Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

Minutes

cde

EDAC

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

Attendees:		
	Janice Cook	Brooke Robinson
	Ruth Grindeland	
	Stephanie Hund	
	Loraine Saffer	
	Patrick Mount	
	Andrew Pippin	
	Marcia Bohannon	
	Jan Rose Petro	

Agenda topics

General Business

- Meeting Minutes 7-Feb-2020 – Approved.
- Late Item Submissions (MARKED IN RED)
  - o PWR-102 – Approved
  - o OLU-107 - Approved
- EDAC Credit Renewal
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee
- Membership Request Follow-up with CSI Representative – Commissioner Katy Anthes and Terry Croy Lewis will be attending April's EDAC meeting on April 3, 2020. This is a discussion about making CSI a permanent member of EDAC. Is there any preparation that we would like to do that? We have forwarded comments from past meetings to CSI and Commissioner Katy Anthes. This discussion will be about whether or not we want to change EDAC's bylaws and allow CSI a permanent member. EDAC values everyone that wants to be on the committee. However, it may get confusing when we start grouping permanent or not permanent members. EDAC members currently have 4 year

membership. If CSI represented all charter schools across the state, it may be an easier decision. There was something in the past that did not work, but that doesn't mean that it can't work now. Janice Cook currently reaches out to CSI every month to get input on if CSI wants Janice to bring information or questions to EDAC. There may be already enough necessary input to the committee. There will be an open and honest discussion that will happen next meeting. It is important that all district representatives speak up. In the past, the charter school position within EDAC is one of the hardest to fill so it would be nice to have CSI be able to fill that position in the future. Do we think CSI is equivalent representation to just charter schools? Yes, the point is to get perspectives from all areas. It isn't just CSI requesting a permanent seat, it is anyone requesting a permanent seat that is concerning. All districts would like to have more than one representative to have a permanent seat in EDAC, but that should/would never be the case due to unfairness in vote and discussions. Finding out the root to why this needs to be a discussion would be helpful in making a decision for this permanent seat within EDAC. Would it be helpful to provide Commissioner Katy Anthes information about board members before the meeting? Yes, this would be helpful to show charter school representation on the board or the different perspectives that are brought to EDAC, i.e. different positions within the districts. Each voice matters; it is important to hear from superintendents, charter schools, rural districts, etc. We will begin the meeting by introductions for this discussion to give an overview to both Commissioner Katy Anthes and Terry Croy Lewis.

- Meeting Locations 2020-21 – The November 6, 2020 and January 8, 2021 EDAC Meeting locations will need to be somewhere other than the Colorado Talking Book Library. The Denver area may be best for location purposes. Patrick Mount is going to look into meeting location at Innovation Center. Jan Petro will contact Jonathan Levesque about meeting locations as well. Innovation Center will be scheduled for the November meeting.
- Other – Computer Science Education Grants for Teachers have more money than what was expected. This was announced via email by Jan Petro.

Update Approval
- DAE-102 Survey of EASI Applicants – Can EASI be spelled out before the use of the acronym on the survey? This will be helpful to those that aren't familiar with the acronym.
- DMC-120 School Discipline – On page 2, there is a link for behavior statutes, but the link doesn't work, shows "file not found". This feedback is from CSI – CSI's concern is highlighting across Data Pipeline. The highlighting of documents normally relates to the change of a document from the past year so it is easier for EDAC members and others to find changes quickly. On page 1 of 17, Incident ID should be highlighted since it isn't something that has been seen before, i.e. new.
- DMC-125 Non-Public School Information
- DPSE-130 McKinney-Vento Education of Homeless Children and Youth Program End of Year Reporting
- EDL-103 Designated Agency Data Collection
- ELA-104 National Certificate of Eligibility
- ELA-106 Migrant Education Program Residency Verification Form
- OFP-141 School Improvement Retention of Funds Request Form
- OFP-145 District Managed Activities (DMA) Waiver
- PWR-102 Concurrent Enrollment Expansion and Innovation Grant Program (Brought to EDAC New in September) LATE

- SED-282 Colorado Continuous Improvement Process Indicator 14 Post-School Outcome Data – On page 2, it mentions to go to question 17 through 21, and there are no questions 17 through 21.

All Approved (some questions/edits on DAE-102, DMC-120, SED-282)

Proposed Legislation

State Board Rules
- 1 CCR 301-10, Rules for Administration of the English Language Proficiency Act (Policy Revision)
- 1 CCR 301-37, Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991
- 1 CCR 301-86, Rules for the Administration of the Concurrent Enrollment Program

3 Minutes	STU-7 Used School Bus Dealers Registration (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The Used School Bus Dealers Registration certifies that they will not sell any school transportation vehicles that do not meet the Colorado Vehicle Minimum Standards. CDE can distribute the list to assist districts when purchasing vehicles. PII is not collected for this. Susan Miller handles drive qualifications and trainings. Fred Stewart handles the vehicles and garage work within districts. There has to be better protection for buses due to the buses having to travel through the mountains. The transportation unit has to be compliant with Colorado standards, especially with used buses. The form has not changed.

Discussion: Susan Miller and Fred Stewart see a positive impact on schools since they both have started working for CDE. The main focus is keeping the students safe. One of the biggest concerns is illegal passing. Working with transportation has been a rewarding system. Transportation is getting great reports from the districts. Fred Stewart was originally on the other side, working within the district, and realizes that transportation has grown by being more approachable and easy to talk to. Transportation is willing to answer any questions from districts. Transportation has been participating out in the field with districts which has helped the past years. Colorado was one of the few states that was ready for upcoming federal changes within transportation in districts. CDE Transportation has taken initiative to learn requirements that are not necessarily required to learn for easy transition. It has been tough finding bus drivers willing to do the training and have split shifts. CDE has recommended to give these bus drivers a job that fills these split shifts. CDL operators are tougher to find due to the requirements. Many districts are looking into smaller vehicles due to these CDL requirements. CDE Transportation is working on getting a more organized training program for these drivers. Any districts that are in need of an inspection, please reach out to the Transportation Unit to get on the schedule. The Transportation Unit is always on the road and wants to eliminate unsafe environments.

Conclusion: Approved.

2 Minutes	STU-8 School Transportation Vehicle (Small Vehicle) Pre-Trip and Post Trip Requirements (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The School Transportation Vehicle (Small Vehicle) Pre-Trip and Post Trip Requirements Form ensures that school transportation vehicles are in proper working condition prior to putting the vehicle into service on a daily basis. This helps school districts ensure that their vehicles are in proper working order when in use. It also assists maintenance costs when defects are caught early. Most importantly, it prevents placing defective vehicles in service. This is more or less documenting that the vehicle was checked before and after the trip. This also includes trailer transportation within the form. There have been no changes within the forms.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.

2 Minutes	STU-9 School Transportation Vehicle (School Bus) Pre-Trip and Post Trip Requirements (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The School Transportation Vehicle (School Bus) Pre-Trip and Post Trip Requirements ensure that school transportation vehicles are in proper working condition prior to putting the vehicle into service on a daily basis. This helps school districts ensure that their vehicles are in proper working order when in use. It also assists maintenance costs when defects are caught early. Most importantly, it prevents placing defective vehicles in service. This is more or less documenting that the vehicle was checked before and after the trip. This also includes trailer transportation within the form. There have been no changes within the forms.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.		
2 Minutes	STU-17 Medical Information - Activity Trip/Small Vehicle Operators (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The Medical Information – Activity Trip/Small Vehicle Operators form documents if an activity driver has any medical conditions that could prevent them from transporting students in school transportation vehicles. This statement is signed by the operator of the vehicle. This form ensures that the driver is physically capable operating the vehicle, i.e. has diabetes, needs oxygen, etc. There was a small change within this form. The statement about the physician's release is located at the top of the page instead of the bottom.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.

2 Minutes	STU-20 Application for CDE Annual Inspector Qualification or Recertification (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The Application for CDE Annual Inspector Qualification or Recertification form documents the required training and licensing to become an Annual Inspector, and to re-certify as an Annual Inspector. Some PII is collected, i.e. supporting documentation on the person. Every vehicle that transports students in the state of Colorado has to be inspected every 12 months. Nothing on this form has changed. A CDE Annual Inspection has to be done.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.

4 Minutes	STU-22 Application for Inspecting Site Certification (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The Application for Inspecting Site Certification form documents the required criteria to perform CDE Annual Inspections on School Transportation Vehicles. Certificates are only approved after CDE School Transportation Unit employee performs an onsite visit. Charter schools are also required to have inspections done. This certification has to be done every 3 years. Fred Stewart goes to sites and inspects that the right tools are being used, the correct lighting, etc. for these sites. Nothing has changed on this document.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	STU-24 Brake Inspector Qualification Certificate (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The Brake Inspector Qualification Certificate documents the required Training/Experience to become a CDE Annual Inspector. This requires a signed certificate and supporting documentation. The inspectors, themselves, fill this out that ensures they meet safety guidelines. One example of a guideline is at least 2 years of experience within the field.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.

3 Minutes	STU-25 CDE Affidavit of Annual Inspection for School Transportation Vehicles (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart

Overview: The CDE Affidavit of Annual Inspection for School Transportation Vehicles form documents that a school transportation vehicle has passed a CDE Annual Inspection. This requires signed certification and supporting documentation. Operating vehicles that have passed this inspection is imperative for the safety of our students. The annual inspector will leave either the top or the bottom of the sheet in the vehicle to show that the vehicle has been inspected. There have been no changes to this document.		
Discussion: No discussion.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
2 Minutes	STU-26 CDE Annual Inspection/Preventive Maintenance Checklist (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart
Overview: The CDE Annual Inspection/Preventative Maintenance Checklist form documents in detail the process of an Annual Inspection indicating that a school transportation vehicle has passed a CDE Annual Inspection. There is no PII involved. Copies of this form are maintained in district vehicle in paper or electronic format. This requires Annual Inspectors to meet required training and also re-certification every 3 years. This document has no changes to it.		
Discussion: No discussion.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
2 Minutes	STU-27 CDE VO-AG Trailer Annual Inspection/Preventive Maintenance Checklist (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart
Overview: The CDE VO-AG Trailer Annual Inspection/Preventative Maintenance Checklist form documents in detail the process of an Annual Inspection indicating that a school trailer vehicle has passed a CDE Annual Inspection. There is no PII involved. Copies of this form are maintained in district vehicle in paper or electronic format. This requires Annual Inspectors to meet required training and also re-certification every 3 years. Very few districts transport trailers behind school transportation vehicles. They normally pull trailers with vehicles that are not transporting students. These inspections are primarily performed by the school employed Annual Inspector. If a districts decides to use a certified outside site, the price can vary. There have been no changes to this document.		
Discussion: No discussion.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
2 Minutes	STU-30 Application for Qualification or Recertification of CDE Annual Inspector Hands-On Tester (Review)	Susan Miller, Fred Stewart
Overview: The Application for Qualification or Recertification of CDE Annual Inspector Hands-On Tester is for Annual Inspectors that want to become Testers that observe potential future Annual Inspectors. The inspectors need to be retested every 3 years to remain in the program. This form has not changed. CDE has been checking these documents to make sure they have updated EDAC stamps.		
Discussion: No discussion.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
5 Minutes	DMC-109 Data Pipeline – Discipline Interchange (Review)	Lindsey Heitman

Overview: Section 618(a)(I)(A)(vii) of the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires that states report to the Federal Government, the number of children with disabilities, by race, ethnicity, and disability category, who are removed to an interim alternative educational setting, and the number of children with disabilities who are subject to long-term suspensions or expulsions. The Sped Discipline Interchange file is submitted by member school districts of the Administrative Units. School districts use a variety of Student Information Systems to store their data. This data is collected and used for required Federal and State data reporting. Additional staff is not required. This data has been collected annually for more than a decade, and Administrative Units have systems in place to collect and submit this data. No funding is specifically attached to this collection. Discipline data is one of the Federal reporting data requirements and specifically Indicator 4.

Discussion: There were no updates to this collection. What is the integrity of reporting this? The training could be better on how to report/what to report on this. There is a slight concern of the integrity on reporting and can be approved upon. Maybe there needs to be more training. CDE can only do so much on what is reported by districts. Take out highlights within document and only highlight what has changed within the document.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.

10 Minutes	DMC-110 Data Pipeline – Special Education IEP Interchange (Review)	Lindsey Heitman

Overview: The 3 files that comprise the Special Education IEP Interchange include: Child File, Participation File and CEIS File. These files feed into the Snapshots of Special Education December Count, Special Education End of Year and to a lesser extent the Special Education Discipline (demographics info). The Special Education December Count Snapshot collection is an annual count of Eligible Students Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) as of December 1st. Special Education December Staff Data is also required to obtain actual data on special education staff employed by administrative units on December 1st of each year so that appropriate licensure and endorsement of staff can be verified; reports can be made to the State Legislature, Federal government, local administrative units, and the public. The Special Education End of Year Student Snapshot collection is required to obtain data on students who were referred, evaluated, or received services in each Administrative Unit or State Operated Program during the current reporting period. Many Administrative Units use the Statewide IEP System Enrich to generate their data files; however, some AUs use other data systems. Enrich is contracted with CDE and follows CDEs requirements regarding data security. This data is collected and used for required Federal and State data reporting. Additional staff is not required. This data has been collected annually for more than a decade, and Administrative Units have systems in place to collect and submit this data.

Discussion: CDE wants to remove code 57 this next year to simplify the collection. Code 57 was not being captured as a justified code. The other codes that were changed were the Educational Environments 200 level codes as it now does not strictly go by age; Kindergarten students are now grouped in the school age setting.

Conclusion: Approved.

15 Minutes	EE-101 Educator Effectiveness Assurances: Implementation of Great Teachers and Leaders Act (Review)	Carolyn Haug, Mary Bivens

Overview: The Educator Effectiveness Assurances are required by statute and State Board rules: Beginning in July 2013, and by July 1 of each year thereafter, CDE must collect an assurance from each school district and BOCES indicating that the district or BOCES is either implementing the state model evaluation system or is implementing its own distinctive personnel evaluation system that adheres to the requirements in statute (C.R.S. 22-9-106) and Colorado State Board of Education rules (1 CCR 301-87) for teachers, principals, and special services providers. This process does not collect PII. The assurances allow the Department to report how licensed educators in Colorado are being evaluated. Summary information is provided to the public on the Educator Effectiveness website. In past years, the assurance

collection reporting only represented half of the evaluation system. With the additional details about LEA weighting and student learning measures, a complete picture will be available to the public and districts. The Educator Effectiveness regional team uses this information to support districts statewide. In the past several years, districts have asked for statewide trends on how districts use student measures in their evaluations. This complete picture of district evaluation systems will help the Educator Effectiveness team work individually with districts, support regional PLCs, and report on statewide trends for both the professional practice and student growth measures of evaluations. The Department approximates that it takes a district/BOCES an hour or less to complete the assurances process after ensuring they have access to the necessary information. Response time will vary depending on the complexity of the LEA's evaluation system.

Discussion: This is a survey monkey form now since it has changed to branching logic. This branching logic allows districts to skip over questions that do not pertain to their district. The survey, as it shows printed out, does not display how short the survey is. How will this additional information be used? The information collected has not accurately displayed how people differentiate between subgroups of teachers. The only way CDE was getting this information was by word of mouth. This information has not been kept anywhere. CDE also doesn't know how MSLs are applied. Is there a risk that will pertain to the MSLs not being rigorous enough? CDE does not want specifics as CDE is looking for very vague information on this. Are all questions required? Yes, they are required depending on the path districts take. On the last statement, districts will have to mark "Meets Requirements". There can be a "No" option, but this is just a final assurance that the form was filled out correctly. There used to be an extra document, years ago, that would highlight all state statutes that displayed why the document was being filled out. This last statement takes the place of this document. There used to be a website link that had to be added by districts that linked to their district's website, and this was taken out. This information was not pertinent to the collection. This information will be collected in order to provide information to districts that are asking questions about other districts and what they are doing. July 1st is the due date as typically, this is launched in April. For the window from April to July, generic reminders will be sent and after July 1st, CDE will start calling individuals for this information.

Conclusion: Approved.		
5 Minutes	DMC-105 Data Pipeline – Finance (Review)	Adam Williams, Tim Kahle

Overview: According to CRS 22-44-105 (4)(a), The state board of education, with input from the financial policies and procedures advisory committee, shall establish, implement, and maintain a statewide financial, student management, and human resource electronic data communications and reporting system that is based on a standard chart of accounts, a standard information system, and a standard personnel classification system. The department of education, the state charter school institute, and all district charter schools, institute charter schools, school districts, and boards of cooperative services in the state shall use the system to report and obtain necessary financial information. This is an ongoing collection, with the first year being FY1998-1999. The costs associated with the collection of Financial December data pipeline data are "minimal" in relationship to how districts are funded, the importance of the data collected (users of the data: state lawmakers, advocacy groups, the federal government, and the general public via the Financial Transparency for Colorado Schools website). The fiscal impact of districts varies per district as the expertise and experience of staff, size and resources of the district's finance office, and the complexity of the district's independent audit are different. Public School Finance then takes this information and compares the Data Pipeline information to the audits that are performed. If there are inconsistencies, then it is sometimes necessary to reopen their collection and have districts resubmit. It can take a significant amount of time to pass edits within the system.

Discussion: EDAC appreciates how quick and easy the process is.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
5 Minutes	PSF-104 Report of November Elections (Review)	Adam Williams, Tim Kahle

Overview: The School Finance Act of 1994 requires the collection of election information to ensure accurate calculations by the state. State share funding is intended to make up the shortfalls of local funding. Districts utilize this information to assist with contract negotiations and projections for future years. Districts are required to provide this information to local counties for elections. This is not additional information requested from CDE but in conjunction with local elections. Other units within CDE that utilize this information obtain this information from school finance and do not collect themselves.

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.		
10 Minutes	PSF-108 Assurances for Financial Accreditation (Review)	Adam Williams, Tim Kahle

Overview: By CRS 22-11-206 (4), For purposes of monitoring a school district's or the institute's substantial and good-faith compliance with the provisions of this title and other statutory and regulatory requirements, the department shall obtain assurances from the school district or the institute that it is in compliance with:… This form is ultimately reviewed by CDE, compared to the independent audit. The form is signed by the primary business official at the district, the Superintendent and the President of the local BOE. This is deeply tied to Finance December collection. On the form, there are about 20 questions that are all based in statute and are all related to finances and health of the school. All questions are related that if a district or BOCES answers "No", then that district or BOCES is not in compliant with statute. If "No" is answered, then other information is required by the district or BOCES to explain why this is occurring and what is being done to fix the situation. All of the questions on the form are important as it keeps districts strict with spending and in compliant with laws. Deficit fund balances are also monitored with this form, and the form allows CDE to get this information to keep districts and BOCES out of the negative fund balance region.

Discussion: Public School Finance is very responsive when districts ask questions. Questions are normally answered in a day. CDE provides this information to the districts quite frequently so it does show that this information is helpful to districts.

Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	PSF-119 Certification of Mill Levies (Review)	Adam Williams, Tim Kahle

Overview: The Certification of Mill Levies is pursuant to the School Finance Act of 1994. CDE must calculate the local share of Total Program funding in order to determine the amount of state share to be paid to each district. Districts utilize this information to assist with contract negotiations and projections for future years. Districts are required to provide this information to local county assessors for certification. This is not additional information requested from CDE. CDE provides this form as a means for districts to certify to the counties and provide a copy to CDE in conjunction with this certification. Other units within CDE that utilize this information obtain this information from school finance. This form is meant to provide a tool for districts and provide CDE with the same information that districts receive. They have removed "full day kindergarten" references since there is no need, but added "total program reserve fund".

Discussion: No discussion.

Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	DMC-111 Data Pipeline – Staff Profile Interchange (Review)	Annette Severson

Overview: The updated educator evaluation fields have been presented and approved by EDAC in 2019. There are also updates for the job class codes to align with the Chart of Accounts job class codes and updates to the Probationary Status field.

Previously provided information for the Evaluation Data Fields:

Educator effectiveness ratings data provides statutorily required information to the state and allows the state to provide districts with tailored support and with analyses of the data to improve implementation through self-reflection. Currently, teacher and specialized service provider (SSP) effectiveness ratings are collected in the same fields. Because ratings data are collected in arrears (e.g.19-20 EE ratings data are collected in the HR20-21 collection), collecting both groups' ratings in one set of fields comingles the data. By separating out the fields so that teacher and SSP effectiveness ratings are collected separately, the meaning and interpretation of the ratings data becomes significantly clearer. Additionally, due to the changes to State Board rules approved in April 2019 the number of fields needed to collect effectiveness ratings for principals, teachers, and SSPs also needs to be reduced from 7 to 6 per group.

Collecting educator effectiveness data allows the CDE to annually release metrics around the data to help districts and schools view trends in their data in order to reflect on and refine their evaluation process. CDE is also able to use this data to determine which districts may be in need of support in conducting and reporting educator effectiveness ratings. The data is also an outcome indicator for educator preparation programs, which the State Board of Education authorizes and oversees, and provides evidence of program strengths and areas for improvement.

Discussion: There was discrepancy with "Demonstrates In-Field Status 1" under "Degree (BA or higher in subject area)" on how many hours are required. It has changed from 24 to 36 hours. That is happening due to a State Board decision. This information is located in the document on page 42. There has been some confusion on what qualifies as 36 hours. Federal programs will be providing input on this.

Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	DMC-121 Dynamic Learning Maps: ELA and Math Student Biographical Data (Review)	Pamela Amato

Overview: The Student Biographical Data Review process for Dynamic Learning Maps allows districts to make updates to student biographical data that is used in public reports and for accountability purposes. The SBD review process is also a way that districts can provide invalidation codes for the WIDA assessment. Colorado statute requires that assessment's information be reported each school year. The information collected in the SBD Review Process for DLM provides the assessment unit with the information needed to provide public reporting at the state level, district level and school level as well as in aggregated groupings as required by law. Data gathered during SBD review is also used by the Accountability Unit. This year, the primary disability code will be consistent with other CDE units. This will prevent a conversion from DLM code, as originally collected, to CDE codes.

Discussion: What are the changes in the document? Is it the highlighted portions? Yes, most of the highlighted portions of the document are name changes instead of the actual field definition. Some of the fields were also removed. Many EDAC committee members look for highlighted sections in the document to show what has changed within the past year. A lot of highlighted sections makes it look like there are a lot of changes to the document. There are only mostly name changes and that is it. Will these changes affect any vendors that districts are using? No, the vendor data is the same. Assessment is only changing the way the data is presented.

Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	DMC-122 Colorado Measurements of Academic Success (CMAs): English Language Arts and Mathematics Student Biographical Data (Review)	Pamela Amato

Overview: The Student Biographical Data Review process for Colorado Measurements of Academic Success allows districts to make updates to student biographical data that is used in public reports and for accountability purposes. The SBD review process is also a way that districts can provide invalidation codes for the WIDA assessment. Colorado statute requires that assessment's information be reported each school year. The information collected in the SBD Review Process for CMAs provides the assessment unit with the information needed to provide public reporting at the state level, district level and school level as well as in aggregated groupings as required by law. Data gathered during SBD review is also used by the Accountability Unit.		

Discussion: There will be stricter rules on how special accommodations will be reported. This is restricted in the actual SBD layout. This will not be a big burden to the districts who are filling this out. There are a lot of highlights due to the field name changes on the document. On pages 5 and 15, "Accommodation Type Used" is a new field. The valid values in the right hand column will be given to the districts. This will help Assessment and districts to determine whether or not the student had accommodations or not. Were you having an issue with districts reporting wrong? Yes, this is why this clarifying field was added. The confusion was where the student was, academically, as they were being tested for the English Language.		

Conclusion: Approved.		
5 Minutes	DMC-124 SAT/PSAT Student Biographical Data (Review)	Pamela Amato

Overview: The Student Biographical Data Review process for SAT/PSAT allows districts to make updates to student biographical data that is used in public reports and for accountability purposes. The SBD review process is also a way that districts can provide invalidation codes for the assessment. Colorado statute requires that assessments information be reported each school year. The information collected in the SBD Review Process for SAT/PSAT provides the assessment unit with the information needed to provide public reporting at the state level, district level and school level as well as in aggregated groupings as required by law. Data gathered during SBD review is also used by the Accountability Unit.		

Discussion: There were no major changes to this document. The highlighting on the document is just for field name changes.		

Conclusion: Approved.		
10 Minutes	P3O-105 Preschool and Kindergarten Stakeholder Focus Groups (New)	Megan Rogers, Kristy Cowers

Overview: The P-3 Department is partnering with the National P-3 Center at UCD to conduct focus groups to collect information on the implementation of Kindergarten, school readiness, partnerships within communities, and Preschool-K transitions. Voluntary participation will allow participants to share their experience and learn from others, while providing the state with valuable stakeholder feedback. Participants will include state funded Colorado Preschool Programs and school district kindergarten programs. The P-3 office is seeking stakeholder feedback on Initiatives currently impacting districts to inform future strategy and implementation. The focus will be on current practice, and how we, as a state system, can better support evidence-based practices, intentionally and systematically, within a mixed delivery system to ensure school readiness. This information will be combined with previous collections. The CDE will also complete a report for the Governor's office as part of a specific request made by the Governor's office. Notes for the focus groups will be taken in real time and stored on a secure, encrypted server hosted by University of Colorado Denver. No recording will occur. While participant job role will be collected, individual responses will not be linked to specific individuals and responses will be shared in aggregate form. The cost is currently being worked on to minimize the costs of travel and to reduce the time required for the focus groups by hosting groups virtually. Additionally, P-3 is working to answer questions and inform strategy across multiple initiatives to ensure it maximizes both district time and CDE/UCD's time. Data will be used to inform the P-3 office in planning for future support for districts and also statewide strategies. The focus groups will run about 60-90 minutes, and it will be voluntary. In order to reduce burden, they are looking to do these virtually.

Discussion: What do community partners look like? It can be council, private childcare providers, etc. This will help establish a relationship with the CPP providers. What is KEA on the last page? It should be KSR, Kindergarten School Readiness. On the back page, you should change the question to "What are the obstacles?" instead of "some". One more comment on the back page is, "Who.." questions seem a little vague. EDAC would suggest to clarify these questions more so you can get the correct information needed. Will the results be available? Yes, the information will be available. However, protecting identity will be important and will be looked at.

Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.

15 Minutes	NU-122 Community Eligibility Provision Notification Form (Review)	Benjamin Wetherbee

Overview: Every year, all districts are required to notify the state agency (School Nutrition Unit) of two totals as of April 1 for all sites operating the National School Lunch Program (NSLP): the total enrollment for each site, and the number of identified students at each site. These two numbers determine the site's eligibility for the Community Eligibility Provision for the following school year. The data is submitted in the secure system contracted through Cartewheel Technology Solutions. There is no PII involved in this data request, but the totals that are submitted are scrubbed for eligibility and then posted on the CDE website per federal regulation referenced above. The benefit of a school district that chooses to implement CEP could be invaluable to both the non-profit food service account at the district and, more importantly, to the students who benefit from the program's operation. Every child eats for free at no cost to the family. From April 1st to April 8th, it is open in their hub. There is no PII collected.

Discussion: It is difficult to identify students that fall within this category. If one child shows up on this list, and there are others that are in the same household as that student, those students will be eligible automatically. Documentation to back up these students is helpful, but it is not required. The most important thing to note that this is self-reported data so there are errors when reported. However, Nutrition Unit goes through this and double checks everything before the official submission.

Conclusion: Approved.

10 Minutes	NU-128 Independent Review of Applications (Review)	Benjamin Wetherbee

Overview: The IRA process is required by the USDA for sponsors that have demonstrated a high level of, or a risk for, certification errors based on data obtained during an Administrative Review. Sponsors with a high percentage of errors (5% - 10%) are required to have an individual, other than the original determining official, complete a second review of all submitted free and reduced-price applications to ensure they were processed correctly. Results of this second review are required to be sent to School Nutrition by November 15th and these results are sent to USDA. No PII is requested and no outside vendor is used. The sponsor completes the form and returns to School Nutrition via email. The largest cost is time spent completing the report by the sponsor and School Nutrition reviewing for accuracy and submitting to USDA. It is rare that schools have major errors. This is maybe less than 5 schools per year.

Discussion: There has been a ton of positive feedback from the USDA that Colorado is one of the best reporting states within the United States. Colorado is usually ahead of the game when it comes to reporting this data.

Conclusion:

5 Minutes	Report Card March Re-Envision Process	Brooke Robinson

Overview: 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. 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.

Discussion: March is usually the best time to collect this data with fewer fields. The decision to keep Report Card March during the March timeline was decided.

Conclusion: Highlight what has changed for next meeting when Report Card March comes to EDAC. Bring RCM to EDAC in April.

10 Minutes	PI-131 School Health Services Data (Review)	Sarah Mathew

Overview: This collection is completed to address increasingly complex health needs of students, school nurses and administrators to use student health conditions and health staffing data in order to achieve adequate school health supports. Health policy-related questions inform professional learning needs. School nurses currently collect health services data for use in districts. Our efforts help to standardize what is already being collected. By collecting consistent data at the state level, CDE can better support the student health needs of districts by offering a standardized format and process. The school nurses are the ones that report this data and are involved with the health information data collection for the district. There is no PII that is reported. This is important for districts as it shows how districts use Medicaid dollars. This data is how the money is brought into the state. This money goes to help all children.

Discussion: On item 1, is this the head count of the students, or where is this number pulled? This is the head count. On page 2, SIS is collected multiple times across various collections, so this is an area that CDE should only ask once. CDE will investigate for next year to remove this question from all collections except one source. CDE needs to figure out where it is required, if it is required in another collection. Brooke Robinson and Jan Petro will look into this.

Conclusion: Approved.

10 Minutes	OLU-107 Successor School Stakeholder Feedback Survey (New) LATE	Renee Martinez

Overview: The Successor School Stakeholder Feedback Survey is to be completed by those who are interested in providing feedback about the criteria, determination process, and SBE appeal process for online schools who have been deemed a successor school as outlined in SB19-129. It provides the opportunity to have a voice in the process. The Office of Online and Blended Learning will maintain the data collected in a confidential manner. No PII will be collected. It will be presented in a web format, probably a Google Doc. It will take about 3-5 minutes to complete.

Discussion: How will this information be used? It will be related to how they implement the process, or the "Other" box on the Review form. This is a brand new form, and it was passed this year last year, 2019. EDAC would like to see "What was successful about this process?" For future surveys, it may be best to add these types of questions. This is prior to the collection so these types of questions may not pertain to what needs to be asked. Will this be given to all districts and BOCES? Yes, this would be best to get as much information as possible. This document will be collected in a timeframe, by May 21st if possible. This will restrict on when we receive the survey. This will be a one-time only survey. The data will be housed in a CDE system and not a personal computer as mentioned on the form. The Attorney General is giving guidance on what CDE is proposing and will be sent with the survey. Should we wait to approve it until it is fully done and gone through the Attorney General? The survey is completed to a way that CDE can collect enough information.

Conclusion: Approved with minor changes.

10 Minutes	GFMU-203 Federal Competitive Fiscal Monitoring Doc (New)	Steven Kaleda

Overview: The Grants Fiscal Unit is federally required to complete risk assessment and monitor at least once per performance period for each grantee. The information that is collected is key in terms of determining risk factors in sub granting federal funds, ensure that CDE stays compliant with federal USDE as well as determining and ensuring appropriate use of federal funds. The costs are minimal for this. The sub-grantee already has all documentation to be reviewed. These 12 physical requirements will cover about 80% of grants.

Discussion: The consistency throughout the document is appreciated. It falls within the same outline as many documents districts receive.

Conclusion: Approved.