

Committee of Practitioners
November 14, 2013
Colorado Children's Campaign Conference room

Attendees: In-person - Mary Ellen Good, Dianna Hulbert, Mark Rangel, Ines Stabler, Jesús Escárcega, Laura Gorman, Bridgette Muse, Mark Rangel, Kirk Banghart, Melanie Jones, Myra Westfall
Phone - Amy Bollinger and Holly Goodwin

The meeting was called to order by co-chairperson, Jesús Escárcega. The committee reviewed the minutes from the April 2013 meeting. Action: A motion was made to accept the minutes with no changes and seconded with approval by all members present.

Tiered Intervention Grant State Application – Brad Bylsma

Brad explained that 2013-2014 is the fifth cohort for this grant. The state is intending to ask for a waiver of several requirements. A question was asked about other elements that might also be included in a waiver request. Brad told the members that with these four, all of the elements that can be waived have now been requested.

- N-size waiver – check on this with Brad
- Priority Schools list waiver – The intent is to help align the Tiered Intervention Grant application language with that of the state accountability system and naming
- Period of availability of FY 2013 funds waiver – the state would like to increase the length of time from 1 year to 2 years before a schools must reapply
- Schoolwide poverty measure -

Action: A motion was made by Mary Ellen Good to accept the waiver suggestions as discussed and seconded by Bridgette Muse with approval by all members present.

NCLB Waiver Renewal – Pat Chapman

Pat explained that all comments about the waiver request are collected and added to the waiver comments section before the full document is sent to the USDE. The original waiver expires in the spring of 2014. It has enabled Colorado to use state accountability to meet the federal requirements

- As of 11/14/13, a letter was received from the USDE that now extends the original waiver for one year to expire in the spring of 2015.
- Colorado will proceed with collecting the feedback relative to the waiver request in an effort to learn about what is working and what is not working.
- Colorado is using SB163 to meet the federal requirements
- Pat hopes to have an updated waiver document for the members to review at the February CoP meeting.

EMH Levels – Barb Vassis

Barb led a discussion about the CDE proposal to change the method of designation of elementary, middle, or high at the school level.

- Will this new method present a problem for CSPR collection? Barb indicated we are continuing to investigate this issue
- Kirk Banghart believes this is a great change for small districts
- A question was raised about how schoolwide plans will be affected by this change.
- Members were encouraged to check with others in their districts to determine level of support or concern

Title I Plan – Barb Vassis

Barb explained that there will not be a need for Targeted Assistance plans from schools that are not running schoolwide plans.

- Schools with Schoolwide Title I programs will be expected to have a Title I SW Requirements Template that addresses the 10 statutory elements
- Only schools with a plan type assignment of priority improvement or turnaround will be collected and reviewed by CDE.
- All schools with plan type assignments of improvement or performance will address the Title I SW Requirements in accordance with their school district's guidance

Discussion

- Many in the group expressed the concern about having another plan to complete.
- Some encouraged the use of the UIP addendum process to address the issue.
- Stressed the need for much greater training about how to use the addendum and make it fit for Title I purposes

SES Rethink – Kathryn Smukler

Prior to the meeting, the members were sent a document with the following questions to consider

- Which components of the current SES program should be maintained?
 - Why should those components be maintained?
 - What changes or amendments, if any, are needed to strengthen those components?
- Which components of current SES program should be eliminated?
 - Why?
- What other suggestions do you have?

Responses at the meeting are listed below:

- Get rid of SES; small districts have been burnt by the promise of online providers that didn't follow through
- Don't ask LEA to apply to be a provider; they should just be able to do the necessary work
- Need to have ownership of the program by the principal in order to have a successful program
- SES should be a district issue not just a Title I program

Consolidated Application Survey Results – Eric Young

Eric presented the results of the survey conducted following the submission and review process for the 2013 season. The graphs show the result of the survey and will be sent as a separate document from the minutes.

Next meeting – February 13, 2014