

# Minutes

cde



# Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

February 5, 2021  
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  
Virtual Meeting

Meeting called by:

Educational Data Advisory Committee

Type of meeting:

Scheduled Data Review Meeting

Facilitator:

Jan Rose Petro

Note taker:

Genevieve Hale

Timekeeper:

Attendees:

Marcia Bohannon	Andrew Pippin
Janice Cook	Lorraine Saffer
Genevieve Hale	Cheryl Taylor
Merlin Holmes	Aislinn Walsh (guest)
Lazlo Hunt	
Mimi Livermore	
Mina Parthasarathy	
Jan Petro	

## Agenda topics

### General Business

- Meeting Minutes 15-January-21-**Approved**
- Tentatively Scheduled March Collections-**No comments nor concerns**
- Late Item Submissions (**MARKED IN RED**)
- EDAC Credit Renewal
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee
- Cameras-Jan asked the EDAC members if they would turn their cameras on so that she could see their body language to better gauge how the meeting is going.

### Update Approval

- CGA-238-Colorado Student Wellness Grant-question came up as to whether or not individual charter schools can apply and if not, do they have to be in a consortium and do they have to be under one authorizer as a fiscal agent (referring to p.8 for eligible applicant)? Clarification needed. On the budget side on instructions tab there are no instructions on how to do the revision. On the budget detail page is it supposed to show the district code or name on this page? Should there be a district name in addition to a district code? In the budget detail, tab 3 it's allowing both instructional and support and EDAC member is questioning why both categories could be in the same column. In the program field it reads instructional/support and these items should be separated out. On 3A budget summary there should be a check figure after total budget to ensure there is

an accurate balance. On tab 4 on the budget detail it was suggested to add a column for districts to explain if there are any revisions and why the revisions need to be done. That EDAC member sent some comments regarding the budget which were forwarded to Mandy. **Approved with changes**

- DAR-108- Request for New School Code, Closure, Name Change and Grade Change Forms-**Approved**
- DMC-101-Record Integration Tracking System-Comment that RITS system in the add single student option the male 02 appears as first option and female 01 appears as the second option. On the RITS system they would suggest that on the screen the order would be switched with female listed first and male listed second to be in numerical order. Debbie mentioned that a bug for these changes had already been submitted to the CDE programming staff-**Approved with changes**
- DMC-112-Data Pipeline Colorado Access for ELLs SBD-**Approved**
- DMC-125-Non-Public School Information-**Approved**
- GFMU-202- Colorado 21st CCLC Cohort VII - Close-out Requirements-**Approved**
- PPS-104-Credential Reporting Document-**Approved**
- PPS-105-Career Success Development Success Program Intent to Participate-**Approved**
- SED-275-Request for Reimbursement of Substitute Teacher-**Approved**
- SED-279-Documentation of a Tuition Rate for Public Charter Schools, Not Including On-line Programs-**Approved**
- SED-280-Documentation of a Tuition Rate for Public Online Programs in Charter Schools-**Approved**
- SED-409A-IDEA Federal Application Project Narrative-**Approved**

#### **Proposed Legislation**

None

#### **State Board Rules**

There are no rulemaking hearings or notices of rulemaking this month.

However, staff from the Attorney General's Office let CDE know that there were some technical problems with the rulemaking for:

1 CCR 301-37; Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991, that was voted on during the January 13, 2021 State Board of Education meeting.

To remedy this, they have decided to address it during the State Board of Education special meeting scheduled for Friday, January 29, 2021. They plan to:

1. Terminate that rulemaking (Secretary of State tracking number 2020-00837).
2. Create a Notice of Rulemaking for those rules (1 CCR 301-37), for a hearing at the March 2020 SBE meeting.

They will be exactly the same rules as were noticed and voted on in January, so EDAC would have already reviewed them in the fall of 2020.

30 Minutes

DMC-102- Educator Identifier System (EDIS)

Debbie Puccetti

**Overview:** The Educator Identifier System (EDIS) assigns unique identifiers to educators in the state of Colorado for the purpose of evaluating and measuring teacher effectiveness, linking teacher and student achievement data, reducing the use of social security numbers when reporting in a variety of data collections. The use of the EDIS System will allow the district/BOCES a means to submit required data without the use of the educator's social security number, thus ensuring a safe transmittal of the educator(s) data.

**Discussion:** Nothing has changed in the EDIS system since the last time it was brought before the committee. It was just up for a review after a few years. Sometimes cases may go to review and Debbie works with districts to update the information and to issue the EDID.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes

DMC-103- Data Pipeline Directory

Debbie Puccetti

**Overview:** The Data Pipeline Directory contains key information about school districts and their member schools. This information includes, district contact information, school contact information, district key personnel, district board membership, vendor system information, calendars and 4-day school week application.

**Discussion:** A new field was added last year which was the district work-based coordinator data element which was based on a state bill from last year. All of these tabs are populated by districts. Directory information is used for various agencies, various websites and this information is used for many things across CDE such as for school calendars. There have been no changes in Directory since last full review with the exception of the work-based coordinator field. There were no questions from the EDAC committee.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes

OFP-101 ESEA Consolidated Application  
Budget

DeLilah Collins

**Overview:** Under the ESSA, state educational agencies (SEAs) are required to collect local education agency (LEA) plans that address the requirements of the law, as well as descriptions of the activities the LEA will implement with its Title I, II, III, and IV allocations. To meet this requirement, the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) has developed, with stakeholder input, a new consolidated application, which includes a set of five cross-program questions, organized around five core elements: a comprehensive needs assessment, meaningful consultation with stakeholders, identification of student supports, delivery and progress monitoring of programs, and evaluation of programs funded by the ESSA.

**Discussion:** Every year the Federal Programs go through the applications. The ARAC section did not change. Poverty measures on the application did change this year to capture more reliable data than just based on current year's October Count alone. October Count data will be pre-populated from 2020 and 2021 and LEAs can choose which year of data to use. Once one or the other year is chosen that year's information will be pre-populated into the application. For new schools if 2020 is chosen, the districts would add that data as it could not be pre-populated. Whatever year is chosen that data must be used for the whole application. There will also be flags in the application if a district decides to change the year as what was previously filled in would be erased to now for allow for a different year. Federal programs work with stakeholders to get feedback on application. Some other changes include: new progressive disclosure text was added. Also, Title I Part A question #6 was adjusted for services to students in facilities. Federal Programs staff decided that questions for neglected students need to be different than what is needed for delinquent students in facilities. Districts will describe services in neglected facilities and what supports those students will have when they transition out of those neglected facilities. Another change was made for the targeted assistance support and improvement question and criteria for exiting schools was adjusted. Another change was under delinquent facilities in that questions were condensed and clarified. Yet another change was that a table was added to calculate the proportions for Title IV categories into a set-aside content category page to help with the calculations so districts don't have to manually fill in the information. One EDAC member commented that they liked the changes but asked if it will it make a difference for district allocations depending on the year used and the response was that the allocations would not be affected but just that the data would be more reliable. The allocations are based on U.S. Census data. EDAC liked that the application has been streamlined and that the Title IV section was improved.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes

CGA-146C-End of Year Reporting for Cohorts  
7 & 8

Juliana Rosa

**Overview:** As part of receiving funds, subgrantees are required to complete an annual end-of-year survey. The survey asks for information on subgrantee activities and outcomes from July to June (full year). Results from the collection help monitor programs as well as inform program improvement and technical assistance provided to subgrantees.

**Discussion:** The 21<sup>st</sup> Century grant has two cohorts with very different requirements so they each have their own surveys with nuances in reporting. These results are reported back to the U.S. Department of Education. These are not new reporting requirements. These surveys get at how well the grantees are doing implementing their grants, the surveys report performance measures, family engagement, success stories, sustainability plans, and grantee feedback for CDE as well as the surveys are used for technical assistance. The program managers use the surveys to discuss next steps for grantees and for continuous improvement. These surveys are done in Qualtrix to streamline the process. Cohort 7 is finishing their funding so there are more reflective questions on the survey for that cohort as they close out whereas Cohort 8 survey is to check in with progress. There were no questions from EDAC.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes

CGA-146F-Quality Implementation Rubric

Juliana Rosa

**Overview:** As part of receiving funds, subgrantees are required to complete a Quality Implementation Rubric (QIR) during their continuation years. It is optional for subgrantees who are closing out their grant. The QIR measures quality of programming. Results from the collection help monitor programs as well as inform program improvement and technical assistance needs. The QIR document is attached, which includes all the constructs that will be measured during the collection.

**Discussion:** This tool is a way that grant managers can check up on grantees and to set expectations. The rubric has multiple components where grantees self-assess on various indicators to let CDE know how well they are doing. Evidence-based practices are asked about and grantees are asked whether or not they are making progress on their indicators and if they are using evaluations. Sustainability of programs is also reported. This is done in Qualtrix. This tool helps CDE with providing support to grantees. They have an advisory board that looks at the survey tools for the grants. There were no questions from EDAC members.

**Conclusions:** Approved

30 Minutes	CGA-146-21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) Grant Program	Mandy Christensen
------------	--	-------------------

**Overview:** The purpose of the 21st CCLC program is to provide opportunities for eligible applicants to establish or expand activities in community learning centers. Provided services focus on helping children in low-income schools, also referred to as centers, succeed academically through the application of scientifically based practice and extended learning time.

**Discussion:** This RFA is for the latest cohort of this program to distribute funds to establish or expand community learning centers. Priority is for students who attend high poverty, low performing schools. Services include helping children succeed academically through various evidence-based activities and to help parents have opportunities for meaningful engagement. Mandy went through various application requirements around eligibility and who would receive priority consideration. There are 3 types of applications such as for traditional programs (before and after school programs), for extended learning time during the regular school day and the third is the combination of the two preceding types traditional programs and extended learning time. There is program monitoring, federal evaluation and reporting (table of GEPA measures), and state evaluation and reporting, as well as local evaluation and reporting. There are various sources of technical assistance for this RFA. For review process applicants are using the Survey Monkey system for all the various documents to complete. This is a competitive RFA. One EDAC member commented that they liked the RFA process. Another EDAC member sent some comments regarding the budget which were forwarded to Mandy.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes	CGA-174-Early Literacy Grant Program Supplemental Funds Request	Mandy Christensen
------------	---	-------------------

**Overview:** In 2012, the Colorado READ Act established the Comprehensive Early Literacy Grant (ELG) Program to provide money to local education providers (LEPs) to implement literacy support and intervention instruction programs to assist students in kindergarten and first, second, and third grade to achieve reading competency.

**Discussion:** This is for a supplemental funding opportunity to focus on system-wide early literacy efforts for K-3. With this funding to support the establishment instructional systems that are scientifically based, increase professional development, assist with evaluation and implementation of assessments among other things. Only current active cohort 3 and 4 recipients are eligible to apply. There is \$740,000 available for this supplemental funding. Evaluation system will match what the recipients already participate in. Submission process is through a smart sheet. This is a very brief application. One EDAC member had some comments on budgeting items for this collection but also with regards to budget documents in general from all CDE units which included the following:

She noted that there is little to no consistency from one grant to another. She commented that it seems like a master budget template could be built through a unified process so that the forms can be interchangeable between grants. Also, she commented that it seems like the budget document is not verified before issuing by the various departments so that many times, cells are locked, don't link between sheets or miss allowing options for key chart of account codes. That EDAC member sent some comments regarding the budget which were forwarded to Mandy.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes	OPR-101- Colorado Counselor Corps Grant Program End of Year Grantee Report	Marina Kokotovic/ Andy Tucker
------------	---	----------------------------------

**Overview:** The purpose of this collection is to obtain benefit and because the department is legislated to report on program outcomes.

**Discussion:** This is an annual \$10 million grant that has been around for about 10 years. Year one reporting is different than for years 2, 3 and 4. Andy will be adjusting some of the dates based on some feedback he received from the CDE fiscal people the day of this meeting. One EDAC member commented that they liked the clarity of report. The purpose of the report is how the grantees are using the grant dollars. In year one grantees need to do a needs assessment and an environmental scan as well as other planning processes so when they get additional dollars in subsequent years, they can fill the roles and initiate the programs determined in year one to be needed and therefore year one grantees receive less dollars. In subsequent years the report is more about what grantees have done and what the outcomes have been and the allocations increase. For grantees in years 2-4 there is a district level report and a school level report as well. Andy mentioned that this report might be good for a future biennial stamp.

**Conclusion:** Approved

30 Minutes	<p>Biennial Process Discussion-To be discussed this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Data Services Unit</b>-DMC-101, DMC-102</li> <li>➤ <b>Exceptional Student Services Unit</b>-ELA-423A, ELA-423B, SED-282</li> <li>➤ <b>Federal Programs</b>-OFP-143, DMC-107, OFP-111, OFP-125</li> <li>➤ <b>Migrant Education Program</b>- ELA-115, ELA-427, ELA-109, ELA-104, and ELA-105</li> <li>➤ <b>State Library</b>-STL-106</li> <li>➤ Status of Biennial Stamp Document</li> </ul>	EDAC Committee
------------	---	----------------

**Overview:** In order to reduce burden on CDE staff who manage data collections that have data elements that rarely change, the EDAC committee is implementing a pilot biennial stamp process so qualifying data collections would only have to go to EDAC every other year rather than annually unless there are changes. At this point three CDE units have been approved for the pilot biennial stamps for specific collections which are Nutrition, Transportation and Capital Construction. For other CDE units the EDAC committee is discussing the biennial process for expanding this next school year.

**Discussion:** Most of the collections have not changed in a long while so most of them would be good candidates for a biennial stamp. There should be at least two years of no change on a collection before the committee considers a collection application for a biennial stamp. What should we do with an application that eliminates data elements before the two years with no changes and would those applications be considered for a stamp? It should be considered that EDAC is tasked with eliminating data burden.

EDAC committee began going through biennial request collections listed above. The committee is not approving these applications for now but rather just going through them to refine the biennial stamp process. For the RITS and EDIS collections there were no changes since 17-18. There was no feedback from EDAC on these. Next reviewed were the collections from Exceptional Student Services Unit and a couple of them (ELA-423A, ELA-423B) that had not changed since 12-13 school year. There was no feedback from EDAC on these. For SED-282 there was a change in three consecutive school years from 2017 through 2020 however, it's anticipated that there will be no changes in future years. EDAC committee thought it was a good idea for this one to wait for two years before a biennial stamp could be considered. There is concern that additional adjustments will still need to be made for this application so this would not be a good candidate for now. Next for the Federal Programs collections, two had never changed (at least for 7 or 8 years). For OFP-111 various items were eliminated more recently. What should the policy be if the only changes were eliminating items? Can a collection still be considered for a biennial stamp if the change is recent but it's only eliminating items? One EDAC member commented that they still thought it is important that the collection be brought to EDAC to bring it to the CDE staff member's attention to make their stakeholders aware of the eliminated items as this affects how the stakeholders collect the information. Other members agreed. They would like these types of applications to be put on hold and to come back to EDAC. In other words, deletions are considered a change and those collections would have to be put on hold until two years after the deletion was made. As for the Migrant Education Programs, most of the changes were last done in 17-18. EDAC members said they had no concerns about these collections. Lastly was the State Library collection STL-106, there was a deletion to eliminate questions in 19-20 so given the last discussion they would have to wait until 21-22 for a biennial stamp. This would be supported for next year.

Committee looked at progress report of collections reviewed thus far for a biennial stamp as well as a summary chart of types of collections to determine the next year's burden for approving these collections. In total 61 collections have been reviewed thus far. At least 59 of those collections will be considered next school year for a biennial stamp. The bulk of those will be considered in March 2022 for a stamp. The EDAC committee agreed for the March collections to hear those at the first March meeting. Overall the committee felt comfortable with the number of collections coming forward next year for a biennial stamp as well as with the processes discussed. SED-182 and OFP-111 were asked to wait for two years but all the other collections would be good candidates for a biennial stamp beginning next year.

**Conclusion:** Genevieve will type up a document with the agreed upon processes.