

ESEA Committee of Practitioners (CoP)
September 22, 2016
11th Floor Aspen Room – 1560 Broadway, Denver, CO, 80202

Committee Members:

Jesús Escárcega, Mary Ellen Good, Arlene Salyards, Roy Holloway, John McKay, Amy Beruan, Mitzi Swiatkowski, Lynn Kintz, Bridgette Muse, Jessica Martinez, Clint Allison, Miles Pimentel (for Dawn Roedel), Lori Cooper, Laura Gorman, Clare Vickland, Lucinda Long-Webb, Amy Spruce (phone), Lynn Mather (phone), Myra Westfall (phone), Tracy Thatcher (phone)

Guests:

Valerie Bass, Joshua Shoemaker, Kay Bridges, Moses Regidor

CDE Representatives:

Brad Bylsma, Pat Chapman, Jeff Klein, Stacy Goodman, Jennifer Simons, Lynn Bamberry, Robert Hawkins, Dana Scott, Linnea Hulshof, Lulu Buck, Shelby Schaefer, Rebekah Ottenbreit, DeLilah Collins

The meeting was called to order by chairman, Jesús Escárcega at 10:00 a.m.

Chair Escárcega introduced a discussion of the minutes from the September 8 meeting.

- Amy Beruan made a motion to approve the minutes as written.
- Clint Allison seconded the motion.
- ***The motion passed by a unanimous vote – the updated September 8 meeting minutes were approved.***

Brad Bylsma introduced a discussion about the proposed local educational agency (LEA) questions for the Consolidated Application. This item was a follow-up to the work session from the September 8 meeting. CDE solicited feedback from those present:

- Questions are getting better – more clear and easier to understand and plan for, but the information in the “considerations” column and how it should be used needs to be clarified
- Title III questions are clear and other sections can emulate them
- Some questions seem repetitive
- Focus on family partnerships seems to be missing from proposed questions
- Avoid negative wording, such as “describe how an LEA will address” – the implication is that all LEAs are failing to meet an expectation
- Clarify difference between Title I-A neglected and Delinquent Set-Aside and Title I-D and the expectations for applicants
- Format of prompts is inconsistent and not all items are questions (describe vs. how)
- Questions were brought up about the necessity of some questions and if there was a statutory requirement for them to be included
- Clarify level of specificity needed to adequately respond to questions

- Provide examples of appropriate responses
- Include a rubric if possible so applicants can gauge development of responses and anticipate how they will be evaluated
- Connect Consolidated Application questions to monitoring indicators
- Questions arose about unaddressed areas such as financial requirements. CDE responded that the items being discussed related to the LEA plan requirements in ESSA, but were not inclusive of all information that would be collected in the application or required throughout the year.

Jennifer Simons presented sample sections of a self-assessment and a program review tool that the Federal Programs Unit at CDE is developing. CDE solicited feedback from those present:

- In response to a question about the frequency of conducting a self-assessment, participants suggested once every three years
- Ensure alignment between the self-assessment indicators and the Consolidated Application
- Provide the self-assessment in electronic format
- Some LEAs may struggle to complete the self-assessment as the relevant work happens in various departments throughout an agency

Lisa Medler provided an update on the work of the School Improvement Spoke Committee.

- Participants asked about the definition of research-based in the statutory requirements for school improvement strategies
 - They also asked if CDE would be providing sources of research to support the field
- The group discussed the role of ESEA funds and school improvement funds in particular and the relationship to an LEAs total budget
 - Many practitioners did not know the percentage of total funds that come from ESEA programs, but noted it was likely below 15% and that there is a disconnect between funds provided and program requirements
- Participants asked that CDE differentiate expectations for rural and metro districts
- Participants requested resources that are proving to be effective around Colorado, based on demographics of schools and communities
- Participants suggested that CDE's role should be supportive and should assist LEA's to be critical of themselves, rather than state-level monitoring
 - Build trust and promote further engagement
- CDE should work to make connections between districts facing similar challenges
- Turnaround Leaders Grant is competitive and eliminates some of the neediest schools and districts
 - Participants asked for supports that are available to all, not based on competition for funds
- CDE should provide more support to grant applicants, including samples of successful applications
- LEAs and schools need supports before they are identified for more intensive state supports

- Family partnership strategies, including welcome centers, were proposed as a school improvement strategy
 - Examples were provided of LEAs that set money aside for refugee community supports and an LEA that uses their 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant for parent welcome centers on weekends

Meeting was adjourned at 2:30