

Minutes

cde



Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

February 7, 2020

9:30 -12:30

Colorado Talking Book Library
180 Sheridan Blvd
Denver, CO 80226

Meeting called by:	Education Data Advisory Committee
Type of meeting:	Scheduled Data Review Meeting
Facilitator:	Jan Rose Petro
Note taker:	Brooke Robinson
Timekeeper:	

Attendees:	Lori Benton (phone)	Brooke Robinson
	Stephanie Hund	
	Lazlo Hunt (phone)	
	Jonathan Levesque (phone)	
	Patrick Mount (phone)	
	Andrew Pippin	
	Marcia Bohannon (phone)	
	Jan Rose Petro	

Agenda topics

General Business

- Meeting Minutes 10-Jan-2020 – Approved with minor edits
- Late Item Submissions (**MARKED IN RED**)
 - CGA-200 Approved
 - CGA-226 Approved
 - OFP-101 Approved
 - OFP-140 Approved
- EDAC Credit Renewal – Jan wrote down names of the people who are on the call, and they will sign the Credit Renewal next meeting.
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee
- Membership Request Follow-up with CSI Representative – Commissioner Katy Anthes and Terry Choy Lewis will be attending April's EDAC meeting on April 3, 2020. It was originally March 6th. However, there were some scheduling conflicts.

Update Approval

- CGA-146 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Grant RFP

- CGA-185 Gifted Education Universal Screening and Qualified Personnel Grant
- CGA-200 Colorado Regional Grant Writing Training **LATE**
- CGA-226 Colorado Regional Grant Writing Training Effectiveness Survey **LATE** - One suggestion would be to add as many pull down options for questions to increase the response rate. If you could provide this to all questions, there is a possibility it will help with their data.
- DMC-101 Record Integration Tracking System (RITS) – Why do you need Local ID on page 1? Districts wanted the Local ID to help track within their own systems. It helps with communication with districts and tie their system with the RITS system. Districts will fill in this number with whatever makes sense to them. We recommend they use the first 4 digits of their district code. It could be something we could visit as it being an optional field and see how this goes with districts. Everything now is digital and may be a security risk so we need to think about using this information in the future.
- DMC-102 Educator Identifier System (EDIS) – Why is the Social Security number required as well as Date of Birth, etc.? It seems like a lot of important information. Is the last 4 digits of Social Security number an option instead of all digits? The only problem with that is if you have Social Security numbers with the same 4 last digits, there will be duplicates when matching behind the scenes. Can the duplicates be solved with another unique identifier? When you are putting in a new employee, the system takes the Social Security and compares this with all Socials within the system. If they are close matches, we then see if the person is already in the system. Often with common names, the Social is the only thing that differs the two people. How often do you see overlaps? You would be surprised as there are a lot of people that have the same names. The middle name is not a required field so there are many duplicates if the first and last name are the only thing to compare. If you use the last 4 of the Social Security, will that still not be enough? Debbie doesn't believe it is enough and might require extensive research. Can we explore providing other information besides this pertinent information? The first step is to check with the Educator Talent Unit and take it from there. We will investigate and do some work with this. We are getting into contact with a new contract licensing company so it should be something we should look into.
- DMC-103 Data Pipeline Directory - Will there be continued discussion regarding adding any of the Report Card March data to the Directory? Report Card March will not be added to Directory. However, the timeline may be changed to better align with Directory. Jan had Debbie update the Directory definition online.
- DMC-133 Kindergarten School Readiness Data Reporting – There were discussions last year regarding EDAC possibly not providing a stamp to DMC-133. The executive team decided that since this is still in law, the stamp still needs to be a requirement. The format of the report must stay as it is something that needs to be brought to the State Board. At that time, during the Retreat last year when it was originally denied, the EDAC Committee talked about this and put together why and how reporting should be different. We will present to the State Board about these discussions at a better time.
- ELA-109 State Migrant Student Information System, Students Migrating Academically on the Right Track (SMART)
- OFP-140 Title I Part A Equitable Services to Non-Public Schools Provisions **LATE**

All Approved (some questions on CGA-226, DMC-101, DMC-102, DMC-103, DMC-133)

Proposed Legislation

State Board Rules

- None

10 Minutes	SED-218 IDEA Federal Budget and Expenditures System for the State of Colorado (Review)	Evan Davis
<p>Overview: AUs/BOCES/SOPs must complete the IDEA Federal Budget and Expenditures System to receive IDEA federal funding specifics and provide fiscal data as to how the IDEA federal funding will be expended. There is no PII collected and no outside vendors are utilized. The information that is collected is one of the key factors in determining the appropriateness and allocable use of federal funds awarded to the AU each year. It is also a key in determining actual expenses and, if available, carryover of funding between fiscal years. The costs are minimal for this collection and the system is functioning for the AUs/SOPs to enter in financial data for their flow-through funds for IDEA as it stands today. However, the system is in need of a major update to simplify the process and reduce time/effort when manually reviewing by CDE staff. Most AUs can complete their mandatory budget within a day and voluntary revisions will take only a few hours. CDE gets alerted about the available funds with the annual IDEA Part B application notification from the US Department of Education.</p>		
<p>Discussion: Evan called in to the meeting due to travel. Are there any upload features like Excel? Currently, there are no upload features. We are looking into making this more efficient. Due to budget restraints, we are unable to do that now so it has to stay as manual process. Will there be any features that allow a rollover process from the current year? When the IMS Department rolls over this data, this will pull from the year before to help with this process. Will there be support to help identify questions from users? Yes, anytime anyone has any questions or concerns, they contact Evan directly. It is a very simple system and CDE is always available for support. Data always rolls over, and it is very simple to make changes.</p>		
<p>Conclusion: Approved.</p>		
20 Minutes	DAR-108 Request for New School Code, Closure, Name Change and Grade Change Forms (Review)	Debbie Puccetti
<p>Overview: The emphasis on accountability and assessment measures at both the state and federal level has led to a need for more consistency within the process of assigning new school codes, changes in grade levels, closure of schools and changes to the school name. The School Code Review Committee is tasked with determining when school codes will be retained versus reassignment. Districts/BOCES that meet the definition of a Colorado Public School are required to report mandated student and staff information and meet accountability and assessment requirements. Thus, ensuring data trends, historical data, and School Performance Framework data is retained regardless of the school code change request. The information that is collected intersects with a variety of collections, such as: End of Year, Student October, December Count. In addition to these collections, many Colorado Department of Education Units use this information to guarantee that all historical data associated with the school code remains with the school code regardless of the requested changes. There were many changes throughout the applications such as adding contact information, rewording questions, condensing sections so they aren't as wordy, and conditional respondent questions only for charter schools.</p>		
<p>Discussion: Debbie called in to the meeting due to travel. Will these changes be published? Some of these changes are published, but the rest will be published at the end of next week.</p>		
<p>Conclusion: Approved.</p>		
10 Minutes	ELA-115 Out of School Youth Student Profile (Review)	Tomas Meija

Overview: The Out of School Youth Student Profile is a required element of the Migrant Education Program to determine needs and services for youth who have dropped out or are not enrolled in school. This information is of value to the 5 regional Migrant Education Programs who work closely with youth who are not in an educational setting. All out of school youth must have an Out of School Youth (OSY) profile completed on them and placed in the student's file for monitoring purposes. In the agriculture world, many kids are on the crews, and this information is not picked up by any other collection. It is very important to us that we pick up this information and address their needs. We found that it is very hard to serve this population due to the time we have with them. We want to expand this time with them before moving on to their next destination.

Discussion: Tomas called in to the meeting due to travel.

Conclusion: Approved.

10 Minutes

ELA-427 Colorado Migrant Education Program
Priority for Service (PSF) (Review)

Tomas Meija

Overview: The Priority for Service form is a required element of the Migrant Education Program to determine children, students and youth who have moved within the past 12 months and are failing or at risk of failing academically. The information is of value to the 5 regional Migrant Education Programs who work closely with the districts and schools in their region. This information allows for regions and districts to work together to support student achievement. The cost to the district are provided by Title I and are therefore, minimal to non-existent. We broke this up into all of the age groups and we prioritize how students are identified. The first criteria we look at is state assessments whether or not they are passing or failing these tests. We also look at English assessments. It is an automatic priority if the students are not in school.

Discussion: Tomas called in to the meeting due to travel. Are we allowed to ask their status of citizenship? We are not allowed to ask that due to the law, and we only focus on whether or not they are in school.

Conclusion: Approved.

10 Minutes

PPS-106 Accelerated College Opportunity Exam
Fee Grant (Review) - Return from Oct, added a
survey to Exam

Marina Kokotovic,
Andy Tucker

Overview: The collection on AP exams administered and student information is required by statute, and is required to receive funding. This addition enables us to offer interim information regarding funding so that grantees are able to better prepare. This survey is being appended to the Accelerated College Opportunity Exam Fee Grant and will be presented as one the following year. This survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete. However, the entire Exam Fee Grant takes about 2 hours to complete so it really will not impact the amount of time for the entire collection. We wanted to add this within PPS-106 so we can get an estimated amount of how many exams are needed. This is a new collection as of last year. This needs to be added because we aren't sure, from lack of data, how many tests are needed.

Discussion: Andy called in to the meeting due to travel. When will this be submitted? We plan to send it after March as this is a good timeframe. This will be due by April 1st, i.e. about 2 weeks' timeframe. We think this will be a good benefit to everyone. What is the definition of low income? Eligible students are defined in application. The application is clear about this range, and it is the same definition that is used everywhere. We can get you that information if that would help. A suggestion would be to add this as a footnote to the survey.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.

15 Minutes

OFP-125 Online Comparability Data Collection
(Review)

Barb Vassis

Overview: The Unit of Federal Programs has ended the online comparability data collection system for assuring that districts are using their Title I funds to “supplement” and not “supplant” State and local funds for educational resources and materials. UFPA is calculating comparability based on the FTE method(s) using Student October Count and the Human Resources (HR) collection. Districts that CDE’s analyses does not demonstrate to be comparable can use Excel calculators provided to demonstrate comparability through the FTE or per-pupil alternative method approved by ED. This information is mandatory to receive Title I, Part A funding. Comparability ensures that general funds are allocated among schools as the primary resource to meet the needs of students without regards to federal Title I, Part A funding. Costs associated with the Comparability collection are minimal. First, LEAs with less than 1,000 students and one school per grade span are exempt from demonstrating Comparability. Second, CDE conducts analyses on behalf of LEAs to test for Comparability using existing collections (Student October and HR) first. LEAs already submit both data sets (Student October and HR), and UFPA will attempt to demonstrate Comparability using these data. If CDE is able to demonstrate Comparability on behalf of the LEA, no additional action is required on the LEA’s part. Only districts for which CDE is not able to demonstrate Comparability using existing data are required to submit the Alternate Calculator. Demonstration of Comparability is required by statute. As LEAs are already collecting this data for Student October and HR, completing and submitting the Alternative Calculators at the aggregate level should take less than 10 hours of additional staff time. For all districts with less than 1,000 students and one school per grade span, as well as districts for whom CDE is able to demonstrate Comparability using existing data, there is no additional district staff time required.

Discussion: Barb called in to the meeting due to travel. Are you saying there are about 30-40 that go through this process? Yes, this is correct. We had about 10 districts that we consolidated and did not run the calculations for as it is based on the percentage from the funding pool. The others had some issue that did not make the cut. There are various factors that they look into like enrollment, and the “cut point” of schools. For example if the enrollment is about 30 students, we would not consider that to be a valid “cut point”. You can’t compare just Title I schools to each other and non-Title I schools to each other. There must be comparisons throughout. You can also look at poverty, i.e. separate schools based on poverty and look at low income students. Title I schools have to have equal or greater amount of services to non-Title I schools.

Conclusion: Approved.

15 Minutes	PWR-104 Concurrent Enrollment Website Online Survey to LEPs	Andy Tucker, Michelle Romero
------------	---	------------------------------

Overview: Per SB19-176, by July 1, 2020, the Colorado Department of Education (COE) and the Department of Higher Education (DHE), with advice from the State Board, must make available a website providing information on concurrent enrollment options and requirements to students, parents, and legal guardians. In order to provide the best information we can on this website, we are trying to learn if districts/charter schools have information online regarding how a student participates in their Concurrent Enrollment program. The costs of collecting, analyzing, and reporting information are minimal in relation to the benefits to be derived as the survey can be completed quickly and accurately, as well as (once received) the data can be uploaded and posted to the website in a timely manner. Students and parents will benefit from having access to a comprehensive, online tool that provides them with a general overview of concurrent enrollment and links to their specific LEP's concurrent enrollment process. There are 10 required statutes in order to post on website.

Discussion: Michelle and Andy called in to the meeting due to travel. Students and parents will benefit from having access to a comprehensive, online tool that provides them with a general overview of concurrent enrollment and links to their specific LEP's concurrent enrollment process. We thought this would be the most effective way to get this information out there. It will be helpful for parents and students to have somewhere to access, "what is happening at my school?" On page 2, why are you using the word "policy"? Will it be less formal than that? We are directing that it should be in the board policy. We are suggesting to districts to put in policy because we want it to be very formal. It would be one of the top ways to get this information across to parents and students. You may want to recommend that it is a "board policy" instead of just "policy". There were some legislative changes recently, so it may be after April until this is approved. The website has to be live around July 1st and previewed prior to that in May for launch. Right now, it is not required. We did not ask for it to be a mandatory survey as it was just advised to have this information. Does the law specifically say we will collect this data? No, it does not. One thing we could do is change this to a required to obtain benefit survey instead of a voluntary survey as it will not be tied to CDE if this is not done. If it is changed to required, what is the benefit? If you do not fill it out, your information will not be on CDE's website. It should not be a voluntary survey. Gathering information on a voluntary level is very labor intensive. Required to obtain benefit may be best as we are trying to limit mandatory collections. If you do not get information from all districts, will you reach out to those districts that did not provide this information? We will try to make further contact with districts, and we will do our best to reach out as much as we can to get that information.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits. Change from voluntary to required to obtain benefit.

10 Minutes	SIS-103 Computer Science Grant Program (New)	Kim Burnham
------------	--	-------------

Overview: Completion of the grant application is required to compete for funds, and completion of the connected end of year report as mandated by the State Board of Education and Legislation. The cost is minimal in relation to the benefits to be derived as the information is collected for grant application and management. Additionally, an end of year report is generated to the State Board of Education and Legislation as mandated. The only anticipated fiscal impact on school districts statewide of this collection is staff hours to complete the application and end of year report. This information is currently not collected elsewhere as the data collected is tied directly to the performance of the grant and is contingent upon each districts' specific expenditures. The enrollment data requested is tied directly to computer science education, and isn't currently collected from districts. There is \$250,000 available for this grant. We may be bringing the other half of this application back in the future, but currently we are only looking into the Computer Science portion. We are having a webinar in February and applications are due May 1st. This is for the 2020-2021 school year. PII will not be collected within this grant.

Discussion: On pg. 4, Eligible Applicants Eligibility language is confusing as LEAs are identified as districts and CSI in statute but on pg. 4 they are listed as: A School District, A Board of Cooperative Services (BOCES), A District Charter School, An Institute Charter School, and An Online School. We have updated it to reflect LEP vs LEA. We have made this clearer in the new version. We also made it clear that Charter Schools can also apply for this grant. Is there a difference between Computer Science Activities Grant and Computer Science Grant? Yes, this is a whole different application. The original version, Computer Science Grant, is what they are going to submit. The footers need to reflect the correct grant name.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.

10 Minutes	NU-147 Community Innovation in Summer Meals (New)	Kim Burnham
------------	---	-------------

Overview: The Community Innovation in Summer Meals Program is an expansion of the successful Community Meals Pilot Program administered by the Share Our Strength No Kid Hungry Campaign over the last three years in Colorado. Results show community partnerships are a key component in reaching more youth where they live and play and sustaining summer meal programs over time. The goal of this grant is to expand the Community Meals Model by supporting summer meal sponsors in implementing best practices, in coordination with community partners, shown to be effective in increasing youth participation and program access. Best practices include selecting locations that reduce the distance kids must travel to a summer site, marketing and promotions, working with trusted community members to support the program (e.g. provide activities, serve meals), aligning meal service with programming and activities, innovative food service models (e.g. mobile meals), and offering free adult meals. Costs associated with this grant program will primarily be funded through the grant program. Postage and supply costs will be minimal, as applications will be submitted electronically. \$20,000 is available for this pilot program, for an expected four awards of \$5,000 each. You must be an approved summer meal sponsor. They will be doing a webinar in March and will try to get notifications out by May.

Discussion: Is this a pilot? This is not a pilot anymore. On page 2, it talks about it being a pilot program. One suggestion would be to remove all instances of “pilot”. On page 4, the dates seem confusing compared to what is needed and when. They are correct dates on page 4. Is there a copy of budget included? No, we usually do not add that in there.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.

30 Minutes	OFP-101 Consolidated Application (Review) - LATE	DeLilah Collins
------------	--	-----------------

Overview: Consolidated Application is the LEA plan to use ESSA federal funds. The plan must be approved to obtain benefit. Many of the requirements for ESEA funds are in line with Civil Rights requirements that are already being met by the LEA. The information collected pertains to increasing academic proficiency, improving teacher quality, increasing English language proficiency, and creating safe and civil learning environments. Capturing and reporting information to CDE should be minimal in relation to the benefits derived. The fiscal impact on the school district would have to be calculated by the district prior to accepting these funds. It is the district’s decision to apply for the funding based on the fiscal impact. Funding is awarded through appropriations. Federal budgets are set by Congress and unless there is a cut or defunding of a program, CDE anticipates funding for all 5 programs in the application annually.

Discussion: DeLilah will update 2019-2020 to reflect the correct year. There are many changes throughout the application. The reasons for these changes are due to cleaning up the verbiage. On page 19, the questions were updated. These changes are due to feedback they have received regarding the Consolidated Application. DeLilah went through each section and explained what had been added (highlighted portions of the document) and what had been taken out (crossed out sections). There were no questions regarding these updates. There is also a capability now to export the application to Excel. This is new as of this year.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.

10 Minutes	Report Card March Re-Envision Process	Brooke Robinson
------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------

Overview: Report Card March Data Collection is currently being looked at as a Data Burden Collection. They are looking into the pros and cons of keeping Report Card March, getting rid of it, as well as combining with Directory. The submission process of RCM vs Directory, file uploading vs form, timing of both collections, and other areas are different with each process. RCM collects in March and Directory is year round. Currently file upload is feasible with RCM, might not be the case with Directory. Also, one must resubmit RCM, but not Directory in Pipeline. Presented two options and the pros and cons of each.

Brooke met with the Legal Team at CDE and determined how many fields we can remove/how many fields we need to keep as required by statute as well as rules. There are two options that are available: keep Report Card March during the March timeline and report what has happened the past school year or change the timeline of this collection right before the school year (possibly July/August time) and report on what the school will offer. Each of these options has a different amount of required fields depending on what has been collected prior to these timelines.

Discussion: If the timeline changes, there will be 46 fields that are required to report. If the timeline does not change, 28 fields are required. The main difference between these two is due to being able to pull from other collections. If we keep the timeline of March, we can reference many other collections' data and not have to report that in Report Card March. What would be the benefit of changing timeline? Parents would be able to access this information earlier on what will be offered during the next year. Changing the timeline would also enable the extension of the collection timeframe, i.e. more than one month. Extending the timeframe, for example March through July, will be beneficial to smaller schools as they are not sure what is going to be available. Everyone will go back and talk to Report Card March representative and discuss this information presented.

Conclusion: We will vote on it next meeting.

20 Minutes	DMC-106 Data Pipeline – Student Enrollment Interchange (Review)	Genevieve Hale, Ahern Nelson
------------	---	------------------------------

Overview: The student interchange is required for state and federal reporting. Data in the Student Enrollment Interchange is used to determine funding and graduation, dropout, and mobility/stability rates. Any outside vendors are contracted by the districts. CDE has strict policies regarding PII data. CDE helps districts report this data publicly in the form of enrollment, graduation, dropout, and mobility/stability rates. The public record of this data hold schools accountable and helps inform the public. CDE will accurately report to the public what districts have reported to the state. It consists of 4 different files, Student Demographic, Student Association File, Advanced Course Completion, and Graduation Guidelines. There were additional changes to the Student Demographic File.

Discussion: We are adding a new field regarding military enlistment as required by a new statute. On page 16, the definition is copied and pasted directly from the statute. We do not have sharing capabilities with the military so we are “loosening” this verbiage on page 16. In the Student Demographic File, we added whether or not a student’s parent is enlisted in the military as well. In Graduation Guidelines, there is a new menu item on page 7. On page 5, in Graduation Guidelines in Accuplacer field, there will be 4 new categories added to this. In Graduation Guidelines on page 7, we have expanded this into 3 new fields regarding accommodations. In Graduation Guidelines, there is no way to tie a student’s accomplishments between two districts. Graduation Guidelines will go into effect next year. On the Graduation Guidelines, not all students will be taking all assessments so will this be only referred to graduation guideline assessments? You are not required to report on all assessments, but CDE encourages people to report all assessments the student has taken. Are the menu options changing over time? The next school year is when Graduation Guidelines will be put into effect. There will be only one menu option change for this next year. There are concerns with these changes as it may be difficult for navigation and reporting. How will you handle graduating with different years in order to help students cross the finish line? The intent is not to remove menu options. The tracking of this data is very concerning to districts. CDE is asking LEAs to submit all assessments that the student takes. It is not required, but encouraged. Tracking the assessments from district to district might be difficult as well. If a student meets one of the criteria in an earlier year, it will be honored in the district. If the student then transfers to another district, then it would be the new district’s decision whether or not they want to accept that criteria from an earlier year or not. We do not have district of origin, military definition, new Accuplacer, and graduation definition on the current document. Would it be possible to get a summary of changes out to EDAC Members? We add this document to Syncplicity.

Conclusion: Approved.