

# Minutes

cde



# Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

March 4, 2022  
9:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.  
Virtual Meeting

Meeting called by:

Educational Data Advisory Committee

Type of meeting:

Scheduled Data Review Meeting

Facilitator:

Jan Petro

Note taker:

Peter Hoffman

Attendees:

Janice Cook	Lazlo Hunt
Mimi Livermore	Eric Mason
Patrick Mount	Mina Parthasarathy
Cheryl Taylor	
CDE:	
Jan Petro	Marcia Bohannon
Peter Hoffman	Annette Severson

## Agenda topics

### General Business

- Meeting Minutes February 4, 2022 - Approved
- Tentatively Scheduled May Collections – EDAC Requests that the collection type (Mandatory / Required to Obtain Benefit / Voluntary) information be added to this item in the future.
- Late Item Submissions (**MARKED IN RED**)
- EDAC Credit Renewal
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee
- EDAC Sunset Hearing Discussion - EDAC Sunset Hearing rescheduled for March 17th at 1:30pm. Eric was able to speak to education committee to support removal of sunset provision. A member of the education committee asked the question if this would be helpful or if EDAC would like the opportunity to view legislation before it is moved into vote – EDAC would provide a data advisory note. Eric responded that this would be extremely helpful. The education committee did take this into account, and this may be added into the provision. Education committee was advised to remove sunset provision and that EDAC would just exist until repealed.

What is CDE's recommendation for sunset clause? State board has not taken a position on the sunset clause for EDAC. Previously, we have asked to extend the sunset for more years but would prefer if the sunset provision was removed.

- Open meeting law training will be held at the May 6<sup>th</sup> EDAC meeting. The Attorney General's office will provide training on this topic that will take approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour.
- Biennial Schedule Discussion - Biennial schedule - every collection comes every 4 years. With biennials - do we want to extend when they must come for review?

Could it be conditional - prior to a regular review have the data owners of collection do a survey of the respondents to make sure there is nothing they can change to make it easier. Part of submission for the full review would need to include the results as a part of the regular review process. Should these surveys be done every year? This adds an additional data burden to districts. 8 years feels like too long of a period - it would even cross EDAC membership timelines. There is consensus among EDAC - 4 years feels like it is long enough, no change needed.

### **Update Approvals – All approved, Feedback Noted**

- CGA-251 Local Food Program
- DMC-104 Data Pipeline – Report Card March
- DMC-109 Data Pipeline – Special Education Discipline Interchange
- DMC-118 Data Pipeline – Teacher Student Data Link
  - Please update the fiscal impact section of the EDAC form, currently it has the initial information from the initial EDAC form for TSDL.
  - There is a feeling that this collection is not valuable – what can be reported back as to what this data is being used for? The Student Course Participation Report, Educator Preparation Program Report, and CRDC are all active reports that utilize TSDL data.
  - Is this a data submission that needs to be added to the annual report with legislative recommendations? This was done several years ago, and CDE has tried to revise and/or get rid of TSDL, but the commissioner feels strongly about the collection and feels value will eventually be gained from it. For years, EDAC and CDE has tried to get TSDL updated and changed and it did go through EDAC's shared re-envision process. We have gone through a long process of checking what was mandated by statute, how many people were accessing the reports, we took this info to the bill sponsors, but they still felt it was needed.
  - EDAC feels they need to keep repeating concerns surrounding the collections. Repeat our concerns in the annual report. Can we add metrics to utilization of collection and if they are not being met add a sunset provision? One benefit for districts has been how TSDL helps with submitting Civil Rights Data Collection data. TSDL covers approximately 25-30% of this data when CDE prepopulates this data.
- DMC-121 Dynamic Learning Maps - ELA and Math Student Biographical Data
  - Federal race field was removed – which is good news but why was this change implemented? This will be calculated by CDE using the individual race / ethnic field.
- DMC-122 Colorado Measurements of Academic Success English Language Arts and Mathematics Student Biographical Data Review
  - Federal race field was removed – which is good news but why was this change implemented? This will be calculated by CDE using the individual race / ethnic field.
  - Why is preferred first name being asked for? The assessment company suggested to add this that will be used in the parent reports. This field needs clarification whether they mean just a nickname or a different name. What is CDE really asking for?
- DMC-124 SAT PSAT Student Biographical Data Review
  - Federal race field was removed – which is good news but why was this change implemented? This will be calculated by CDE using the individual race / ethnic field.
- **DPSE-129 2021-2022 COLORADO HOMELESS EDUCATION DATA COLLECTION**
- **DPSE-130 McKinney-Vento Education of Homeless Children and Youth Program End of Year Reporting**
- OPR-102B SCCG Supplemental & FAFSA Completion Grant End of Year Report
- PI-131 School Health Services Data

- PWR-101 Application for Early College Designation
- PWR-102 Concurrent Enrollment Expansion and Innovation Grant
- SED-222 Standard Record Review Including Early Childhood and Transition Age Students

**Biennial Update Approvals – All Approved**

- FAC-103A Facility Schools Tuition Cost Application - Data Pipeline
- FAC-103B Facility Schools December Staff
- SED-282 Post-School Outcomes Survey

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; and 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.

**Discussion:** Districts have encountered times when students are identified but parents don't enroll students - is there a code for this? Or should this be a new code? Delay code 45 is for any parent related delay. This code will not change at all. 59 delay code can also be used - which is an exception and filled in with own reasons for delay - and can be filled in with parent delay.

**Conclusion:** Approved

60 Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DMC-106 Data Pipeline – Student Interchange</li> <li>• 2020-2021 Graduation Guidelines Reported Guidelines State Overview</li> </ul>	Brooke Wenzel, Reagan Ward
------------	---	----------------------------

**Overview:** The Student Interchange consists of data fields shared by many different collections required by state and federal law, such as Student End of Year, Student October, Special Education December Count, and more. Student Biographical Data, pulled from the Student Interchange data fields, allows districts the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the demographic data submitted for each student participating in state assessments. State and federal accountability reporting including school and district performance framework ratings, Title III Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO), and priority and focus school designations all rely on accurate demographic and test score data.

**Discussion:** If there is a business rule change - how is EDAC notified? EDAC does not look at business rules at all. If there is a concern over business rules, people should work directly with the collection lead.

**Right now, there is an error on code 90 related to Graduation Guidelines file that would reject students that do not have information in the Graduation Guidelines file. It is mandating something and rejecting a graduate that doesn't have information, and the legislative committee for CASB felt this may be a violation of Title IX Section 15. Committee thoughts on business rules and EDAC reviewing them?**

**To clarify concern - When a student graduates under unique circumstances (No capstone / SAT) and nothing can be marked in the Graduation Guidelines file but the student still receives a diploma because the school board makes the decision on whether students graduate - the business rule for exit code 90 rejects this student and the data unit recommends they be changed to a 5<sup>th</sup> year senior. CASB and superintendents are concerned over this issue. When does EDAC weigh in on a business rule, that because of the way it is being handled, might violate the autonomy of a local district?**

**Clarification on error – it is a snapshot level error. The business rule is in reference to the menu of options. The way that some phrasing is used in the collection is concerning to CASB. CASB feels they should control education and instruction in the state and using phrasing such as “met our guidelines” and “met Colorado guidelines” is concerning. When does EDAC address issues like this related to business rules? Is EDAC**

interested in looking at business rules for every interchange and snapshot that runs through CDE? EDAC doesn't feel they have the capacity to take on business rules for every single collection.

Alternate idea - EDAC Members can bring concerns that districts have brought up over business rules to EDAC meetings and have appropriate people notified. There are other avenues for concerns over business rules such as town halls or working directly with the collecting unit.

A CASB concern that this small change with a significant effect was communicated through mid-level data respondents, and not through school boards or superintendents. Districts concern is that it is their right to graduate a student and CDE cannot reject a submitted graduate. Perhaps EDAC should have the power to request a CDE unit be brought in when these concerns are raised to ask them the questions? Who is responsible for reconciling this? Is it the State Board / Legislators? This item is on the agenda for the March 9<sup>th</sup> state board meeting - actions they will take is unknown. If a student is rejected by the state, who does it affect? The student? Will the district be penalized? How will it work? CDE thinks that this is what the State Board is figuring out.

Should we add another graduation code? For example, Graduated with LEA approval, the district has said this student is a graduate.

Eric requests from the legislative committee of CASB to remove this error from the business rules on Exit Code 90.

Exit code 90 verbiage should be simplified – EDAC recommendation is: Student who received a regular high school diploma upon completion of local requirements.

Clarification of whether re-envision process is for 2022-23 or 2023-24. EDAC concerned that they felt / understood that it was for 2022-23 and this will need to be communicated back to districts and constituents that the State is not considering changes for 2022-23, but for 2023-24. The re-envision process takes a full year, and since any mandatory collection must be approved in March to give vendors time, there is not currently enough time to make major changes for 2022-23.

With the high level of concerns over Graduation Guidelines is the re-envision process useful since it doesn't change it for 2022-23? It is at a higher level for 2021-22 and being viewed by the State Board. If changes are enforced for 2021-22 by the State Board, shouldn't these changes be able to be also applied to 2022-23? Law says mandatory collections must be approved before April 1 of the prior year. This allows time for work with vendors to be done in time.

Regarding Graduation Guidelines purpose statement, Eric states that the statute does not have a legislative requirement to collect the minimum standards. C.R.S. 22-2-106(1)(a.5) does not require a data collection. This statute only requires that local boards adopt the menu of options – it doesn't require a data collection. Concerning C.R.S. 22-11-204 Higher bar, recommendations from Eric that have been heard by CASE, CASB and regional superintendents: Remove 3 codes for Capstone, Industry Certificate and Collaboratively Developed Performance Assessments. Add new code that just is only met local guidelines. This allows districts to report that a student graduated but this graduation has nothing to do with calculating a higher bar. This recommendation is for 2022-23. Justification hasn't been given on why these codes need to stay in.

Mina – In order to give districts and vendors enough time to prepare, we should leave the collection for 2022-23 as it is for now so that we can take the proper amount of time to have a proper discussion and hear the districts to give them a voice.

Eric – Since the 2022-23 collection closes in August – September of 2023, there is plenty of time to address these concerns now. Districts are concerned about this right now. If we wait till 2023-24 districts may feel we have missed the boat for collaboration. The requested changes are minor but would significantly reduce the burden on districts for next year.

The letter from district superintendents has been sent to the state board, and we are unsure of what action they will take. The board may take a different action when they meet on 03/09 which may impact EDAC's decision on DMC-106.

**Motion to move vote on collection DMC-106 to the March 18th meeting to see what happens with the state board - approved.**

**EDAC appreciates the effort CDE put in to create the Graduation Guidelines Reported Guidelines State Overview report.**

**Conclusion: Vote postponed until March 18<sup>th</sup> EDAC meeting. DMC-106 to return March 18<sup>th</sup>.**

5 Minutes	HAW-108B Brief Staff Survey for the K-5 Social Emotional Health Pilot Program (Pilot / New)	Amy Plog
-----------	---	----------

**Overview:** The legislation (House Bill 19-1017) responsible for the K-5 Social Emotional Health Pilot Program specifically called for evaluation of the program in order to determine the impacts and outcomes of the program on participating students and pilot schools. The Brief Staff Survey provides important information on the degree to which teaching staff feel confident in their ability to support mental health and believe they have sufficient time to focus on academic teaching (a stated desired outcome of the program).

**Discussion: Some districts don't have good systems in place to track this data. A lot of districts have made their own in-home products to track this information. Is the plan for CDE to work with SIS vendors to have a robust tool that will help districts gather this information? CDE has asked grantees if this information was available to them, and most districts said it was. CDE will work with them (for example internal Google sheets) to help districts keep track of the information. Perhaps CDE should have a conversation with the SIS vendors about a way to track this information to help the districts.**

**Conclusion: Approved.**

5 Minutes	HAW-108C Mental Health Systems Evaluation for the K-5 Social Emotional Health Pilot Program (Pilot / New)	Amy Plog
-----------	---	----------

**Overview:** The legislation (House Bill 19-1017) responsible for the K-5 Social Emotional Health Pilot Program specifically called for evaluation of the program in order to determine the impacts and outcomes of the program on participating students and pilot schools. The Mental Health Systems Evaluation too provides important information on the degree to which participating schools follow best-practice in implementing effective school-based mental health systems.

**Discussion: Some districts don't have good systems in place to track this data. A lot of districts have made their own in-home products to track this information. Is the plan for CDE to work with SIS vendors to have a robust tool that will help districts gather this information? CDE has asked grantees if this information was available to them, and most districts said it was. CDE will work with them (for example internal Google sheets) to help districts keep track of the information. Perhaps CDE should have a conversation with the SIS vendors about a way to track this information to help the districts.**

**Conclusion: Approved.**

5 Minutes	HAW-108D Performance Measures for the K-5 Social Emotional Health Pilot Program (Pilot / New)	Amy Plog
-----------	---	----------

**Overview:** The legislation (House Bill 19-1017) responsible for the K-5 Social Emotional Health Pilot Program specifically called for evaluation of the program in order to determine the impacts and outcomes of the program on participating students and pilot schools. In addition, the legislation outlined recommended data points that guided the selection of the specific performance measures.

**Discussion: Some districts don't have good systems in place to track this data. A lot of districts have made their own in home products to track this information. Is the plan for CDE to work with SIS vendors to have a robust tool that will help districts gather this information? CDE has asked grantees if this information was available to them, and most districts said it was. CDE will work with them (for example internal Google sheets) to help districts keep track of the information. Perhaps CDE should have a conversation with the SIS vendors about a way to track this information to help the districts.**

**Conclusion: Approved.**

5 Minutes	ESL-423A Resolution Meeting Verification Form for Due Process Complaints under IDEA (Biennial Review)	Jenny Woods
-----------	---	-------------

**Overview:** This form is sent to an Administrative Unit (AU) or State Operated Program (SOP) only after a Due Process Complaint has been filed against the AU or SOP by a parent regarding special education services for a

student with a disability. This collection provides CDE with required information for Federal Reporting purposes and it also serves a dual purpose for the parties so that they do not have to create additional agreements. The form (and the guidance letter that accompanies each form) gives the Aus and SOPs the guidelines within which to comply with resolution meeting requirements under the IDEA and the ECEA Rules when they receive a due process complaint.

**Discussion: None**

**Conclusion: Approved.**

14 Minutes	ESL-423B Resolution Meeting Verification Form for Expedited Due Process Complaints Related to Disciplinary Removals under IDEA (Biennial Review)	Jenny Woods
------------	--	-------------

**Overview:** The form only goes out to Administrative Units or State Operated Programs when an Expedited Due Process Complaint has been filed by a parent. This collection provides CDE with required information for Federal Reporting purposes and it also serves a dual purpose for the parties so that they do not have to create additional agreements. The form (and the guidance letter that accompanies each form) gives the AU's and SOPs the guidelines within which to comply with expedited resolution meeting requirements under IDEA and ECEA Rules when they receive an expedited due process complaint.

**Discussion: None**

**Conclusion: Approved.**

35 Minutes	GFMU-204 Fiscal Requirements for ESEA and ESSER Monitoring (New)	Bill Parsley
------------	--	--------------

**Overview:** Any State Educational Agency that receives funds under federal law is required to conduct monitoring of the sub-recipients use and fiscal management of those funds to ensure they are implementing programs in compliance with federal statute and regulations. CDE receives approximately \$200 million per year under ESSA and has received close to \$2 billion under federal emergency stimulus funds and is therefore required to monitor the sub-recipients of funds under each program, which includes districts, BOCES, Administrative Units, Facility Schools, Indian Tribes, and Division of Youth Services. The information gathered with these forms is used to document the required risk assessment on each sub-recipient to ensure our fiscal monitoring activities are sufficient to allow CDE to reach a reasonable assurance the LEA is complying with federal requirements. They also facilitate information gathering necessary to monitor identified fiscal indicators.

**Discussion: Are these two separate collections, will some people get one or will some people get another? They will all go out as one packet, so one form number should be fine. EDAC thought that some school districts are going to be monitored prior to the 3 years. Is the questionnaire being sent out on the 3<sup>rd</sup> year mark regardless of if they've been monitored before? EDACs concern is that some smaller districts haven't had to go through single audits, and some of the questions might confuse / concern them now that they will be audited for ESSER. CDE can review the single audit – so districts will not have to submit single audits. The questions are designed around awards that went straight to a school.**

**Conclusion: Approved.**

5 Minutes	PWR-109 Teacher Recruitment Education and Preparation Program (TREP) Intent to Participate (New)	Andy Tucker
-----------	--	-------------

**Overview:** SB 21-185 created the Teacher Recruitment Education and Preparation (TREP) program to increase the number of students who enter an educator pathway, particularly students from low-income background and underserved communities. The TREP program allows for students in the pathway to receive two years of free college tuition. Districts should complete the collection, including the Alchemer survey and Excel spreadsheet, so that they can have students participate in the program.

**Discussion: EDAC appreciates that each district gets an opportunity to have a TREP student. ASCENT led to some inequities, TREP was designed to try and avoid this and provide an opportunity for all districts to participate. 200 TREP slots will be available.**

**Conclusion: Approved.**