

# Minutes

cde



# Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

September 4, 2020  
9:30 a.m. -11:45 a.m.  
Virtual Meeting

|                           |                                   |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Meeting called by:</b> | Education Data Advisory Committee |
| <b>Type of meeting:</b>   | Scheduled Data Review Meeting     |
| <b>Facilitator:</b>       | Jan Rose Petro                    |
| <b>Note taker:</b>        | Genevieve Hale                    |
| <b>Timekeeper:</b>        |                                   |

|                   |                           |                            |
|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Attendees:</b> | Lori Benton (by phone)    | Cheryl Taylor (by phone)   |
|                   | Janice Cook (by phone)    | Marcia Bohannon (by phone) |
|                   | Lazlo Hunt (by phone)     | Jan Rose Petro (by phone)  |
|                   | Patrick Mount (by phone)  | Genevieve Hale (by phone)  |
|                   | Andrew Pippin (by phone)  |                            |
|                   | Loraine Saffer (by phone) |                            |
|                   |                           |                            |
|                   |                           |                            |

## Agenda topics

### General Business

- Welcome to New Members-skipped as no new members in attendance that day
- Meeting Minutes 5-June-20-Approved
- 2019-20 EDAC Annual Report-Committee continued to work on/discuss report. Janice Cook will help edit report to send again to committee for October 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Need to clarify that 70% turnover rate is for membership. Might want to mention diversity of membership in accomplishments section. Maybe should add that committee will work with CDE staff using the EDAC forms to streamline them and to make them more user friendly. Mention launching the biennial pilot and monitor for effectiveness in future focus areas section. It was noted that the principal prep survey has not yet been taken out of legislation. This will be left in the report this year but follow up needed. Conversation about providing data governance advice for the SLDS program. Perhaps put in pie chart for mandatory, voluntary, etc. collections. Discussion about reviewing next month's upcoming collections in advance to see if any need to be pulled for further review of legislative intent. Committee thought it better to provide generalized suggestions for CDE and for legislature on how to streamline collections rather than listing out specifics of how in special section.

- Discussion about 20-21 EDAC Meeting Calendar-Calendar was approved. January meeting will be the 15<sup>th</sup> due to holidays.
- Late Item Submissions **(MARKED IN RED)**
- EDAC Credit Renewal
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee-Nothing for this committee from EDAC
- Draft Survey-This survey was from the Schools of Choice Office that had to go out quickly so asked for approval and to discuss with EDAC. This survey is to evaluate need to assist in planning for devices and services that are likely becoming available for charter schools. It would help to collect the data in the next week or so that they would have good information to estimate how many devices of the overall count should be set aside for charter schools vs. districts and also to keep as a buffer to respond to a high need area. Jan reviewed the survey and gave suggestions and the survey was sent out. It was received by charter schools the weekend before this EDAC meeting. Did not get a stamp. This survey was to ensure that charter schools would have access to hot spots as well. It is not known who the recipients were for the survey but may have gone to heads of schools or their leadership.
- Next meeting (Oct 2<sup>nd</sup>) there will be a discussion of the EDAC Biennial Process. There will be four individuals from three CDE units. Jan has drafted a proposed application to go out to these CDE individuals for their comments/feedback prior to the next EDAC meeting. This proposed application will be discussed at next meeting.
- Helpful/Hurdle Comments on EDAC forms-What should committee focus on to improve work of EDAC? For the most part it was commented on that EDAC is helpful but also for repetitive collections how can collections be streamlined. Comments reflected discussions in spring meeting, to reduce number of times CDE staff have to reappear in front of committee. Maybe biennial review process for certain collections. Will bring in CDE people who had comments to talk to EDAC in November. EDAC committee might want to have a response such as piloting a biennial process this year.

### Update Approval

- CGA-228 School Health Professional Grant Evaluation-**Approved**
- CGA-235 Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI) Grant-**Approved**
- DPSE-126 Colorado Student Re-engagement Grant Program-**Approved**
- DPSE-138 Educational Stability Grant Program-**Approved**
- ESL-116 Medicaid School Health Annual Report-**Approved**
- NU-132-Administrative Review Survey-**Approved**
- OFP-134 ESEA Consolidated Grants Final Expenditure Report-**Approved**
- OPR-104 High School Learning Opportunities Program-**Approved**
- PI-110-Healthy Kids Colorado Survey-**Approved**

### State Board Rules

- 3 notices of rulemaking for: 1 CCR 301-52, 1 CCR 301-58, and 1 CCR 301-70 for the September SBE meeting, scheduled for 11:15 on September 10, 2020. The attached memo is in regard to all three rules, as they are being asked to have these repealed. If the board votes to proceed, the hearings will be held in November.

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.

DMC-103 Data Pipeline Directory (Review)

Debbie Puccetti

**Overview:** SB20-081 states that each school district and/or high school designate a name and contact information for at least one Apprenticeship Training Program contact person. This position in Directory will be titled “Work Based Learning Coordinator”

**Discussion:** The directory is a collection in which districts submit a variety of information and this is up for full review as there's been a change in a new state bill (listed above) in which there needs to be a contact for the Apprenticeship Training Program. Collection lead wants to add this additional field to the directory collection. Each district decides who would be assigned (could be an existing employee). There were no questions.

**Conclusion:** Approved

**10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.**

**DMC-125 Non-Public School Information  
(Review)**

**Debbie Puccetti**

**Overview:** Per C.R.S. 22-1-114 it is requested once per year that non-public schools report the name, address and grade along with the number of students enrolled in each grade. We collect all of this information through a manual process - sending out a hard copy to the nonpublic school, in which they complete and send to the school district. The school district then enters the information into the Non-Public School Directory. The information collected in this once a year Non-Public School Fall Report was used during the COVID-19 Pandemic to share important communication to the non-public schools regarding the benefits available through the CARES act, in addition to this the Governor's mask project in which non-public schools were able to receive mask for all staff members. It was during this pandemic that we realized that not enough information is collected in order to provide the non-public schools with accurate information and resources should a disaster, pandemic or other major historical event occur. Every other year the National Center for Education Statistics conducts the Private School Survey. Two of the fields that are requested in this non-public school survey are not collected in the state of Colorado. We would like to add the following fields to the Non-Public School Fall Report:

- Non-Public school email address
- Non-Public school Principal or Director phone number
- Non-Public school Principal or Director email address

These fields would facilitate direct communication to the non-public schools should a disaster strike again. The school email address could negate the use of sending a hard copy of the Non-Public School Fall Report, thus the non-public school could complete the student enrollment via an electronic form that could be included within the email. Thus, saving the state money as well streamlining the gathering of data from the non-public school.

**Discussion:** This is in law as well. The grade levels for each non-public school are reported to CDE each fall. This has been used extensively this year due to COVID-19 for non-public schools to know to go to their area districts to get masks for staff and also so that the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) can collect information for a voluntary survey which CDE participates in. Additional fields are needed. CDE would like to add a few fields such as for a historical event as well school email address, principal; or director's phone number, principal's; or director's email address, LEA's email address. Right now the survey is laborious and manual by non-public schools receiving a paper survey via U.S. postal mail and then the non-public school fills out the paper form and sends the form. Would like to add the fields so then the non-public schools could fill out the surveys and then use email. This would not occur until 20-21 school year. CDE must send out the non-public school forms (mandatory) but the non-public schools are not required to fill out the forms. Members were supportive of automating the survey rather than sending the survey via U.S. Postal mail.

**Conclusion:** Approved

|                         |   |                  |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|
| 11:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m. | New-GE-101 BOCES and GE Quality Program Assessment Rubrics (Review) | Rebecca McKinney |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|

**Overview:**

An assessment of gifted program quality is required by ECEA rules to be a part of the 5 year gifted education monitoring cycle. Please note one form is designed for single district AUs and the other is designed with BOCES in mind. BOCES gifted leaders helped in the development of the BOCES form.

**Discussion:** Developed as revamping monitoring process. The GT Office staff are mandated to have a program quality assessment. This is a self-evaluation that coordinators/directors will complete the year they are being monitored. On average the GT Office monitors 12-13 Administrative Units (AUs) per year so a district would only be monitored using these rubrics every five years. Will be used as part of onsite monitoring conversations but not issuing findings around these particular documents. Modeled after 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grants rubrics. Some minor edits will be made to document. Developed two rubrics because there are differences between single AUs and BOCES. First year of rolling this out so there may be changes in the future based on feedback from the field. Committee thought the documents were comprehensive but had brevity. They liked the format of the documents.

**Conclusion:** Approved

|                         |   |                  |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|
| 11:15 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. | New-GE-102 MCR Action Plan Completion Form (Review) | Rebecca McKinney |
|-------------------------|---|------------------|

**Overview:**

When an AU completes the required gifted education monitoring and if they have areas out of compliance, they will build a plan to address the areas within their required Comprehensive Program Plan. Once the AU feels they are in compliance, they will complete the form for the monitoring team to review and update records regarding compliance. This is replacing a One Year Improvement timeline and any additional timelines that would need to be developed. This new process reduces the burden on the AU gifted director.

**Discussion:** This form is part of the revamped monitoring process. Eliminated the need for the one-year improvement timeline after a monitoring. This form is for AUs to demonstrate compliance. Instead of writing a strategic plan this form is used to demonstrate compliance. Only needs to be completed if AU is found out of compliance at monitoring visit. This is a quick accountability form. There were no questions from EDAC committee.

**Conclusion:** Approved

|   |  |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| 11:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.   | <b>New-OPR-104A-Innovative Learning Opportunity Pilot Program LEP Annual Report was incorrectly listed on agenda as PWR-105-Innovative Learning Opportunity Pilot Program LEP Annual Report (Review)</b> | <b>Andy Tucker</b>              |
| <p><b>Overview:</b><br/>LEPs that are selected to participate in this program are allowed to count their students that are enrolled in grades nine through twelve and are participating in innovative learning opportunities as full-time pupils, regardless of the actual number of teacher-pupil instruction hours and teacher-pupil contact hours for each pupil.</p>  |  |                                 |
| <p><b>Discussion:</b> This is a new program for this school year. It provides Local Education Providers (LEPS) the opportunity to develop plans for students to have out of classroom experiential learning options. Any student who is enrolled in an approved ILOP program gets full time PPR. The report is required by statute. EDAC liked the form and how to track the program. There is a technical assistance provider to help with collecting this data from districts.</p>  |  |                                 |
| <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Approved</p>  |  |                                 |
| 11:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.   | <b>New-CGA-206A -P-TECH Annual Report was incorrectly listed on agenda as PWR-106 P-TECH Annual Report (Review)</b>  | <b>Andy Tucker</b>              |
| <p><b>Overview:</b><br/>P-TECH schools and programs (in existing high schools) can receive full-time PPR for their students for the 5th and 6th years of high school. Positive progression of each school's/program's students to high school graduation and attainment of an industry-recognized associate degree, in addition to gaining relevant workplace skills, is required for P-TECHs to receive this additional PPR.</p>   |  |                                 |
| <p><b>Discussion:</b> P-TECHS were approved a number of years ago in statute. This model was developed by IBM as a workforce development strategy. The first P-TECH in Colorado was in Longmont. Requires that the Local Education Providers (LEPs) partner with higher education institutions and a workforce partner. There is up to 6 years of funding for the student in order to provide them with a high school diploma, an industry accepted associates degree and work-based training. There are 9 P-Techs in the state. This is the reporting requirements for those approved P-Techs. Information will go out to these programs from Postsecondary Office about how to submit this data. This report is going to EDAC the first time this year.</p> |  |                                 |
| <p><b>Conclusion:</b> Approved</p>  |  |                                 |
| 12:00 p.m. – 12:15 p.m.   | <b>DMC-106 Data Pipeline Student Interchange (Review)</b>  | <b>Jesse Cooper/Andy Tucker</b> |
| <p><b>Overview:</b> The student interchange is required for state and federal reporting. Data in the student interchange is used to determine funding and graduating, dropout, and mobility/stability rates.</p>  |  |                                 |

**Discussion:** In July the State Board of Education voted to provide flexibility for the Graduation Guidelines for the menu of options for the class of 20-21. It now allows local education agencies for this class to have a local measure to show college/career readiness for both English/Math going into full effect for class of 2022. Needed to add a 12<sup>th</sup> measure so that districts can report kids meeting local measure in English/Math. This is only for the class of 20-21 and not beyond. This allow data respondents to report students as graduated via those local measures. There are 3 accepted values in this modification of the Graduation Guidelines in the student interchange file. Question about when report is due. This is due as part of the Student End of Year collection by September of 2021.

**Conclusion:** Approved

12:15 p.m. – 12:30 p.m.

**SPS-135 Adjustments to READ requirements for UIP**

**Susan Barrett/Andreia Simon**

**Overview:** The Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) streamlines federal and state improvement planning requirements for schools and districts. The programs include state accountability, ESSA accountability (e.g. comprehensive support), READ Act, Gifted Program, and several grants (e.g., 21st Century Community Learning Centers, EASI school improvement grant application including Diagnostic Review and Planning, Turnaround Network, Connect for Success, Pathways Grant, State Turnaround Leaders). The 2019 updates to the READ Act (SB19-199) require that districts report their K-3 instructional literacy programs by school and grade level beginning in the 2020-21 school year. In addition, districts that use READ Act money and/or Early Literacy Grant funding for teacher professional development must provide information on how their PD plan aligns to science-backed literacy instruction. This requirement is annual, regardless of whether districts are eligible for biennial UIP flexibility.

**Discussion:** In 2019 passed SB19-199 which include additional reporting requirements (see overview above). Districts need to report by school and grade level. Worked with units across CDE to develop this template for districts to report this information and attach to their Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). Reached out to districts to get feedback about barriers and how to best gather the information. Committee asked if there would be guidance about what would be placed in the professional development (PD) plan. CDE staff suggests that districts report their PD in the body of the UIP plan. Districts beginning this year are required to submit in their budget plan any plan to spend READ Act funds. EDAC committee had question if this is duplicate work. CDE staff will look into this question of duplicative work or not.

**Conclusion:** Asked to return to October 2<sup>nd</sup> EDAC Meeting. Committee will vote then.