

# Minutes

## cde



# Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

January 15, 2021  
9:30 a.m. to 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:

Lori Benton	Cheryl Taylor
Janice Cook	Marcia Bohannon
Merlin Holmes	Jan Rose Petro
Mimi Livermore	Genevieve Hale
Patrick Mount	Aislinn Walsh (guest)
Mina Parthasarathy	
Andrew Pippin	

## Agenda topics

### General Business

- **Meeting Minutes 4-December-21-Approved**
- **Tentatively Scheduled February Collections-No comments**
- **Late Item Submissions (MARKED IN RED)**
- **EDAC Credit Renewal**
- **Data Pipeline Advisory Committee**
- **2019-2020 EDAC Annual Report**-The Assistant Commissioner made some edits to the report and Jan shared with the group what those few small edits were. There were some questions about review outcomes and so Jan added a phrase that some districts are invited to re-submit a collection. Jan added a phrase about TSDL and RCM being re-designed and then swiftly approved. The committee liked both sentence additions. Jan re-worded the type of collection to shorten it but the content stayed the same. Under 20-21 legislative recommendations there was a question on second bullet down in the report about whether or not this is EDAC's role. The thought to this is that this is not feasible given time and other constraints on EDAC. It was mentioned that EDAC thinks the intent is one thing whereas the CDE business unit may think it's something else. In actual practice CDE staff don't believe this is EDAC's role. One member mentioned that the forms and collections that EDAC reviews often have elements that are required and EDAC members serve more as reviewers. Another member mentioned maybe there is a lack of clarity about EDAC members and CDE staff about what the role of EDAC is. It's important to clarify what the respective roles are. Jan brought up a couple of examples about where there was this lack of clarity about who does what and the

legislative intent. Maybe this topic should be discussed at this year's retreat. EDAC members are likely to hear the disconnect between the field and CDE and perhaps can slow down those collections to think more intently about how they are implemented per legislative intent. Jan made a note to put this topic on the disconnect on the summer retreat agenda. Marcia will talk to the Assistant Commissioner to see where her thoughts are on this topic of the disconnect. There was a brief discussion about the font(s) and how it should appear on the document. Should the font be compartmentalized, or should the font be the same throughout? The committee liked the font on the document the way it is. Committee talked about bullet on past accomplishments and how to make the idea about collections more understandable/clear. EDAC members discussed that maybe they should clarify the statements such as clarifying/improving the collection processes to make them more understandable to respondents or maybe making the collection submission form more understandable. The committee settled on this language for the report "Improving collection submission form by clarifying the process and purpose for respondents." The report is now ready to go to the State Board and the State Education committees.

**Technological Opportunities**-Marcia reported out that T-Mobile is still running a hot spot project for FRL students and there is still some capacity. They are over half-way through rolling out the project, but they still have hot spots available. If districts are interested, they can visit the T-Mobile site directly rather than go through CDE. On July 1<sup>st</sup> they will add an additional 34,000 available hot spots for schools/districts. Second, there was another \$20 million-dollar grant opportunity that the legislature passed in November for broadband services. That grant process just completed and reviews are going on now and shortly LEAs will hear about the decisions. The number of applicants and requests for funding were less than what is available so it's a good chance that all the grant requests will get approved. To apply for T-Mobile hot spots go to: [www.t-mobile.com/p10m](http://www.t-mobile.com/p10m)

#### **Update Approval**

- DMC-106-Changing Local Measure Coding for Graduation Guidelines-**Approved Jan will get response from this unit to email out to committee regarding why non-passing data needs to be reported.**
- CCC-101-VE-135 CTE Secondary Enrollment Data File-**Approved**
- CCC-102-VE-130 CTE Instructors Data Collection-**Approved**
- CGA-172-School Counselor Corps RFA-**Approved**
- CGA-185-GE Universal Screening and Qualified Personnel-**Approved**
- ESL-403-Gifted Education Comprehensive Program Plan-**Approved**
- TAL-103-Colorado Preschool Program Annual Report and Re-Application-**Approved**

#### **State Board Rules**

- No notice of rulemaking.
- State Board meets January 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> to discuss 3 rulemaking hearings that are as follows:
  - 1) 15.01 Rulemaking Hearing: Rules for the Administration of the Waiver of Statute and Rule, 1 CCR 301-35
  - 2) 16.01 Rulemaking Hearing: Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991, 1 CCR 301-37
  - 3) 17.01 Rulemaking Hearing: Rules for the Adult Education and Literacy Grant Program, 1 CCR 301-98

30 Minutes

COVID Stakeholder Report/UIP Re-envision Process

Susan Barrett/Erin Loften

**Overview:** Susan and Erin were invited to talk to the EDAC committee about the UIP re-envision process and to talk about the COVID stakeholder report.

**Discussion:** The Improvement team welcomes the collaboration with EDAC on the UIP process. The UIP is meant to help support LEAs in best practices for strong improvement planning and it pulls a myriad of requirements they must meet into one place so they can get a wholistic picture of their school/district improvement planning. Both state/federal requirements are pulled into one UIP document which makes it a complex undertaking. Maybe now with pandemic it's a good time to step back and make the process better based on feedback from the field and from CDE. The Improvement Planning team is hoping that today they can learn from EDAC what their thoughts are about this process such as what they hope to accomplish as well as any concerns. One EDAC member said that there are a few pain points such as first sometimes principals feel that they are asked to enter data into UIP that CDE already has and can there be a way for CDE to pre-populate this data? Another pain point is the 90-day plan for schools and a lot of this information is repeated in the UIP and asked if the 90-day plan can be incorporated in the UIP plan so that folks are not duplicating their efforts. The next pain point is that the template doesn't match the way the PDF is printed. The flow of these two documents doesn't sync. One recommendation is that perhaps certain sections of previous year's plan can be copied and reflected on this in Section 2 and they could have schools give a brief summary. Another EDAC member talked about the tremendous growth of the UIP for schools/districts and the number of things that keep getting added on to it which causes a lot problems. There is a lot of duplicity. EDAC member mentioned examples of READ and Gifted and Talented and should those collections really be a part of the UIP process? She gave examples of why she thought these two collections shouldn't be included. The timeline for the UIP is very problematic in that it's too soon given all the constraints that LEAs are under such as assessments, getting parents on the committee, and when schools start etc. The October 15<sup>th</sup> timeline is just not very feasible for a high a quality UIP document. The UIP has just gotten too big and can certain program requirements be reported elsewhere? The Improvement Team is hoping to start the planning process a little earlier in the year to address timeline issue. They want improvement planning to be grounded more to local data. This validation of prior year data (this would flip how this has always been done) creates the concern that this timeline for this involves the summer when there is a lot of staff turnover which itself is problematic. The Improvement Plan needs to think through supports if the timeline is adjusted. EDAC member says there is a frustration that more shouldn't be legislated into the UIP process as now the process has become unwieldy. The field should be consulted about time/training burden if additional items are legislated into the UIP. The READ collection was given as an example of extreme burden on LEAs. The Improvement team is working on some of the READ requirements to reduce duplicity and to have them collected elsewhere and then added by CDE to the UIP. CDE still has to adhere to what the law states with respect to READ but CDE staff are willing to put processes in place to collect the information differently for the UIP for READ. Another EDAC member commented that the UIP feels like a compliance issue and should they really look at this improvement plan as a living document, they suggested that they can upload their own process easily into the UIP. Another EDAC member stated that they think the UIP and state testing should be suspended for now. Also, they advocate for the creation of a new, much more simple assessment, accreditation and accountability process. Overall the UIP needs to be more focused, simple and have more realistic timelines. The UIP also needs to be more a living document. Susan and Erin have agreed to come back to EDAC periodically to talk about process and how it's going. The Improvement Plan team is hoping to do a year-long re-envisioning of what the UIP can be by working with diverse group from the field to take the input and to try to re-envision of what the plan/template could look like. They want to use feedback to implement the plan the first part of the next school year that is new and better. There was a discussion about short cycle planning and connecting this better to the UIP. They are working to respond to local priorities. Erin is compiling a list of factors for folks to understand what all goes into the UIP process. The end goal for the plan is coherence and best practice. Not every idea should be in UIP otherwise the utility gets lots. Erin will pull together what the different components are and will provide more detail about next steps.

**Conclusion:** Susan and Erin will take the EDAC committee's suggestions back to their unit. They will visit EDAC again for further discussion most likely at one of the March EDAC meetings.

30 Minutes	<p>Biennial Process Discussion-To be discussed this meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Educator Talent Division-Research and Impact Unit-</b> EDL-103 and DMC-11A</li> <li>➤ <b>Exceptional Student Services Unit-</b> SED-202A, SED202B, SED-275, SED-279, SED-280, SED-409A</li> <li>➤ <b>Exceptional Student Services Unit Office of Facility Schools-</b>FAC-103A, FAC-103B</li> <li>➤ <b>School Finance and Operations Unit-</b> DMC-105, PSF-110</li> <li>➤ <b>Teaching and Learning Unit Standards and Instructional Support</b> -CGA-236</li> </ul>	EDAC Committee
------------	---	----------------

**Overview:** Committee discussed what the process should look like to make decisions about requests.

**Discussion:** Jan talked about email she sent out and the response CDE got back. She also brought up CGA-236 and that it has changed every year but going forward it won't. Is this type of collection something that should be considered? EDAC member commented that she liked the description given on this form. However, she said that only collections that have had no changes for a long while should be considered. She also asked what the cost/benefit analysis is of people coming to EDAC with these requests. Jan asked if there was some additional narrative that needs to be added to the application form. Jan also discussed concern about collections coming to EDAC that shouldn't be considered. For example, no new collections should be considered for the first two -years. Also, if any rules have changed such as new legislation, those should have to come back to EDAC. Committee also said there should be at least two-years with no changes before committee will consider the application. Genevieve will reach out to owner of CGA-236 to let them know they have to wait for at least two years with no changes to collection and then the following year they can come back to EDAC for a biennial request. If the forms are not filled out thoroughly the committee can send it back saying that they need more information but Genevieve will check forms that are sent in for dates. With Transportation collections it was stated at a previous meeting that if there are small variations in the forms the EDAC committee will allow them to continue so there can be some flexibility. Some confusion from folks who submitted for a biennial review. See the following collections:

SED-275, SED-279, SED-280, SED-409A

These collections should be reviewed in February as per usual protocol. This was not a review of the application document but rather just a discussion of the process. It was decided that more collections could come to the EDAC committee in February to continue the discussion of the biennial process. Should there be a different level of scrutiny for mandatory vs. required to obtain benefit collections? The thought was that for now there shouldn't be but in the future committee may need to scrutinize mandatory collections more. For NAEP collection should a biennial stamp be given as it's already biennial? EDAC allowed the stamp to be extended to next year as long as nothing changes as it was already approved but collection got delayed due to COVID. Then they'd have to come back again for next collection after that.

**Conclusion:** Jan and Genevieve will craft some new narrative for the application form. Biennial process discussion will continue into February meeting.