Minutes

Colorado Department of Education EDAC Committee

January 10, 2020
9:30 -2:15
Colorado Talking Book Library
180 Sheridan Blvd
Denver, CO 80226

Meeting called by:	**Education Data Advisory Committee**
Type of meeting:	Scheduled Data Review Meeting
Facilitator:	Jan Rose Petro
Note taker:	Brooke Robinson
Timekeeper:	

Attendees:

Lori Benton	Jan Rose Petro
Janice Cook	Brooke Robinson
Stephanie Hund	
Lazlo Hunt	
Jonathan Levesque	
Andrew Pippin	
Loraine Saffer	
Marcia Bohannon	

Agenda topics

General Business

- Meeting Minutes 6-Dec-2019 – Approved.
- Late Item Submissions (MARKED IN RED)
  - None
- EDAC Credit Renewal
- Data Pipeline Advisory Committee – Nothing.
- Membership Request Follow-up with CSI Representative – Jan Petro checked in with Commissioner's secretary. They are still working on date where both Terry and the Commissioner can come in together. It will either be the March or April meeting. We will just need to wait until we hear from them.
- Template for Collections Reviewed – September, or any month, should link to the Meeting Minutes for that month. The Start and End Date should be clearer. People will know what they are looking for when looking into the document. Location should be right on EDAC CDE web page. What should the link be named? Collections Reviewed (By Month).

- EDAC Report Presentation – We are invited to come to the State Board. We will not have time on the State Board agenda until at least March. Do we want to pass for this year, and go next year? We think it is important enough to give them a report, and possibly not face to face. We should have some sort of report even though it may not be presented to the State Board. Report should be given February. We can then see the work that has been done.
- Statewide SIS (Student Information System) – There are good reasons to do it, and some not good reasons to do it. The people that respond to request for feedback were people that do the data submissions. We are trying to reach out to smaller districts and talk to them directly. Marcia spoke to Lazlo Hunt's boss, and he came from a district in Washington before taking the job in Colorado. They had a separate entity that runs the system. They also manage other large scale systems so the districts don't have to worry about it. If schools have a problem or question, they can go to this support entity with those issues. Everyone in Colorado school districts now have many different systems. What exactly will help you in data reporting process (asked to districts)? The districts didn't have an answer to this. It would be best to take data burden off the districts, and have someone else do it. The ease of reporting is very important, and was never really executed well. It would be nice if everything "talked" to each other (meaning computer systems). If we could move students electronically, and all districts' systems talked to one another that would be helpful to organizations. The downside is it is a different approach than what we are used to. It would have to be legislated. We are not sure if legislature would agree, but if all districts are willing to participate, it would have statewide recognition. It can then get to the right people for this recognition. We can definitely see benefits from this, but we want to make sure this is what people want. It has to be a certain vendor as well. Some of the larger districts are going to be less likely to jump, but smaller districts are going to want to jump on this. Maybe we can look into regional rather than district wise. When we hear more about this, Marcia will share. The integration piece will be the greatest cost as well as the expertise. When you are trying to integrate systems that "talk" to one another, we need to think that programming may be limited within districts. It all depends on how you approach this integration. The purpose of this system needs to be up front.

Update Approval

- ADA-101 Request to Reconsider Feedback Survey
- CCC-101 Secondary CTE Enrollment – Is the EDAC Process new for them? They rarely submit to EDAC. What is the definition for completer? It will be hard for people to make that shift for language. One suggestion would be to clarify and train on definition changes. They need to seek feedback from field that uses this document and how useful it is. They may not be getting the information they think they are getting. The timeliness is not ideal. Submission is in July and they do not hear back until November, sometimes January. It is very hard to understand file format and what is needed.
- CCC-102 Active Teacher – There should be a singular date field and not 3 separate options. They are allowing different types, and we don't understand that logic. CCC-102 is saying you can put 3 different types of date field, and this won't help with looking for teacher's information. We have to submit teacher's credential number. Everything is manual and a pain to fill out, so clarifying fields would make this more seamless. It is a 3 month process to get money back. Smaller systems will not have credential number and expiration date. If there was a way to increase efficiency for people, that would be great.. Can EDID be tied to credential number? Doesn't every credential teacher have an EDID? Yes, so it can be tied and would make things easier. Marcia Bohannon and Jan Petro will talk to them to see how this can happen going forward.

- CGA-246 School Health Professional Grant – In the application on page 12, in comparison to the beginning, the language differs. On top of page 7, it should also state something about 0 points, like mentioned on page 12. On page 5, “Individuals who will fill these…”, it needs clarification on funds for non-licensed.
- NU-143 Procurement Self-Check – If something goes from Mandatory to Voluntary, is that considered a change? No, it is not considered a change. Should this be a different form within EDAC stating if the status has changed? How do we need to get this (Mandatory to Voluntary) information out? Nutrition needs to get information out on how this will be known to public.
- PPS-104 Credentials Reporting Document
- PPS-105 Career Success Pilot Program Intent to Participate
- TAL-103 Colorado Preschool Program Annual Report and Reapplication

All Approved (some questions/edits on CCC-101, CCC-102, CGA-246, NU-143)

Proposed Legislation

State Board Rules

- CCR 301-10, Rules for the Administration of the English Language Proficiency Act – This is a very confusing rule. Everything that is being taken out of it makes it seem there is nothing left of the rule. We do not know the politics behind removing all of this information. It is a simple granting of money that gives money to English Learners. 42.00 (3) (c) needs to be updated with correct verbiage, not proficient and advanced. What is also considered “high”? Lori Benton will submit EDAC comments regarding rule and get back to EDAC.

30 Minutes	P3O-103 READ Budget Reporting Process (New – Resubmit)	Whitney Hutton, Floyd Cobb

Overview: Each LEP shall ensure that the READ Act per-pupil intervention money it receives in each budget year is used to improve the reading competency of students enrolled in kindergarten through third grade and does not replace other money that would otherwise be used for this purpose. An LEP shall provide specific expenditure information to the department that specifies the manner in which the LEP spent the per-pupil intervention money it received in a budget year. Districts are able to use this information to ensure that they are in compliance with the Colorado READ Act. They can also use this information to ensure that every student identified as having a significant reading deficiency receives intervention supports that are approved by the department. New legislation was passed and put into effect 2019-2020 school year. There is a new requirement for districts to report budget to CDE. READ Act data collection, a new additional requirement occurring April through June, is a budget description on what the funds will be used on. The two new uses can use funds to provide CORE programming and can purchase software for these programs. There is a budget planning within Data Pipeline, but may be taken away on Pipeline. It is not required by the data collection anymore. They are working with programming team to collect this online. It will be similar to EASI application due to wanting it more consistent with other collections. This is being suggestive that they have it implemented for this data collection (April of 2020). It is a tight deadline as the initial submissions are due by May. Communication to the field is a priority for this collection. There will be webinars, guidance documents, etc. to get this information to districts. It will be an online platform. This is collected at a district level, not school, but the districts will need to work closely with schools to complete it.

Discussion: We want to engage in an open conversation about READ Act. Floyd Cobb answered all questions that EDAC presented last time and was sent via email. Whitney Hutton created timelines for both data recording and budget process. The timelines seemed very helpful to show what is expected by the districts. What kind of support will be given for this collection? Is this doable for larger districts? Who is going to be web management respondent? The bill was restructured like a grant process rather than what it was in the past. Guidance and support will be available for anyone and everyone. There are multiple portions of this grant that are going to require more support, i.e. larger vs. smaller. Some of the statutory changes are making this more like grant. The narrowing of the READ Act was due to legislation and them explaining to legislation how this process will work. Preschool Department would say the changes are small, because this is a massive bill and will require a significant amount of change. There is a lot of money, but not a lot of explanation of where it will be spent. People are very concerned about timeline and time crunch. The challenge that we run into is that statute limits the timeline. In small schools, people are already wearing so many hats, so adding this collection, time wise, is very concerning. Some school districts might deny funds due to timeline. READ Act is not optional, as it will still be there whether funds are accepted or not. The bill is structured to keep the responsibility on the districts. One suggestion is to display clearly how the money will be spent. Are there going to be webinars, etc. on where this money will be spent? We will be able to provide technical support on whatever you need. This week and next week, the Preschool Department will be providing technical narrative more on the READ Act. The larger districts will have the most problem handing the money out to all of the schools within their district with this short timeline. Is the revision due the 30th of September? They don't know the specific deadline for revisions. It may be December time. The major concern is that the funds are used appropriately. Because there are multiple divisions associated with this, there must be a budget and narrative timeline in order to set it up in a sequence. Again, it will be more like a grant and different than it was in the past. What can you purchase with these funds, i.e. list of things? Preschool has a list on the website right now. We will have vendors available as well. In the event where a program was on the list in the past and now is removed, they will work with that district to make sure they meet requirements. Preschool Department can provide support if something is not on the list. It all depends on the type of purchase that is needed, but more than likely, it will go through the process and be accepted. The rubrics and application for how they are going to evaluate these program purchases are located online. There are about 160 programs to be reviewed. They should be finished by mid to end of March. Are indirect costs allowed? There isn't anything in terms of an allowable use in statute, so technically it is not a grant. Be careful about calling it a grant. If it was a true grant, it would be set up tighter than it is now. It needs to be clarified that it is not a grant, but similar. What would be submitted and when? The timeline, itself, helps with this. We can't really do anything about this timeline so it is about the support that is given to make sure districts meet this timeline. It still isn't clear on what/how you will be submitting. Please keep in mind that this is a small portion to a bill. If this were the only change, then yes, we will be able to dedicate resources to this bill. This bill is huge and we do not have Preschool Department staff to assist with this. Is there a way to give feedback on ways to make it better? Yes, absolutely. We know you are responding to legislation, and the Department is doing the best you can. The monitoring part is going to be the heaviest lift. Is there going to be a monitoring process? This will come next. The monitoring process is going to relate to funds being used and where. There are groups that are looking into that right now. They are across the state and had specific interest in the READ Act. Anji and Whitney are hosting webinars every month to help districts with this process. The webinars will be recorded and available to view. Another problem is looking at whether or not the teacher is comfortable making these changes. There is a one year wavier for this. Every teacher K-3 will need to complete this training. Two and a half million dollars were allocated to not restrict anyone from taking this training. This could be a concern for small schools as teachers move around and switch grades. Is it possible to adjust to August, i.e. change timeline, so you can meet our own requirements? There are requirements that need to be completed by the end of the fiscal year. The budget needs to be completed by June 30th. We are putting this in process so we can get the money out to districts as soon as possible. Either way, because of the limits, everything will need to be submitted before June 30th.
Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	NU-113 Summer Food Service Program Application (Review)	Alicia Grove
Overview: Based on USDA regulations 7 CFR 225.14, sponsors must annually submit an application and receive approval by the CDE School Nutrition Unit in order to operate the Summer Food Service Program. Applications are reviewed and verified by CDE School Nutrition prior to approval. The Summer Food Service Program is an entitlement program and reimbursement funds are available based on the number of meals served. The information collected is of value to the CDE Nutrition unit as it allows the unit to determine which sponsors and sites qualify for the Summer Food Service Program. Approval of this program is of value to districts as it allows them to serve and claim reimbursement for meals during the program. None of the information collected contains PII. This is required by the USDA to participate in programs. The school year will change with this.		
Discussion: Is this a state or federal grant application? We allow multiple. It is mostly federal. What are Fringe Benefits and why would they use that verbiage? These are all required by the USDA. It seems foreign to have this on the application. If they are covering health insurance, this would be under that.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
5 Minutes	NU-116 Food Safety Inspection Reports (Review)	Alicia Grove
Overview: Based on USDA regulations 7 CFR 210.15, participating school food authorities are required to submit the number of food safety inspections obtained per school year by each school under its jurisdiction to CDE School Nutrition. This information helps to ensure that school food authorities/schools, that are not able to obtain the required inspections through no fault of their own, follow proper food safety practices and have a HACCP-based food safety plan to protect the safety of school meals. CDE School Nutrition can use this information to communicate with State and local public health authorities to facilitate progress in obtaining the two required inspections each year. CDE School Nutrition has streamlined the reporting process to minimize administrative burden to School Food Authorities.		
Discussion: Is this just kitchens or warehouses too? Each school has different sites. It will be looking at each site depending on the school. They are just looking at what is happening per site. It doesn't matter where this is per school. Side Note from Alicia Grove: If you are interested in learning about what School Nutrition does, we have a monthly newsletter called The Dish that goes out every month. This is focused on many different initiatives. Alicia handed out post cards on the newsletter.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
20 Minutes	ESL-403 Comprehensive Program Plan (Review)	Rebecca McKinney
Overview: The Comprehensive Program Plan (CPP) is a submission requirement for administrative units under the Exceptional Children's Education Act (ECEA). Submissions are required at least once every 5 years. The CPP does not request or contain personally identifiable information. The data management system used in the Exceptional Student Services Unit (ESSU) to house program plans is supported by an extensive contract between CDE and the vendor, including all provisions regarding PII. A Comprehensive Program Plan is a public document that describes the administrative unit's gifted program elements. The anticipated fiscal impact is minimal. The CPP form has been updated to eliminate the collection of data already available to CDE, such as the Early Access Addendum information. Completion of this form every 5 years should take minimal staff hours. Maximum estimated hours every 5 years would be about 6-8. This estimate is based on the need to gather information and complete the narrative sections for each of the required elements of rule. This cost was derived from personal experience (from Rebecca McKinney) as a Gifted Director who completed the CPP documents for the AU.		

Discussion: Any new documentation will be brought to EDAC. The piece that was shared with EDAC, it is missing some components as compared to what is seen normally. Is this every 5 years? Yes. Should the plan say 5 year plan instead of 4 year? Rebecca kept 4 year as it aligns with monitoring process instead of changing it to 5 years. The language should be consistent, either 4 or 5. Is this Required to Obtain Benefit or Mandatory? This is Mandatory, and not Required to Obtain Benefit. Within the BOCES, does every school district still need to submit this even though they didn't submit UIP? On page 5 on the bottom, all of the text is from ECEA Rules is noted. They don't have to submit it, but need to explain why they didn't submit. At the top of page 2, "district" should be "AU". Is this an electronic form? This lives in the Data Management System, currently. This is loaded in as a template. Rebecca is leaning toward this to become an upload. What does the department do with the data submitted? Rebecca is trying to align it with onsite monitoring. Her hope is using this information with the onsite monitoring so this document should be submitted first. They will look at targets and if they line up. They will align supports to help with steps. Under budget 12.20, are you imagining them to attach documents to support this? Yes. On 12.25, the checkbox is appreciated. The adjustments are appreciated, and once they get feedback from field, it will be even better. As long as we narrow the information entered, it should be an improved process. It should not take more than a couple hours. The quality in programming piece whether it be rural or inner city should be the same. What is CGER (pronounced *seeger*)? Colorado Gifted Education Review.		
Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.		
10 Minutes	OLU-106 Diagnostic, Exploration and Improvement Planning for Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) and Online Schools (Review – Split from another collection)	B Sanders
Overview: The Diagnostic, Exploration and Improvement Planning for Alternative Education Campuses (AECs) and Online Schools program is an offered service through the Empowering Action for School Improvement (EASI) application process. The service is also being offered to schools that have not been awarded funding through the EASI process. The Diagnostic Review tools that are submitted for review are those that are utilized during the diagnostic review process. No PII is collected with this tool. Participating schools work with CDE staff to conduct a school-based diagnostic review, visit other pilot schools, and facilitate an improvement planning process. Reviews result in a diagnostic report and recommended actions. The facilitated improvement planning process is designed to assist the school in building upon the recommendations to refine its Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). Costs associated are minimal and may include coordination of staff release time to participate in the diagnostic review process. Postage and supply costs will be minimal as the self-assessment will be submitted electronically. They go in and interview staff, teachers, sometimes students and parents to get these issues.		
Discussion: Is this the same as the pilot program last year? Some things were readjusted (order wise) and taken out. It is very in depth. This is a great tool overall. What is the burden on this, the alignment of the grant, etc.? When we go into a site visit, we don't ask every single question. This acts as a question bank, rather than a full questionnaire. It is a set amount of time that they have during the site visits, so getting through all of the questions is nearly impossible. They take the information from the site visit and create a report for the campus. The burden of the school is that they need to host CDE reps for the day. The campus is not expected to do this before CDE reps get to the school. There are very great questions to guide anyone, not just an AEC. It hits all of the targets.		
Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.		
10 Minutes	HAW-102 Report of Designated Personnel and Stock Epinephrine (Review)	Sarah Blumenthal

Overview: If a district adopts a policy to stock Epinephrine Auto-injectors, the school nurse must report to CDE whether they have trained and designated any personnel to administer epinephrine auto-injectors and the number of staff that have been trained and designated. (22-1-119 CRS) In order to protect PII, they remove any PII prior to the vendor analyzing the data. The data provides a general overview of the designated staff and anaphylaxis-related incidents that occur each year which is a great value to districts and CDE. Information is used to analyze school data in relation to state trends and to identify strategies to support successful student health outcomes. The fiscal impact is time to report, approximately less than 10 minutes per year, as reported anecdotally by districts. Most of the events are occurring in the classroom. Medicines are kept in health office. This collection has helped with where to keep medicine. There are about 150 deaths per year, so it is pretty rare, but we need to collect it.		
Discussion: How many reports do you get? It has been increasing over the years. This year, there has already been 60 events. This doesn’t mean there was medicine given though. There are about 30 districts that have the stock epinephrine. It is heavier in the rural areas due to response time from the community. The larger districts are struggling to adopt stock epi. They do have a quick response time, and they can’t afford having stock. The Epi pens cost about $600 and only have a 12 month lifetime. Some concerns are that students will not bring their own Epi pen if the school has it. The Epi pen has to be in room temperature. The reporting should be within 10 days of the event occurring. It is helpful to go into the site and create the report. Sarah Blumenthal has created a cheat sheet in which the questions that will be asked post process so they can ask the right questions during the episode. There should always be a secondary delegate to administer the medicine just in case nurse is not in. The Epi pen is an auto injector. Once you open the cap, the Epi pen has to be used immediately and the cap cannot be replaced. The policy states that it has to be the auto injector and not the standard needle. There is research going on for a nasal spray instead of injection, but this is projected about 6 years from now. Epi is the named brand, and there are generics. The auto injector can be any brand. When they develop the spray, the rules are going to have to change.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
10 Minutes	HAW-103 Epinephrine Administration and Anaphylaxis Reporting (Review)	Sarah Blumenthal
Overview: C.R.S. 22-1-119.5(8)(e) requires that CDE collect from schools any incidence of anaphylaxis and/or administration of epinephrine in the school. In order to protect personally identifiable information, they remove any PII prior to the vendor analyzing the data. The data provides a general overview of the anaphylaxis-related incidents that occur each year which is a great value to districts and CDE. Information is used to analyze school data in relation to state trends and to identify strategies to support successful student health outcomes. The only cost to districts is time needed to report. The only time they need to report is if there is an anaphylaxis incident. The benefits outweigh the cost. The fiscal impact is time to report, approximately 10 minute per incident, as reported anecdotally by districts. The Nutrition department created a template data collection template that helps streamline the reporting process.		

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">Discussion: How many reports do you get? It has been increasing over the years. This year, there has already been 60 events. This doesn’t mean there was medicine given though. There are about 30 districts that have the stock epinephrine. It is heavier in the rural areas due to response time from the community. The larger districts are struggling to adopt stock epi. They do have a quick response time, and they can’t afford having stock. The Epi pens cost about $600 and only have a 12 month lifetime. Some concerns are that students will not bring their own Epi pen if the school has it. The Epi pen has to be in room temperature. The reporting should be within 10 days of the event occurring. It is helpful to go into the site and create the report. Sarah Blumenthal has created a cheat sheet in which the questions that will be asked post process so they can ask the right questions during the episode. There should always be a secondary delegate to administer the medicine just in case nurse is not in. The Epi pen is an auto injector. Once you open the cap, the Epi pen has to be used immediately and the cap cannot be replaced. The policy states that it has to be the auto injector and not the standard needle. There is research going on for a nasal spray instead of injection, but this is projected about 6 years from now. Epi is the named brand, and there are generics. The auto injector can be any brand. When they develop the spray, the rules are going to have to change.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Conclusion: Approved.</td></tr>
<tr><td>10 Minutes</td><td>SED-275 Request for Reimbursement of Substitute (Review)</td><td>Kim Boylan, Lauren Rossini</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Overview: The Exceptional Student Services Unit cannot reimburse administrative units with federal funds for substitute teachers who do not hold valid educator licensing credentials. Since there are no outside vendors utilized and PII is not kept, forms are sent to Accounting for payment and are protected there. The costs of collecting, analyzing, and reporting information is minimal in comparison to reimbursement received by the school districts. Staff hours are estimated to be 30 minute or less per completed form. The forms are then scanned to ESSU for processing so no postage is required. The funds are available at the beginning of each fiscal year, and are budgeted accordingly. They can limit to the last 4 digits of social security number instead of full social security number for security purposes. The social security number would come in handy for Kim Boylan because she does not have access like Lauren Rossini when it comes to common names. If we at least had the last 4 digits of the SSN, it would make lookup a lot easier. Social security numbers are always an issue with all collections. Social security is required because that is the main way they pull data.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Discussion: If you have an active teaching license you would have an EDID, correct? EDID numbers are not contained in the licensing system. We would all love to just use the EDID numbers and not the Social Security Numbers. The licenses are pulled in with just Social Security Numbers and not the EDIDs. EDIDs are assigned via SSNs. The EDID is a main field in December Count that are required. Until we can figure out tying EDID instead of SSNs for licensing purposes, we will need to stick to SSNs. If you could narrow it down to the last 4 digits that would be a step in the right direction. Keeping SSN entries is a nightmare due to locking them up for security reasons. This could be online someday, but it will still need to be a print out for Accounting Department. They use a SSN to verify a person’s license, only if the credential number is not provided. Can you black out SSN when you forward them on? Not sure, that is not something they handle as this is something the Accounting Department handles. This will be something they look into. If this is data they don’t need, then there is no need to provide it. Who is filling this out? Most of the time, it is the school secretary filling it out, but it is all dependent on the school. This is not tied to the narrative. They will absolutely check to see how the SSN is handled after Fiscal Team hands it off to Accounting Department.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Conclusion: Approved.</td></tr>
<tr><td>10 Minutes</td><td>SED-279 Documentation of a Tuition Rate for Public Charter Schools, Not Including Online Programs, Fiscal Year 2020-21 (Review)</td><td>Kim Boylan, Lauren Rossini</td></tr>
</table>

Overview: The Department is charged with establishing a tuition rate for the special education program for students identified with a disability enrolled in Public Charter Schools. This form is needed to collect the necessary information form administrative units and BOCES in order to set the tuition rate for Public Charter Schools. PII is maintained in secure filing. The costs are minimal to the schools and/or districts that utilize this form in relation to the benefits received. The anticipated fiscal impact on school districts statewide are minimal as the staff hours are estimated to be less than 4 hours to complete form. The form is then mailed to CDE-ESSU, so postage is less than $5.00. Funds are available at the beginning of each fiscal year and budgeted accordingly. This is currently a paper submission. In order for a school to qualify, there are certain criteria they have to meet. The students have to have a severe disability and a percentage of the school has to have a severe disability. There is more or less a formula that determines this percentage. Currently, only Rocky Mountain Deaf School in Jefferson County uses this form since they are 100% Special Education enrollment. The volume isn't here to establish an online system for this as there is only one school that submits. They submit various data mainly staff salaries and benefits. There are other things that go into the formula. They also collect staff SSN as well. If the staff do not have a license in Special Education, then the salaries and benefits are deducted from this rate. This process has been around a long time.		
Discussion: Is there an instruction page available for guidance or timeline? The criteria is available in the rules. The act goes through what is needed to apply. Kim Boylan and Lauren Rossini are aware that there is a need for a guidance sheet or instructions with this. Lauren did put together an information sheet that is posted with this on the website that is available as well as other reference documents. The form itself is pretty self-explanatory. They hope that this will be moved to online collecting, but they are still waiting on more involvement. These are due the middle of July, beginning of August. The problem with this form being submitted with an established deadline at CDE, is the form has to go through various levels before CDE gets it, so it is always a little bit late for submission. Instructions should not be difficult to put together as they already have documents that mirror this submission closely. They require SSN because they have to verify the license, again. If staff did not have a license, benefits and salaries must be deducted, so SSN is needed due to those audiences not having EDIDs. The last 4 digits may be beneficial in this collection as well, like SED-275. They are doing two rates now, one for pre-K and one for K-12. All of these applications are in locked cabinets and not destroyed due to auditing purposes. Do they (Rocky Mountain Deaf School) take kids outside of the district? Yes, they do. When you don't need the paper forms for auditing, do they get destroyed, and how do you manage that? We have secure destruction services. They keep them in year order, and once it is audited, they can destroy the documentation.		
Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.		
5 Minutes	SED-280 Documentation of a Tuition Rate for Public Online Programs, Including Online Programs in Charter Schools, Fiscal Year 2020-21 (Review)	Kim Boylan, Lauren Rossini
Overview: The Department is charged with establishing a tuition rate for the special educational program for students identified with a disability enrolled in Public On-Line Programs. This form is needed to collect the necessary information from administrative units and BOCES in order to set the tuition rate for On-Line Programs, including On-Line Programs in Charter Schools. No outside vendor is used for this collection. PII is protected in secure filing. The costs are minimal to the schools and/or districts that utilize this form in relation to the benefits. Funds are available at the beginning of each fiscal year and budgeted accordingly. No one has ever applied. There is certain criteria they have to meet in order to apply. If they would submit, then this would be handled the same as the charter school (above). It would be the same process, paper submission, as above in SED-279.		
Discussion: The social security number should be last 4 digits.		
Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.		
10 Minutes	SED-409A IDEA Federal Application Project Narrative (Review)	Kim Boylan, Lauren Rossini

Overview: AUs/BOCES/SOPs must complete the IDEA Federal Application Narratives to receive IDEA federal funding and specify and provide assurances as to how the IDEA federal funding will be expended. There is no personally identifiable information collected, and there is no outside vendor utilized. The costs are minimal in that this form is required once every 3 years for the AUs/SOPs to receive their flow-through funds for IDEA. Staff hours are estimated to be less than 5 hours for initial 3-year submission and less than 5 hours each year for the End of Year Performance Reporting when completing this form. CDE is alerted to available funding with the annual IDEA Part B application notification from the US Department of Education. It was just a paper process for many years, so this electronic system is much improved, compared to paper process. There is a corresponding online budget system that should be together in one system. They are hoping to get some additions to this system, i.e. drop downs in system that will align with narrative because they are standalone. In many cases, there are different staff working in them. SPED director, budget person, office, etc. are some of the examples of staff that work within this system. They are just text boxes that anyone can type in. It does work pretty well, but there are some disconnects within these two systems.

Discussion: It works well for some, but it would be great if they were married together. Somehow auto populate fields so it would make it easier. Drop downs would make things easier for the user to figure out what is needed. It would be ideal to mirror facilities system to this system.

Conclusion: Approved.

5 Minutes	OLS-108 PBIS within MTSS Tier 2 Training Series Results Survey (New)	Jason Harlacher

Overview: This data collection is part of the Office of Learning Supports' (OLS) Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) trainings offered to the state. (PBIS is a schoolwide behavioral framework that improves school climate and culture.) As part of this series, OLS is offering a training on an intervention called Check-In, Check-Out (CICO). CICO is a type of a Tier 2 intervention for students with mild behavioral issues, such as inattention or disruptive behavior. (For reference, Tier 1 instruction is provided to all students, Tier 2 interventions are for students with mild needs, and Tier 3 interventions are provided for students with intensive needs.) The training is a 3-day series, taking place on Jan 16, Jan 17, and Feb 28. To determine if the training is effective for students that receive CICO, schools will be asked to complete a survey asking them to document the results of using CICO. Schools are piloting CICO with 3-6 students as part of the training. They will begin piloting in late January. They will be asked to share data on their piloting efforts on Feb 28th (they will be asked to report how many days each student was on CICO, the number of days the student met their goal, the student's grade level, and if the student is currently on an IEP or not. This will help OLS determine if the training is reaching and benefiting students, particularly those students with disabilities. Schools will be asked for these data on Feb 28th and then at the end of the year if they have piloted CICO with more students. The costs are minimal, and the benefits include determining the impact of OLS' training and technical assistance. If the results of the data indicate that the Tier 2 series is effective, and particularly effective for students with disabilities, OLS can make a case that its work is beneficial for Tier 2 and that it directly benefits students with disabilities. The fiscal impact is minimal for schools. The survey is 3 questions, so the time commitment is extremely short (i.e., 5-10 minutes) and the survey is completed using a web-based system (i.e., Survey Monkey). The person that completes the survey will need to access their school's progress monitoring data, and many schools will have systems in place for progress monitoring. If they do not, a free resource (i.e., Excel template) is provided as part of the training to schools to assist with entering and graphing progress monitoring data. Schools can also purchase the use of Schoolwide Information System, which is a data warehouse that enables schools to enter behavioral data and generate progress monitoring graphs. SWIS costs between $300 and $500 per school, depending on the number of schools that a district may purchase SWIS for and the number of SWIS applications that are purchased.

Discussion: There is no student information on the survey. They are labelled "Student 1, Student 2, etc." Is this only for the pilot? Yes. After this year, the plan is to scale out to the rest of the school. What is the goal? The goal is to learn at least 80%. It is great you are doing training with PBIS. The training will go over how to choose different students for their 6 students. Is this voluntary? A school does not need to partake if they don't want to, so yes.		
Conclusion: Approved.		
30 Minutes	P3O-104 Early Childhood Service Delivery Models, Practitioner Survey and Administrator Interview Protocol (New)	Heidi White
Overview: A study of early childhood special education service delivery in Colorado is being conducted through practitioner surveys and administrator interviews, in order to establish rates of implementations of designated components of high quality inclusion across preschool settings. This study is being conducted in order for CDE's preschool team to identify technical assistance and professional learning needs of practitioners and early childhood administrators related to implementation of high quality inclusive practices. This study is being conducted by the Morgridge College of Education at the University of Denver. This vendor was selected because of their involvement in the development of nationally recognized tools, as a part of a nationally funded technical assistance center, to measure preschool inclusion practices. The vendor works under contract with the National Center for Pyramid Model Innovation which is funded by the Office of Special Education Services and supports the federal government in developing requirements for states in measuring state's performance on Indicator 6: Early Childhood Least Restrictive Environments. An Agreement to assure the confidentiality and protection of PII is in place as a component of the Purchase Order developed with the study contractor. The costs of the Purchase Order with this vendor equal less than .5% of the annual grant provided to the state of Colorado for Preschool Special Education (IDEA, Part B Section 619). This will allow us to more carefully utilize funds designated to provide technical assistance and professional learning with the funds granted to the state to deliver supports. The costs associated with development of the survey and interview protocol, dissemination of the survey, conducting the interviews, analyzing all data, and development of an initial report is an average of $38 per interview or survey, which is entirely reasonable given the anticipated benefits. Ongoing significant effort and resources are put forth by local practitioners, regional specialists, and state administrators to ensure compliance with the Least Restrictive Environments requirements in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Data from this study will inform the state's administrators to ensure that supports, resources, and technical assistance are targeted to specific needs, and that professional learning is focused to the specific barriers or challenges experienced. Additionally, the study protocols allow the vendor to identify model cases that can be utilized to inform best practices efforts, and professional learning offerings. Colorado performs better than every state on this indicator. The national average is 42% and Colorado is 84%. Preschoolers with disabilities should be held to high expectations and be included like students without disabilities. It will provide customized assistance to the personnel that are helping these students in the classroom. They are willing to provide a survey to any staff that is willing to participate. University of Denver helps build capacity for special education staff. They took information from the State and developed a survey from these findings. Administration can look very different throughout the state when we look at early childhood. All of this is based on the policy statement from the federal government. "All young children with disabilities should have access to inclusive high quality early childhood programs, where they are provided with individualized and appropriate support in meeting high expectations".		

Discussion: Were the survey questions created between the partnerships? Yes. University of Colorado developed questions, and CDE took these questions and made adjustments. There was a lot of back and forth with this process. In terms of the research study, how do you keep your subjects' information secure? They will be de-identified after they take the survey. The University keeps this data on lockdown and will get this information de-identified as soon as possible. This is also voluntary so it is not required to take the survey so if someone doesn't feel comfortable taking the survey, then they don't have to. They are looking at different areas in the state. They will identify administrators for each region to assist with this process. The administrator interviews will be recorded, but then deleted after information is taken from interview. They are not going to transcribe interviews, just take the information. The reason they are using interviews with administrators versus a survey, is because it is hard to set one survey that will probe the right things based on what is being asked to each person. That is why they need professional interviewers to get the information they need. This will solidify that the data is meaningful and what they need. How much time are the interviews going to take with administrators? The cost is based on contracting with the college for this study. The cost for districts is different. The interviews are no longer than 90 minutes, hopefully around 60 minutes. We hope that there are more interest than the 60 slots they have available. How can we invest in looking at performance? Do you think you will have enough people to fill these 60 slots for 60-90 minutes? Yes. They believe they will fill the slots. They do not have to go 60 minutes, but informing people that it can go 60 minutes gives the interviewers the opportunity to probe the interviewee to get the right information that is needed. They talked about making this interview more of an intervention. Is there an opt-in for the students? There is nothing here about students. We are interviewing staff on their methods teaching children. We are not asking about specific students, but general practice or procedures. There is no child level data being collected. There is no data here that will be linked to a teacher, administrator, program, etc. Are you looking at collecting data for paraprofessionals? No, but one question is asking if they use paraprofessionals. They will not be interviewing classified staff. On question 16, it may be best to not use the word "co-teach", possibly use a different term for that. Who initiated this collection? CDE initiated this. Because Colorado is ahead of the game, other states are looking at tips/tricks on what Colorado is doing. Are you looking at just special education administrators, or administrators in general? We are looking at preschool administrators, but ones that specifically work with special education. On item 1, there is duplication. On item 11, you should clear up question based on probe. Since we have a finite group of interviewers that will be doing these, there will be intensive training on how to ask questions to certain groups of people.
Conclusion: Approved with minor edits.