

Minutes

cde



Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

January 6, 2022
9:30 a.m.-12:05 p.m.

Colorado Talking Book Library
180 Sheridan Boulevard
Denver, CO 80226

Meeting called by:

Educational Data Advisory Committee

Type of meeting:

Scheduled Data Review Meeting

Facilitator:

DJ Loerzel

Note taker:

Peter Hoffman

Attendees:

Tamara Durbin (remote - nonvoting)	Lazlo Hunt (remote - nonvoting)
Curtis Lee (remote - nonvoting)	Mimi Livermore
Eric Mason	Michael McManus
Mina Parthasarathy (remote - nonvoting)	Andrew Pippen
Cheryl Taylor (remote - nonvoting)	
CDE:	
DJ Loerzel	Annette Severson
Peter Hoffman	Marcia Bohannon

Agenda topics

General Business

- Meeting Minutes November 6, 2022 - Approved
- EDAC Credit Renewal
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee
- Gender Category Update
 - Has Infinite Campus and other SIS updated their options? CDE will work with vendors as best it can to inform them of this change.
 - Should changes to collections in this field be brought as reviews or updates / does it need to be approved every time? EDAC consensus that it should just be a notification / update when it is only a change to the gender field.
- December 5, 2022 Emergency Review of PSF-CC03 Best Grant Application Approved
- For in person meetings, EDAC members must be present to vote. Reiterated that anyone can listen in to the public EDAC meetings.
 - Future EDAC meeting agendas to be made clearer on in person versus virtual
- EDAC Website – When will annual report be added to the website? EDAC members would like access to the agreed upon report.

Update Approvals – All Approved, with notes below.

- CGA-172 School Counselor Corps Grant
- CGA-206A Pathways in Technology Early College High School (PTECH) Addendum
 - Update to the director.
- CGA-249 Early Literacy Grant - Professional Development
- HAW-102 Report of Designated Personnel and Stock Epinephrine
- HAW-103 Epinephrine Administration and Anaphylaxis Reporting
- NU-153 Colorado Health Foundation Mini-Grant

50 Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Graduation Guidelines Discussion 	Reagan Ward, Robin Russel, Marie Huchton
------------	---	--

Overview:

See slides below.

Discussion:

What is the exact number of exceptions for graduates? The number is suppressed. What was the total number of graduates? Number cannot be given until the data is released publicly on January 10th.

Were any exceptions approved? Yes.

It was stated that it was asked to change type code, is it better to use the phrase required? This doesn't sound like a request; it sounds like a requirement to get past an error.

What happens with a student that was given a diploma from the district what happens with the state? The diploma is not taken away from the student – it just doesn't count toward graduation rates. Graduation rate is affected by the data collection and to students exit types.

Under the metric, if a district used only a capstone, would they be penalized? Yes, on a small level, it should have a minimal impact on a school. Is there a long term plan on finding a way to not penalize districts on this and look at the metrics? CDE is implementing the current legislation, however CDE thinks it is possible that in the upcoming years that this metric may not be up to the task and need to be reassessed.

The EDAC annual report has suggested a repeal or change to the Graduation Guidelines legislation. The list and metrics were set by a committee – not by legislation.

Can we separate the higher bar field out? This will help people understand that there are two pieces of legislation driving this data collection. One for the guidelines, one for the higher bar. Can we see a version with this separated out in the re-envision process? What was brought in September is based off the current legislation, and there is no way to separate higher bar out without adding fields which causes its own problems.

EDAC likes that there is a stakeholder group forming for the menu of options. There are issues of equity with graduation guidelines and the options a rural district may have. While collecting the data is great, EDAC still has issues, especially with the error code and the CDE determining if a student is a graduate. EDAC wishes that it was not tied to the entire Student Interchange.

Conclusion: Not Applicable

20 Minutes	STL-109 Colorado School Libraries Survey 2022-23	Amy Bahlenhorst, Suzi Tonini
------------	---	---------------------------------

Overview:

The Colorado State Library is surveying school library workers in Colorado in order to gain a better understanding of staffing, collections and services within them. The information shared will inform state and district decision-makers about the current state of school libraries in Colorado.

Right now, the CDE does not have a way to see what resources that school libraries have right now. This collection will provide insight into the services available in school libraries, and who needs support.

Should take respondents 10 minutes at most to complete, so the CDE estimates the impact to be low on day-to-day schedules.

Discussion: Is this going to all schools? CDE wants to send it to all public and private schools. Why is the survey asking for a student count with a link to where the data can be found. Since we are giving them the data, we don't need to ask for it. This field can easily be removed. Can this information be gained from other data sources? EDAC struggles with the purpose of this in general. Smaller districts likely need support, but larger ones probably have the resources already so the intent in purpose seems unclear. CDE feels this may not be the case – as personal experience within a larger district encountered a dissolution of library support. How will CDE be supporting these districts? Connecting districts to other districts, based off the information gained. EDAC is unsure how the questions in the survey would help set up these networks. The questions allow CDE to find which districts have certain resources, and what districts may lack those resources, and connect students with no access to larger collections. The survey gives an idea of what resources are there, and how CDE can support where needed.

Perhaps CDE should add a section on the expected outcome to the survey since it may not reach a librarian. If it is known for resource development and collaboration it may lead to a better response.

Conclusion: Approved with feedback – remove question on enrollment and add section on expected outcomes.

10 Minutes

DMC-134 Selection of Accountability Measures for Alternative Education Campuses School Performance Framework

B Sanders

Overview:

Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) have a specialized School Performance Framework (SPF). As part of this specialized SPF, AECs are allowed to submit optional measures based on local data. This form is the method by which AECs can submit their approved optional measure data to be reported in their AEC SPF (see State Board of Education Rules 1 CCR 301-57 for specific guidance on this policy).

Discussion: Is innovation an option? Yes. A correctional facility is slightly different – they could technically be and AEC but there would be no benefit. The biggest hurdle is not the submission, but getting the data from the AEC and getting the to understand the data, since there is a lot of turnover at AECs.

There is a lot of back and forth outside of the collection that is not apparent in the file layout. Should these collections come every time the measures are updated / changed? CDE hasn't in the past, but we can if EDAC feels its necessary. It would help if CDE let respondents know they have different measures to select from. The form should not limit the thinking of the respondents, if they see a list they think it is all they have to choose from. There should be better training on the flexibility that schools have on measures.

Conclusion: Approved

10 Minutes	DMC-135 Application of Designation as an Alternative Education Campus	B Sanders
<p>Overview: A school that wishes to be designated for the first time as an Alternative Education Campus or to renew its designation as an Alternative Education Campus must submit the following application verifying that the school meets eligibility criteria no later than April 29, 2023 as per C.R.S. 22-7-604.5 (2) (a) “A district school board for a public school that desires to be considered an alternative education campus pursuant to this section shall file with the state board a request for designation as an alternative education campus. The request shall be in a form approved by the state board and shall contain sufficient information to establish that the public school meets the requirements of the rules adopted pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section. The state board shall approve the designation of alternative education campus for any public school for which a request is filed pursuant to this subsection (2) that is found by the state board to meet the requirements of the rules adopted pursuant to paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section.”</p>		
<p>Discussion: See DMC-134.</p>		
<p>Conclusion: Approved</p>		
15 Minutes	DMC-116B READ Teacher Training Reporting	Whitney Hutton
<p>Overview: Colorado school districts must annually ensure that all K-3 teachers who provide literacy instruction, have completed evidence-based training in teaching reading as a result of changes to the Colorado READ Act in SB19-199. To receive READ Act funding, LEPs must submit evidence to the department that each teacher has completed the training by reporting the training option each individual teacher has completed. Teachers only need to complete the required training once and districts will not report teachers who were reported during the 22-23 reporting window.</p> <p>See summary report below.</p>		
<p>Discussion: It was hard with unions to get teachers to submit something when not required by the state. Districts do a lot of switching of teachers, which is going to cause a headache and waste of resources to track this information at the teacher level. Did any districts not participate? Three districts did not participate due to size and the funding level was not seen as worth it. There was a lot of confusion for staff that are not normally involved in the data submission process. The 2022-23 collection seemed to go as good as possible for what EDAC views as bad legislation.</p> <p>Change code 10 language to just say submitted to CDE to avoid confusion. EDAC appreciates the removal of the narrative.</p> <p>Did the READ act reduce any districts funding based on the results (ie if a certain percent of teachers did not complete the training)? No, it did not, districts got 100% of funding regardless of extensions. In the future CDE is unsure of what the impact may be if there are teachers that do not complete the training.</p>		
<p>Conclusion: Approved</p>		
10 Minutes	ADA-101 Request to Reconsider Feedback Survey	Aislinn Walsh
<p>Overview: To submit feedback on the updated 2022 request to reconsider process so CDE can make adjustments for 2023. Request to Reconsider is required per H.B. 18-1355 and in 2022 S.B. 22-137 enabled the state to offer an updated request to reconsider process to all schools and districts. Board rule 1 CCR 301-1 describes the requirements for a request to reconsider. This survey would provide needed feedback on this updated process.</p>		

Discussion: Could this survey be used to give a way to let districts submit concerns over students that showed growth but were not able to be submitted. Perhaps a question along the lines of “were you able to submit all of your data?” that would allow for districts to show students that would have changed the outcome.

This form goes to anyone that has expressed interest in this process.

Conclusion: Approved

5 Minutes

STS-103 21st CCLC Summer Supplemental Funding

Mandy Christensen

Overview:

In June 2022, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (BSCA) was signed into law. The BSCA awarded \$50 million to states for their 21st CCLC programs based on their regular 21st CCLC allocations for FY2022-23. Colorado was awarded an additional \$463,994 for its 21st CCLC programs.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (BSCA) promotes increased student engagement and attendance and emphasizes supplementary supports to existing subgrantees to provide or expand services to students. BSCA funds should be used by 21st CCLC programs to:

- Create a welcoming, safe, inclusive environment
- Support family engagement and provide family supports
- Promote strong connections with schools to allow continuity of supports
- Implement trauma-informed practices
- Establish mentoring programs built on strong relationships
- Provide relevant and engaging learning experiences

Discussion: This was as minimal as CDE could make it to get the information needed for the grant.

Conclusion: Approved



COLORADO
Department of Education

Graduation Guidelines File Reenvision

January 6, 2023

Agenda



- Review Reenvision Process
- Updates
- Data Usage
- Upcoming ReEnvision Topics

Reenvision Process

2023-2024 Graduation Guidelines File





EDAC has created a shared re-envision process to work collaboratively with the data collection leads and related subject matter experts, to address data collection concerns and should be instituted when EDAC identifies a collection that is challenging or for some reason is flagged as significantly contributing to district data burden. The process may also be initiated when/if EDAC's stamp recommendation is referred to the CDE executive team and the decision is overturned. The shared re-envision process may take one full year- 12 calendar months or more to complete. Data collection leads and/or related subject matter experts are expected to regularly attend EDAC meetings to hear concerns and prepare information for future meetings.

Reenvision Process: Timeline



Sample (from prior EDAC Reenvision Processes)

Concerns/ Provisional Approval	Obtain Basic Rule/ Regulation Data	New Collection Suggestions	Legal Review	EDAC Officially Deny	Collection to Executive Team	Follow-Up	Return to EDAC
EDAC Meeting <i>March</i>	Month 1 <i>April</i>	Month 2 <i>May</i>	Months 3-5 <i>June—Aug</i>	Month 6 <i>Sept</i>	Month 7 <i>Oct</i>	Months 8-11 <i>Nov—Feb</i>	Month 12 <i>March</i>

GG to date (2022-23 file focus with 2023-24 in mind)

EDAC request for more information	Special Meeting: GG data collection overview	DMC 106 documentation update with basic legislation for Graduation Guidelines	2022-23 provisional file review with initial data field reduction	Special Meeting: 2022-23 file approved and Legal Review
November/ December 2021	January 13, 2022	February 4, 2022 *vote to begin reenvision process	March 4, 2022 March 18, 2022	March 31, 2022

Graduation Guidelines Reenvision Timeline (2023-24 file)



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Concerns •Provisional Approval, •Basic Rule/Regulation Data •Legal Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •EDAC team input •Supporting COGNOS Reports •Data Field Review
January 2022-March 2022	April 29, 2022

Continued Research based upon EDAC team input & Legal Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Information from field •New File Layout Suggestions •Policy Review Recap 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Downstream use of data •SEY Collection Update 	2023-2024 GG File reflecting changes (w/DMC 106) to EDAC for approval
May 2022 — August 2022	September 2022	January 2023	February 2023

Updates



2021-2022 Student End of Year Collection Update

- Collection closed December 1, 2022
 - 2021-2022 Student Interchange closed
 - Student Demographic file
 - Student School Association file
 - Graduation Guidelines file
 - Adjustment file
- Data will be publicly released January 10, 2023



- 100% of districts submitted this required file for 2021-2022
- 32% of districts have uploaded a file for 2022-2023 thus far
 - Target date for initial upload will coincide with the 2022-2023 student end of year collection that opens in March 2023.
 - Districts are encouraged to upload early if they wish to utilize the COGNOS reports designed to support monitoring GG
- Webinar: Collaborative Monitoring of Graduation Guidelines
 - Held November 15, 2022
 - Data Respondents & Program staff directly invited and encouraged to share the invite with any interested district staff
 - Recording and PowerPoint are posted on the [Student End of Year](#) and [Graduation Guidelines](#) webpages
- Shared information with stakeholder groups as requested

Missing GG Exception Requests



- Exception Request: Request for a student to be counted as a graduate for the purpose of graduation rates even though they do not have reported GG data in one or more areas
- 7% (13) of districts requested at least one missing GG exception for review
- Exception requests were reviewed for 0.08% of possible graduates (Total AYG 2021 and AYG 2022 reported students plus AYG 2023 and beyond early graduates)
 - Requests reviewed on a case-by-case basis
 - Approximately 1/3 of requests could be reconciled with the current options and additional technical assistance
 - If a request was denied, districts were asked to change the exit type for the student in alignment with their district policy
 - Exit 92 non-diploma certificate of completion
 - Exit 40 dropout

Data Uses

Accountability Implications: PWR Indicator

Overview of Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness (PWR) measures

- PWR indicator currently includes:
 - Colorado SAT Achievement results
 - **Best-of 4-5-6-7 Year Graduation Rate** – *impacted by GG collection*
 - Dropout Rate
 - Matriculation rate (includes industry credentials and military enlistment)
- Legislatively required new measures:
 - **Meeting Higher Bar in ELA and Math**- *impacted by GG collection*
 - AP/IB/CE course completion for non-ELA or non-Math

Graduation Rate

- For AYG 2021 and beyond students must have reported graduation guidelines measures to be counted as a graduate
- State and federal accountability reporting uses the "Best Of" rate from amongst the 4, 5, 6, and 7-year graduation rates
- This means the impacts of grad guidelines reporting will phase in over time for the 1-year frameworks (blue shaded cells in the table below).

	AYG Cohorts Included in "Best of" Grad Rate			
Framework Year	4-Year	5-Year	6-Year	7-Year
Fall 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019	AYG 2018
Fall 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019
Fall 2024	AYG 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020
Fall 2025	AYG 2024	AYG 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021

Graduation Rate (continued)

- 3-year aggregate graduation rates have also historically been reported, but were suspended in 2022 due to the pandemic
- Decisions are still pending, but grad guideline impacts will likely phase in even more slowly for 3-year aggregations

Framework Year	AYG Cohorts Included in "Best of" Grad Rate			
	4-Year	5-Year	6-Year	7-Year
Fall 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019	AYG 2018
Fall 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019
	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019	AYG 2018
	AYG 2020	AYG 2019	AYG 2018	AYG 2017
Fall 2024	AYG 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020
	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019
	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019	AYG 2018
Fall 2025	AYG 2024	AYG 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021
	AGY 2023	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020
	AYG 2022	AYG 2021	AYG 2020	AYG 2019



Planned Impact: New Higher Bar Metric

- SB17-272 required the addition of a new state accountability metric as part of the PWR indicator.
 - Proportion of students meeting higher achievement levels in ELA and Math, as defined by the State Board, on certain graduation guidelines measures (Accuplacer, ACT, ACT Work Keys, AP, ASVAB, Concurrent Enrollment, IB, SAT).
- Data will come from grad guidelines collection as well as available vendors
- CDE is currently consulting with the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) to operationalize this metric and determine how it will be incorporated into the frameworks
- Planning to include for informational purposes in fall 2023 frameworks, and for points in 2024

Planned Impact: New Higher Bar Metric (cont.)

Measure	Higher Bar & PWR Diploma Endorsement Cut Scores	
	Reading, Writing & Communicating	Mathematics
ACCUPLACER Classic	80 Reading Comprehension or 95 Sentence Skills	85 Elementary Algebra
ACCUPLACER Next Generation	246 Writing	265 Arithmetic or 240 Quantitative Reasoning or Advanced Algebra
ACT	18 ACT English	22 ACT Math
ACT WorkKeys	Silver	Silver

Planned Impact: New Higher Bar Metric (cont.)

Measure	Higher Bar & PWR Diploma Endorsement Cut Scores	
	Reading, Writing & Communicating	Mathematics
Advanced Placement (AP)	3	3
ASVAB	50	50
Concurrent Enrollment (credit bearing course)	Passing grade of C or higher	Passing grade of C or higher
International Baccalaureate (IB)	4	4
SAT	480	530

Decision Making & Learning

Planned PWR unit next steps



- The State Board of Education requested a review of the Menu of Options after the completion of the first year of the full implementation of Graduation Guidelines (2021-2022).
- Beginning in 2023, a stakeholder group will review the collected data and consider possible updates to the menu, based on input from district and school leaders and psychometricians, advocacy groups, students and parents, and community and business leaders.
- CDE will make a recommendation for any updates to the state board in 2024.

Upcoming Reenvision Topics

Upcoming Reenvision Topics



- February EDAC meeting
 - 2023-2024 DMC 106 presented for review
 - Includes 2023-2024 Graduation Guidelines file
 - SEY collection final status

Questions?



COLORADO
Department of Education

Education Data Advisory Committee 2022-2023 READ Data Report

Table of Contents



For digital format only: Use the links below to jump to different sections of the report, or use your right or sidebar scroll to move through the report sequentially.

<u>Summary</u>	3
<u>Support Provided</u>	4
<u>Process Analysis</u>	5
<u>EDAC Q&A</u>	5
<u>Related Statute</u>	6
<u>Planned Improvements</u>	7
<u>Data Reporting Changes</u>	8
<u>CDE Outreach & Support Schedule</u>	9
<u>January Checklist for LEPs</u>	10

Summary Report

Summary

For the 2022-2023 READ Act Teacher Training data collection, 15,000 professionals completed the training and were validated through an internal review process or from LEP-provided Evidence of Completion (EOC).

Local Education Providers (LEPs) reported staff as having completed the training whose evidence came back as invalidated. This means, the CDE had no record in the Colorado Online Licensing system (COOL) that individuals met the training requirement. These individuals were automatically placed into a data review cycle and assigned an individual data review consultant to support the LEP in submitting EOC.

During the review, the CDE noted several trending issues that contributed to the number of invalidated/erroneous reports of educators listed as having completed the training. While the majority of these individuals had, indeed, met the training requirements, they neglected to successfully add their evidence to the COOL data base attached to their license. This user-end error resulted in LEPs reporting the training requirement as met, however the evidence was never submitted to the CDE by the educators or by the LEP. While this was not the only reason for errors in LEP reporting, it did account for a large percentage of errors.

Complicating the process, several LEPs did not have a system in place for storing and collecting EOC from their staff for the purpose of providing it to the CDE. This, understandably, resulted in additional pressure on the individuals responsible for submitting EOC to the CDE. The CDE noted that many of the individuals responsible for submitting districts' EOC were not necessarily the same individuals receiving outgoing communication on the collection process.

Additional delays were observed by LEPs who were unaware of deadlines, struggling to log and submit data, and who were facing staffing issues impacting their data submission.

To address these data submission issues, the CDE data review team conducted a courtesy search of EOC for educators and LEPs. This helped mitigate the number of individuals LEPs needed to provide EOC for to the CDE, reducing the number of LEP-submitted EOC to only the individuals the CDE could not validate using internal systems.

The CDE recognizes areas of improvement and actions that the department can take to streamline the internal validation process and broaden our communication efforts. The CDE has also identified recommendations for LEPs on key actions they can take to ensure their own systems are built for the READ Teacher Training data collection and submission process moving forward.



CDE Support Summary

For the READ Act Teacher Training collection, CDE developed an internal review team to validate any Evidence of Completion (EOC) provided by LEPs and to review any Good Cause Extension (GCE) before submitting it to the State Board of Education.

During the review process, it became apparent that more personalized support for LEPs was needed. The CDE data review team members began providing 1:1 support for LEPs with the primary goal of moving them forward in the data collection process and getting them closer to funding-eligible status.

The CDE began running courtesy checks on their internal systems to find EOC for LEPs as opposed to LEPs providing the evidence as written in statute. Because of a large number of educators completed the CDE trainings, this resolved many LEPs who had invalidated data. However, the CDE does not have the capacity to validate the training pathways outside of their control, and LEPs were still responsible for providing EOC to the CDE for individuals who met the READ Act training requirements using pathways outside of the CDE systems.

The CDE provided 1:1 technology support and targeted outreach to LEPs who had not met submission deadlines, as this was the necessary first step in the review process.

Support Delivery



**Data Pipeline & Cognos
Technical Support**



**1:1 Email Support
w/ LEP-Assigned
CDE Consultant**



**1:1 Phone Support
w/ LEP-Assigned
CDE Consultant**



**Direct Outreach to
Superintendents &
Data Approvers**



**Budget support for
multiple funding
collections**



**Instructional
materials on process
and reporting**



**Asynchronous
Recorded Webinars**



**Synchronous
Webinars w/
Interactive FAQ**



[Return to TOC](#)

Process Analysis

Internal Process Analysis

As part of our continued dedication to supporting Local Education Providers throughout the state, the CDE conducted an internal process analysis of the inaugural year of READ Teacher Training Data collection. The analysis includes feedback from LEP personnel, the data review team, and superintendents.

This process resulted in several key areas of improvement recommendations for both the CDE and LEPs that are likely to result in improved systems for the 2023-2024 collections. These recommendations are detailed on page 7 of this report.

EDAC Questions & Answers

Q: Why can't this be a part of the HR Report?

EDAC has expressed concern that this collection should be part of the HR report, as the data is more applicable to the work done in Human Resources as opposed to READ Data Respondents.

A: Unfortunately, this collection cannot be a part of the HR reporting due to timing and funding alignment.

For example, if we were to align the HR reporting with the READ Data collection, LEPs would not receive funding until late spring. Current school-year HR Reports are not updated until the beginning of the calendar year, whereas teachers are expected to have the training before they begin teaching for the school year in the fall.

Q: Can this process be a separate snapshot?

The CDE would like more clarification on what EDAC is asking. The CDE is currently working on ways to streamline the READ Act Data collection process so it more closely mirrors other data collections.

A: This question will be addressed in person following more clarification.



[SB 19-199 PDF](#)

[READ Act Rule PDF](#)

22-7-1210.5. Per-pupil intervention money - uses - distribution - monitoring - repeal.

(3) (a) At the beginning of each budget year, the department shall distribute to a local education provider that meets the requirements specified in subsection (3)(b) of this section the amount of per-pupil intervention money calculated for the local education provider pursuant to subsection (1) of this section for the applicable budget year.

(b) To receive per-pupil intervention money in a budget year, a local education provider must meet the following requirements: (I) The local education provider must submit the information described in subsection (2) of this section and in section 22-7-1213 (2); (II) For the 2022-23 budget year and budget years thereafter, the local education provider must submit evidence that it is in compliance with the teacher training requirements specified in section 22-7-1208 (6); (II.5)

Planned Improvements

Local Education Provider (LEP) Recommendations

1. Develop an internal system and process for tracking, collecting, storing, and naming conventions for all staff who have completed the training requirements, regardless of the grade level they teach or position they hold.
2. Ensure staff who have completed the training requirements have successfully added the READ Act designation to their Colorado Online Licensing Accounts (COOL).
3. Ensure the Data-Approver information for your LEP is updated and accurate. This person is the key point of contact for outgoing CDE communication on the process.
4. Create a Professional Development plan for the individual(s) responsible for the data collection. Town Hall, Webinars, and Office Hours will be offered throughout the year to answer questions, model the process, and to announce important updates and check-points leading up to the submission deadline.
5. Submit data collections by the deadline, allowing an adequate time buffer for problem solving should your data have invalidated information.

Colorado Department of Education Planned Improvements

1. Develop a validation process for the internal systems the CDE has access to that occurs before data can be locked.
2. Provide professional development and outreach to data approvers and the field that focuses on meeting recommended targets throughout the year.
3. Adjust READ Data codes to simplify the data reporting process for LEPs.
4. Improve outgoing communication and provide reports specific to:
 - a. Any 2021-2022 professionals who were granted Good Cause Extension and must be reported in the 2023-2024 school year
 - b. Any staff who are newly hired and/or are changing to K-3 grade levels and must meet training requirement
5. Offer increased live support for LEPs via Zoom before submission deadline.
6. Adhere to submission deadlines to ensure timely funding to all LEPs.
7. Improve the EOC submission process for LEPs needing to submit EOC on the behalf of their staff persons.



Data Reporting Changes

Recommended Reporting Changes for 2023-2024

1. Update the Staff's Primary Grade Level category to include a reporting option for staff who do not teach a specific grade level or who provide literacy instruction to multiple K-3 grade levels:

Staff's Primary K-3 Grade Level - Grade primarily served by the educator (most classes/class time). Code 000 should be used for staff who are administrative and do not provide literacy instruction.

TBD	Not a teacher
007	Kindergarten
010	Grade 1
020	Grade 2
030	Grade 3
TBD	Multiple grade levels

2. Remove code 11 in the Staff's Teacher Training Status category to alleviate reporting confusion and to simplify the reporting process.

Staff's Teacher Training Status – Required for all K-3 educators. Educators need to only complete one of the options to meet the training requirement. For a teacher to successfully meet the requirement, they must have passed an end of course assessment of learning. Please select the training option that the individual educator completed. If the educator has not yet completed the READ training and is newly hired, use code 12. If the educator has not completed the READ training for another reason, use code 13, however additional information is required in the next data element.



10	Yes, evidence has been submitted by the educator to CDE via COOL or Secure Transfer , confirming the completion of a CDE approved, evidence-based training in teaching reading and passing the end of course assessment.
11	Yes, evidence has been submitted by the district to CDE via Syncplicity, confirming the completion of a CDE approved, evidence-based training in teaching reading and passing the end of course assessment.
12	No, this educator did not complete the training as they were newly hired after the required deadline.
13	No, this educator did not complete the training due to another reason other than being newly hired. (Note that usage of this code should be very limited and over-use will cause an error.)

3. Replace narrative category with an auto-populated list that aligns with CDE reporting to the State Board of Education:

~~**Staff's Teacher Training Not Complete Narrative**—Required for any educator who is coded as 13 in the above data element. Please provide a narrative explanation for why the educator has not completed required teacher training (250 character limit).~~

Staff's Teacher Training Not Complete Status Code – Required for any educator who is coded as a 13 in the above data element. Please select the reason for why the educator has not completed the required teacher training.

01	Human Resources Leave of Absence
02	Medical - FMLA
03	Natural Disaster
04	Did Not Complete



CDE Outreach and Support Schedule

Recommended Timelines

The CDE is running a concurrent improvement and implementation plan for the 2023-2024 school year. A high-level overview and support schedule is being shared now. Each month, more detailed guidance and information will be distributed by the CDE for the purpose of supporting LEPs who are ready to develop systems and begin preparing for data submissions.

It is important to note that dates and the timeline are recommendations only, and that adjustments are to be expected as our data system improvements may also impact information the CDE shares.

The CDE will be publishing materials LEPs can use to help ensure they are prepared and on-track for the data collection system in January of 2023. LEPs can expect more detailed guidance each month. A checklist for January 2023 is provided on page 10 of this document.

2023 Optional LEP Recommendations for the READ Act Teacher Training Submission

January

Systems Development & CDE contact/communication channels in place
Introducing the GCE report

February

Pulling the Good Cause Extension (GCE) report
Adding new staff and newly assigned K-3 teachers
Teacher Training registration deadlines (CDE)

March

Kickoff to spring data reports
CDE Recommended Timeline Tool
Checking the GCE report

April

CDE Recommended Timeline Tool
Reporting Codes: Focus New staff, newly assigned K-3 Teachers

May

HR/Data Export
Preparing for Summer/Fall deadlines on data reporting

