Minutes

cde

EDAC

Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

April 13th, 2018
9:30 a.m.-2:00 p.m.
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Ave
Denver, CO 80203

Meeting called by:	**Educational Data Advisory Committee**
Type of meeting:	Scheduled Data Review Meeting
Facilitator:	Ruth Grindeland
Note taker:	Genevieve Hale/Dennis St. Hilaire
Timekeeper:	N/A

Attendees:		
	Norm Alerta	Marcia Bohannon
	Ruth Grindeland	Tammy Johnson
	Nikki Johnson	Mike Porter
	John McKay	Genevieve Hale
	Natalie Morin	Dennis St. Hilaire

15 Minutes	**Agenda topics**

General Business
- ➢ EDAC Credit Renewal
- ➢ Email review of CGA-162 Early Literacy Assessment Tool Project (ELAT)-Approved

15 Minutes	Membership Discussion	EDAC Committee

Overview: Under EDAC rules a member can serve past their term limit with committee approval.

Discussion: There was discussion about extending Norm Alerta's (of Cherry Creek School District) EDAC term to another term. Also, John McKay (of Poudre School District) said that due to reorganization of duties at his district there was just too much on his plate to continue to serve on EDAC while at the same time fulfilling his work obligations to the district. John said that he had spoken to Jan Petro about this prior to the meeting and that he would be looking for a federal programs person to replace him on the EDAC Committee.

Conclusion: Both those items were approved. Norm Alerta was approved for another term and John McKay will have a replacement.		
30 Minutes	EDAC Data Burden Survey Refresher	Norm Alerta

Overview: Over the course of the past school year the EDAC committee created an EDAC burden survey that addresses all mandated (by legislation) collections that the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) conducts. The purpose of the survey was to get feedback from the data respondents in all the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that submit data as to how much of their time, staff and resources were spent on each collection and whether or not each collection was of benefit. The idea was to find out the true cost and benefit of each collection. CDE sent out the Survey in the fall of 2017 and between 80 to 90 respondents completed the survey. Respondents included districts, Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), Administrative Units (AUs), CSI and migrant regions. Percentage-wise this is less than half of the LEAs but still a sizeable number.

Discussion:

➢ Norm Alerta of Cherry Creek walked the committee through the data that had been compiled and displayed in Tableau. He started off by showing the ribbon at top that helps the user navigate what they are looking at and what data is available. There are different filters on each of the slides. The committee started by looking at collections within certain units. There are about 84 collections and they are sorted based on the number of respondents.

➢ Norm explained the icons and the search functions. He explained the various graphics and what they meant. Depending on what you're counting you can get different numbers but it's based on who actually responded. So without required responses numbers can vary. There were bar graphs and maps of districts etc.

➢ Looking at the data overall, it appeared many respondents felt that they were committing a lot of time/resources for very little benefit. The most popular collections appeared to be Student October Count and Transportation with a couple of the least popular being Teacher Student Data Link (TSDL) and Report Card March. There were some regional differences in responses.

➢ There was a question that came up about who filled out the EDAC data burden survey in the LEAs. The Poudre representative, John McKay, talked about how they got stakeholders involved. However, the BOCES representative on the committee didn't know how their districts went about completing the survey. Denver Public Schools (DPS) had the data submitters fill out the survey and return it. No researchers filled them out for DPS.

➢ Then somebody suggested that perhaps who filled the survey out may not see the benefit but maybe another stakeholder would. Because some collections are federally mandated it might take time to see the benefits of the collection.

➢ Someone else asked if the collective "we" are taking the time to see the benefits. Someone who is submitting and spending all the time on the collection(s) may not see the benefits but someone else in the district would. Not clear if CDE derives a benefit.

➢ CDE should provide leadership on giving information to LEAs as to what's working and what's not. For example with TSDL, CDE could present data on what the secret sauce is that the best practitioners use to teach. The education community should learn from who is doing things well.

➢ There was a recommendation to present what is required and how to make it beneficial. If something is beneficial, respondents will take more time to ensure data is accurate because they benefit from it.

Conclusion: See discussion above		
180 Minutes	Ways to Look at the Data	Ruth Grindeland/Norm Alerta

Overview:

- ➤ This part of the meeting was to address the following:

    - What questions should we ask?

    - How should we segment the data?

    - What trends do we see?

    - What does the data tell us?

Using these questions as a guide the EDAC committee had a robust discussion (detailed below) on the various questions posed above.

Discussion:

- ➤ After the data survey refresher, the committee began discussing various aspects of the data up on the screen that they had just reviewed. As to TSDL, a comment was made that one difference between large and small districts was that for large districts it was not as big of a burden as it was for small districts in part because TSDL feeds automatically into the Civil Rights Data Collection which is even more of a data burden so at least the TSDL serves a useful purpose in that sense. Also large districts have more resources dedicated to time and labor intensive collections such as TSDL and CRDC.

- ➤ Next the discussion turned to the Unified Improvement Planning Process (UIPs) for schools and districts. The consensus seemed to be that UIPs were not beneficial perhaps because of the way the process is done in some schools and districts. One person in the group disagreed and said that UIPs were in the end helpful to the school improvement process. They commented that it was intended for the school improvement process and when looked at this way it is more beneficial. Some folks in the group thought that the UIPs were just about meeting requirements. There was discussion about making UIPs more meaningful such as describing what internal systems schools are using to describe their story. There was discussion about comprehensive needs assessments for the UIPs. Some districts may not be fully utilizing all their tools in the UIP and there needs to be attention to the internal process piece.

- ➤ Following the UIP data discussion someone asked if the committee wanted to look at this as a data burden survey or should the committee look at what collections the state is doing and whether or not they are beneficial and if so is the state explaining why the collections are beneficial. If something is required/mandated in statute is this something about communication. Someone said that there needs to be a layer of this looking at systems improvement at the state level. For example they brought up the Kindergarten Readiness collection and whether or not anything was going to come from this for staffing, resources, etc. There are a couple of pieces in this collection such as an assessment tool and report cards. If there is no money nor requirements involved then why is the state conducting certain collections? There was a brief discussion about data security concerns around TS Gold and about how good data is masked.

- ➤ Someone in the group brought up a salient point asking whether or not a collection was or should be beneficial only because an LEA/district gets money for it. They noticed a correlation between beneficial responses and whether or not funding was tied to the collection. Following that observation, another person asked what is benefit? Receiving money? Systems improvement? Does receiving money necessarily promote systems improvement?

- ➤ Where do parents play into all of this? There are a lot of savvy parents who understand legislation as for example, with kindergarten readiness parents want to know if their children are school ready.

- Do legislators know what's best for schools? Do they trust schools to know what's best for students?

- The group then asked how to go about looking at the data for today's purpose. Someone suggested a matrix using the categories of high benefit and low benefit and high effort and low effort. Somebody then came up with the idea of using a quadrant such as this:

High Benefit, High Effort Student October Count Transportation	High Benefit, Low Effort
Low Benefit, Low Effort Report Card March Statewide Standard Course Codes McKinney Vento	Low Benefit, High Effort Civil Rights Data Collection Kindergarten Readiness School Discipline & Attendance School UIPS Human Resources

- The EDAC committee, using the quadrant above, categorized the collections contained therein.

- After using this matrix and looking at resources would that change the outcome? The committee discussed where the recommendations should end up. Some collection recommendations may have to be addressed by board rules, some may go to the legislature but each collection would need rationale based on data. There should be data to quantify the cost of data collections to give legislators a perspective and sense of what things cost.

- Cost benefit analysis, what is being taken out of the classroom? How many full-time equivalent personnel (FTE) are involved? What are the FTE costs? Who is the information valuable to? How can we pass on best practice?

- At this point there was a brief discussion on the statewide student information system (SIS) feasibility study that may come to fruition if the legislature funds the study this year. There was some discussion on how to include stakeholders (LEAs large and small) and the feasibility and politics of a SIS. There are various options for a statewide SIS such as opt-in and or mandatory. Different LEAs would get different things out of it.

- The committee asked how Colorado compares to other states with respect to data collection. The conclusion was that Colorado is in the normal range. Several states have pushed on the federal officials about the value of the data but there is no progress so far.

- Getting back to the quadrant after the digression, the committee discussed what percentage of respondents would be statistically viable when looking at whether or not a data collection was beneficial. They came up with the "n" count of at least 30 to validate data.

- Someone suggested perhaps using two different quadrants, one for rural and one for urban LEAs.

- There was a discussion as to what the committee's sphere of influence is.

- There was also a comment about needing to look at duplications of data collections.

- Someone on the committee suggested breaking apart the data by district size and to look at the comments.

Conclusions: See Above		
30 Minutes	Create Skeleton Table of Contents for Product	Ruth Grindeland/Norm Alerta
Overview: This part of the meeting was to create a skeleton Table of Contents for the Product		
Discussion:		

- ➢ The guiding questions throughout the meeting were:
  - Cost benefit
  - What is being taken out of the classroom?
  - How many FTE are involved? What are the FTE costs?
  - Who is it valuable to?
  - How can we pass on best practice?

- ➢ The report with the recommended changes for legislators to consider should contain:
  - An executive summary
  - Process that was used such as collection of data and number of respondents by segment
  - Data using quadrant
  - Key observations and recommendations and maybe a handful of comments by LEA respondents along with the committee recommendations.

- ➢ Need to communicate data burden survey results to applicable CDE staff.
- ➢ Norm will apply beneficial criteria to dashboard filters and will filter by maps.
- ➢ Dennis discussed maybe using splatter graphs.
- ➢ Group discussed how to narrow all this information down to tables, graphics etc. to tell a story.
- ➢ Dennis will send Norm definitions for each collection for tool tip.
- ➢ Need to distinguish was is federally required vs. state required.
- ➢ Before May meeting Norm will:
  - Apply filter of 50% or higher of beneficial/not beneficial color coded as red or orange
  - Look at people hours to median (take out highs and lows) and then look at median. For example, average people hours of 25 with an average of $20/hr
  - Make a list of most beneficial/least beneficial collections converted to dollars.
  - Enhance graphics.
  - Figure out what's missing e.g. what districts are missing?
  - Cost per collection

- ➢ Meeting adjourned

Conclusions: See above