Synopsis of January and February Hub Committee Meetings

The ESSA Hub Committee met twice in January and once in February, 2017. This document summarizes the actions taken by the Hub Committee at those meetings. Please see the [Hub Committee Report](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essahubcommreport) and [Hub Committee Dashboard](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa_hubcommitteedashboard) for final recommendations and report on the Hub Committee’s work.

## JANUARY 2017

### Accountability

The Hub Committee unanimously recommended the following decisions for a portion of the accountability section of the ESSA state plan:

* Require a minimum cohort size of 20 for purposes of calculating median growth percentiles and a minimum cohort size of 16 for purposes of calculating achievement
* Use chronic absenteeism and existing post-secondary and workforce readiness measures in the short term as an “other indicator of school quality or student success” to be included in the accountability system.
* Identify schools eligible to receive targeted support based on the presence of at least 3 indicators

### School Improvement

The Hub Committee unanimously agreed to recommendations related to the following decisions for a portion of the School Improvement section of the ESSA state plan:

* SEA supports for identified schools
* CDE should provide a list of available (but not required) evidence-based interventions

### Effective Instruction and Leadership

The ESSA Hub Committee voted unanimously to adopt the spoke committee recommendations for the purpose of reporting “the statewide rates at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers:

* Continue to use the existing definition for an “inexperienced” (<3 years) teacher.
* Continue to satisfy the requirement for a plan to address disproportionality in the equitable access to teachers by including the plan in the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP)
* Continue to include *all* schools when calculating rates of equitable access to teachers

In addition, the Hub Committee majority adopted the recommendation to use the existing practices under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) for purposes of determining “out of field” teachers for the purpose of reporting “the statewide rates at which low-income and minority students enrolled in schools receiving funds under Title I, Part A are taught by ineffective, out-of-field, and inexperienced teachers.

Although the Hub was not asked to adopt a recommendation, it did provide feedback to CDE on its activities designed to recruit and retain educators in Colorado.

### Title Programs and Assurances

The ESSA Hub Committee voted unanimously to adopt the spoke recommendations to:

* Distribute the 3 percent of Title I funds to school districts rather than retain them at CDE to create Direct Student Services grants
* Maintain existing re-designation and exit procedures (with applicable changes to identification criteria based on WIDA Screener when available) for English language learners
* Maintain existing entrance and identification procedures for English language learners (with applicable changes to identification criteria based on WIDA Screener when available)
* Provide ESSA Assurances (General, Title I and Title III)

## FEBRUARY 2017

### Accountability

The Hub Committee unanimously recommended the following decisions, which were the remaining decisions needed for completion of the accountability section of the ESSA state plan:

* English language learners, who have been in the U.S. less than 12 months and are determined to have a language proficiency at the Non-English Proficient (NEP) level, will be exempt from taking the English language arts (ELA) assessment, unless their parents opt them into the ELA assessment. Students who are determined to have a language proficiency at the Limited English Proficient (LEP) level or higher will participate in the ELA assessment.
* For the English language proficiency indicator required in ESSA, Colorado will continue to use the sub-indicator for English language proficiency growth, called the median growth percentile (MGP), on the language proficiency assessment. Additionally, and when available, Colorado will add an indicator to measure growth to a standard on the language proficiency, using a six-year stepping stone timeline to help identify students who are and are not on track for attaining language proficiency.
* Colorado will disaggregate each major racial and ethnic group for accountability purposes when the race/ethnic group has a large enough student population to meet the minimum number required for accountability (i.e., 16 for achievement and post-secondary and workforce readiness indicators and 20 for growth indicators). Any race/ethnic groups that do not meet the minimum number will be combined into one group and if the combined group meets the minimum number will be reported on a disaggregated basis in school and district accountability reports.

Colorado interim progress and long-term achievement goals will be based upon mean scale scores for the academic achievement indicator and four-year, plus extended year adjusted, cohort data for graduation rates. The timeline for reaching the state’s long-term goals will be six years, with interim progress checks every two to three years. In addition, the Hub Committee, by majority vote, recommended that Colorado establish interim progress and long-term achievement goals based on historical data.

ESSA requires states to identify an “other indicator of school quality or student success” to be included in the accountability system. The Hub had previously reviewed and approved the short-term plans for the other indicator at the Jan. 19 meeting. At the February meeting, the Accountability Spoke shared the plans for identifying the other indicator to be used in the long-term. The Hub agreed to recommend the Spoke committee recommendations for the long-term development of an “other” indicator and recommended that additional detail regarding stakeholder input and timelines for development be included in the state plan.

Although the Hub was not asked to adopt a recommendation regarding the 95% participation rate requirement, the Hub committee provided feedback and reaction to the State Board and CDE to consider when determining how participation rates will be factored into the statewide accountability system.

School Improvement
In addition, the Hub Committee, by majority vote, adopted the School Improvement Spoke recommendations on how CDE will allocate the required 7 percent of the state Title I funds to support schools identified for support and improvement. The recommendation reflects a hybrid model of competitive/formula fund allocation that allows for predictability and sufficient grant size.

The recommendations included allocating a larger proportion of funds to schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement than those identified for targeted support and improvement. When determining supports for schools, CDE will collaborate with schools and districts to align the supports for the identified schools with the needs delineated in the schools’ improvement plans. Emphasis will be placed on the quality of plans developed by districts of identified schools.

Rather than having districts apply for a variety of grants, CDE will use one application process to match schools, in collaboration with the schools and districts, with the supports based on specific criteria (e.g., identified needs, stakeholder and community input, current practices in place).