

# CDE MEETING AGENDA



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

## VISION

All students graduate ready for college and careers, and prepared to be productive citizens of Colorado.

## MISSION

Ensuring equity and opportunity for every student, every step of the way.



## Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting: ESSA Committee of Practitioners  
Date & Time: Thursday, November 3, 2022; 10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m.  
Location: Daniels Fund, 101 Monroe Street, Denver, Colorado 80206

Meeting Leads: Amy Beruan (Elected Co-Chair), Joey Willett (Elected Co-Chair)  
Shannon Wilson and Rachel Temple (CDE Leads)

Objective: To allow the Colorado Department of Education the opportunity to provide updates to and elicit recommendations from the Colorado Committee of Practitioners regarding relevant and timely issues related to CDE's responsibilities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESSA).

### Agreed Upon Norms:

- Be present and engage fully.
- Let everyone have a voice and be heard! Don't talk over each other.
- When not talking, turn off mic on your computer/phone to minimize background noise.
- Begin and end meetings on time. Stick to times allotted for topics, to the extent possible, or develop next steps for moving the work forward if running out of time.
- Use time productively.
- Assume positive intent and ask for clarification when something lands wrong.
- Come prepared.
- The chair of the meeting should enforce the norms.

Attendees: Clint Allison, Cassandra Berry, Amy Beruan, Kristin Duncan, Megan Eikleberry, Sandy Gecewicz, Shineth Cunanan Gonzales, Laura Gorman, Ryan Hartgerink, Stephanie Hund, Alan Nall, Sandra Rahe, Marcie Robidart, Christy Sinner, Mitzi Swiatkowski, Cheryl Taylor, Toni Vaeth, and Joey Willett.

## Agenda Items and Next Steps

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Welcome Committee Business</b> 10:00-10:15 <i>Shannon, Rachel</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quick Introductions</li> <li>• Representation Map</li> <li>• CoP members will vote on the approval of the minutes from the previous meeting and review the agenda for the meeting.</li> <li>• Revisit norms to ensure on track with expectations / commitments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2022 Meeting Minutes are approved.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Revisit Bylaws Discussion</b> 10:15-10:45 <i>Amy, Joey</i></p> <p style="color: blue;">Feedback Needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review <a href="#">current bylaws</a></li> <li>• Discuss needed changes</li> <li>• Vote on needed changes</li> </ul> <p>Guiding Questions: What bylaw changes or additions will help our group function more effectively?</p>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members are asked to provide feedback on the bylaws by November 17. We will revisit and vote on the updated version at the March meeting.</li> </ul> <p><u>Feedback from CoP Members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CoP is not representative of the State; we are I-70-centric from Ft Collins to Pueblo. Additional outreach needed. Recommendation to contact Darcy in Family School Partnership and Dale at Southeast BOCES.</li> <li>• School boards and teacher/paras are difficult to recruit; they are saturated and it's difficult to pull them away from direct support.</li> <li>• Request that CDE share a recruitment flyer that explains the committee and membership needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CoP Response: A recruitment email was sent in August. CDE will provide a resource to be shared with interested parties.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• 3.3: Membership is approved by a majority vote of members present. If a vote is needed between meetings, a special short meeting will be held (~15 minutes). As this is an unscheduled meeting, it will not be counted against members if they are unable to attend.</li> <li>• 3.4: Members unable to participate for half of the meetings scheduled for the year may have their membership revisited and possibly terminated by a majority vote of the committee <i>at the final meeting</i> of the year.</li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.2: Omit “vote by proxy shall be permissible, and, when necessary, this may be conducted through email or phone.”</li> <li>6.3: Recommendations that the officers/chairs terms be staggered.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Upcoming Consolidated Applications</b> 10:45-11:30 <i>Laura, DeLilah</i></p> <p>Feedback Needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comparison between 22-23 application and applications for upcoming years</li> <li>Provide rationale for the differences</li> <li>Identify any concerns for the field that need to be addressed during Spring trainings.</li> </ul> <p>Guiding Questions: What are the areas to consider regarding technical assistance to the field regarding the transitional application?</p>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After review of the current application, it was decided that CDE will need to collect a response from LEAs on the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Module A</li> <li>Cross Program 3.3 &amp; 4.1</li> <li>Title I, Part A 5-5.5</li> <li>Title I Targeted Support and Improvement Page</li> <li>Title ID 2.2 &amp; 3.1</li> <li>Title II, Part A</li> <li>Title III</li> <li>Title IV</li> </ul> </li> <li>Questions that are not required will be visible; LEAs can opt to provide a response or use the pre-populated text.</li> <li>CDE has received a monitoring report from USDE with a corrective action, which may require that an additional question be added to the application.</li> </ul> <p><u>Feedback from CoP Members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is done with the answers provided by LEAs? Additional support is requested from CDE to ensure the necessary changes are being addressed.</li> <li>Will we run into back-to-back years of year 1 as we transition to the new platform? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDE Response: This upcoming year is considered a transitional year (year 4). We will start the next 3-year cycle in the new platform.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Request that CDE provide in-person trainings when we transition to the new platform.</li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"> <b>ESSER Reporting Template</b>            11:30-12:00  <i>Tina, Mackenzie, Matt</i> </p> <p style="color: blue;">Feedback Needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share potential data collection tool</li> <li>• Gather feedback about tool</li> <li>• Determine if additional resources are needed to assist LEAs in completing tool</li> </ul> <p>Guiding Questions: What resources could help support LEAs in collecting/reporting this information?</p> <p>Which format would be better for LEAs to use to submit information?</p> <p>What’s your preferred communication strategy from CDE on this data collection?</p>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The USDE has been authorized by Congress to collect data from ESSER I, II, and III (and other ESSER award) grantees including but not limited to the uses and impact of funds.</li> <li>• CDE is able to use the ESSER I, II, and III applications to provide the vast majority of requested data with the exception of the following data points:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How students with poor attendance or participation have been re-engaged.</li> <li>○ How school level allocations were determined</li> <li>○ LEA and school-level participation in ESSER activities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The USDE requires that data be reported at the district level. Surveys will be sent out to LEAs yearly to collect data.</li> <li>• Members are asked to provide feedback on the survey <a href="#">template</a> and provide feedback on the <a href="#">trainings/resources, communications, and timelines</a> within the next 2 weeks.</li> </ul> <p><u>Feedback from CoP Members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When will this be reported?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: 2022-2023 data will be collected at the end of the year (summer).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will data be shared with CoP?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: The aggregate level data will be made publicly available after it has been submitted to USDE and each ESSER fund has ended.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will there be separate data collections for ESSER and ELO?               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: The collection applies to all ESSER I, II, and III, including 90% and state set aside activities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Confusion on numbers, for example “what is the capacity of the program?” That is a scary number for a district. If all students are reported, the figure could be 50,000, whereas only 1,000 students may have participated.</li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would assume charter schools would also need to attest to this information. As an LEA we would need to gather from them, correct? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: LEAs report on how all ESSER funds were used, including Charter schools. An excel template has been developed to allow individual sites to gather information, which can then be rolled up into the final survey submitted to CDE.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Is there a separate collection for each program? Request for CDE to provide all applicable grant codes on the instruction form. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: CDE currently does not have a separate collection for the 90% and 10%.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If the data is aggregated, how will the SEA pull the data apart? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: It may be beneficial to have toggle functionality built in which would allow LEAs to select the applicable program. LEAs will need to report on how competitive and formula funds were used.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Will it be by particular grant codes?</li> <li>• Helpful addition to this page would be including the year you're capturing information for.</li> <li>• What if a charter limited who was eligible but the district provided for all students?</li> <li>• Right up front you should put this is a 22-23 year collection.</li> <li>• Google forms is a one-time sign in, not a great idea for a bunch of data reporting.</li> <li>• If the Excel template is available, do we need to use Google? The Excel template is a more district friendly tool for data collection.</li> <li>• Are we reporting info for all subgroups or is it specific to Special Education?</li> <li>• I was wondering about n sizes for many of the rural districts.</li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: A minimum N size does not apply to Federal reporting; N size compression applies to public reporting.</li> <li>● Recommendation that CDE provide a short video/training for LEAs.</li> <li>● What is the reporting timeline? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: CDE will report the data at the end of the 2022-2023 calendar year.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Intensive lift for districts, not a minor ask. Even for rural districts, this is big and will impact work significantly. The sooner info is shared with field, the better.</li> <li>● It is one thing to get the template out, but we need clarification on points brought up today. This will likely land on the shoulders of the people who completed the ESSER applications.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Stronger Connections Grant</b> 12:00-12:30 <i>Tammy, Evita, Nathan</i></p> <p><a href="#">Feedback Needed</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Status update</li> <li>● Collect feedback on risk factors to be used in definition of high-need LEA</li> </ul> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <p>How broad should the eligibility criteria be?</p> <p>What risk factors should Colorado consider in our state’s definition of high-need LEA?</p>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Colorado has received \$9.35 million in funding under SCG. CDE will award no less than 95% of allocated funds to “high need LEAs”.</li> <li>● Funds should be in line with allowable uses under Title IV, Activities to Support Safe and Healthy Students.</li> <li>● ED does not provide a formal definition of “high-need LEAs” however encourages States to consider poverty rate and one or more additional criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ High student-to-mental health professional ratios</li> <li>○ High rates of chronic absenteeism, exclusionary discipline, or referrals to the juvenile justice system, bullying and harassment, community and school violence or substance abuse</li> <li>○ Where students recently experienced a natural disaster or traumatic event</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Members are asked to provide <a href="#">feedback</a> on what Colorado’s definition of “high-need LEA” should include; how grant funds should be allocated to participating LEAs; how much time</li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<p>should be provided to LEAs to complete and submit the application; and preferences on the acceptable start date (22-23 or 23-24).</p> <p><u>Feedback from CoP Members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically, competitive grants will allow Charters to apply. It is not equitable for a Charter school to get the same amount as a district.</li> <li>• Is this a one-time application or would they apply each year? If Prop FF passes what the FRL would look like in the upcoming years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: It is a one-time application. Funds could be disbursed over 1, 2, or 3 years. (22-23, 23-24, 24-25)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If it is a competitive grant, non-public school allocations should not fall on the district,</li> <li>• The definition of LEA matters, is it LEA school level or district level?</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Lunch</b> 12:30-1:00</p>		
<p><b>Update on State Accountability</b> 1:00-1:30 <i>Lisa Medler</i></p> <p><b>Informational</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an update on State Accountability school year process for the 2022-2023 school year, and introduce anticipated changes (e.g., new metrics) in future years.</li> </ul> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <p>What would be most helpful to hear about today? Here are some starters possible topics: 2022 framework trends, assignment of Insufficient State Data, implications for sites on performance watch, participation in state and in federal accountability, upcoming metrics within the frameworks, available supports and resources</p>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB 22-137 restarted the framework calculations fall 2022, using 2019 statewide performance indicator targets. The growth participation rate was added to the framework reports.</li> <li>• Insufficient State Data ratings are assigned when the state does not have enough data to assign a rating or plan type. Reasons include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Small tested population (1-year v. 3-year frameworks)</li> <li>○ No students at grade levels tested for State Assessments</li> <li>○ In 2022, no achievement, growth, or postsecondary workforce readiness data</li> <li>○ For multilevel schools, this also applies if one or more elementary, middle, or high school levels do not have reportable data for achievement or growth</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In 2022, less than 25% total participation in English language arts and math</li> <li>○ In 2022, AECs are eligible to receive an ISD rating</li> <li>● Performance Frameworks have been delayed due to coding errors related to participation codes and students who otherwise would not have received a score. The errors did not impact student scores and overall performance framework results. The requirement will resume for the 2023 frameworks.</li> <li>● The 2022 frameworks were based on 1 year of available assessment date. In 2022, 2 years will be available; in 2024, we will go back to having both 1 year and 3-year versions of the framework available.</li> </ul> <p><u>Feedback from CoP Members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● In 2022, is the participation in English language arts and math less than 25% of students statewide? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: It is less than 25% of the total testing population. The system also anticipates request to reconsider as an option.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● What if district participation continues to decrease? What is the States plan? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: This is a concern of policy makers. The State Board is having conversations about what is in their control and what they can do.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Will it be the same grade levels for science? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We are required to test science once in elementary, once in middle, and once in high school.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Headline Time Presenters	Agenda Item	Summary/Notes
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ESEA State Plan</b> 1:30-2:30 <i>Nazie</i></p> <p style="text-align: center; color: blue;">Feedback Needed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a recap of the decision items needed in order for us to revise our ESSA State Plan.</li> <li>• There are 3 types of decision items going to the State Board of Education and then to U.S. Department of Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Addressing the impact of assessment gaps due to the pandemic</li> <li>○ Addressing the long-term plans on the SQSS indicator</li> <li>○ Addressing changes needed due to changes in State Accountability</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <p>What are CoP recommendations on the needed revisions to the ESSA State Plan?</p>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2022-23 schools identified for Support and Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State Accountability: 146 on performance watch only; not ESSA identified</li> <li>○ ESSA Identification: 251 ESSA identified only; not on performance watch</li> <li>○ 156 both State and ESSA identified.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ESSA requirements that do not align with state: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identification of high schools based on grad rate only</li> <li>○ Use of grad rate even for AECs</li> <li>○ Identification based on student group performance</li> <li>○ Identification of schools that only serve K-2</li> <li>○ Using as many years of data needed to include all schools</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Feedback from stakeholders, shared with the State Board of Education: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Keep chronic absenteeism</li> <li>○ Add student growth to standard</li> <li>○ Add student, educator, and/or parent ratings of school climate or safety</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CoP will reconvene virtually December 8 (2 hours) to continue ESSA State Plan conversations.</li> <li>• Members are asked to provide <a href="#">input</a>. CDE will use the feedback to create options for public comment posting (mid-November - mid-December).</li> <li>• Poverty data quality is a concern. We will revisit the topic at the March CoP meeting.</li> </ul> <p><u>Feedback from CoP Members:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping as 3 years, are you including those in the 5%? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: We originally identified the lowest 5% based on the year's performance, however as the amount of schools identified has exponentially grown, it has</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<p>exceeded our capacity to support the schools. We are proposing that the plan be revised to only identify up to the lowest 5%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would be the result of establishing a 5% cap? We had 2 schools identified this year for CS lowest 5%. With the recommended changes, fast forward a year, would those school still be identified? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: Calculations would be run every year. If they are reidentified, it would impact their eligibility to exit, resetting the 3-year clock. With a cap, we would not add any new schools until some of the schools have exited.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The downside is that lower performing schools may not be identified and included in the supports and services if the cap has been reached.</li> <li>• In the CS hold category, would people have the same UIP requirements? I am not in favor of a system where you are identified for 1 year, but it takes 3 years to get out.</li> <li>• Are we able to see the number of schools that would be currently identified, to see the impact on current identifications? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: Based on today's suggestions, we can bring data points back for consideration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SPFs are at a 60/40 split between growth and achievement. Anytime that type of change happens in the landscape, it changes the norm.</li> <li>• Can there be multiple poverty measures?</li> <li>• Can we break up the poverty data collected at office hours? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE Response: The office hours data collection was informal; we did not collect district identifiers. It would be beneficial for BOCES representatives to partner with</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Headline Time Presenters</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Summary/Notes</b>
		<p>CDE to gauge how the system impacts smaller districts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a requirement in statute that poverty data be a single year of data? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDE: Statue indicates that it is the most recent year of poverty available at the LEA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Recommendation that we work with CDE’s nutrition team on alternate poverty measures.</li> <li>• 50% of our district is on federal installation. We have no idea of the potential impact of other measures.</li> </ul>
<p><b>FPSU Updates</b> 2:30-2:50 <i>Nazie</i></p> <p>Informational</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is currently happening in the Federal Programs and Supports Unit</li> <li>• What is upcoming between now and the next meeting</li> </ul>	<p><u>Presentation Highlights:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upcoming topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ESSER funding cliffs</li> <li>○ Resource Allocation Review Manual</li> <li>○ Monitoring self-assessment results - use results to enhance guidance, TA, and trainings: what would CoP recommend based on identified trends</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Final Thoughts, Discussion, Closing</b> 2:50-3:00 <i>Rachel, Shannon</i></p>		<p>Next Meeting: December 8, 10:00-12:00, virtual</p>

Feel free to share your agenda topic submissions through the [submission request form](#). Please let us know if you have any questions.