**Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Listening Tour**

# Pueblo, CO – May 4, 2016

## Standards, Assessments, and Accountability

### Discussion Question #1: How should we measure student progress toward meeting the standards?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Students should be measured from where they start not to other students with more resources and family/school support.
	+ Develop a body of evidence that can be used. More than one test score.
	+ In a consistent way. Changing the test (if it is a test) too often doesn’t allow for quality, data‐driven decision making. Give schools a chance to get used to it. Also, provide feedback on the test ASAP.
	+ Pearson seems to be running the school and making $$.
	+ Project based learning/other.
	+ Use multiple measures – not just one in one moment in time.
	+ Application of learning not just memorizing for a test. So many tests – teachers have no time to adjust instruction.
	+ Body of evidence‐ growth, assessment, quarterlies, attendance/mobility, ELL consideration, and apply what they know vs. memorization. One test is not accurate view of child ‐ # of illnesses during testing, social issues. “Mini” PARCC test vs. one long test.
	+ Data that makes sense to parents.
	+ Performance assessment.
	+ Not assess all at a certain age or grade.
	+ Competency–based learning and standards–based grading.
	+ Use assessments that are pre/post instead of assessing assess.
	+ Body of evidence (more of). Quarterly assessment (mini PARCCs).
	+ Assessment, growth, quarterly assessment (4‐quarter PARCC), limit kindergarten, body of evidence.
	+ Multiple options not just one test. As a parent, too many tests, stresses kids out. As an administrator, cannot meet with students testing most of the year.
	+ Growth, attendance, add root causes, mini‐quarterly PARCC’s, qualitative.
	+ Body of evidence, consider root cause, multiple measures, application, district/local assessment, mini‐PARCC assessments.
	+ An assessment that is meaningful to parents, competency‐based systems, multiple measures/qualitative, ability to apply knowledge (project based learning), grade level equivalent – not partially proficient – what does that mean?

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Assessments – grade level equivalence, parents are expected to partner with school but how can I do that when/if I can’t understand the assessments used.
	+ Competency based assessment system that is not a snapshot in time but allows students to demonstrate competency.
	+ Not all students go to college. Focus should be continuing education. Disaggregated students, especially twice exceptional, are most affected.
	+ Normative, applied, competency‐based and tested when they are ready to meet that assessment.
	+ Districtwide, kindergarten students are expected to do a lot of testing when they are not developmentally ready for testing.
	+ DIBELS and TS Gold would be more developmentally appropriate for primary grades. More valid than what district is currently using.
	+ Non‐academic pieces are out of the school’s control so it’s hard to include in accountability.
	+ Agrees with earlier comments.
	+ First question – importance of multiple measures and not just using just one. Use qualitative measures – the ability to measure application of information more than just memorization.
	+ Formative assessments and how they are contributing to the perception that too many tests are going.
	+ High stakes testing without any formative testing is problematic [because] students need practice
	+ School quality – measure of resources available to the school [because] that is correlated with success.
	+ Take into consideration students’ aspirations and CCR.
	+ Teacher evaluations – having teacher evaluation is an important measure of quality.
	+ Teacher retention needs to be part of what gets addressed.
	+ You spend a lot of time and resources on getting teachers trained and up to speed in your district and then they leave your district to go to a higher paying district.
	+ Why come to a district that is low performing? Also poses a problem for districts and needs to be addressed.
	+ CCR – we are too focused on college going pathway; starting to talk about college in middle school, need to bring back the vocational conversation. Student at the table had school start talking to her about college when she started 9th grade. What happened to the high school focus and experience? She feels like she went straight from middle school to college and she was not ready for that conversation.
	+ Get rid of the one snapshot of PARCC and have 4 mini assessments per year. 90‐minute test is not developmentally appropriate for 4‐6th grade so break up the test into four sections and capture the growth.
	+ Make test results available more real time so it can be used for instruction.
	+ Breaking it up will help teachers use test results better and allows students to take shorter tests.
	+ Will there ever be an opportunity for Teacher input on PARCC assessment and Pearson not building tests in a bubble? Not having teachers part of the development is contributing to the opt‐out issue.
	+ Looking at BOE instead of single assessment. Looking at EMH and if developmentally appropriate.
	+ Multiple measures – don’t rely on just one measure. Formulaic as well as qualitative measures. Provide an area for schools and districts to rationalize their progress. Be able to measure but don’t assess too much. We need a balance. Interim assessments. The state tests and the district tests are too much. Formative vs summative.
	+ Concerned about inappropriate amount of assessments that have trickled down to Kindergarten. They can’t read yet. We tend to think that all children need to fit in the same box as older children, and that’s just not right. Our tests are not a valid or reliable method of knowing what kids know. The interim assessments at all grade levels in our district are of particular concern (it is a paper/pencil test). There are other ways to assess that. We are not using TS Gold. There has been a huge technology issue. The interim assessments are on top of the unit tests.
	+ There are valid, developmentally appropriate tests, like TS Gold. But our district’s interim assessments are a problem. At some point districts need to be told when to limit the use of assessments. TS Gold and DIBELS are fine, but when you start putting in these higher level rigorous tests, it gets difficult. You do have to have tests to measure progress. When the State said they would limit the number of tests, it got higher at our district. We really need to limit the number of tests, maybe progressively build it up as they get older. This is why you’re getting more opt‐outs. Kids are very stressed about taking the tests. I wish the district and the state could see that they should trust the teachers.
	+ 11‐year old with Downs and autism. School special education teacher is bogged down with paperwork. Is this an opportunity for parents to access funds or advocate for school to get funds? If so, how?
	+ Parent of a special education child‐ the ESS teacher is so overwhelmed with paperwork she loses time to connect with the kids. Will this law provide the opportunity for parents to gain resources for their SPED child?
	+ Golden opportunity to rethink accountability. Targeted supports approach it that way as opposed to:
		- Grad rate requirements – local control with grad requirements and yet they count the same for accountability purposes. She encourages the SEA to think about minimum requirement for measuring grad requirements and how locally defined. Look at the definition of basic requirements for grad requirements.
		- Same goes for dropouts. If students drop out the second time, they count twice against the district. Only count a single student once. Don’t punish districts for trying to re‐engage dropouts, even more than once. Districts should be encouraged to continue with the same student – so don’t ding us for trying to re‐engage dropouts.
		- Address mobility – students move in and 2 weeks later take assessments. Before count all assessments in accountability, make it so students have to have been in districts at least since October 1. Not hurt school or teacher’s evaluation.
		- Look at differentiated system – takes into consideration FRL and mobility.
		- Not use Social Studies as an accountability measure. Move back to US History and Geography. Social Studies gets convoluted in assessments.
		- Targeted supports – differentiate [between] PI and TA.
	+ Through grant opportunities to support the building capacity of teachers and districts. Provide definitions about guidelines‐ what effective instruction looks like for specific needs students. A rubric of best practices. Regional professional development like the CDLE. Find creative ways to deliver professional development to teachers on their timeline. Use a trainer of trainer’s model. Should have subject area competencies, as a state.

### Discussion Question #2: What measures of school quality or student success should be included in the school accountability system?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ I’d like to see districts have to submit an overall report for DIBELS and tests like that pre‐ mid and post, rather than all of the monitoring going on now.
	+ District measures of success. Move away from unintended consequences that create competition in education.
	+ Teacher retention and stability of staff. Usually a stable faculty and staff indicate a level of “happiness”, etc. This is complicated though.
	+ Graduation/completion rates, % of students showing yearly longitudinal growth.
	+ School quality – offering of career readiness/CTE, community partnerships.
	+ % growth, school’s support systems, retention.
	+ Whole child!
	+ Multiple measures – formative leading to summative. Be careful of perceptions (over‐ assessment).
	+ After school support: academic/emotional.
	+ Growth %, extra support/tutoring, teacher evaluation.
	+ Get schools to become “quality” in order to encourage student success.
	+ % student growth, extra support, social‐emotional, teacher retention, attendance, mobility.
	+ Wrap around services, school climate, teacher retention/satisfaction, after‐school opportunities, clubs, reading, family/community involvement, addressing/attempting to improve.
	+ Parent involvement in a school is shown to really make a difference so perhaps this is measurable in some way.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Teacher evaluation can be used and kept in Colorado. How many resources are available to the school? Student success must be tied to the students’ aspirations and wants for the future. Behavior can be a measure.
	+ It would make sense in a high performing school to use discipline and behavior, but it wouldn’t make sense in a turnaround school that has a lot of transience and behavior issues. Maybe a growth model with these things would work.
	+ Being a high poverty district, we are getting students who need a lot more before they get to school and we have to teach that before we could move them on. If we could show growth, that would be helpful. Something like decreasing suspensions and referrals by a certain amount. Maybe addressing chronic absenteeism. You need the district and court system support to do these things though. Maybe something that the school self‐selected indicator and goal.
	+ Strong compelling academic data, great achievement that is possible when we invest in families and provide to access to high quality, affordable childcare and healthcare. Is it sufficient to start testing in middle school? Should we start testing at 3 years old? PBS series of raising America. There are now some Title II dollars. How can they be accessed?
	+ What are you hearing from Community members?
	+ Yes, teachers should have to prove competency in all subjects. These are our at‐risk and high need students and they deserve the best teachers.

### Discussion Question #3: How should the state consider the 95% assessment participation requirement?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ What assurance do we have that schools/districts will not be held hostage if there is less than 95% participation?
	+ As they are now.
	+ What we need from CDE: Regional professional development based in real best practices and CDE mandates also based in best practice, not some ones idea of ED reform – with no data to back up, as well as CDE to help change state laws which create or exacerbate these situations. Regional induction programs for probationary system.
	+ Incentives? Maybe $ for schools/districts that have rates above a certain level.
	+ The 95% requirement should be ignored as long as schools don’t counsel low performers to opt‐out.
	+ Formula with proposed plan – know how the monies will be used.
	+ Consider rotating schools – 3 to 5 years.
	+ How many schools are left out if only competitive?
	+ Develop a system parents can support and then it is a non‐issue.
	+ Without the opt‐out students.
	+ Opt‐outs not to be counted against school. This is governed by state law.
	+ Parent opt‐out.
	+ If assessments were meaningful and their value understood by parents, maybe opt‐outs would decrease quite a bit?

### General Discussion Notes:

* + 95% participation – more opt‐outs this year and hate to see school be affected when there are so many opt‐outs, out of control.
	+ Did not talk that much about participation. Need to think about consequences for how we are counting the opt‐outs.
	+ The current weight for the 95% participation rate is fine. I would think it would be very unfair if my school’s rating dropped because kids were opting‐out. Do it in a way that doesn’t punish those of us that are really trying to get kids to the test but they’re just not showing up.
	+ Bring back the differentiation between M1 and M2 in the exit criteria for both reading and writing. The state should have a proficiency requirement that is used statewide.

### Discussion Question #4: Should school improvement funds be awarded as formula or competitive grants?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Smaller districts do not have grant staff and therefore cannot compete with larger districts. The need for support (funds) is probably greater in smaller districts because of a lack of funds.
	+ If these funds are supposed to help students who need extra support, why would it be competitive?
	+ If this is about getting resources to the kids who need them most, why even consider competitive grants?
	+ Formula only – do not use a competitive process.
	+ Formula. A competitive system is more likely to further drive wedges between those who have the resources to put together a good proposal and those who don’t. It sucks up time and effort from other things.
	+ Formula basis – otherwise funds stay in I‐25 corridor because of politics.
	+ Combination so as not to eliminate or leave out schools/districts.
	+ Half and half – don’t make the competitive grant solely “needs based” – districts are already penalized in funding formula for small number FRL.
	+ Formula\*\*.
	+ Formula – fair for all schools districts to obtain.
	+ Hybrid would be good to help with both sides.
	+ Formula – with a plan and accountability for funds.
	+ Mixed model – some of both – accountability plan to use the dollars.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Formula v. competitive grant – all schools that meet the requirements for the formula should get the money but have to have a plan that covers what is best for students and has follow‐through on how funds are spent.
	+ Grant writers in some districts create disparities in small/rural districts.
	+ Formula waters down the amount for each school so not sure which is better
	+ Formula/competitive hybrid. Pot of money that is substantial enough to make it worthwhile but keep some as formula for making it predictable
	+ Yes, give funds. With a mixture of both formula and competitive grants.
	+ I would really hate to be a turnaround school and not get the support. But yet the watering down of funds in a formula is also a concern. Not sure which way is best. When we had Read to Achieve, we showed the need but the State wanted to spread the wealth and so Pueblo got left out.
	+ We don’t have resources to write grants to compete with larger districts that can write jazzy grants. Votes for formula. Are grants going to be divided by geographic region?
	+ From a small, rural district, my concern is that we don’t have time to put a grant together that has “bling” and so how can we be competitive with Cherry Creek or Denver? Are these grants going to be allocated regionally and geographically?
	+ Create an operational definition of healthy students. Provide a rubric and best practices for use statewide. Offer a menu of best practices and programs. Connect the resources that CDE already has and bridge the resources that are already out there.

### Discussion Question #5: What supports and services can CDE provide that would be helpful to districts with schools on improvement?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Actual organization of trainings around strategies that actually work. Real training for real teachers that will benefit students.
	+ Develop or find and implement an effective and comprehensive anti‐bullying program to be provided to all schools and districts on an ongoing basis at no cost.
	+ Maybe facilitate coordination between K‐12 and higher education to help with supports. IHEs can provide this help much more cheaply than other consultants.
	+ Observation/evaluation training for administrators. Data drives decision making training, strategic planning. Work with CASB to train board members.
	+ Some districts may need grant writing assistance if competitive grants.
	+ Resources – best practices. COASCD and help via Framework 2021 tinyurl.com/essacoascd.
	+ More hands‐on in classroom. Professional development – CDE should be present in schools!!
	+ Help direct schools that are having problems instead of higher administration to cover up and by‐pass teachers and parents. Listen to all staff.
	+ More hands‐on professional development.
	+ Turnaround network?

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Continuing Turnaround Network, best professional development she has received in her career. Networking with other schools, asking hard questions,
	+ As a Turnaround school, the best support and professional development I’ve gotten has been from the Turnaround Network. The performance management tool has really helped a lot of principals.

### Discussion Question #6: What is an appropriate length of time before more intensive interventions should be required for “consistently underperforming” schools/subgroups?

* This question was added to the presentation after the Pueblo event was held, therefore there is no feedback to report here.

### Other comments about standards, assessments, and accountability:

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Let’s try to make assessments make sense for students. I recently proctored IB exams. Students get a reading period of 5 minutes and can highlight on the test. It makes much more sense.
	+ Please be sure to involve the education profession in your stakeholder work: CASE, CASB, CEA!
	+ The present state assessment system is unworkable! Getting results back in Oct/Nov from an assessment taken in March/April prevents using assessment data for school improvement planning, curriculum development, SB191 teacher effectiveness measures, etc. Does the state have a sound philosophy and vision for an assessment program?
	+ DSS Title I 3% discretionary state funding support – funds in addition to the 7% set aside for school improvement. New range of additional academic opportunities progressing beyond at‐risk students. Engage community (parents and whole families).
	+ Not crazy about “mini‐ PARCC” mentioned here. All computers would potentially be used 100% of time for assessment rather than learning. This is a huge problem now – all tech used for assessment two months solid.
	+ Ensure all ethnic groups are being looked at, not just the large groups (i.e., Native American usually 1% at school districts).
	+ Not college and career ready, but continuing education and career reading. Not all students will go to college.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + ESSA is a great opportunity to [incomplete response]. It talks about targeted supports and it is better to approach education that way instead of a one size fits all model. I encourage the state to look at the graduation guidelines because it is local control but the evaluation is one size fits all. Same goes for drop outs, if we reengaged the kids but they drop out again, it is punitive to the district that is trying to reengage the students. Only count the drop out once. Address the mobility factor and assessment‐ look at a time limit or time minimum that only counts the kids who have been in the district for a certain amount of time. Differentiated system for accountability that takes into account the kids that are on F/R lunch. Do not use social studies as an accountability measure and move back to geography and world history. Targeted support for accountability. Differentiate between priority improvement and turnaround schools in a varied manner.
	+ Reinstate highly qualified as Colorado.
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## Quality Instruction & Leadership and Supports for Student Success

### Discussion Question #1: What supports should CDE provide to help teachers, schools, and districts provide effective instruction to students with specific learning needs?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Organize a “menu” of sorts with training available for teachers.
	+ We need more funds to help teachers add endorsements in CLDE.
	+ Small districts aren’t able to provide equal number of services and tools as larger more affluent districts.
	+ Many ESS teachers are overwhelmed with paperwork and tracking data and writing IEPs and scheduling meetings. As a parent that same teacher should be using her/his time as a hands‐on educator, like helping modify lesson plans. With community centered boards there are 3 staff members – data coordinator (to get the numbers to state and feds), care coordinator (to help coordinate and schedule meetings), care provider (teacher) – need more staff.
	+ Think outside the box in helping develop paras/teachers in various ELL languages.
	+ More professional development opportunities.
	+ Skills/info
	+ Community schools.\*
	+ Teach us how to help the community, networks/class sizes.
	+ Fund parenting classes.
	+ Truancy officers and court.
	+ Community.
	+ Each student has specific learning needs. Pave way for personalized learning system.
	+ Professional development for diverse learners. Staff who are a perfect fit but cannot afford higher education.
	+ How to tailor/modify curriculum for diverse learners – more differentiated instruction and learning to all educators.
	+ Behavior instruction to all educators.
	+ Technology skills – the kids have more skills than some teachers.
	+ At many districts there is not enough TE to have adequate support for the students. Educators working in these areas are overworked and under paid.
	+ Personalized learning to address all learners’ needs.
	+ ELL: Our teacher serves multiple schools and many students in our building – not effective.
	+ Alternative Licensure – does not factor in critical classroom management practices.
	+ Stop assuming all students need a college education to be effective! Technical/industrial/Blue collar work matters.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Money ‐ fund full day kindergarten maybe a jumpstart program to address the needs of the kids.
	+ Data –access to data from many different venues. Connect .
	+ Mental health support for kids with behavior challenges.
	+ How to tailor modify curriculum for diverse learners not just those SWD. Would then be able to serve all students better, including SWD.
	+ Include more community advocates; have more people come into the classroom to help students become more healthy, happy, active, and safe. Address Socioemotional needs. Pueblo City Schools used to have a lot more advocates but not anymore. Need to get them back into the classrooms.

### Discussion Question #2: In addition to holding a license, should teachers be required to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ IDEA defines Highly Qualified the same as NCLB. NCLB is gone but IDEA is still the same – guidance is needed.
	+ Only if you raise the pay.
	+ This should already have been done to get the license??? Or is this a reference to student performance?
	+ Yes, but consideration must also take into account the number of students in the classroom and the students as a whole, ability to learn and readiness.
	+ We do currently demonstrate competency (evaluation process).
	+ Higher Ed should prepare and support new teachers.
	+ SB191 is terrible and does not show effectiveness – of course teachers in low SES schools get lower scores and lower ratings – it’s not the teacher. \*
	+ Teacher evaluations take care of this.
	+ Evaluation.
	+ Emphasize leadership skills and UbD (instructional design). “Expertise” available in the pockets (phones).
	+ Yes. Not all teachers are a fit for area of content (i.e., math – many students struggle with higher math, not enough qualified tutors).
	+ There needs to be a lot of discussion of what demonstrating competencies would look like – it’s not a master’s degree and who would be “qualified” to say (rate the teacher’s competency).
	+ Not so much in the content area, but instructional practices – UbD, questioning skills, management, counseling, ability to facilitate –not “sage on the stage”.
	+ No requirement for full day kindergarten – Look to Finland.
	+ Yes, but this should be determined at local levels. Just because someone can pass a test doesn’t make her/him qualified to teach a course. This is a huge misconception impacting schools everywhere. What about retention and recruitment?

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Flexibility with HQ going away is a good thing. Worried about math specifically because in order to pass the PLACE test in Math, you have to know Calculus. This doesn’t make sense for middle school math teachers. Possibly a middle school math endorsement option. Subject matter competency is important, but the criteria for endorsements right now are too limited.
	+ Of course! The question is how we define competency and how we allow the competency to be demonstrated. What does that mean that you have to demonstrate

competency? Why should someone have a degree in teaching and then have to show competency?

* + Teachers need to know how to deal with students with discipline challenges than sending to office.

### Discussion Question #3: How should CDE modify current EL Identification, Re‐designation, and Exit guidance to meet the ESSA state plan requirements? What additional criteria should be considered?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Body of Evidence\*\*\*
	+ Body of evidence, perhaps an automatic review after some number of years, how to exit if mis‐identified, if ESS will likely not show grade level proficiency regardless of language learning.
	+ How will this impact testing and accountability of this population group?
	+ Appropriate placement. Example: Native American Navajo speaks her language, was put into a classroom with refugees. Extremely difficult to get her out. She ended up dropping out of high school and went to an alternative program to graduate.
	+ How successful can the student access regular instruction?
	+ Access test – what skills are being targeted? Does it address if other factors are factoring in, such as ESS? Multi‐linguistic learners (which languages should be targeted)? Language capability vs. other academic needs.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Will funding be tied to exited ELs in the new Title I accountability? Will there be any change in exit criteria for ELs?
	+ Body of evidence.
	+ Sometimes when students cannot become FEP on Access based on issues other than language (SWD?) – long term ELs, it is difficult to prove to the state that they are no longer EL. Need to consider those students in developing criteria for exiting FEP.
	+ When students are misidentified as EL – can’t exit from FEP.

### Discussion Question #4: What does well‐rounded and healthy students mean to you?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Exposure and participation in an array of areas (art, music, PE world language, enough recess, social studies, science, math, English/LA, etc.).
	+ Community schools, with services available for mental health etc., in our schools.
	+ A student whose academic, social, emotional and physical growth is met by various school programs.
	+ Community schools with services available for mental health, etc., in our schools.
	+ Background/behavior/morals/ethics/character/Healthy emotional/social support/Fed/physical education/drug free home environment/In school – absenteeism addressed.
	+ Experiences, character, active, nutrition, arts, music, safe, engaged, supported, challenged, prepared for success. \*
	+ Morally and ethically sound good character.
	+ Background experience/moral/ethical/character/drug free home. environment/social/emotional support.
	+ Don’t worry. Leave this very broad. Life‐long learner.
	+ Address the whole child‐ Healthy, safe, engaged in learning, supported by qualified caring adults, challenged academically, and prepared for success.
	+ Other activities: arts, health, physical to encourage their social and emotional side. Healthy snacks and meals available for all regardless of $.
	+ Nutrition in school lunch.
	+ Maintain programs in arts, music, and physical education.
	+ Students that have had exposure to arts, music and physical education – not just academics.
	+ Classes/instruction to be a well‐rounded citizen (financial, health, exercise, job search/finding talents).
	+ Every student has access to enrichment/clubs to support health, career path opportunities.
	+ Students attend rotary, etc. Access to community service organizations, community gardens, travel, cultural experiences, enrichments in arts programs, variety of clubs, PE, dance/movement classes. Healthy, nutritious breakfast and lunch options, farm to work plate programs.
	+ Busing – funds to pay teachers to run the programs outside school hours – PD‐ healthy snacks, intercession, afterschool, Saturday school enrichment options – local control.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Well rounded‐ PBIS implementation and replacing funding that has gone away for these supports. Could Arts be included in our alternative accountability measures (references question #2 in previous section)? What about RtI indicators?
	+ Not focusing strictly on academics for well‐rounded and healthy students.
	+ Healthy child, safe child, engaged child, and supported by caring adults. Each student is challenged academically and prepared for success.
	+ 21st Century skills. Most students know more than the teachers.
	+ Physical education.
	+ Addressing healthy, active, safe students.
	+ Creating a system where each student is challenged and prepared for success.

### Discussion Question #5: Should CDE reserve 3% of Title I, Part A funds for direct student services grants?

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ No – get it directly to districts.
	+ No.
	+ No. Streamline this. Competitive grants take lots of resources and further separate the “have” and Have nots”.
	+ Yes – allocations should be made to qualified students not on a competitive basis.
	+ Yes, as long as the grants are formula grants.
	+ Maybe CEA could be involved in supporting direct student services.
	+ Yes.
	+ This is “extra” in addition to the 7%. Please present it correctly.
	+ Yes. Not all Title I districts support other programs such as Title VI.
	+ Yes – as long as there is fair access for all who wish to apply.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + How can these funds help with ECE especially in districts with other challenges?

### Other comments about quality instruction & leadership and supports for student success:

* **Feedback Forms:**
	+ Teachers are never included in decisions about professional development or how to actually improve schools, perhaps including them will help.
	+ IHE’s (and districts/teachers) could benefit from more clarity about what the state would accept for courses toward adding endorsements, etc. Right now those worksheets are a bit vague and we are at the mercy of reviewers. Could we get a list of courses or at least more guidance on what would work or not work before people pay

$110 (or whatever it is) in application.

* + Use funds to revamp higher education preparation for teachers.
	+ Make sure any and all subgroups include representation of students with disabilities/ELL.
	+ There should be some type of teacher accountability for technology skills.
	+ We need to advocate for limits on welfare that encourage people to get back to work instead of incentivize welfare. We have created multi‐generational poverty and sustained lack of motivation to grow academically. Many students don’t value school because 1) their primary adult(s) don’t work and 2) they won’t have to.

### General Discussion Notes:

* + Committees: have they been formed and is it possible for us to be members of these committees?
	+ If there is a gap in equitable distribution of teachers, are we going to be eligible for more funds?
	+ I’d really like to see more funding going toward our pre‐schools so that kids are ready for Kindergarten. We don’t have enough aides in the primary grades and funding is needed to improve that.
	+ What worries me about holding back the Title I schools is that you’re making the most challenged schools do the most paperwork. I would be building these direct student services into my Title I plan anyway, so I don’t want you to hold back the funds and make me apply for it competitively.
	+ Need to support technology skills for adults in the classroom.
	+ I’m so glad that ESSA and CDE are talking about disciplinary action and keeping students in class. The larger the class size, the harder it is to manage students. I would love to see the state take a little more action in this area.
	+ I’m a para‐educator and I feel sorry for our general educators who have to deal with our students with Autism. You can’t expect these teachers to know what to do with them. There’s not even training for them on what to do with me (paraprofessional): how do you utilize me? And I don’t get paid to do that, but I would like to.
	+ Glad to see SEA is interested in and talking about disciplinary actions and keeping students in school. Don’t forget to include discussion about class sizes – larger classes make it hard to have effective classroom management – SEA should continue emphasis on reducing class size.
	+ Autistic kids – working with SWD is challenging especially when you have not had any training. You can’t expect a new teacher out of college to just do observation at sped intervention or another classroom and then know how to handle the needs of SWD that are in his/her classroom.
	+ Teachers need training on how to work with para educator – need to know how to more effectively utilize them.
	+ UCCS has just launched BA with emphasis on K‐6 education with endorsement in SPED and CLDE. Fully integrated curriculum where future teachers will be learning how to support all students in the classroom. Looking for places where their students can be placed for internship.
	+ ESSA emphasis.
	+ Title XI is not mentioned and wants to make sure that their voice is heard as well. Our Indian kids play into the consideration as well.
	+ Funding is from Indian Education, but all part time staff working in over 60 schools.
	+ Last year Georgina (CDE) has taken over and she has been able to help them because of her knowledge of their local context. She has helped them get as far as they are now. They would not be this far without her.
	+ I want to make sure that our voice is heard as well. We run into a lot of challenges and similar issues. Some of it is the funding. We get all of our funding from the Office of Indian Education. We are a small part‐time staff trying to reach over 1,000 kids in over 60 districts. It has been a huge improvement to have Georgina Owen to help us with this program.

# ESSA Listening Tour – Event Feedback

### How can we strengthen our process to involve parents, educators, and other stakeholders in developing our state plan for ESSA?

* Sounds corny, but a recorded message from our new Commissioner would be inspiring. Have heard him speak and he is good!
* Allowing teachers to participate in the process and listening to them about testing. They want and can drive their instruction.
* To make sure that when initial information goes out that administrators forward on to others and not just keep information to themselves, administrative assistants, coworkers need to know. Not just at the admin level. Information should be shared with the educators and parents who are out there working directly with students.
* It is just hard to get people involved in education. They want to complain but don't want to offer assistance when provided the opportunity.
* Perhaps hold regional meetings and invite school boards, DACs, etc. Maybe local BOCES could help coordinate so that you are certain to hear a variety of voices.
* I would have like to have had more chances to circulate in the room. Parents see things that I don't and vice versa. More "meeting of the minds" would have been nice.
* The Listening Tour is a great start. Follow‐up publicity would allow other stakeholders to be informed. Afford the taped tour to be seen on social networks.
* Perhaps have more tours at other locations. Maybe even have some just for parents and community.
* I think this provided an opportunity.
* Remember that 80% of Colorado school districts are rural, so working group meetings should be in places like Durango, Steamboat Springs, LaVeta, Limon, and Sterling instead of the metro area. Meetings should be linked to live weblinks that allow connection/participation through videoconferencing. Include both day and evening meetings. Ensure that all committees and working groups include full stakeholder representation.
* Broadcast a live webinar that allows people to type questions in chat.
* Coordinate with school after school activities, church programs and online response thorough the school e‐mail.
* Continue being available.
* Have meetings in the outer reaches of the state ‐ Lamar, Craig, etc.
* Maybe send surveys to parents and school staff. It's hard for parents to go to meetings during the day.

### What additional opportunities should we create for stakeholders to provide input?

* In addition to hosting meetings in various parts of the state, perhaps send a rep or two to existing meetings where stakeholders will be gathering. Provide an online session too ‐ record, and disseminate. Collect info via surveys like this one.
* If teams from rural school districts could be in on the planning and allow them to construct what is best for them.
* Encourage that all programs are included. Such as Title VII (Title VI). Some school districts promote matching funds or supported funds, but not all are on board yet. More education about Indian Education.
* I think you have plenty of ways for providing input.
* Surveys.
* I would like to see an opportunity for written feedback to be submitted.
* For those stakeholders unable to attend a listening tour, a survey either on survey monkey etc. could be made available. For those who have students in a public school system, a survey template, provided by CDE, could be available on school's website or sent home.
* See above.
* I think your webinar may be very popular. Perhaps more of those.
* Listening tour questions forms in a survey monkey format, so after processing all the information, folks have a quick way to get suggestions, concerns to you.
* Accept feedback from community groups, GO Forum, Eagles etc.
* Keep being available for help.
* Allow for letters from stakeholders to be part of the process.
* Series of short surveys, asking schools to send information home.

### How do you plan to involve parents and other stakeholders in local ESSA planning decisions?

* I personally will discuss informally with neighbors. Otherwise, I do not have contact with parents in my current position.
* I haven't made a plan yet.
* Using the District Accountability Committee as the information clearinghouse, we are going to invite input from the stakeholders to participate in informational meetings.
* We are creating an ESSA workgroup of district staff. We also work closely with the District Accountability Committee to get parent input from all schools.

### What aspects of the ESSA Listening Tour session do you feel were particularly successful?

* Loved all of the opportunities for table discussion. Would have enjoyed mixing up the tables for the second discussion though ‐ to meet and hear from some different perspectives.
* The sharing out after discussions.
* I did enjoy learning about some of the new changes; I think it will allow more opportunities to those who were not able to receive those chances before.
* I really liked the slides that showed the differences between NCLB and ESSA. Very helpful.
* The CDE representative at our table was very helpful in facilitating the conversation and prompting our thinking.
* I like that CDE is out conducting these tours.
* The roundtable opportunity and the general sharing‐out time.
* The time to collaborate and discuss with others.
* Good to have CDE asking for input.
* The informational handouts were very helpful. I also like that the handouts were all available online and accessible to all stakeholders.
* Presentation was focused and well presented. I particularly liked the green text for federal points that need decision making.
* Open discussion, feedback and discussion. Multiply sessions.
* Better relationship with CDE staff. Well done.
* Some of the background information on ESSA was useful.
* I thought it was clearly explained and a chance to process it at our table was helpful.

### What can CDE do to improve the ESSA Listening Tour?

* I think overall this was really well done! Thanks for the opportunity to give input. It feels good to be "listened to." We will be interested to see how your data is shared and incorporated, if applicable.
* Make sure all the rural communities can participate.
* A chance to speak about concerns other than the discussion points. Limited of course. I wanted to express my thoughts about Title VII and it was not mentioned with the other Title programs and I did not know when would be the best discussion chance to mention it.
* Nothing. Thank you for the pizza!
* Make sure that each time you ask for public comment, you allow for table conversations first.
* Add more ways to interact, it just felt really stiff and formal. I'd also like to see CDE come with a better framework for ideas instead of just throwing questions out there, more of a comparison, here's what we do now, here's what we could do, that kind of thing, so that there is a frame around the conversation.
* As the tour continues to travel the tour will generate more conclusive information as CDE learns more. The later tours will have more definite answers.
* I'm not sure.
* Have special education present to talk about the interface of ESSA and IDEA. ESSA no longer requires HQ, but the language is still in IDEA. What is the state and federal position on this?
* Instead of having discussion and writing on paper, include short text your thoughts while the Listening Tour is active. Faster and easier.
* Allow table time for discussion after each component. Have one representative from each table share out key points to the whole group.
* Implementing some of the obviously good or practical suggestions made by community groups. This will demonstrate your commitment to and value of community recommendations.
* Keep providing opportunities as more answers become available.
* Let people know what CDE is thinking about doing with regards to the "local control" of assessment, allowing teachers to teach in areas other than their major area of preparation, provide leadership in formulating some base ideas for people to consider.
* Somehow advertise it better.