or 500 persons of a particular language, the state will investigate closely what is happening from an instructional point of view and have conservations about what direction needs to be taken. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Here is how I can imagine that playing out – you have a sudden influx in very large number of Russians in 7th and 8th grade like you mentioned, maybe if the district decides to do a dual language program with those students, and this is going to continue, we may need the assessments. If this is just one year and this is a place where they temporary spread and then are gone, we wouldn’t necessarily need to. But it is that trigger point to look to say what is coming up. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Just one point of clarification, I think of the things that I am looking at is from an accountability perspective, such as SB-191 and teacher evaluation. Because of the fact that the assessments impact them as well. So this is why we need to have this at a lower level so we can say how do we measure against what is going on in the classroom. So I think there will be an obligation of the state to say what student groups or native language groups are actually not being served by assessments in their native language.**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I think just as a clarification - a teacher who speaks Russian or who has that skill can translate the assessment, the students can take it now. All they are saying here is that the assessment would be translated ahead of time and built. So it hasn’t changed. All those students generally must take the math assessment the first year, can get the one year waiver for language arts, but that doesn’t change. As far as which students test is independent of whether or not the assessment is translated or not.  **Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator: So are there any objectives moving forward with this compromise?****Decision of Hub Committee:** No objections. In terms of next steps, we do think if we put this out for public comments, we will need to provide some context. Otherwise people will be asking the very same questions that you all brought up. Thank you for your time and focus. Assessment presentation ended at 11:16am (1:14:27 on recording)Presented by Pat Chapman, CDE Representative (1:15:55 on recording):Share and presented overview of the updates from U.S. Department of Education for ESSA – most recent regulations. Materials were sent out. New windows are April 3, 2017 and September 18, 2017 to submit plan. Replace March and July submission deadlines. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** How will new deadlines impact releasing funds to local LEAs? **Response from CDE Representative:** All states will submit assurances, and then that would enable the state to receive funding under new law and then state would submit plan when ready. We propose to take our plan to the State Board in March and submit plan in April and that the State Board will be acting on it in April. Move to Accountability presentation at (1:22:45 on recording)  |
| 11:30am  | **ESSA State Plan: Accountability** * Review revised regulations
 | Presentation lead by CDE Representative: Alyssa Pearson Goal of presentation is to deliver new information based on final regulations (Nov. 29) and to receive input from Hub Committee to determine what recommendations will be brought forth for the next meeting. **Regulations** – PowerPoint Slides 16-19New regulations provide state and district flexibility, but there are some other specific rules that limit state flexibility and there are new things that were added that were not in the draft that also hinder flexibility and where CO was heading as a state. Going to talk about today. Also, see challenges with internal consistency in the rules. There is a lot about public reporting and what needs to be reported publicly. And also about data privacy. With the details that they have added with some of the metric that we use, like the proficiency metric, makes it hard to do both. They also have some requirements around meaningfully differentiating schools for identification and ensuring we can support the schools that are identified. Because of this, we may want to put some things that we want to put forward in plan that does not fully align with regulations. Need to talk about and gauge comfort level in doing that. **Concerns and New Challenges** PowerPoint Slide 17Concerns that got addressed in the draft: Timeline for identifying schools and implementation. USDE clarified that schools will not identified for this upcoming school year based on 16/17 data. * Comprehensive schools – next year
* Targeted – year after next

Did not change reporting timelines and when data needs to be reported publically. Accountability requirementsPut forth comments regarding a single state accountability system; using the 4-year graduation rate and that being included; having same minimum N or the indicators; about participation requirements and each ethnic group. There were some changes to participation, not all concerns were addressed. New regulation – achievement measure - use of percent of students at benchmark for achievement measure (and may use other measures too). Colorado uses mean scale score instead of percentage benchmark to get at a few things: 1) ensuring that we are not just looking at those bubble kids – every kid as an equal weight regardless of where they are on the proficiency line. Want to look at kids all along the performance spectrum. But now that is not allowed under new regulations, and 2) data privacy requirements – under percent at benchmark it is easier to tell how everyone scored – under mean scale score – if you meet the minimum N, you can’t figure out what kids scored. Data reporting requirements – additional data and desegregation for charter schools and reasons for school identification. Congressional Review Act – has only been re-appealed once. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** On the areas of misalignment – will those be revisited as part of the work of this committee? Specifically on the alternative education frameworks? **Response from CDE Representative:** So the alternative ed campus frameworks, we do not have a specific decision point around it. We have state law that says we have alternative ed campus frameworks. So we would plan to put forward the in the state plan or not depending how the questions they ask us. But we will plan to implement our state law. Might be raised later on. **Commentary on Decision Points** (01:33:00 on recording)**:** Nov. 30, 2016 – distributed for public comment and feedback: 1. English learner assessment policy (1st year in US)
2. Long-term goals and interim measures
3. English learner progress measure(s)
4. “Other indicator” of school quality or student success
5. Minimum number of students
6. Method for identifying and exiting schools for support and improvement

Survey will close Dec. 14, 2016.Survey results will be reviewed, analyzed with the Accountability Work Group and shared with the Hub and State Board of Education in mid/late January.Want feedback from the Hub today. Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator, steps in to move on to break.Used survey to decide on which decision points Hub Committee wants to discuss first and go in order of Hub preference.  |
| 12:00pm | Lunch Break | **Break for Lunch** 11:40am (01:36:21 on recording)  |
| 12:20pm | **ESSA State Plan: Accountability** * Discuss and provide feedback for Spoke Committee
 | Convene back at 12:00pm (2:00:22 on recording) Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator, resumes discussion on Accountability. Presentation lead by CDE Representative: Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson(starts on 2:01:24 on recording) **Decision Points** **Other Indicator** ESSA allows us to identify another indicator of school quality or student success to be used in our accountability system. The small group who have been working on this decision point had several things to consider. They took into consideration what are reliable and valid indicators that we could use for that other indicator. They came to the conclusion early on that in order for us to have a really meaningful and useful measure for the other indicator, we would have to go forth with proposing something for the short run and then something for the long run so that we have more time to engage with stakeholders and figuring out what is the most useful indicator to use. For the short term, they have come up with a recommendation that we use something that doesn’t require additional data collection for the first year and that it measures school performance that aligns with our current frameworks. What they have come with is the recommendation that we use student absenteeism. An example is improving chronic absenteeism or looking at truancy rates or lowering mobility rates as potential options for that first year. And then coming back and identifying an option that fits into one of those three categories there. We could look at school climate in the long run. We can add to our current postsecondary workforce readiness indicator or we could include something that involves social and emotional learning. So at this point, we would like you to discuss on the decision catcher (handout). Have a discussion on where you want to see this decision go and if comfortable with using absenteeism in the interim until we figure out the long term indicator. **Break for Table Discussions and Fill out Decision Catcher**  (2:06:49 on recording)Convene back at 2:15:39 on recording Selections on Decision Catcher Form are not formal votes, just preferences. Also, to gauge how much work needs to be done to reach consensus. **Long Term Measures and Progress** Under ESSA, the requirement is that we ensure that the state sets ambitious yet attainable long term goals which include measurement of interim progress. The statute also requires the state to set the same timeline for all students at each disaggregated group to reach those goals. We also have to take into account the improvement necessary to significantly close achievement gaps. In regards to the goals based on the achievement metric, the Accountability Spoke is looking at two different considerations or two different options: 1) set targets based on the mean scale score 2) set on graduation rate – either the 4-year in addition to the extended year, which is what the Spoke Committee is recommending and want to know how much Hub agrees on that. The other option that was being considered was to use only the 4-year grad rate. Using the 4 year plus the extended year allows for recognizing and honoring schools that do concurrent enrollment, enrollment in 5 year programs such as ACSENT, also focuses on every student succeeding and graduating even if they need additional time to meet those graduation requirements. So the long term goal can be based on either the cut scores informed by historical data provided by the state such as using percentile ranks, or it can be based on theoretical criteria such as what was done under NCLB - that students should be a certain level by a certain time or all of our schools should be at a certain level by a given time. We have to establish the timeline as well. So the Accountability Spoke is recommending that we go with using our historical data (percentile ranks) from the state to establish that goals and then to use 5-10 years to set those. On the last decision point, they’re considering two different options, but do not have a specific recommendation at this time. We are looking for feedback on establishing targets. By setting the same interim targets for all students and all disaggregated groups, we are varying them based on the starting point of the disaggregated groups. The other last decision point is frequency of interim target increases and those can be set at every year or every two or three years. Decision Catcher Handout – pros and cons under each decision. Looking for guidance on these options.**Question from Hub Committee Member:** How does this tie into all of accountability around the comprehensive and targeted schools. If the state sets ambitious targets and does not meet them, what happens? I don’t remember where any accountability is triggered if we do or do not meet these targets. **Response from CDE Representative:** I think, but not sure, we have to tie those interim targets to our accountability system. So our state expectations, those interim targets would be built in. Our achievement expectation would be our interim target and would have to be met over time. Is my understanding. Reflect our accountability systems. Moving along trying to hit this high goal in the end. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So this is then going to define what a turnaround, priority improvement, and performance school is? **Response from CDE Representative:** It would trigger what the cut scores are for achievement and grad rate for the meets or exceeds. If I understand your question correctly, you are asking once we have established those long term goals as a state, over the course of time, once that time arrives and we as a state have not met those goals at that point. I think that is the work that still needs to figure out. If we a state miss our goal, what are we going to do? Historically with IDEA and NCLB, the USDE did not necessarily come back us and say you have not met your goals and we are placing you on some sort of correction action plan… they have interacted with us more frequently on things that we have put in our plans and have done some monitoring on that. I think if there is a possibly that if we set these goals and do not meet them that the USDE might raise questions similar with what they are doing with IDEA. They could place us on improvement status or set targets that we need to meet. They could do something like that, but historically they have not. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So I guess I just need clarification on raise targets every year or every 2-3 years. Is that decision impacting school performance frameworks? So if I say every year, the targets would change every year and the school could make progress but would actually always be at the bottom because we are raising the targets? **Response from CDE Representative:** That is my understanding that you make that alignment so that there are not these separate targets sitting here that are just floating around. So every year you would see those challenges increasing every year. Constant moving expectations. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** I have a question on the long term goals, you reference historically data – what historical data does that include – is that CMAS, PARCC? And what are you defining as historical given that we don’t have that much history with PARCC. How do we determine that? **Response from CDE Representative:** So our Spoke has focused on discussions around 2016 PARCC data. That is what has been established those baselines for our performance frameworks this year. We had that same conversation on whether we would be using those current baselines. We haven’t set that as a final recommendation for our methodology. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Since we don’t really have longitudinal information could there be a caveat in this particular one where there could be leeway once that information is gained? Could that further inform where these targets are set or are we locked in? **Response from CDE Representative:** For all of the accountability work we have been doing, we have been having conversations around changes in assessment that we need to accommodate for. We can set things in place right now, but we need to wait and see what that data looks like after we have 3-4 years of longitudinal data. So right now it’s an interim plan set forth on things that will require several years of data because we don’t have that currently. To be able to establish those long term goals, we are working under the assumption that these sections of the plan will need to be revised as we have more data. Just like the rest of the plan, we can make amendments. **Break for Table Discussions and Fill out Decision Catcher**  (2:31:05 on recording)Convene back at 2:36:17 on recording **Minimum N**State statute requires a minimum N of students with calculations that is statistically sound and reliable yet is not so small that is does not protect personally identifiable information. So we have to create that balance. A couple things that we need to keep in mind, the minimum N has to be the same for all students and each disaggregated group. So we can’t use a minimum N of 5 for English learners for English proficiency then use 20 for students with disabilities for example. Has to be the same for all students and each disaggregated group. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So why did they decide that - what is their argument? **Response from CDE Representative:** It is that equity piece, making sure that the disaggregated groups get the same level of protection for their personally identifiable information as well as relying on statistically sound methodology. So what is good for one group should be carried forward to all other groups as well. In the regulations, they went on to extend that to using the same minimum N on all indicators, which is something that we do not currently do in Colorado and based on the work from the small groups, they came up with three options: 1. Achievement – N=16
2. Postsecondary Workforce Readiness (PWR) – N=16
3. Growth – N=20 steady and stable

**Spoke Recommendation:** The Spoke recommendation is to keep 16 for Achievement, 20 for growth and use 16 for PWR. However, that does not align with the current final regulations. We have to decide what will be appropriate for Colorado. What is best for Colorado? Do we change it?**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I understand your answer, but this is not an equity issue, this seems like a statistical issue. I think there is a different argument. I think there needs to be more explanation for why different indicators have different statistical properties. **Response from CDE Representative:** That is exactly what we put in our comments back to USDE. When it comes to individual indicators, we totally agree that we shouldn’t use a different minimum N for different groups. But we push back on the notion that in order for something to statistically sound, such as growth, the minimum N of 20 makes more sense – more reliable and stable. We don’t know their justification. Something we can research. Would like direction and guidance from the Hub. Another decision point for minimum N required in final regulations is that each minor and major racial group needs to be considered separately for accountability. We can however combine them for reporting as long as we count them separately in accountability. Prior to knowing the final rules, the small group had recommended that we use one minor group for accountability, but report the results for each major racial group and ethnicity separately. But again, this does not align with the new regulations. This is another decision point – do we do what is best for Colorado? Or do we revise our accountability system so that each group would get a separate score. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Who is included in the super subgroup? **Response from CDE Representative:** The super subgroup includes EL and students with disabilities. The notion behind super subgroup is the same student would not be counted in multiple categories. So each student would only count once regardless whether they are an English learner and a student with a disability and a student of poverty they would still be counted only once. Combining minority just gives us enough minimum N to have a score for a larger number of our schools. If we considered each racial group, each student would not be replicated. Even if students identify as two or more races, they is a separate category for two or more races. This is one that there is not a clear answer for Colorado. There are pros and cons either way. The main concern is meeting that minimum N. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** What is the number of schools who are affected? **Response from CDE Representative:** We ran information to see how many schools would be impacted based on adjustments to the minimum N, but we haven’t yet run it based on splitting a part each race and ethnicity category, but that is certainly something we can do. We can bring you all impact data in January. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So ESSA requires us for purposes of accountability to disaggregate each racial and ethnic category. It’s not sufficient to have a separate report.**Response from CDE Representative:** It’s not sufficient to have a separate report for reporting. For accountability, the law says for each minor and major ethnic group. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** What is major?**Response from CDE Representative:** It is not defined in there. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** We have 80% Hispanic. There might be some others that you see – Asian, etc. they are going to fall out of accountability in schools if they have to reach an N of 20. **Response from CDE Representative:** We do it by grade span. But still it is an issue. Will bring back conversation in January once numbers are ran both at school and district level. **Break for Table Discussions and Fill out Decision Catcher**  (2:48:55 on recording)Convene back at 3:00:25 on recording **Testing English Learners (EL) Newcomers**How should first year in US EL’s be included in ELA testing, accountability, and reporting?Recommendation from Spoke Committee, is if a student has been enrolled in a US school for less than 12 months and is classified as Non-English Proficient (NEP) - based on the WIDA screener and local body of evidence - he or she is exempt from taking the CMAS PARCC ELA assessment. A student’s parents can opt the child into testing if they choose, and then the score results will be used for accountability and growth calculations. If a student has been enrolled in a US school for less than 12 months and is classified as Limited-English Proficient (LEP) or Fluent-English Proficient (FEP) - based on the WIDA screener and local body of evidence - he or she should be assessed on the CMAS PARCC ELA assessment. So this notion of using language proficiency for a determination factor for whether or students should be tested or not is in final regulation and allowable by statute and is supported by the stakeholders who have consulted so far. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** You might want to talk about why this matters. Might be helpful for folks to have the same background that we had which is what is the effect of deciding not to test a student in the subsequent year for proficiency versus growth measures. **Response from CDE Representative:** Under statute, if we assess the student in the first year, then they would not be counted for accountability that first year on achievement, but would be counted for achievement and growth the next year. If they don’t get assessed, then following year, they do get assessed and they would be included in achievement, then the following year after that they would be counted for growth. We have to have two years of data to be able to count them in growth. There are benefits and cons to having students assessed. A lot of the concern about testing, especially a non-English proficient student in that first year is that it is very stressful and strenuous for a student. They are not really being assessed on their content knowledge as much as their English abilities. So giving them that additional year to access the language and then assess their content knowledge is a benefit to the student and the overall system. **English Learner (EL) Language Proficiency Growth**How will Colorado incorporate progress in acquiring English language proficiency for ELs in our state accountability system? Based on federal requirements and Colorado stakeholder input, the Spoke recommends to continue to use the sub-indicator for ELP growth - median student growth percentile (MGP) on WIDA ACCESS. The MGP metric provides information on how much progress students with two+ consecutive years of WIDA ACCESS scores have made in acquiring English proficiency in comparison to their English proficiency peers. For accountability reporting, 4-rating categories are applied (Does Not Meet, Approaching, Meets, Exceeds) that roughly correspond to the 15th, 50th, and 85th percentiles of the school growth distribution. Second recommendation from Spoke Committee – Add a sub-indicator for ELP accountability measuring growth-to-a-standard on WIDA ACCESS. Proposing to use CDE’s current 6-year stepping-stone timeline with potential modifications (depending on transition to ACCESS 2.0 and revised standard setting results) to determine students’ progress towards achieving English proficiency. If at any point a student did not make the progress expected on the stepping-stone trajectory based on their prior year proficiency level, they would be considered off-track. CDE has a plan of future action for establishing timeline and growth-to-standard expectations. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Any particular reason for why these two are being decided on right now, rather than submitting feedback on these two? **Response from CDE Representative:** This particular group as gone and met with stakeholders and have received input and together with the Spoke have come up with these recommendations. We are just trying to gauge how much agreement there is on these recommendations. No vote. **Break for Table Discussions and Fill out Decision Catcher** (3:10:36 on recording)Convene back at 3:14:12 on recording **Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator to the Hub Committee:** Where do you think we will need to spend more time discussing and have deeper conversations before decisions are made? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** The fifth decision point - English Learner (EL) Language Proficiency Growth. Would like continued conversations on this at future meetings. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Well this last one we were working on, I can’t tell if we have the background here to make a decision. It really takes 6 years to become English proficient? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** With no English background – taking 5-7 years to become proficient is standard. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Are there any programs that accelerate or are faster? Maybe Colorado should look at something that is not the national average. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I am one of those kids or was one of those kids. It’s scary to not know what is going on and sit in the back until somebody finally acknowledges you. It does take that long. That information has not changed. Every child is different. We have kids who will be bright, gifted children in our country, but because they don’t speak English they can’t see that. Depends on their background – how native their parents are, quality of program and staff, etc. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Need to pick a measure that will raise the bar. Are there programs that will accelerate this? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** The measure is how much one can read, write, and speak with no support. There is not one program that says we do it faster. **Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator to the Hub Committee:** Is there any more information that we can bring forth that would help with this decision? **Break** (3:23:12 on recording)Convene back at 3:35:14 on recording 1:35pm **School Identification** What methods and criteria will Colorado use to identify and exit schools for Comprehensive Support and Improvement? Lowest Performing 5% of Title I SchoolsHigh schools with graduation rates below 67%Additional Targeted (**chronic** low performing student group(s))What methods and criteria will Colorado use to identify schools for Targeted Support and Improvement?Any schools with consistently underperforming students group(s)English learners, students with disabilities, students from any major racial or ethnic groups, and students of povertyGreen font on PowerPoint slides represent areas where we need decisions and recommendations from the Spoke Committee. So the first decision point was how are we going to use our accountability system to identify these schools? Comprehensive Schools: Use School Performance Frameworks data (percentage of points earned or use plan type) For example, we could say we are going to make all of our Title I schools comprehensive, but that would put us at risk for some years not having 5%. Using the percentage points allows us the opportunity at the state to always set that 5% minimum. We could identify schools up to every three years of data. So we can identify schools every year, every two years, or even three years. The recommendation of the Spoke is to consider every three years. We also considered how long a school should keep its designation and are making the recommendation of three years for alignment purposes. For high schools, use 4-year graduation rates only, 4-year plus extended, or something else. The recommendation from the Spoke Committee is to use the 4-year plus extended year. This honors those schools who take a little longer to graduate students who need that additional time. However, in the final regulations, for purposes of identification of schools, we have to use a 4-year. Which for Colorado is going to be significantly different in terms of the number of high schools that will be identified. For additional targeted, what the state has to determine is which one of the targeted schools have a subgroup that also meet criteria for being in the lowest 5% and if they do then we are required to provide additional targeted support to those schools. We also have to set the timeline at which additional interventions will be required. And in our discussions, could have been set at one year, two years, or three years. The recommendation of the Spoke Committee is three years before more rigorous interventions are required. And we have to establish the exit criteria for comprehensive schools. If a school no longer meets identification criteria at end of three years then they will be considered as having exited. Targeted Schools: For targeted schools, we also recommend using School Performance Frameworks data (sub-indicator ratings or % point on sub-indicator) for each disaggregated group. In essence if you will think of it as running the entire SPF for each one of those subgroups and then identify those who do not meet. We are also back at recommending the number the years. The Spoke Committee recommends to use every three years of data to identify schools. That means that the school has had three years of consistent low performance in given subgroup before they have been identified. However, final rules only allow up to 2 years or have to justify longer. Then from there gets kind of complicated…Are there any questions? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So one of the considerations on the decision catcher document, asks how will the criteria for defining the lowest 5% be determined? It says it might create misalignment with our state accountability system. Just curious to know where that misalignment might be? **Response from CDE Representative:** So if we use the percentage points earned, there could be years where setting the criteria, saying that Title I schools in the lowest 5% will be identified as comprehensive. It is possible that it will align perfectly as it does right now and that includes all of our Title I turnaround schools. Or in some years it is possible that that the lowest 5% on the percentage points earned might include a few schools who are on priority improvement, the next category above turnaround. Does that make sense? Based on the 2016 data only, it just so happens that our Title I turnaround schools are 7% of our Title I schools. So this year if we were to use turnaround there would be alignment. But if we say the percentage points earned is what is going to be used to set that criteria even though this year it aligns for turnaround, in future years it could tip the scale and move to priority improvement. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Versus, so what could happen then, let’s say you see great improvement, we might only have 4% of the Title I turnaround and you have to identify 5%. Percentage points will allow us to keep it in that range?**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Then wouldn’t they force schools who may not be indicative of a turnaround to be in the bottom 5%?**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** That is actually what the statute goes for, the bottom 5%. They don’t say turnaround schools, they just want the lowest 5% of schools. That is all it says. **Response from CDE Representative:** At least the lowest 5%. The words “at least 5%” is why we went with the percentage points because then that gives the state the flexibility. For example, there might be three of our schools who are turnaround, but we would need an additional two percent to meet that minimum criteria. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** So essentially then we are force ranking the schools. **Response from CDE Representative:** Everything that we try to do in the state…the schools think constant…so that their isn’t that norming that goes on every year so that there isn’t school always at the bottom. We really try to set those standards. What I would say looking at the data that we have more than 5% of Title I schools that struggle and need support. So for now and the near future to be at the 5%, there will probably be needs and supports that those schools could use. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I am not saying that is not true. **Response from CDE Representative:** It’s hard that it is normed. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Would you talk about why you want to go to the three years? For exiting? **Response from CDE Representative:** So the question is why do we want to use three years of data for identification? For exiting. We don’t set the exiting criteria for targeted – the district does. So for the comprehensive, we had a conversation around how long is a reasonable time to allow schools to implement school-wide reform and come out of that comprehensive status. Three years is what kept coming up because one or two years is too short. Anything longer than that seemed like it would take...the students within those systems will have moved on so we felt that was a fair timeline. Does that answer your question? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** For identification, three years is average I take it?**Response from CDE Representative:** To average data across three years so that we have a larger number of schools included. So that was the reason for using three years of data. And also we felt that consistently low performing schools can be categorized once we have three years of data. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** How would this then intersect with the current state accountability system and have you guys sust through that at all? **Response from CDE Representative:** We did have conversations about this and what happens to our state’s accountability clock. One of the decisions moving forward is how will these two intersect. Consensus so far has been that we cannot use federal accountability to reset state accountability and that state accountability will hold. So if a school is on year three and get identified as comprehensive – then that would shorten their timeline to exit versus resetting the accountability clock to give that school an additional year to align. So here comes the complicated part – under ESSA we have to use numerous indicators. Define using “all indicators.” So what does this look like? All available? All possible? Or there must be a minimum of 3 indicators. The group is leaning towards the minimum of 3 indicators. There could be up to 8 indicators for one subgroup. **Response from CDE Representative:** Yeah.**Question from Hub Committee Member:** Just for clarification…Could you list out when you say 3 indicators…across achievement, across growth, maybe its graduation rates, maybe its dropout rates… we thought too many schools would fall out if they didn’t have all 8 indicators they would immediately not be considered. **Response from CDE Representative:** It is academic achievement on English Language Arts and Math. Academic growth on English Language Arts and Math. The English language proficiency indicator for schools that have a large enough population of English learners. For high schools we have to include graduation rate. And for all of the schools we will have to include the other indicator. So that is how we came across all of hose indicators. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Do we know how many schools don’t have enough students across all indicators?h, thank you. On the decision catcher are some estimates. These will 100% change because not based on other indicator and also only on 2016 PARCC data. We do not have three years of data, just one year. We have provided a range of schools that would be identified right here, right now if we had to implement this system. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** How many schools today if minimum N was 16 or 20 really don’t have enough students for those indicators per grade level? I am thinking about 14 districts within my BOCES don’t have that minimum N of 16 or 20. **Response from CDE Representative:** It depends on how we define all available. When we look at the all possible indicators we would be identifying about 75 schools. But if we used all possible, we would be looking at like 650. I can’t tell how many schools can’t be identified at all. Gives you a perspective and how factors will impact decisions. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So just so I understand, if you said a minimum on three, that would…the schools you added up would they all fall into all possible as well? **Response from CDE Representative:** No, so if we say a minimum of three what it will eliminate is are of the schools that were being identified on just one or two indicators. The majority of the time what was happening was that schools were being identified for their students not making achievement expectations, but they were with growth. By saying minimum of three, that includes one growth indicator and then that way it is more representative of our state accountability system and how those schools are performing. Any other questions? **Break for Table Discussions and Fill out Decision Catcher** (3:57:43 on recording)Convene back at 4:02:22 on recording  |
| 2:00pm  | **ESSA State Plan: School Improvement** * Discuss and provide feedback
 | Presentation lead by CDE Representative: Peter Sherman (starts on 4:04:20 on recording) 2:10pmSo as we have been discussing assessment and accountability, the work in our committee is really about what are we going to do about it? How do we support schools and the districts who are in those lower categories and provide funding opportunities for them?So we are going through three different topics. Goal is to provide background for January meeting. Also have note catcher for Hub Committee to fill out and provide feedback. **SEA Supports for Identified Schools** Questions we have been pondering and working through: What are the definitions, timelines, interventions, and supports that Colorado will offer to identified schools and their districts?What are the unique characteristics of state supports for Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools?What are the unique characteristics of state supports for Targeted Support and Improvement Schools?Proposal for Supports – PowerPoint Slide 55 Overview of some of the components for comprehensive and targeted schools for each:PlanningEvidence-based Interventions Menu of Supports Proposal for Timeline*Comprehensive Schools*Build in planning phase with thorough needs assessment, community engagement and intentional strategy selectionImplementation for three to four years with progress monitoring and plan adjustmentsPush to 4 years before more rigorous intervention which aligns with accountability clock process*Targeted Schools*Timeline directed by LEAsFour years for Additional Targeted Schools before moving to Comprehensive School designationTechnical Assistance for Comprehensive Schools Proposed Structure for Services* Needs assessments based on consistent criteria
* Goal-setting and action planning
* Application for common support and funding resources
* Consultation on best supports from CDE and/or external partners
* Establish short-cycle performance management tools and processes to support and monitor progress
* Evaluation and planning

Technical Assistance for Targeted Schools Proposed Services* Needs assessments based on gap analysis
* Goal-setting and action planning
* Consultation on best supports from CDE and/or external partners
* Evaluation and planning

 **Break for Table Discussions and Fill out Decision Catcher** (4:10:19 on recording)Convene back at 4:15:18 on recording Next section of presentation lead by CDE Representative: Lisa Medler **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Just an observation, I see here respondent demographics, that as Title I administrators, teacher, parent – its super technical – I know its technical work, I think this will not read like English to parents. Would teachers be able to make their way through this? If you want general parents or community to be engaged, need much more basic. **Response from CDE Representative:** We are trying to rush through due to time, but there were many public meetings where feedback was received, including from parents. We are good to ensure that we have parent representation and participation. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So when you are doing that, speaking to parents, give some examples. What does that look like in a classroom? **Response from CDE Representative:** Yes, please write down some of those comments. **Evidence-based Interventions** Should Colorado provide a list of identified evidence-based interventions, strategies and partners?*Pros*Schools/districts can move more rapidlyExamples to learn from and clear road mapsPotential for statewide rates to address economy of scale *Cons*Potential risk of reduced rigor CDE’s capacity is limited -- focus CDE’s efforts on creating tools insteadSchools may jump to solution before planningCould stifle and weed out viable partners or local options **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Quick clarifying question, if you are maintaining a preapproved list here, are we talking about a list here where you may pick any of these things and nothing else or are we talking about something that functions as an optional clearing house where it is a secured list, but you can come up with a solution of your own if you were able to meet whatever rigor attachments for evidence-based?**Response from CDE Representative:** I think that is a potential to do either honestly. I think this really left up to the state to decide which direction we go. Certainly there are website that have done some of this work as well on pre-vetting and looking at these strategies for folks to take a look at. But we could do a blend of the two. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I think an either or is not the right way to go especially for smaller school districts having that kind of resource in reliable sort of way made available for the department. I would add to that here are some ideas that you should be looking at – some assistance in evaluating what is on the list. I do think one of the things that CDE could bring to this table is that we have thought a lot about this, we know what is out here…but on the other hand I don’t think you want to close doors. I think you and I both know there have been some very creative things done by school districts that probably won’t show up on a list like this. **Response from CDE Representative:** Exactly, and so we have actually expanded and have talked quite a bit about that we are talking about intervention strategies and partners. The regulations and the law suggests that it is an either or thing and that we have actually expanded to a set of tools that helps asks questions – but it can be more specific depending on the situation. One other thing that I wanted to point out that there is a capacity issue at CDE that makes it hard to maintain. We do have the option to differentiate for more intensive supports that provide vetting of strategies and partners.Turnaround network as an example. They have a set of approved partners where part of the program is intensively working with CDE, but they also have external partners who they can work with. Something to opt into. Room for some hybrid. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** As you list partners that districts can choose from, who is responsible in ensuring those partners are actually helping the schools? What is the evaluation or feedback to keep that partner on the list? Not trying to put pressure on you guys. If I went to this agency and nothing happened… Just making sure CDE has ownership to evaluate who is on this list.**Response from CDE Representative:** I think it is a combination of folks who do the evaluating. It is really up to that district, the LEA, and the school to be evaluating whether or not this is getting them to where they need to go. So there is responsibility there. If they are purchasing services, that contract is between them. The state does not oversee that necessarily. So we would expect them to be following up. However, the state does share responsibility because we need to be making sure that we are serving as resources but that there are actual practices being made. There are requirements within ESSA where this progress needs to be monitored. If we are not seeing progress, CDE will be asking questions as well. But it is up to the LEA and the school. All play a role in monitoring the progress. Next section of presentation lead by CDE Representative: Brad Bylsma (4:27:48 on recording)**Allocation of School Improvement Resources** We are providing some disclaimers on our part regarding the use and implementation of strategies. So this is an illustration that you have probably seen before, but provides context regarding the funds we are talking about. PowerPoint Slide 62. The entire pie represents the Title I allocation that the state receives. The state receives approximately $150 million on an annual basis. Today’s conversation we are focusing on the orange pie piece. So the state must set aside 7% of our Title I allocation to support districts and schools in these districts that have been identified for improvement. So 7% is approximately $10.5 million. 95% of that must go to districts with identified schools. 5% is held at the state level in order to administer these programs. Following up the plans that have been created to address the individual needs of those schools, following up on how funds are being used, etc. So there is a set aside at the state level to support those activities. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Do we have data on where the funds go to support those schools and programs and do you know if it is actually helping them? **Response from CDE Representative:** There is some data for several of those programs who have supported activities in the past. Two-tiered Intervention Grant for example. We have been doing evaluation on those programs. Under NCLB, we had to set aside 4% of our Title I allocation, those are 1003A funds and we have had discretion for how those funds were distributed – Turnaround Network, Connect to Success, etc. have been supported by that in the past. We had another set of funds – the 1003G funds which were allocated to the state after we have applied for them for the lower 5%. There is some similarity between NCLB and the 7% under ESSA. But we certainly have data on the impact. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So is that 7% roughly more, less, or the same than the previous year.**Response from CDE Representative:** About the same. We received about $4.5 million for the set aside and about $6 million for the Tiered Intervention funds. So it’s very similar. Under NCLB, we had to distribute these funds under a competitive basis. ESSA provides us an opportunity to distribute funds through a formula basis or a competitive basis. We are also proposing to think about a hybrid. Some of the reminders –awards must be of sufficient size for an LEA to implement improvement strategies regardless of what we decide. Also, allotments must represent the geographic diversity of the state. We have three options: Formula, Competitive, and Formula/Competitive Hybrid. For all options, there must be a plan in place: We want to emphasize, regardless on how we distribute the funds, there must be a plan in place to access the funds and to then implement the strategies. There has to be a plan that includes those evidence-based strategies, a needs assessment, a budget for using the funds, and an assessment of the quality of the strategy that they are choosing to implement. Handout includes pros and cons of each that Spoke Committee developed. Page 4 of the handout does provide information on some possible arrangements. Please understand these are speculation this point. For example, we have identified 575 targeted schools – somewhere in the $3,000 range would be distributed to the schools. Take a look at our considerations. The amounts are what would be reasonable to implement something. What amount would begin to have a positive impact on these schools? There are some ranges on page 4 if we narrow down schools. For CSI and TSI, under new regulations we have the option to determine amount that are sufficient. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So currently based on our turnaround schools, what is the average cost that is going to a school based on the size? **Response from CDE Representative:** Through the current grant process, comprehensive schools are very similar to the priority improvement schools under our waiver, and those grants were awarded through the tiered intervention grant and they were awarded anywhere from $500 to $2 million over a three year grant period. I think there is range. The tiered grants are designed to be large grants. But we also have other grants offered through the Department that range from $30,000 to $50,000 for schools. Really depends on what is needed. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Just wondering, if we only have these three options? I mean for example, you can look at a local districts ability to support this work and have a sliding scale based on the resources of that district. Boulder Valley for example can bring in a lot of resources compared to Greeley who doesn’t have many resources. Has there been any thought in sort of calibrating the dollars in some way to what is going on in the district compared to plans? **Response from CDE Representative:** That is an interesting thought. That would be something that we would want to capture. I do know that something that will be a part of this going to down the road, those who continue to chronically underperform there will be a certain resource allocation process that we need to go through. But we haven’t really had this conversation even though it has come up. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** It is the case that we have very broad local capability and capacity to bring to the table just based on what had been done to the funding formula and then the local taxpayer support. I think in Colorado at least that local resource has become a major issue. This needs to be factored into this conversation. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Quick question, on the distribution of funds, just knowing how much ESSA is focused on school accountability and school based intervention, is there any assurance or requirement written in that the money that goes to the LEA needs to be funneled down to the school level. **Response from CDE Representative:** LEA who have high numbers of these lower performing schools, the money must trickle down to the schools and not stay at the LEA level. Good question. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So what I am hearing is, with the requirement is that there has to be a large enough amount allocated within this 7%. It is important to remember the 93% is formula and this 7% is going to become de facto competitive either way, right? It’s not truly going to be formula if you can’t fund every school. Is it competitive in the sense that CDE comes up with the magic formula that will decide or do we allow schools to provide options on a competitive basis? It’s hard to see how spreading that out in a formula basis would create an impact there. In consideration in the other 93%. I would strongly encourage us to think about how we can maximize impact. **Response from CDE Representative:** One of the things in my mind, regardless if formula or competitive, the district and school will have to work up a plan to justify the amount of funds they receive and the plan to use those funds. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So if they have shown all of these requirements, and we are not going to be able to fund every school who wants to do this, my point is that this is going to be competitive regardless. So if we are just honest about this and being competitive from the start, we can identify the priorities and help the most disadvantaged students. **Response from CDE Representative:** We will be working with accountability to identify these schools. But it does make sense that the amount will have an impact. It will be something that will be considered. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** It would help us to test some strategies and the amount of money that it takes to actually do those serious turnaround strategies and then scale those in other places. We can’t spread the peanut butter so thin that nobody can taste it. We will never be able to see what works and what doesn’t. I feel like identifying and placing big bets on things we think can make a difference will have the most impact that can then be applied to more schools in the future. **Response from CDE Representative:** From speaking with the field, we have heard consistently that programs need to be able to depend on that money and constantly operating under a competitive basis is very disruptive to their systems. As you are looking through the pros and cons take a look at what the committee has come up with. It’s all very real to the field. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Regardless of what number, the case can still be made that we are potentially going to see greater impacts by focusing in on strategies that we feel are going to work. So the number matters to some extent, but would love to see that we are getting maximum leverage with the dollars that we are spending and I think that is true no matter what. **Response from CDE Representative:** In January we will come with examples and costs associated. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** It is important to be clear, that even if it’s formula or competitive driven, that you don’t get the funds without meeting certain criteria. In other words, you don’t just say I have 100 kids in this school so give me the money. And one of difficulties with grant driven programs is not just uncertainly, it tends to penalize districts who don’t have the administrative infrastructure to manage those grants. It is just absolutely the case that truly grant driven programs are penalized at small districts at the expense of large districts. Districts who are resource short to districts who are not. One of the reasons why I was thinking about that local district resource capability as part of the formula is so that we can have an impact. So you can say school district A over here who has a lot of local resources, we will give you some money but you will have to match that with local monies to do these kinds of programs. So we can target districts with the same expectations so we see meaningful program development. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Has it ever been the case that somebody has not gotten the formula dollars? And if so, can we talk about that? Has that ever happened?**Response from CDE Representative:** We are talking about the blue pie piece, but the answer is no. The question now under ESSA, is that there is an extra hoop that they have to jump through to access these funds – the plan. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** We have planning support for those who need to get off the ground during the first year so that they can get funds flowing during implementation year. Need to help programs plan for those implementation dollars.  |
| 2:45pm  | **ESSA State Plan: Effective Instruction and Leadership** * Consider recommendations for adoptions
 | Presentation lead by CDE Representative: Colleen O’Neil (starts on 4:53:42 on recording) 2:55pm  **Teacher Qualifications in ESSA**Background information handout on NCLB requirements and definitions of State terms providedESSA now requires LEAs and States to ensure that teachers and paraprofessionals in programs supported by Title I funds meet applicable State licensure and certification requirements. This replaces the highly qualified provision in NCLB. Overview of state statute – PowerPoint Slide 73 **Decision point:** paraprofessionals – Should a recommendation be made to the Colorado Legislature regarding requirements for paraprofessionals?We do have to identify some of the requirements for paraprofessionals who work with Title I schools. Spoke recommends that Title I instructional paraprofessionals continue to be held to the highly qualified requirements that existed under NCLB. Have a level of understanding beyond high school. The demonstration of subject matter competency either by college credit or assessment. Should a recommendation be made to the Colorado Legislature regarding requirements for paraprofessionals?**Question from Hub Committee Member:** Up until now, parapros did have to meet highly qualified if they are working in a Title I school? **Response from CDE Representative:** Correct. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Which was a college degree? **Response from CDE Representative:** So it could be two year of college credit or accrual of two years worth of credit or an assessment on content knowledge. Because we currently don’t license paraprofessionals in the state of Colorado, the State Board does not adopt assessments for them because of that, they have had flexibility. We have established guidelines of what an acceptable assessment would look like. Content knowledge is determined by the district. We have put forth that parapros meet those requirements.**Question from Hub Committee Member:** So designated by the district, not the state? Now we are considering having a license for a paraprofessional I think?**Response from CDE Representative:** Yes, and what that would look like. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** This is going back a ways, but just curious what the regulatory environment for paraprofessionals looked like prior to NCLB?**Response from CDE Representative:** There was none. The reasons for paraprofessionals has changed significantly over the last 10 years. We use them a lot more. I should also say on the side that this is not about special education paraprofessionals. That is completely independent moderated by IDEA. When we discussed this as Spoke Committee, we didn’t have the final template from USDE yet. So there recommendation is to continue with the exact same requirements that have existed under NCLB. The decision point to make the recommendation to the legislature. What we have learned is that there is no place to put in the state plan, so as far as meeting those requirements as written in ESSA – is our state law sufficient? Do we need an update our current law or do we want to stay with what we have, which is nothing, and say it complies with ESSA. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** If we move forward by incorporating this into state statute, would the everyday person on the ground – district school administrator or school operator – see any meaningful difference because it did previously exist under NCLB? Has there been any blimps for this year with people adhering to the highly qualified provision in practice? **Response from CDE Representative:** We are in the middle of collecting the data on that right now so cannot answer. We spoke HR Directors around the state and their response is that there would be no change for anyone. There is rumor out there that this would be stepping up the requirements. Because there is nothing in state statute, it makes it seem like we are stepping it up, but it really aren’t. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** What percentage of paraprofessionals would meet district requirements?**Response from CDE Representative:** Right now it is 100% today. Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator, steps in to moderate discussion. Recommendation is to continue hold paraprofessionals to the standard that they are currently being held to, which is highly qualified, right? There is a separate question around legislative change, but is not something that will be included in the plan. What we need from Hub is yes we support that recommendation? There is an assumption that every state has this in their law. Really a discussion around state practice. There is no action for the Hub to take. But still continue to provide comments. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** I didn’t see any recommendations around teachers. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Would schools benefit if we had something like a license for parapros? Does this help districts weigh in or does this scare them and make them worried that they will have to pay them more? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** State HR Directors really do not want a license for paraprofessionals – something that they have to go get. We are talking about folks who are some of the lowest paid in the school districts, so why would we raising the standards, doing more than we already do, for folks that are not getting paid to go get and costs them more. Just doesn’t seem fair. **Response from CDE Representative:** The recommendation there is really looking at the equity lens. Next section of presentation lead by CDE Representative: Jennifer Simons (5:13:14 on recording)Terms that need to be defined – table of definitions (handout)We will be discussing how CDE has been using and measuring terms currently and explaining how these terms shift under ESSA. **Equitable access to teachers**Changes from NCLB to ESSANCLB required LEAs and States to ensure that low-income and minority students were not taught at disproportionate rates by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers who are:* + Inexperienced
	+ Unqualified
	+ Out-of-field

ESSA continues this requirement by adding ineffective teachers to the above list.All of the above terms must be defined in the State PlanExcerpt - Identifying gaps – using prior year dataDetailed in the 2015 Educator Equity Plan (see handout)Schools are organized into quartiles based on poverty and minority populations. Four separate groups. NOTE: CDE includes ALL schools when calculating quartiles. One of the new ESSA requirements is that we do these calculations again. They have provided a table for us to fill in. In our conversations, we do not think the new ESSA table promotes equity. The Consolidated State Plan template instructs us to identify rates at:- Low-income and minority students enrolled in Title I schools- Non-low-income and non-minority students enrolled in non-Title I schools Leaves out students who are low-income and minority enrolled in schools who do not receive Title I funds and we know there are a lot out there because not enough Title I funds to go around to all schools who could benefit from it. So we have talked about doing is perhaps to continue doing it the way we have been doing it putting all students into the quartiles instead of only looking at these two categories that ESSA has given. We don’t feel it is equitable to leave those students out. Something else to be aware of when looking at these equity gaps that we have identified – because of the role highly qualified played under NCLB requirements and meeting this equitable access requirement as well. When we are talking about unqualified and out-of-field, non-highly qualified was used as the measure for both of those. So there is role there from state waivers as well that we will get to. What you will notice here, we have identified as gaps using these measures in the way that we did under NCLB, we gaps we have identified as recently as last year, are primarily with the distribution of inexperienced teachers is what you will see there.**Question from Hub Committee Member:** you reference ‘unqualified’ – that is not under ESSA? **Response from CDE Representative:** Correct, that was used under NCLB. Because we do not have a new definition yet for out-of-field.Learning Policy Institute Report – done under NCLB prior to the passage of ESSA so using terms under NCLB. Colorado Public Radio reported on a report by the Learning Policy Institute the day of our October Hub meeting. This report highlighted a gap not identified in CDE’s analysis: distribution of ‘teachers not certified’ in high minority and high-poverty schools ([https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A\_Coming\_Crisis\_in\_Teaching\_BRIEF.pdf#page=14](https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/A_Coming_Crisis_in_Teaching_BRIEF.pdf))CDE has been able to compare the data in this report to our own and have found that the percentage of not certified teachers in these schools coincides with the proportion of charter schools with approved waivers from teacher licensure requirements. Under NCLB requirements, these teachers were considered highly qualified. Presented by CDE Representative Jennifer SimonsThe report that was discussed on CPR the last time we spoke with you, we weren’t able to answer your questions then – but we have looked into the report and the reason why data sounded different from the gaps that we have identified here, is because of the use of ‘unlicensed’ that they were looking at. So you will notice that we have used non-highly qualified v. highly qualified. They looked at the distribution of unlicensed teachers. What that means in the context like a state like ours that allows a waiver for licensure in certain situations for certain schools, we have created an alternative definition for highly qualified for those teachers. So when you are looking at the background on highly qualified in your other handout you will see that. Essentially teachers in a school that receive a waiver for state licensure requirements were considered highly qualified even without a license if they hold a bachelor’s degree and demonstrate subject matter competency with the options listed. So we treat those the same as teachers who are highly qualified through the other definition in our traditional schools that don’t have a waiver. So our data looks a little different from theirs. When we looked at the numbers that represent that share of teachers who are operating under waivers in their schools so the gap looked a bit exaggerated in that way. There are now questions on how we will look at this data and those measures moving forward. Now move to defining terms. Given the background of what these terms mean and how they were defined under NCLB, we now have to define these under ESSA and determine how these will be used to measure equitable access for our student to these teachers – we have decision points that we need recommendations on. (05:19:42 on recording) Presented by CDE Representative Colleen O’NeilSo taking us back to the handout, last time we had a conversation around inexperienced (sorry out-of-field) – out-of-field teachers and the conversation around that – how do you define out-of-field teachers? Again, under NCLB, that was defined as ‘highly qualified.’ That is gone away so now we have to come up with another definition. The Spoke Committee has made a recommendation if you take a look at your handout it is call Equitable Access to Teachers and there are definitions on the side and a matrix that sits there. The third one down, we talk about out-of-field educators and there is a column that says NCLB - what did it mean, there is a column for Colorado state law, what is already in law, and then there is other options. One of the charges of the Spoke that we gave them is to define out-of-field or make a recommendation for the ESSA state plan and to define out-of-field. Previously again, it was subject matter competency under NCLB. Colorado state law actually has a law on the books, under article 60 under endorsement it says designation on a license or authorization of grade-level or developmental level, subject matter or service-specialization in accordance with the preparation, the training, and experience of the holder of such license or authorization. Based on that definition that already lives in state law, and the fact that you cannot have a license without an endorsement, the recommendation from the Spoke came forward with recommending this definition, as the out-of-field definition. When we have presented that to multiple people, there have definitely been different opinions sitting in the room. So we have also identified another option that could lead forward based on conversations that we have had. That option is to allow in-field be demonstrated by using NCLB menu of options for demonstrating subject matter competency, which was: 1) 24 credit hours 2) assessment or 3) degree. There are some pros and cons to that. When we take a look at the chart, there are some potential unintended or intended consequences. The Spoke Committee had deep conversations around that to really identify what some of those pros and cons are. If you look at the Colorado state law and the Spoke recommendation, by saying endorsement already demonstrates subject matter competency because that is the definition of it in state law. When you look at it that way, then it puts the impetuous back on the educator to ensure they have content knowledge, in-field experience, or knowledge around that and the Colorado Dept. of Education. Under the highly qualified provisions, when we talked about it at the district level, the district was held responsible for identifying that for every single educator, every single year and reporting it to the Colorado Dept. of Education. So the burden was definitely significantly more. However, there is a lot of flexibility in that. The district could then define what really is considered in-field for them. What do they consider in-field and they had more flexibility around that. So the options we have sitting in front that we are looking for recommendations on a kind of a consensus to be able to move forward and put into the plan are those two options right now: 1) Either license with endorsement or 2) some other form that is similar to highly qualified demonstration of subject matter without a license. Knowing that Colorado still has a licensure waiver – the issue comes down to how are you reporting them? – not that you cannot hire them. Conversations and Questions? **Decision point:** defining ‘out-of-field’ and ‘inexperienced’For the purposes of ensuring and reporting equitable access to teachers as required by ESSA, how should Colorado define an ‘out-of-field’ teacher?How should CDE define inexperience for the above purpose?(05:25:09 on recording) **Question from Hub Committee Member:** If we have broken the data down by these definitions where would everyone be at in each district?**Response from CDE Representative:** We haven’t been able to do this yet because our data is broken down around NCLB requirements so has been difficult to parse out. We are collecting data without enforcing highly qualified as it was under NCLB so we can do this. But can’t do anything until after this year’s data is collected. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** I just want to know about background checks. Is there a way for teachers to get into the classroom without background checks in Colorado? **Response from CDE Representative:** From a statute perspective, there should not be. So if they require a license and it is not waived, CDE is held responsible for that. If we waive that statute, then the district is responsible for that. There is no reporting at that point to CDE, but the district is held responsible for that. There are statutes in place for the automatic reporting of felony and misdemeanor offenses to CDE from the district flow. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** I think when I hear those terms infield and out-of-field, for me that means so much subject matter competency. In so many ways I feel that the highly qualified provisions of NCLB got at that. The key about the endorsement piece is that it is linked to full licensure. And so if highly qualified enables determination of that subject matter competency, without ruling up into licensure, then that would be an accurate reflection of that subject matter competency. From an equity perspective, the equity report was great in terms of reflecting for high-poverty kids or districts with a high percentage of students of color. The percentage of non-highly qualified teachers is actually lowers for high minority and high poverty districts. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So when you say reported out, reported out to whom? **Response from CDE Representative:** First it does get reported to USDE. Then we also do post the data on our website in school view data center. There are also local planning requirements as well. Also, connected to the UIP process. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So is there an N size as well where you report out teacher experience based on... if you have 10 teachers are they going to report that out? Is there a minimum N number for that as well? (teacher level data)**Question from Hub Committee Member:** So if I am a charter school, they are highly qualified under NCLB and now need to be licensed, if we go with endorsement, I am going to get a report that says I have a high number of out-of-field teachers, and I have to write in my improvement plan how I am going fix that even though everything in statute allows me and I got a waiver from the state to do it – I have to not do it? Trying to figure that out.**Response from CDE Representative:** We have had this conversation several times as well. It depends on how we collect that data. If there is a waiver they are both allowable by state statute. We are at a crossroads with that no matter what we do. Do be perfectly honest, we are either not reporting licensed teachers, but then have waivers - so we are looking at trying to figure out how do we report that? That is adherence to state statute because you have a waiver. In both accounts state statute allows the waiver, but then tells you, you have to have a license. Honestly, it would not be reported necessarily as out-of-field with the waiver opportunity. Not every state sits in the same position that we do. We will need to consult with USDE about that wavier opportunity. So out-of-field in that point of time would be meeting requirements of state law because of the waiver. To add context – in charter schools, about 72% of teachers do hold licenses even though waived from that requirement. Just to take into account. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Want to walk through why this matters. So the point of infield and out-of-field is to determine whether or not minority kids are being taught by out-of-field by a disproportionate amount, right? And so we are measuring whether or not they have content area expertise. The endorsement criteria as described is a good way to measure if someone has content area expertise, is that correct? That is the recommendation from the Spoke? And so teachers, there are a lot of teachers in the state that meet that endorsement criteria but don’t have an endorsement because they aren’t licensed, is that right? **Response from CDE Representative:** We don’t know that because if you do not have a license, you are not reported. What we know, 99% are highly qualified. What we also know, lots of folks are highly qualified under 24 credit hours and they actually never added the endorsement and they already had a license. Again, if you do not have a waiver, that is 100% that have a license. Of our charter schools, 72% teachers have a license right now. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** The criteria listed in the endorsement is pretty obvious, so I think it is safe to assume that there are quite a few teachers who meet those criteria listed in the endorsement, but do not have license, is that right? **Response from CDE Representative:** Actually we would be looking at if there are only 72% of teachers that we know have a license and we are just dealing with the rest of that percentage that don’t have a license. So really we are looking at 25%? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** But there are teachers in the state who do not have a license and likely meet the criteria listed? **Response from CDE Representative:** Yes.**Question from Hub Committee Member:** So if the goal, again take it back to the goal…if the goal is to determine accurately whether poor and minority students are being taught at a disproportionate rate by teachers who do not have that or meet that criteria, wouldn’t it result in inaccurate data to use the endorsement because as you just mentioned, there will be teachers who meet the endorsement criteria, but can’t meet the endorsement because they do not have a license? So if the goal is the data, wouldn’t that almost ensure that we have bad data? **Response from CDE Representative:** Actually, that is why we were talking to Lisa a little bit about the fact that under state statute, you are allowed to have a waiver. So you can waive both ways. So I can say nope I am opting into licensing or opting out. So under that, they are still meeting the requirements under state law by having a waiver to do that. So in all reality, the only thing that this is actually… cut off by Hub Committee member.**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** So the licensing is kind of a separate decision and the Hub Committee has to decide the right definition of in/out-of-field to determine whether poor and/or minority students are receiving disproportionate lack of access. And so while the licensure stuff is a separate conversation, we really need to come up with that definition. I really appreciate the alternative option that you have provided here. Like you have mentioned, the endorsement criteria, not the endorsement itself, it exists, has definitions that people have accepted, and in state statute currently. But if we want the most accurate data to determine whether there is an equity concern, I think it is really important that we do not line out a class of teachers who might have those criteria met, but can’t meet it just because of a requirement that has nothing do with those criteria. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** On the opposite side, I think we have several licensed teachers that are being instructed to go back and get an endorsement because before they used just the highly qualified definition and now districts aren’t accepting that. So we have lot right now trying to pick up credits in a subject that they are teaching because they were highly qualified, but do not have an endorsement. **Response from CDE Representative:** So anecdotally I have heard the same thing. I have gotten that question from teachers. The guidance we have given districts in this transition is to adhere to local policies, given them information regarding what flexibilities they have and what they might be looking at as possibilities for requirements. So I would say that is true in some cases, but we do not know to what extent that is true because it has been driven by district local policy. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Two questions directly related to reporting. 1) I remember when we had this discussion last time, we were discussing the fact that it is reported publically from CDE. I seem to recall that is reported more publically than that in terms if you are being identified as creating a disproportionality in these situations, it actually has to be reported on a performance framework? Am I misremembering that? **Response from CDE Representative:** That has not been the case. Historically, CDE has not set a threshold where we would identify a district that has a disproportionality. We have essentially provided the data and instructed districts to do their own analysis with that data that we have provided and for them to make their own decisions as to whether or not they need to have a plan. We need to think about this practice. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Second question, you know I have heard from a number of folks and most of them have been charter school teachers and leaders, and I have also heard from some other folks that as of right now, schools are still reporting information related to highly qualified despite the fact that NCLB is basically gone. So these folks are still going through their staff and checking relevant boxes to say that they meet the criteria that we were just talking about for subject matter competency. And I want to verify that that is the case because if that is the case, seems like we are essentially already doing what we need to do on that front – that we already have the tools and systems in place to continue doing that and by bolting it on to this extra process, we are really just complicating something that doesn’t need to be complicated. So I would like some clarity on that. **Response from CDE Representative:** Yeah, in a way they are. What we did is pull out any data elements that were not applicable to our state law and we are only for the purpose of highly qualified. An example to illustrate that are provisions. I won’t go into details. We had elementary teachers who were endorsed in elementary education and licensed, but in-field - it was required that they pass a content exam. And for some of our veteran teachers, that was not required for them to get their endorsement. They could get it through other means – so we had alternative measures. Things like that – we took out. Anything else would still be applicable – 24 credit hours, subject area of degree, things like that – we have kept. So you are right – we are still collecting that data and we do have systems set up to do just that. Whatever decision that is made, we don’t really have to change that system. If anything, we can pull data and those elements out. But whatever decision is made, we do not have to put in a new system. We currently check licenses and what their endorsements are. We also make the district report the subject area of what the teacher’s degree is in, if they have 24 credit hours, if they have passed an exam, etc. – we have all that in place. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Given that, help me understanding attaching that to the formal endorsement and license process does for us. So if these systems are already in place and we are already there, we already have the information, I just want to understand why we want to stick it over here, especially keeping in mind some of the feedback that we get from folks has been interesting and I think we are going to have to make changes and we should make changes, but the overriding sense has been is to make the smallest footprint you can. Don’t do things to us that is going to lead to more complications. I think this refers to the group of teachers that Luke was talking about earlier, that are placed between these two camps. I just want to make sure that I get why we are complicating it. **Response from CDE Representative:** So we have had the same conversation in our Spoke Committee, but it actually is more burdensome to collect data at the district level, it is more burdensome to keep track of that, and more burdensome to submit it, than it is to say that you have a license, which is an automatic push through and can eliminate all of those data entry areas. With the last option, we eliminate those data entry areas. So it is shifting the burden in some ways. Get rid of all those data fields that districts have to keep track of and shift to educator licensing and endorsement, which is an automatic pass through. There are pros and cons on both sides for sure. Nina Lopez, CDE co-facilitator, steps in to facilitate (05:41:41 on recording) and to gauge how much disagreement there is among Hub Committee. So far, Hub member proposed alternative option should be put on the table. Right now, the Hub Committee seems to be understanding implications. How many members of the Hub would feel comfortable supporting the alternative option as your recommendation to the State Board?**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** The simple answer would be to be in-field, the teacher has an endorsement or otherwise, meets the criteria listed within the endorsement. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** So the Spoke Committee actually recommended both sections in state law?**Response from CDE Representative:** The Spoke Committee did recommend that we go with state law around licensure. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** The other conservation that we had was around the role of alternative licenses, in that our state is unique and has over 50 programs across the state. We even had rural superintendents weigh in and say if they had a choice of course they would hire a licensed teachers, but they don’t always have that choice. So if they hire a teacher that is unlicensed, their option is to put them through one of those 50 alternative license programs in the state to get them there.**Question from Hub Committee Member:** Are there any meaningful differentiations in your minds between the provisions of highly qualified and alignment with endorsement in the phrase just used?**Response from CDE Representative:** The difference is actually the district can choose. So my example is if I teach 7th grade math, I don’t have to have calculus, I don’t have to have pre-calculus, any of those things. At a district level, I can decide, having elementary math or having just up to Algebra is enough to teach at the 7th grade level. That is a flexibility, but that also means that I cannot move that teacher to an AP calculus class and have them teach that because they would not be able to demonstrate that. So it is a little inhibitive as far as being able to move teachers. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** There are still some uncertainties about this. Let’s talk through it a little bit more in the January meeting. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I would just like to make a point as a parent, I fully support school choice. As a part of that choice, I want to know information about the qualifications of the teachers are in those schools. Meaning if they do not have an endorsement, they should disclose that, but should also say that they have a waiver if they have a waiver. The parents can make a choice based on those pieces of information. I am not saying where in those smaller rural school districts where it is harder – there are other ways to get an alternative license. I don’t see how this becomes an obstacle way of saying we should use a measure for that. We should just say that we will report on that and then that becomes the evidence of what is going on in schools. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I agree with that, for the transparency for parents is important, but I also think it is important to remember what we are measuring here. We are measuring whether or not someone has expertise in a specific content area. So whether or not you have expertise in math right. A license is not necessarily tied to expertise, but the endorsement would be right? But it is the criteria that the endorsement lists. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So what is the threshold if we are saying there are alternative ways of getting a license? So what is the obstacle? If there was only one way to get a license in the state of Colorado then in that point, I would say I fully wholeheartedly agree with you, but because there are other avenues – what is the obstacle for a charter school who’s in an urban area? The large preponderance of charter schools are in the urban/suburban areas where there is plenty of access and resources available to them to get that.**Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Again, that is measure of whether someone is licensed. Would you agree with me that the measure of whether somebody’s content area expertise is different whether someone is licensed? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** I think that is where the endorsement comes in then right? If you can say you have an endorsement, you can show evidence of that through evidence of a license – why not? It’s the same thing – I can read a law book, but don’t ask me to give you legal advice. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** But again, the equity concern here is a poor kid not getting instruction in math from someone with expertise in math, right? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** So then why isn’t every kid in Colorado? We have 800,000 kids in Colorado... why aren’t they getting the same?**Question from Hub Committee Member:** I guess, but wouldn’t you agree that licensure is distinct from content area expertise? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** So licensure just basically states that you have gone through the program and you understand how to become a teacher. And part of that process is getting the endorsement. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** But we have laws, we are not derogating from any of the licensure laws. We are just saying that we want to know whether or not someone has content area expertise. **Question from Hub Committee Member:** But we have a waiver right? You do not have to get a license if you are in a charter school, correct? **Question from Hub Committee Member:** Sure. But does that person have content area expertise? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** How do you show evidence of that – that is actually indicative of law? **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** I think that is when you can meet the criteria listed within the endorsement without going through the process. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** Like I said, we can go around and around on this. **Comment from Hub Committee Member:** January. **Recommendation from the Hub Committee:** Debate unfolded regarding licensure and endorsement for in-field and out-of-field qualifications – did not reach consensus. * Spoke Committee will revisit these decision points in January.

Nina Lopez, CDE co-facilitator, steps in to facilitate (05:48:56 on recording).Hear clear support to move this topic to January. January we have a busy time with two meetings. If you need more information or have more questions in order for you to make a decision, please let Spoke Committees know ahead of time. We have time constraints, but want to give everything the thoughtfulness that it deserves. Help us help you arrive at decisions when we come back to the next meetings.Katy Anthes, CDE co-facilitator, steps in to facilitate (05:51:32 on recording).Please look through this PowerPoint very carefully and jot down feedback and what your vote would be. Sensing this might be the first area where we do not reach consensus – difficult decision. Write down where your vote would be and reason why you would vote that way. Want to make sure all feedback is given to the Board, but also other places where it could rise up. Capture the reason for your vote – whether we could use it for legislature, implementation, etc.  |
| 3:50pm  | **Housekeeping and Wrap-up** | **Nina Lopez, CDE Co-facilitator - Wrap up final updates:**November meeting notes – approved as areHub updates – there will be two meetings in January 2017Timeline – submit plan in April **Decisions made:** * Assessment: Continue to use exception for advanced mathematics students in eight grade to take end of course high school mathematics assessments.
* Assessment: Post for public comment [in January] draft of Section 3: Academic Assessments [consider revising to clarify role of CSI schools
* Assessments to be provided in native language translation assessments
* When state hits 2.5% or 500 persons, CDE would evaluate need for native language translation assessment based upon instructional need
* When state hits 5% or 1000 persons, CDE would be committed to provide native language translation assessments

**For follow-up:** * Disseminate brief survey inviting Hub members to indicate support for draft recommendations in Effective Instruction and Leadership
* Clarify public reporting of assessment for advanced mathematics students
	+ How are they included in accountability reporting?
	+ How is their testing protocol being communicated to families and general public?
* Confirm that CSI is treated as a “school district” for purposes of having a duty to adopt a policy for its schools to make available advanced mathematics courses of study for students when available
* Bring public comment back to the Hub?
	+ Review timeline for eliciting public comment to assessments drafts
* Accountability: How many schools and districts would be impacted if same N is used and broken down by *each* major racial/ethnic group
* School Improvement: distribute handout in soft copy to Hub members (particularly those who may not have been in attendance)
* Consider revising language in School Improvement survey to be more accessible to lay persons (consider including examples)
* January discussions
	+ Need to present data re: Minimum N
	+ “Other” indicator for school accountability
	+ Anticipate debate re: long-term targets and its implications for school performance framework
	+ Program quality and implications for duration of participation in an English language learning program
	+ Potential 4th option for School Improvement – districts provide matching resources based upon local capacity
	+ Make “Effective Instruction” first topic in January 9 – need to revisit out-of-field and endorsements
 |
| 4:00pm | **Meeting Ended** | **Thank you for your commitment - Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm** |