# Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Listening Tour Online Webinar – June 1, 2016

## Standards, Assessments, and Accountability

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

* A couple of smaller tests showing potential for growth seem to have more meaningful data and uses than a big long test at the end of the year if we must do standardized tests. An even better option would be to consider the potential role of portfolio assessment and authentic assessment to show growth. These forms of assessment do not place high stakes judgements of schools and students based on a certain moment in time. Instead, they allow students to show what they know in real‐world tasks. Let's face it, none of us go to work and take tests all day. A student’s ability to take a test does not tell us anything about what they have learned. When considering length and amounts of tests, we must also be conscious of how many smaller tests we are asking schools to do. Much of this occurs at the district level to make sure kids are "on track" for state tests. In 3rd grade, our students take MAP, DIBELS, and PAARC. I knew one teacher who had to take a sick day so she could come in and administer DIBELS tests to her students. This is taking away valuable time to learn for our students. Teachers end up so busy administering tests that there is no time to process data and it is useless and a waste. The state needs to step in and create stronger guidelines to prevent this from happening. Also, all charters and private schools receiving any taxpayer funded dollars should have to meet the same standards as traditional public schools.
* A first priority for the state should include an Assessment Summit to determine what a balanced assessment system should look like, using experts in the area from both academia and K‐12 education. There must be an agreement on what a balanced assessment will be BEFORE just picking assessments. The current state test is insufficient to measure progress for students who are NOT at the benchmark/grade level standard. Alternative measures should be considered that would provide better timely instructional feedback to support students who are not yet meeting the standard set on the large‐scale assessment instead of having those students take the test annually. Essentially, shift the focus to formative data as well as ensuring that fundamental needs are met for students not meeting standards. Additionally, all students in grades 3‐8 plus High School in all content areas should not have to take the test annually. A matrix could be devised to assess different grades in different content areas, similar to the science model. At high school, drop PARCC and prioritize the College Exams that have potentially more value for students.
* It is imperative that a number of measurements are utilized to measure student progress toward meeting the standards. Additionally, student progress should be more focused on student growth than student achievement.
* Less standardized testing. It's taking up too much time and taking the place of instructional time. In addition, how does standardized testing line up with the school assessments/academic measurements of students? In my personal experience my child scores high on standardized tests but struggles to perform on school performance tests. How can we bring these more in line with each other? I like the idea of interim testing to measure growth and progress. However, I don't like the idea of students spending significant amounts of time being tested. Where is the balance? I think we need to be mindful that the purpose of the test is clear and serves a specific purpose. What are we trying to measure? Can we do that with less testing? How can we streamline the process? Less testing!!
* Need to make sure we are allowing and helping support the measurement of advanced students. Many current assessments have ceilings that do not show growth of students already advanced. Build partnerships with Gifted Education State Advisory Committee and CDE's Gifted Department to include measurements for gifted students. Choose assessments that will serve more than one purpose. For example, READ ACT assessments should be able to identify students with reading difficulties AND above‐grade level abilities. Training for educators using TS Gold to also be aware of gifted behaviors and characteristics (could be linked with requirement of Title II to include professional learning on giftedness).
* Colorado has been a leader in the country on using growth metrics to address student progress. I think it is important to keep a heavy weight on growth. Students aren't all the same, so measuring growth helps to make sure that students at every achievement level are considered important.
* Assessments that are meant to specifically measure the standards for each grade level that are tied to measuring more sensitive movement of student growth and achievement.
* PARCC/CMAS assessments are significantly stronger and aligned to new standards vs. our previous state assessments (TCAP/CSAP). We still have work to do with measuring student progress in a holistic way that doesn't prize certain content areas over others (i.e. the arts, etc.) ‐ how are we assessing not only specific standards but the whole child? (Portfolio‐based, capstone, social emotional needs, etc.) We also need to be aware of over‐testing ‐ federal/state minimums should be adhered to vs. piling more local assessments on top for the sake of being "predictive" of major assessments when we are really assessing to the point of infringing on teaching ‐ how might we value and leverage formative assessment (teacher created/meaningful/classroom level) vs. out‐sourcing for various interims/purchasing assessments (Acuity, etc.)? \*
* I believe there should be more, smaller, ongoing assessments throughout the school year and not a single, major testing day or week. It would also be nice to include some sort of body of evidence although I can't imagine the logistics of this.
* Through multiple measures that include non‐standardized measures of assessment, including classroom assessments. Let's remember that measuring the standards isn't going to solve the problem of many students not meeting the standards.
* With more than one tool ‐ capstones, experiential learning assessment, workforce development skills tests. Use a variety of tools that are reliable and valid yet are responsive to individual needs of student learning.
* The current system for K‐3 READ Act perhaps needs some measure of student comprehension in addition to phonics and fluency. The PARCC tests, as tests, are not bad. However, whatever assessment we use, it needs to be a stable measure. That is, it cannot be dependent upon being normed against a changing group (e.g. whichever states are participating). PARCC like test (e.g. Reading and Math with a mix of multiple choice and constructed responses) is good. There does need to be a consistent measure statewide so that we can compare performance. In addition, the measure needs to be able to demonstrate growth. Ideally, it would be nice to have a true pre‐ and post‐measure. However, the length of the testing would need to be significantly reduced to make this feasible.
* To truly accurately measure student progress toward the attainment of standards, student performance must be tracked and validated for every standard ‐ this is a tenet of a competency based system. Current high stakes tests are used as a proxy but they do not really validate the attainment of standards.
* Multiple measures need to be used. Statewide standardized testing can be one, but districts and schools need to have autonomy on their own assessments as well. That assumes the standards are what need to be measured.
* Via multiple measures, both formative and summative. Student achievement cannot be adequately measured through standardized assessments alone. And, we should be monitoring student progress throughout in order to better develop instruction and learning.
* Ask young people what measures are important to them and include them as benchmarks. How do you include school climate measures as a measure of student progress in meeting the standards?
* Multiple measures including student portfolios that provide a holistic rather than piecemeal, shallow representation of students' knowledge, skills, and interests/talents.
* Results of ACT, SAT, ASPIRE, PSAT, PSAT/NMSQT, Graduation Guideline requirements.
* Online tests and continuous assessments.
* We should use adaptive assessment tools or implement above‐level assessments that expand the measurement of student progress beyond grade level expectations/evidence outcomes. Many districts are in a situation where they cannot afford additional district assessment tools and need assessment results to provide evidence of above grade level performance.
* I think using Curriculum Based Evaluation through Curriculum Based Measures (DIBELS, AIMS web) could be helpful for a quick and short snapshot of how our students are doing. This will make it easier to target academic failure, intervene, and easier for schools to distribute and to collect data.
* An assessment that is based on knowledge not necessarily scores. I'm not sure how to word what I mean but students are often overwhelmed with scoring and thus their performance is not as high.
* Gold is good for kindergarten and preschool as it is an DAP authentic assessment system.

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

* Intervention opportunities provided for students to pass a class. Does the school provide study halls, after school tutoring, etc.? Opportunity for students to take advanced courses, including courses for college credit. Does the school educate the whole child (Could be done through elective classes, extra‐curricular, whatever model works for a school)?
* Again, before suggesting measures, the state, including CDE, superintendents, board members and policy makers MUST agree on what a balanced assessment should look like. Once there's an agreement on what a balanced assessment looks like, an accountability system should identify fundamental needs missing in schools/districts to provide support not penalty. As for indicators, measures for early warning systems typically include attendance, behavior and course grades.
* The problem with the disaggregation and weight given to these subgroups in the past is that students who fall into more than one subgroup were counted multiple times and these students are statistically likely to underperform compared to students who qualify for zero or just one subgroup. The largest combined subgroup of students in our district is students qualifying for 3 subgroups, mostly minority students who are English learners and qualify for free lunch.

These students each count three times in the old SPF/DPF rubrics and this group alone totals more counted student scores than the disaggregated group. In other words, when the subgroups are disaggregated and counted equally, the scoring becomes overwhelmingly skewed towards the scores from students with multiple risk factors. This causes a disparity for districts with higher at‐risk populations as the neediest students, traditionally poorer scoring on standardized assessments, and are counted multiple times.

* School Accountability: Schools should be measured by the number of qualified staff members in the building to meet the instructional needs of the students. One of these positions that should be mandated for every school is a Teacher Librarian. In this 21st century world, the need for informational literacy instruction and critical thinking when accessing information is critical. Not to mention that the standardized tests are now computer based, which means students need even more time in front of a computer practicing how to not only just perform basic skills (using a mouse, typing, etc.) but also more in depth skills (effective research, knowing how to sort through information for reliable sources, etc.). I'm extremely disappointed that the school my children attend made the decision not to hire a Teacher Librarian next year because of budget limitations. The SBB (Student based budgeting) negatively affects small schools and their ability

to properly staff buildings. How can schools look more critically at the performance of students on standardized tests in relation to their performance of school based curricular tests? I see a gap here. If a child is achieving high in school but low on standardized tests, what needs to change to better meet their needs? Or if a child achieves high on standardized tests but not in school what is going on? If these measures of success do not align what is the point? Let's think big picture.

* School climate indicators, school connectedness (whether the student is/feels connected to school and/or adults, community coordination (how well is the school coordinating with/connected to community resources), youth‐adult connections (does student feel there is a safe adult to seek help from).
* Gifted student growth. Identification of gifted students that closely matches district demographics. Advanced scores for historically under‐represented populations in gifted (can be linked with the ability to now use Title I funds for identifying and serving gifted students). Include reporting of how Title I & II funds are being used for gifted identification and services.
* Continue with much of what was previously included on the DPFs/SPFs. There is a high degree of public understanding of those metrics. Academic achievement and growth are key factors to include in the accountability system.
* Measures that can more directly measure the critical thinking and 21st century skills students have learned tied to the content area standards. Assessments that students with disabilities can access and show their knowledge of the content area, and their ability to critically think that aren't so heavily tied to the student's ability to access the prompts. Making the assessments meaningful to students is also an integral part to having students fully participate in state assessments.
* Consider perception/culture and climate data heavily ‐ student/parent/staff surveys, focus groups, interviews (community wide, cross stakeholder). Measuring "happiness" and other social emotional factors are proving to be indicative of college and career success and readiness vs. only looking at academic/attendance measures. Teacher retention/experience data. Equity audit ‐ what courses/learning opportunities are available at a school and with which students? (AP/IB, etc. rates by ethnicity and SES breakdown, identifying gifted/advanced across demographics, etc.).
* Not certain but it should be broad‐based in order to paint a clear and accurate picture of the school and not a single or singularly major assessment.
* This is problematic because the timeline does not allow sufficient time to create something new, so we would be limited to what already exists.
* Reliable and valid, consistent, and able to gather sustainable data without having to create another "system" of reporting.
* This measure needs to be a fair one. That is, it cannot penalize a school for having either fewer resources or higher needs populations (e.g. not having as many AP offerings, mobility affecting attendance, etc.). This could be measures of climate and culture that are given statewide with

the same questions. It is important to ensure that we are research‐based in this measure and that there is evidence that it has a direct impact on student achievement. For example, there is little research to justify small class sizes.

* Student outcomes are only one component of an accountability system, but "starting gate" differences for students must be included to accurately show accountability. Process outcomes should also be considered of how students are moved along their growth trajectory.
* Measures that are equitable and appropriate for all districts ‐ urban, suburban, and rural.
* To determine the quality of a school and/or the overall student success at that school, many different factors should be taken into account. The effectiveness of the teachers, the average experience of the teachers, but also the retention of those teachers over time. While test scores can play a role in determining student success is part of what should be measured, other factors should also be included. The overall wellness of students, their participation in academic as well as non‐academic activities, participation in community activities, and the inter‐relationships of all groups within the school community (administrators, teachers, education support professionals, students, parents and other community members) should all be considered measures of school quality and student success.
* Adult perception of student success and adult success (teacher, administration), teacher retention and satisfaction, student/teacher connectedness, etc. Class size as a component of school quality. How does the community support school quality (i.e. passing school bonds, parent engagement, etc.)?
* Attendance, time in seat for instruction.
* Measures of parent satisfaction, evidence of emergency preparedness and student safety.
* Students need ways to express not only their academic knowledge but also experiential skills as well as their levels of happiness (as is already being assessed in various arenas). Teachers', administrators', and other employees' job satisfaction and avenues for piloting innovations must be considered.
* Administrative and teacher quality and leadership skills. Positive school culture with high standards and expectations for all.
* Embed indicators for gifted students for evidence of high expectations for all students and raising of the assessment ceiling for all students. What access do gifted students have to appropriate instruction and assessment? Qualified personnel in gifted education to administer the gifted education program ‐ programs and appropriate programming are required in all administrative units ‐ districts. Graduation rates, PSAT, SAT results, number/percentage of students participating in AP coursework and number/percentage receiving a 3 or higher on AP tests, percent/number of high school students completing Capstone projects. Expand growth indicator to include a top off or stay‐up score showing that students who are exceeding remain in exceeding. Require disaggregation of gifted student achievement and growth for reporting purposes as per state accountability. The federal government has said that each state may

determine how they will include gifted student progress and accountability into the state's ESSA policies.

* I like the idea of graduation rates but I saw a whole‐child portfolio mentioned in the comments that I would like to know more about. Outcome measures such as suspensions and discipline referrals can also be helpful.
* Capstones have been effective.
* Quality should include teacher experience, class size, teacher education and child outcomes.

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

* Schools should not be punished for parents who opt their children out. This is an active decision that parents are making to not have their students take tests that these parents have actively determined are not valid or informative assessments of their child's learning. If needed for national accountability, maybe they could have a portfolio process their children can use to show growth and it could have certain required components to show their children meet the required accountability factors. Schools should only be held accountable for students who were absent on the initial test day. Schools should be expected to make a conscientious effort to assess these students when they return to school. I think it is very important to consider ‐ if that many parents aren't buying into standardized assessments, maybe they are not valuable assessment tools! They provide parents with no useful information of what that should tell you!!!
* The newest procedures seem to work well for grades 3‐8 where schools are not penalized for parent excuses. However, it becomes a bit harder at high school where student test refusals may occur too and in HB‐1323 there seems to be some confusion about whether or not students are actually required to take the college exams in grades 10 and 11.
* Not sure.
* Consider reasons for students to take assessment. There is accountability for teachers/schools/districts but not for students/parents. Historically these tests have not been meaningful for our highest performing students. Parents/students see little reason to take them.
* The more the tests are meaningful to students and their families, the more likely they are to participate. An example is the difference between ACT participation rates and 11th grade CMAS/Science participation rates. There needs to be an emphasis on making the tests meaningful to students and families and only including the ones that are in the assessment system.
* I am not sure how we approach this. I work in Douglas County, and we had much less than 95% participation in the recent state assessments. Perhaps having assessments that are not so time consuming to administer, with results that are quicker and more timely so that instruction can

be adjusted according to the results. It would be beneficial if all participants felt that the feedback from assessments was timely, and that instruction could be adjusted for students in the same school year, especially at the middle school level where we have students only 2‐3 years total.

* This is tricky with current climate and parent involvement around the opt‐out movement. I'm not sure how assessment participation should be calculated ‐ ideally our assessments would all be worthy of students' time (and confined to a small window vs. taking over a school's calendar), valued by the community as meaningful and equitable data which would help ensure higher participation. I see a great deal of "opting out" among families of privilege which further skews our equity, opportunity, and achievement gaps. I wonder if participation could be reported through an equity audit lens ‐ whose progress are we measuring and how? Whose are we missing and why?
* Again, if there were more frequent and smaller assessment that are embedded into the school year it becomes harder for parents to opt‐out because it's just part of the educational cycle.
* Flexibly with as little structure as possible.
* I don't have enough information to provide any feedback on this question.
* The 95% should be kept IF there is not a penalty for parent opt‐out. The state should have a standardized opt‐out process. This can be monitored to see if there are any trends with certain populations and then it can be addressed at the school/district level if there are questions.
* Participation rates reflect value statements. Schools are responsible for the learning of all student and should be accountable for all students not just some by extension the state of Colorado is accountable for all students.
* I have no idea.
* As a desired target, but not a minimum requirement. With the current opt‐out movement among parents who really are opposed to the excessive high‐stakes standardized testing, which many believe does not truly show what students know and can do and has been used in a punitive way for so many years, the misuse of data collected via online testing methods, etc. I don't believe schools or districts should be held to the 95% participation rate. If test data that is considered valid and reliable is at the heart of this requirement, then we should figure out a different way to gather the data we need that does not mandate any set percentage of participation.
* Schools should not be penalized for choices parents make. Provide guidance regarding validity of results relative to participation rates.
* Yes, if all students are required to take the tests and not "opt‐out."
* Mandatory for graduation. Communicate to the public that this is now a federal requirement and differs from what the state considered optional in the past.
* Should be considered as an expectation for all districts ‐ seek change in the conditions that permit waiver of the state tests.
* This is going to be tough with the large special education population. There needs to be clear guidelines of who needs alternate testing and how they qualify.

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

* Absolutely not competitive. Schools should have to present a plan and apply with clear criteria for success. There should be a threshold a plan must have to meet. However, after this point, traditional public schools with the greatest needs should be given priority. This money should not go to charter schools.
* No comment.
* Formula. \*\*\*
* Is it possible to provide some of each? Does it have to be one or the other? There are pros and cons to each. My opinion is to organize a group of community/school members from schools that are having difficulty with performance and ask them what works best. I'm sure there will be a variety of opinions but maybe some commonalities can be discovered. Basically, bring in the experts and the parents/students who have personally experienced being in low achieving schools.
* Not sure, there are pros and cons to each. Competitive grants seem like a good idea, but I fear it would undermine much of the collaborative nature that has been building across our state and districts. Education is usually a field of sharing ideas. However, formulas don't always work either. Current formulas set up the haves and have nots. Maybe a combination of both would allow the pros of each to be utilized?
* I am not that familiar with the differences of the two. However, it would seem that while both make sense, the schools that are most significantly underperforming may need the highest level of support for turning around performance. It seems to me that with competitive grants, if they are considered annually, would give the highest level of support for quicker turn around.
* As stated in the webinar there are pros and cons to each. I wonder if a combination approach might work so that per formula all schools in need of improvement funds get some funding and schools can compete via grants for additional funding to move their respective strategy forward.
* I don't know enough about the funding to really inform this option but feel an approach that values equity in access over competition would be more supportive to meeting the diverse needs of rural, suburban, urban schools/districts.
* Formula with some basic requirements that must be met.
* I will follow up with our network of stakeholders via Colorado Afterschool Partnership and provide a unified answer for this.
* They should be done as a formula grant.
* Formula based but should be contingent based on predetermined outcomes decided by the school, district and CDE. Schools then need to commit to their local improvement plan to be implemented with fidelity.
* A formula. In theory, competitive grants sound great. However, what about the districts that don't have the resources available to apply for a competitive grant? If they don't have grant writers in district, or can't afford to hire them, then those districts are automatically disqualified from a grant process. It needs to be distributed via an equitable formula, and schools need to be held accountable to what those funds are really being used for.
* Definitely formula. That would be a more equitable way of granting funds to schools that need them. Competitive grant programs (such as Race to the Top) simply created winners and losers and led to the creation of systems that might or might not guarantee the awarding of a grant (such as our Educator Effectiveness law and other detrimental systems).
* Definitely as a formula because both urban and rural schools lose with competitive grants.
* I believe that the schools that are on school improvement should be awarded monies as a formula grant. I believe that this would allow all schools equitable access to the funds to better serve the students in most need.
* No.
* Competitive.
* Formula grants with clear evidence of how the funds will be used and what will be the indicators of meeting the goals/intent of the grant. Formula grants have the potential to impact and have positive effects on a greater number of schools.
* Funds should be awarded as formula grants because it is more fair and predictable and gives access to more schools.
* Using the formula is more equitable for schools that are in lower socio‐economic areas. Having the competitive grant process also adds a layer of subjectivity and work that would take away from getting the funds at the student level.

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

* First, when conducting needs assessments of an improvement school, it should be for the entire zip code and for the needs of the whole child. What are the children in the school's access to health and nutrition? Stable housing? Income security? These all impact a child's ability to succeed in the classroom. Help schools develop community school programs and really lift up the students and communities to help the school become an anchor for those communities. Instead of encouraging people to run from these schools because of a "failing label", let's get the entire community to take a role in making this school and this community succeed. In doing this, it will be important to get parents and students in on the conversation. CDE also needs to respect the expertise of the people in the community of the school. They may have a role as a

listener and a facilitator of community discussions. They may help connect schools to resources. However, they should not dominate the process. Charter schools that cannot make the cut should not get these funds. Instead, let's reinvest in the public community schools in the area and help all kids find success there.

* Help identify root causes to provide the best targeted support, funding, and accountability. Should focus on support, not penalties. Are fundamental needs in failing schools being met (e.g., mental health, safety, student and parent engagement, effective, targeted staff PD)?
* It would be helpful if CDE could provide a clear and obtainable path of improvement toward attainment. In other words, focused coaching.
* Look critically at staffing. It's the individual teachers, administrators, and support staff that really make a difference in children's lives. Are teachers receiving the support they need? Are there individual students that require more support to help relieve some of the burden from the teachers? We need to really focus on specific schools and see what is getting in the way of success. My guess is that it varies from school to school and even classroom to classroom.
* Targeted supports and services depending on their areas of improvement. This is like MTSS at a level for districts. We need some common tier 1, 2, and 3 supports but also a problem‐solving process for those unique cases. In what ways can we use the MTSS team to help model the supports and services offered for districts?
* I think that one of the areas that schools could use support in would be in high quality professional development for how to identify and target appropriate interventions. My experience has shown that while we have excellent content area teachers, there still is a gap in the areas of teachers' understanding of how to provide evidence based interventions in secondary classrooms. I feel that there is a need in teacher education programs and for veteran teachers to have professional development to truly understand how to review student data, determine student needs, then develop appropriate interventions, and follow up assessments to determine growth.
* Adequate/equitable funding. Menu of strategies beyond current intensive interventions. Monitoring/data tracking support (beyond initial audits to include follow up and progress checks).
* Support for leadership development for continuous instructional improvement. Long range change planning with short term benchmarks.
* CDE to partner with the Colorado Afterschool Partnership for supporting afterschool/out of school time, particularly as it relates to the 21s CCLC funds within ESSA.
* Having been part of a SIG Grant, the outside analysis (rubric) helped to provide good ideas about which direction to take and allowed the team to have frank discussions (we moved up on the SPF). However, the overall grant process was time consuming and it felt as if there was more time required to communicate about what was going to be done than the time given to complete the activities. If it would be possible to have a "CDE Liaison" whose role it was to support the documentation of efforts ‐ that would be wonderful.
* Ongoing Turnaround Leadership Training/Process for a 3 year period. Improvement Planning Training/Process for a 3 year period.
* Leadership development, targeted teacher trainings (working with ELLs, special needs, etc.).
* Resources, meaningful professional development for principals and teachers, time for meaningful collaboration, assistance and time to create meaningful improvement plans that meet the needs of all stakeholders.
* Money, resources, technology and people!
* Parent engagement strategies and support, school climate strategies and support, teacher retention strategies and support.
* Varied program implementation training held in multiple locations to serve the entire state. Offering more collaborative approaches to solutions rather than a top‐down model. Expand the timeline to account for major staff turnover and proactive approaches to state assessments.
* Provide funding for teachers to work in "innovation teams" that build on their expertise and insight into key problems and fresh ways of addressing them. Teachers would create an "Innovation Team Pilot Project” that, upon approval by the school administrators, would be implemented, evaluated, and improved accordingly. Teachers' creative problem‐solving is rarely supported or recognized; doing so would result in solutions that decision‐makers outside of schools do not consider.
* Funding has been cut. Need more support there.
* Outcome based, proven success programs. Comprehensive package of leadership with high expectations from teachers and students. District must totally "buy in" to the grant program presented by CDE. The districts have already had their opportunity to improve student achievement now it's time to give them something different.
* Focus on support for teachers and classroom ‐ Teachers ‐ teachers and students! Write grants for curriculum and training aligned with Colorado Academic Standards Cultural proficiency training requirements Training of Trainers workshops specific to instruction or curriculum Provide leadership workshops where leaders attend with a team of stakeholders Be an a ombudsman in helping districts find curriculum that meets the needs of their population ‐ encourage cross district, like‐district support.
* Social‐emotional learning curriculums, evidence‐based academic curriculums for all tiers, after‐ school or summer program, parent education or training.

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

* It depends and my answer here may not be very helpful. It seems like a school should be showing efforts of improvement the very next year and if they are not, the state should step in. I think this usually doesn't happen, but schools should have to show some proof early on that they are trying without creating a documentation nightmare for them. That being said, you

may not see the true fruits of change for a few years, and these may be students who always perform poorly on tests. Maybe these schools could implement project‐based and portfolio assessment systems to be used side‐by‐side with greater state assessments and use them as an alternative way to show growth, at least in the short‐run.

* No comment.
* In the event a school's status becomes 'priority improvement', rather than the interventions beginning directly in the fall of the following year. Give the school one year to improve their data.
* Three years. Look for trends not only on a school level but from classroom to classroom over three years. If specific teachers are consistently underperforming something needs to be done to support that teacher.
* Again, model this after MTSS. There should be purposeful progress monitoring and more intensive interventions need to occur when progress monitoring is indicating little impact. How would we answer this question for a student? That answer should be duplicated for a school/district.
* Perhaps 1‐2 years would be appropriate. If schools do not begin to turn around within a very quick period of time, the gap continues to broaden. As the gaps grow, it is much more difficult to bridge that gap. Under the READ plan, interventions are happening K‐3, but we need to be able to have intensive interventions to bridge the gaps at the higher grades, and at the secondary level.
* National "turn around" research talks about 7 years of consistent implementation of a strategy/plan to actualize true systemic change if other school factors are reasonably stable (retention of staff, student demographics, etc.) While I understand there is a sense of urgency to improve struggling schools, we rarely give any strategy time/depth to take root before switching strategies for the next "silver bullet." I'm not sure what an appropriate length of time would be for more intensive interventions but believe the most impacted schools should get access to interventions at their point of need while realistic expectations about their scale and implementation should also be put in place. Mostly, I see a need for cross‐stakeholder involvement in these interventions so it is not something being done to a school but in collaboration with a school and monitoring support from the state. 3‐5 year strategies are only impactful if the staff/leadership isn't turning over year after year.
* Two years, but what you mean by intensive interventions needs to be clarified.
* I don't have enough information to provide any feedback on this question.
* This is dependent on how long we are giving leaders and staff to address concerns. All of the literature suggests that schools need 3‐5 years to make major changes. However, many districts are starting over with new leaders every 2‐3 years. This creates an endless cycle of change. I believe that 3‐5 years is reasonable, but during that time, CDE and the district can be monitoring specific indicators to ensure that there are positive changes occurring.
* This should be collaboratively determined by the school, district and CDE at the beginning of the identification process as it will vary by individual school and their local context. However, sustaining the improvement over time requires at least 3 years.
* I think the definition of "intensive interventions" is vital to understand in order to answer this question accurately.
* Ongoing assessment of what is working and what is not, and a willingness to be able to change throughout would be more helpful than a timeline for more intensive interventions. Also, I think it is important to have a clear understanding of why the schools or subgroups are not performing well before any plans for improvement will really work in turning these schools around.
* Every year that you wait is another year lost to that student. Subgroups can only improve with the money, resources, technology and people to perform the intensive interventions.
* I think it will vary depending on a variety of factors. Have a flexible policy in order to meet schools where they are at, considering the complex issues at play in a given community, will be critical in ensuring this does not seem punitive.
* Three years to get caught up with changes.
* It seems that the 3‐5 year general rule for change is reasonable; however, we see that this is not happening perhaps due to other change issues within the school/district.
* Consistently underperforming schools should go no longer than one school year without receiving more intensive interventions.

### Other comments about Standards, Assessments, and Accountability:

* This whole system still seems very test obsessed despite claims the ESSA cheerleaders are making. We need to make sure that we use the opportunities available to not go down that rabbit hole and instead fight the standardization of our children. As we review state level assessments, there should be an effort to educate the whole child, trust teachers, and let kids have some variety to their personalities and their education.
* Assessments: This year's State PARCC/CMAS assessment window was much smoother than last year. The largest 'testing' complaint regarding testing time I heard was the length of the assessment for the Middle School ELA assessments (110 min. per session times 2 sessions in addition to a 3rd 90 min. session). The online platform was very successful. The CDE support group was stellar! Accountability: It is very concerning the inconsistencies of accountability ratings across schools and districts. How is CDE addressing the reliability of the Accountability system?
* Computer adaptive assessments are included within ESSA. Some of these assessments are suggested for Read ACT guidelines. In what ways have these assessments been vetted to be used with both significant reading difficulty students AND above‐grade level ability students? No mention of gifted within the Standards slide (#9) – ESSA includes the first federal inclusion of

gifted students. It is going to be easy to miss this if we are not highlighting it within Colorado. In what ways will districts be made aware of the ability to now use Title I funds to identify and serve gifted students? No mention of the change in reporting advanced as a separate category within the Accountability slide (#11). This will really help track our students scoring advanced (previously included with proficient). There is no mention of HB 14‐1102 on the ESSA fact sheet from Colorado (under recent education policy). Including this would help educators and parents see how Colorado already included gifted initiatives even before they were first included in federal K‐12 education law. School and district accountability timelines (every three years) are not aligned with accountability measures for gifted programming (Program Plan and CGER every 4 years). In what ways could we help align these for schools/districts so it is not treated as separate initiatives but plans to help support ALL students? This has begun to take place with UIP processes, but is often still viewed as a separate island. No mention of the newly added ability to use Title I funds for identifying and serving gifted students in Support for School Improvement (slide #16). This addition will be easily missed by districts and schools without the explicit awareness. It would be easy to miss the new ability to use Title I funds to serve low‐ income gifted students. How will CDE increase the awareness of this change and encourage districts to use funds in this way? Javits funding is included within ESSA, in what ways will we work to ensure students in Colorado benefit from this federal grant program? In what ways are partnerships being formed between CDE’s ESSA focus team and agencies for gifted students (GE‐SAC, CDE’s Gifted Department, etc.) to address the inclusion of gifted students into federal law? Will sections be added to the reporting of gifted grant funds to specifically show how districts are using Title I & Title II funds? In what ways will districts and schools be supported in the new reporting requirements for student achievement data and how to use this new information to inform support for gifted students?

* In ELA and math a laser focus on CCSS vs. CAS would greatly benefit teachers in making the shifts necessary for college/career readiness and next gen assessments like PARCC. CAS has really stalled progress in ELA (Reading/Writing/Communicating) by masking the shifts and priority standards.
* We need to remember that measuring does not lead to improvement. In fact, sometimes it leads to perceived quick fixes that cannot be maintained long‐term.
* Hopefully, under the revision processes ahead the true vision and potential of CAP4K can be realized where standards are "guaranteed and viable" and are not developed in silos by individual content areas only to end up bloated in numbers. Assessments for the future should not be "time bound" and if they were not students would actually want to "opt in" because the data are important to them given their real time nature. All that is required to make this happen is a change in how the tests (PARCC) are administered not in the rigor of the content.
* ESSA allows states to now make decisions about what standards will be used and what assessments will be used in connection with standards. I hope Colorado will look seriously at using our own Colorado State Standards and not the Common Core State Standards. I also hope

that we look seriously at getting out of the PARCC consortium. It has already been determined that the PARCC does not measure college and career readiness, and if our ultimate goal is making sure our students are college and career ready, why would we continue to use PARCC to assess our student achievement?

* Assessments should be at the minimum. We do not receive the information back in a timely manner. The technology infrastructure is intensive for schools and districts that do not have the technology. The waste of over 2 ‐ 4 weeks of instructional time so it can be completed is insane for a school year.
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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?

* A better way to share information. We often have students we don't even know are on an IEP or 504 because it takes so long to get their file and see what services they may need. Stay out of their way. Trust teachers to be experts and professionals.
* No comment.
* Staffing support and professional development. In addition, there should be educational opportunities for the parents of these students to help bridge the gap between school and home. This should include not only special education but also gifted and talented. I really like the idea of keeping children in the classroom as much as possible and trying to not remove them for behavior. Maybe CDE could create a positive behavior support curriculum for schools. I've seen this done in a Title I school in DE. The school environment was focused around positive behavior support. The teachers/staff were trained in this method and it seemed to help lift students up rather than bring them down. In addition, they hired a full time interventionist to support students and staff as well as a counselor. For schools with serious needs it could help to take a critical look at the school climate and culture. Do students feel welcome? Respected by the staff? Supported by the staff? Take a look at bullying. These measures will help all students, not just those with specific learning needs and the whole school will benefit.
* Support the knowledge and practice of the new requirement of using Title II funds to train teachers and principals in best practices for identifying and serving gifted students.
* A single Student Information System (SIS) that the whole state uses would save a tremendous amount of staff time at each district. When it comes to submission of required files it is incredibly inefficient to have 170+ approaches to managing SIS data.
* Specific professional development or training should be required in order to provide effective instruction to students with specific learning needs. As a Learning/Literacy Specialist, I have had extensive training in order to know how to identify student needs and provide targeted interventions for students across all content areas, and in the areas of executive functioning, and social emotional needs. CDE could provide funds for professional or staff development, or require the individuals teaching students with specific learning needs to be highly qualified, either through training, or experience. CDE could provide schools with funds for research based assessments, interventions, and professional development for teachers, especially beyond K‐3, where it becomes much less specific for how to provide interventions to students who continue to struggle in the areas of literacy.
* Stronger advocacy/alignment and support between higher education (teacher prep) and K12 districts. Mentors. Developing training/leadership opportunities for teachers to develop skill set around meeting specific learners' needs (incentivizing endorsements)?
* How to provide good first instructional supports to help students who may not be ready for grade level content. How to differentiate instruction in the one teacher classroom.
* Currently, the biggest area of need for my schools has been having special educators who have an understanding of content. The generalist license does not require enough background in content.
* I do not believe that CDE has the capacity to do this but it could facilitate partnerships between districts and organizations that do have a track record in implementing a systemic instructional model. CDE could certainly help with recruiting qualified teachers to the state.
* More teacher training on how to provide this instruction.
* Resources. Time ‐ for meaningful collaboration to determine how we can all partner to help students with specific learning needs better succeed. Meaningful professional development that helps us achieve those goals.
* There is a shortage of SPED teachers in rural areas. We have 2 openings and no applicants. A teacher will stay for 1 year and then move on to better paying school districts. It is all about the workload and the money. CDE isn't providing an equitable school for rural students because we do not have the tax base to have the salaries, technology and staff that other funded school districts are given from their tax base plus the per pupil amount.
* Fund Teacher Innovation Teams that develop, implement, and evaluate fresh approaches to instruction. During and after a pilot implementation, teachers will collaborate to improve the approach. CDE personnel would be needed as consultants who may offer outsider perspectives that contribute to improving the pilot program. The key is to listen to and support the insights and expertise of the people "on the ground" who are able to problem‐solve about the specific school population and context in which they work.
* Provide mentors.
* Again, the success of students is dependent on teachers. CDE should be the place where expert proven programs are recommended based on research. However, if there are programs that teach leadership and content skills to specific grade levels that have proven success, those should also be in place in our teacher prep college courses, along with technology skills for online assessment and instruction. Professional development shouldn't be used to teach skills that should or can be taught in college course work.
* Network directly with those who are responsible for administering programs to meet the needs of students with specific learning needs Provide training of trainers to regional and/or district staff Establish an instructional state network for supports and service (there are some that are very successful). Seek state funding in law.
* Access to evidence‐based programs, training, and time to collect data and monitor progress!

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

* Teachers should be required to show some type of qualification in addition to a license. I teach social studies. There is no way anyone should ever let me teach Calculus or Physics. Or second grade for that matter. Ever. A state level endorsement process seems like a really great idea. For high school, it seems like it would focus on content of the subject you are teaching. For elementary school, it seems like it would be more about strategies to get students to learn important skills such as reading and math concepts, and an understanding of the brain development of young children. The state level process would be nice because then teachers could change districts. I think there could be flexible ways of showing that designation.

Maybe teachers who are needed somewhere (especially in smaller districts) that they are directly qualified for could have a year under a mentorship program that would allow them to gain endorsement. This could especially be true for example if someone is going from upper elementary to middle school where there are slight differences in what you are doing but not huge. In other words, teachers should have the opportunity for performance‐based assessments and portfolio assessments as well! I do think it is important to have a qualified educator in every classroom, even private and charter schools. All teachers should have to meet some requirements to be teaching the students and subjects they are assigned to teach.

* No comment.
* Yes. CDE should require this endorsement in the area (your example was spot on ‐ a M.S./H.S. Science teacher should have a Major or Minor in the subject area to receive the endorsement (as it is a specialized area).
* Yes. These assessments should be state‐wide, not per district so educators can easily move between school districts and all students in the state will have teachers/support professionals with the same credentials. However, if teachers and support staff are required to take (and pay for) all these tests, credentials, licensing, etc. there should be jobs for them to go to when they finish. Having moved here from the east coast I'm disappointed that schools can make decisions as to hiring support professionals, such as teacher librarians. Yet to become a Teacher Librarian in Colorado you must not only be a certified teacher but also have a Masters in Library Science. Then you must pay for two licenses (Teacher and Teacher Librarian) and take the PLACE test (which also costs money). However, there are few jobs and many are part time or split positions. Not to mention we are trying to raise children who are technologically educated. It baffles me that schools in Colorado do not have technology instructors or at the minimum a Teacher Librarian in EVERY school to teach 21st century skills.
* Yes. Requirements could come from the state in the form of accountability measures. It should be required that a teacher without "highly qualified" status (to use previous language) will need to be closely monitored the first three years of teaching in that area. How about an endorsement required ‐ like SPED?
* No. This would make it very difficult at small and rural schools to adequately staff classrooms. Even at large districts, it is sometimes difficult to get "qualified" (meaning certified in the specific area) teachers for all content areas. There can be highly talented teachers who do not hold certain qualifications who are prevented from instructing students because there are too many hurdles for them to get through to get into the classroom. And just because a person has "demonstrated competency" doesn't mean they are a good teacher.
* Teachers should be required to demonstrate competency in the subject area in which they teach, especially in the secondary setting. Also, we should be required to demonstrate competency if we are working in a specialized area where we are targeting student specific groups, especially literacy, special education, math, sciences, and EL. There should be some level of state consistency for the requirements of content area teachers. For teachers that have been teaching subject areas, years of experience could be counted towards their competency level in the subject area they teach.
* YES! Teaching is a profession and by lowering the standard here we are saying any practitioner can teach anything. If students are being asked to demonstrate content knowledge teachers need to be able to as well. Especially given the language in 191 and our evaluation system I think teachers will not stay in profession or grow/develop without this support and requirements beyond a license in any area. I understand there is a teacher shortage and that rural districts s struggle with filling positions – however, rural students deserve to be taught by quality teachers who have content expertise ‐ perhaps there could be a variety of ways teachers demonstrate this beyond credit hours. (Portfolio/evaluation plan, video, etc.) edTPA as a requirement? <http://www.edtpa.com/> Increased support and incentives for National Board certification? Teacher prep comments: Support alignment between Preparation programs (higher education) and K‐12 school districts so that teachers (regardless of prep pathway they choose) are prepared in ways that are more closely aligned with needs of the field ‐ beyond student teaching to residency models, compensation/training/monitoring of mentor teachers, advocate for courses taught by practicing PK‐12 teachers in areas where teachers are being prepared to teach.
* Yes, I believe this is critical.
* Yes. It should be required by the state through a standardized content exam or endorsement with coursework requirements.
* This should be done at the district level in order to address the needs of the community and the availability of teachers (e.g. rural schools). However, the measure for demonstrating competency should be the same. Can the state look at creating an online assessment system as they have in other fields? Right now, testing centers are not highly accessible to most of the state. Also, is there a difference in measuring my knowledge of content (e.g. ability to do higher order math) and measuring my understanding of pedagogy of that subject?
* Yes. But "competency" needs to be well defined so it can be measured.
* Yes, they should. The state should require this and it should be a standardized content knowledge exam (PLACE, Praxis, etc.), or an added endorsement through coursework. While I

understand the need for flexibility in some high need content areas and districts, there has GOT to be consistency throughout the state on this, and I don't believe it is something that we can bend on. I don't want my child in a high school calculus class being taught by someone that has a license in art, unless that teacher has passed a math content test or done adequate coursework in math. I actually think that a pedagogical assessment should be implemented, too, as another way of identifying effective preservice teachers.

* While ESSA seems to allow for a lowering of standards for teacher preparation and licensure, I think we need to make sure that teachers in our classrooms have a knowledge of the subject that they teach (at a minimum) and that they have gone through a teacher preparation program that includes the basic methodology, philosophy, and practice of teaching. Effective teaching is not something that just anyone with a set of techniques and a rule book can do. I don't know how anyone could truly help their students attain the standards we have developed without competency in the subject that they teach.
* Yes, we already do that to get our license with the tests. That portion should stay so that students are being taught by teachers who have the minimum 24 hours of college classes and have taken the necessary tests to show their competency.
* Yes!
* The Praxis exam can serve this purpose.
* ?
* Flexibility for rural districts is important, but so are highly qualified teachers. We want teaching to be a respectable field, but not having to demonstrate teacher competency feels as if we are lowering our standards. We want people to be passionate about what they teach, thus inspiring love for learning in their students. Personally, I can't speak adequately on a subject to another person without fully knowing and understanding what I am presenting. Teachers not having to demonstrate subject area competency seems backwards.
* Absolutely. There should be the same assessment tools used for teachers as the ones the teachers will use with their students.
* YES. Ideally this would be in statute. If not, and permissible within the authority of rule‐making, this should be clarified in rule. In small districts where personnel staffing is limited, include exceptions or conditions to become endorsed in a given time frame.
* Yes, the state could require this for the subjects measuring academic success such as math and English at the very least.
* For small rural schools in particular, we are sometimes caught in situations where we cannot find teachers in specific content areas. The need for flexibility at the district level is important in these situations.
* The state should make this decision because at the district level the need for teachers in areas could dilute the requirements and then there is disparity between school districts.

### 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?

* We have students at our school who speak perfect English and perform awesome in their classes, so they obviously have both academic and social English skills. There should be a way to dismiss these students more quickly from T status so that our understaffed ELL teachers can focus on the kids who need their supports more. Pre‐school programs would be awesome. However, they should be dual language programs with literacy components to respect the home environments. We need to be more respectful of research that shows the power of literacy in the home language. Maybe schools could support home language literacy in summer programs, especially for students more at risk due to poverty or other challenging factors. Help them go to college, yes, yes, yes! And provide supports to help them navigate the application process. Most importantly, ask our ELL teachers. Our two ELL teachers are rock stars. They could give you much better feedback than I can! Survey every ELL teacher in the state. There are comparatively not that many. In our school of 100 teachers, we have 2. We have 3 art teachers and 2 ELL teachers. Actively get them into this conversation.
* No comment, defer to ELD experts.
* The current identification and re‐designation of EL learners works very well, at this time we do not recommend that a modification be made to this guidance process. We do recommend that it may be beneficial to gather/provide data from districts regarding the re‐designation timeline of students.
* Not sure.
* Consult with districts that are doing this really well right now. What modifications would they suggest? One suggestion from experience ‐ EL students that have high ability and high achievement are not able to be "exited" quickly. For example, we had an EL student that was identified gifted and was functioning (conversation and academic language) at a very high level. However, she could not be exited from EL because she was not yet old enough to be in a grade that had a standardized Reading/Writing assessment (TCAP at the time). We had to wait as a district to exit her from EL. There either needs to be measures that can be used before 3rd grade OR criteria that does not require state standardize test scores to exit. Professional learning on characteristics and identification of gifted EL students so we are serving this underrepresented population of gifted students.
* I am uncertain of the state requirements, versus our district requirements for EL guidelines, and perhaps they are the same. I have participated in the WIDA Access testing at our school, and that combined with the body of evidence required to exit a student seems to be a reasonable process to me. However, we do not have an extensive EL population at our school, so I understand that this criteria may be unsustainable in a school with a much larger percentage, or a school that has larger turn around than our school.
* N/A ‐ sorry stepped away for this portion of webinar :(.
* We need to follow students after exiting to ensure they are maintaining academic performance. Exit guidance should include both language proficiency and academic success.
* CDE should work with the OCR to ensure that the criteria will also meet Civil Rights requirements. (That is, districts will not have OCR issues). This should be consistent in all districts.
* I don't know enough about the current systems, criteria, or requirements to be able to answer a question about modifying any of those.
* ACCESS already tells a school where their students stand. The exit ‐ monitoring takes place when they have met the criteria. Unfortunately, CDE doesn't fund students for the 7 to 10 years necessary to become academically literate so they become the subgroup that is at highest risk. Reclassification up to 4 additional years will be huge in our population. This also adds to the problem of effective and ineffective teacher evaluations when the students aren't able to close the academic gap.
* WIDA is good.
* Not sure, don't have too much experience in this area. Families should be highly involved and incorporated in the process and cultural beliefs should always be kept in mind.

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

* A student who comes to school with a feeling of security about life. They aren't worried about their family or money or where they will sleep or a quiet place to do their homework. A student who is comfortable with being uncomfortable academically. They know that they learn the most when they reach that place where things are new. A student who is curious. They want to participate in classes and extra‐curricular activities because they want to have new experiences. A student who gives back. They are grateful and appreciative for what they have and want to help others along the way as well. A student who is empathetic and compassionate. They are not they center of their own universe. They can trade places with someone, see things from new perspectives, and are moved to make a difference. A student who is mindful and self‐aware. They know when they need to take a step back. They stay present in the moment.
* Mental health needs addressed, engagement in school and/or community in some way, sees future opportunities for self/hope, has a positive relationship with at least one adult at school.
* Arts, project/problem based learning, STEAM, Integrated curricular programs, Physical Education, (Technology is always a go to! There is SO much more to education than technology!).
* Healthy socially, emotionally, and academically. In my experience, the social/emotional needs of students are not always being met. These needs directly affect academic performance. Students are not getting enough time outside or to play. This includes K‐12. It baffles me that middle and high school students do not get a 'recess'. Ask any adult and they will tell you they

need a brain break throughout their work day. Just getting some fresh air and running around or spending time with friends is so important for social/emotional growth. School lunch rooms. If it were up to me (which it isn't), I'd recommend completely removing all processed foods from lunch rooms. Many kids (not all) will choose a bag of chips over an apple any day. By removing unhealthy choices from school lunch rooms and vending machines it basically forces students to make healthier choices. Fresh fruits and vegetables are key. There shouldn't be any sugary drinks or foods for sale. Kids need to be calm and well fed to perform academically. Filling them up with simple carbs and sugars works against this. The teachers will be thankful for the healthy changes too! My guess is behavior issues will decrease for many students.

* A student who is physically, mentally, and socially healthy. Students who are able to access opportunities to develop and explore new skills through class, clubs, and after school programming.
* A well‐rounded student has achievement and growth that closely matches their ability and they are socially and emotionally well adjusted (knowing how to deal with stress, collaborating with others, understanding/using their own strengths, etc.). The well‐rounded student also has the ability and opportunity to take charge of their own learning. Should not be left to local communities to completely define. This sets students up for disproportionate opportunities.
* Well‐rounded and healthy students include students who are safe. The legislation recommends sub‐grants to cover the following: Page 121 (vx) Providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to prevent and recognize child sexual abuse, p. 126 (b) Types of Activities. – The programs and activities described in this subsection, p. 128 (L) providing training for all school personnel, including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, and paraprofessionals, regarding how to prevent and recognize child sexual abuse, p. 178 (A) drug and violence prevention activities and programs that are evidence‐based (to the extent the State, in consultation with local educational agencies in the State, determines that such evidence is reasonably available) including, (C) programs or activities that, (iii) help prevent bullying and harassment, p. 179 (iv) improve instructional practices for developing relationship‐building skills, such as effective communication, and improve safety through the recognition and prevention of coercion, violence or abuse, including teen and dating violence, stalking, domestic abuse, and sexual violence and harassment, p. 179 (D) high‐quality training for school personnel, including specialized instructional support personnel, related to (vii) bullying and harassment prevention;

(E) in accordance with sections 4001 and 4111, child sexual abuse awareness and prevention programs or activities, such as programs or activities designed to provide (i) age‐appropriate and developmentally‐appropriate instruction for students in child sexual abuse awareness and prevention, including how to recognize child sexual abuse and how to safely report child sexual abuse; and (ii) information to parents and guardians of students about child sexual abuse wariness and prevention including how to recognize child sexual abuse and how to discuss child

sexual abuse with a child. In this lengthy legislation, we are hopeful that Colorado will include the prioritization of the above activities.

* This should be left to local communities to determine.
* This is the tenant of our school, and we have had extensive discussions around this topic. To me, a well‐rounded, healthy student is a student who is safe (academically, socially, emotionally and physically). Healthy students are provided with choice, options, and the ability to access the curriculum, regardless of their needs. I think healthy students include the opportunity to explore personally meaningful learning opportunities, while still accessing content area standards, 21st century skills. Well rounded students to me, have the ability to learn the skills to think deeply and problem‐solve, regardless of the structure of their particular school. A well‐rounded student also means a healthy parent/home connection, the ability to access appropriate mental health services, special education services, or whatever meets student's needs. I think that a well‐ rounded student does not necessarily mean a student in the traditional school setting, which is not always the best fit for all students.
* Social emotional and physical health. Access to a variety of learning opportunities/disciplines (well rounded) with the ability to go deep in areas of interest/aptitude; exposure to a variety (core subjects and the arts, electives, foreign language, STEAM, vocational, etc.). Intellectual curiosity is fostered and honored across contexts. Schools develop 21st century/"soft" skills in addition to academics (communication, collaboration, critical thinking, etc.). Equitable access to college/career pathways (not dictated by zip code, family's college/career status, SES, school/district, etc.).
* A well rounded education includes both an academic as well as a non‐academic focus on student activities such as music, arts, and athletics. It also means that we don't base all decisions on single high stakes assessments.
* A student who succeeds academically, is well‐grounded in the humanities, understands his/her role as a participatory citizen, understands and appreciates diversity, and is exposed to the world beyond his/her immediate environment. This student would also be able to use technology as a tool and resource without over reliance on technology.
* Prepared to handle stress/barriers/challenges = equipped to problem solve, find resources, collaborate.
* This means that schools need to provide opportunities for students to engage in learning experiences that address the whole child. However, this does not mean that schools should start to be in charge of measuring the health, fitness, or social emotional status of students (e.g. BMI. fitness levels, social‐emotional screeners, etc.). Schools are not the parents.
* Competent, agile learners who are ready to contribute to their community and achieve personal success.
* A well‐rounded and healthy student is one that attends a school that is well‐funded with access to a rigorous curriculum and many extracurricular activities. Their school will also have well‐

trained teachers that are licensed in their content area, and their school counselors will be their advocates.

* A healthy student is one who comes to school well‐nourished, well‐rested, and well‐supported and prepared to participate in the learning process. A well‐rounded student is one who has been exposed to and engaged in many different aspects of learning and life, academics, the arts, work and play, behavior, self‐awareness, appreciation of others, etc.
* We already spend extra on healthy breakfast and lunch menus. I wanted to applaud Denver schools when they required physical education for all students. That is a much needed requirement for a healthy student. Elementary and Middle School behavioral health counselors are needed to be able to have well‐rounded healthy students but there isn't any money. These students are stressed, impoverished and in families with high drug and alcohol use. We need a counselor in each level. This leads to more students being in in‐school suspension because their behaviors make it impossible to teach the other 26 students. We lost three more classes of career/tech so for students who are not highly academic this is a huge loss towards their well‐ being.
* A well‐rounded and healthy student is a student that is receiving engaging instruction and enrichment opportunities that build on the whole child approach. The student is academically, socially, emotionally, and enrichment rich in opportunities and knowledge that prepares them for the success of the workforce, 2‐yr or 4‐yr degree programs, and life in general.
* Students are recognized and supported to grow as whole beings with needs and capabilities that are not only academic, intellectual ones but also physical emotional, aesthetic, and moral. Students are well‐rounded and healthy when they are safe, nourished by healthy food, and have abundant outdoor and indoor time that is balanced so that holistic development and health are possible. Outdoor learning should be doubled in all schools at all levels. School gardens are one example of how students' experiential learning out‐of‐doors can contribute to their holistic growth. They are well‐rounded and healthy when they acquire knowledge, skills, and happiness through authentic, cross‐curricular, collaborative, and meaningful learning. What students grow provides food for the school lunch program, which is occurring around the state and country. Art, music, and physical education learning are also crucial to the growth of well‐rounded and healthy students. Learners who are unmotivated and disengaged by shallow test‐oriented paper and pencil tasks require authentic, contextualized, collaborative, and meaningful learning outcomes that are service‐oriented to be fully well‐rounded and healthy.
* Well rounded education (core plus other areas) so student is ready to go on to college or workforce. Also includes physical and mentally healthy components.
* Are monies and outcomes effective or should the monies be spent elsewhere?
* Students who have access to appropriate instruction and affective support systems so that they meet their post‐secondary and career/college outcomes. Students who are connected and feel safe in school ‐ know and feel that it is okay to be different. They have self‐esteem and self‐

efficacy. Students who have access and opportunity to grow in any one of the content areas of the Colorado academic standards.

* They are in a warm, positive climate that supports learning. This can be of any kind such as social, emotional, behavioral, and academic. Students have choices to help get them interested in their passions and the adults in the schools always help guide them with the resources they have.
* A well rounded and healthy student is a student that feels safe and connected and has a family that can access basic needs. Also access to health services in school including a school nurse and wellness programing.

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

* If they are used to support students in traditional public schools, then yes! It is very important that we encourage students who qualify for this assistance to pursue academic and technical education interests. They often do not consider these because it isn't even on their radar that there are these cool opportunities they should pursue. Sometimes, they simply don't try because they know they don't have the $90 to take the AP test, so why should they take the class? We need to give them these opportunities and expect districts to market the opportunities to them so they begin to expand their horizons and dream a little more!

Charters often receive grants and they have fewer rules on fundraising and contributions. These funds need to be saved for children in traditional public schools.

* No comment, defer to funding / budget experts.
* No. \*\*
* Not sure. \*
* I don't feel I have enough information on this to answer objectively.
* Yes, 3% of funds should be reserved.
* Yes if that would help CDE support districts equitably and strategically ‐ a partnership with districts that would allow for support might best help districts with different needs? I think sometimes local control exacerbates inequities.
* I need to know more about what direct student services might include. If it is the "old" programs like after‐school tutoring‐it was very poorly designed and should not be an option.
* Yes. \*\*
* If it would help with a more adequate distribution of funds for this purpose, yes.
* Yes, if we could get back our career and tech classes for high school students that would be excellent.
* Only if such direct services grants include funding for teacher‐developed and ‐implemented Teacher Innovation Teams by teachers at school sites. Such projects will address students' specific challenges and needs in a particular school and community.
* Yes, retain the 3% or at least increase to 2%. If CDE is to provide support and service, then Offices at CDE need funds to provide resources for schools and districts in need of support.
* Yes it would give more support to targeted schools and could be used in a variety of ways.
* This was not clear in the presentation. Are we talking about the 3% optional amount that can be added to the 7%, bringing it up to 10% of the $150M? Has the 7% been successful or are we adding more money to an ongoing problem? Student outcomes should be considered and reflected at the district and school levels.

### Other comments about Quality Instruction & Leadership and Supports for Student Success:

* We need to stop expanding charters until they can show they are actually better for communities than traditional public schools. We also need way more oversight and accountability requirements, including transparency in use of public funds. I do not want my taxes to go to pad a rich person’s wallet. I want my tax dollars to go to students. If my money goes to charters, it needs to benefit students. Being taught by real teachers. Charters have allowed us as a society to throw away and abandon our community public school. Our children are not for sale and our high‐poverty communities are not trash to be thrown out and abandoned.
* The student based budgeting negatively affects small schools. Staffing is cut, resources are limited, and students pay the price.
* No mention of the additional ability to use Title I funds for identifying and serving gifted students on slide 21 (Title I ‐ ESSA) or the options on slide 23. It would be easy to miss the new ability to use Title I funds to serve low‐income gifted students without explicit mention from CDE. Putting in AP and IB does not specifically address gifted students. In what ways will CDE support the knowledge and practice of the new requirement of using Title II funds to train teachers and principals in best practices for identifying and serving gifted students? What are CDE’s plans to ensure teachers are receiving specialized training on identifying and serving gifted students (now required with Title II)? There is no mention of HB 14‐1102 on the ESSA fact sheet from Colorado (under recent education policy) or within any of these slides. Including this would help educators and parents see how Colorado already included gifted initiatives before they were first included in federal K‐12 education law. Fact sheet was found here [http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa\_ltfactsheet.](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa_ltfactsheet) Gifted is included in the "Summary of Changes to Title II, Part A" on the website: [(http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/ESSABlogPosts/titleiiachanges).](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/ESSABlogPosts/titleiiachanges)) Again, it is going to take more direct mention and support in the understanding of this being added for the first time in federal law (like in these listening tours and other training opportunities coming up). The National Association for Gifted Children has a section for the impact of ESSA on gifted students/education <http://www.nagc.org/get>‐involved/advocate‐high‐ability‐learners/nagc‐ advocacy/federal‐legislative‐update/every‐student. Please include this link with other agencies

summaries on the website: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa_ltadditionalinformation> Will there be specific information/listening tours for gifted teachers, administrators, parents, and student (like what was mentioned for early childhood and library)?

* There should be some avenue to provide a "grace" period for a teacher to become qualified in his/her field. For example, if a licensed math teacher wants to become qualified for science, allow them to work in that area for up to two years while showing progress towards being fully qualified without needing to join an alternative license program to just complete a few courses and at the same time not causing the district to be "dinged" and possibly discouraging movement like this.
* Quality Leadership needs to be in place at all levels: State, District and School. Currently, only one of these three key leadership positions is measured in a standardized way.
* If we want to continue to attract effective and committed teachers into the profession, we must work to elevate the profession again. We must not give in to corporate reform initiatives that place individuals in our classrooms with little or no formal training (and there are a lot of those springing up around the country). Not only are these individuals well‐prepared to educate our children, many of them do not stay long and then students are left with a revolving door of teachers. Look to Finland for strategies for transforming the profession back to what it should be, where the voice of the teacher is at the heart of the work, where teachers are treated like professionals and not just laborers, where teachers are seen as the experts in the work that we do. It makes a difference!
* Now that NCLB is gone as are the competitive grants for Race to the Top, etc. Eliminate the 50% data portion on the teacher evaluation as it is primarily an outcome of how seriously the student takes the PARC and CMAS testing. I receive all the consequences when not taken by the student. For a student to do their best there has to be buy‐in which there is not.
* No.
* Have we connected supports directly with money and outcomes?
* CDE includes supports and services for diverse student populations and districts. Offices are dedicated to requirements of law and assisting districts in the implementation of provisions that benefit all students. This PowerPoint does not (yet) recognize that gifted students are a state categorical with accountability requirements and with new references in ESSA. It is suggested that CDE weaves the federal and state provisions into the state's ESSA plan that are new compared to NCLB. Title I has references to gifted students: Must disaggregate data for each subgroup by achievement levels ‐ this includes gifted students Funds may be used for gifted students. Flexibility on how will address gifted education ‐ Colorado should take leadership in integrating the accountability, instruction and leadership for gifted education into the CDE ESSA Plan. Title II has reference to gifted students: Address needs of all students, including gifted students. Describe how educators will help all students, including gifted students Schools may use Title II funds for professional development on how to serve the needs of gifted students

AND those high ability learners not yet identified . There are representatives from parent and educator groups that would be willing to serve on an ESSA sub‐group committee for input on a comprehensive and inclusive ESSA State Plan.

# 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?

* Please give more specific info on who to contact to address particular concerns. Widen the communications that events are occurring.
* I had no way of knowing how many parents participated in the virtual session, or how many attended the face‐to‐face meetings around the state. It was difficult for teachers to get to the face‐to‐face meetings due to the time of the meetings, and teachers in our district were also limited due to the location ‐ the Thornton meeting was the closest to us, but it was still at least an hour drive for most and some could not make the meeting due to when their duty day ended. The virtual session occurred after most of our teachers had left for the year. As we made our way through the virtual session I wondered how knowledgeable parents and community members might be regarding some of the questions.
* Continue to provide free open access webinars such as this one!

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

* Opportunity to email committee chairs with concerns.
* Online surveys, information sessions, progress reports/updates.
* Reach out and collect information through mail, e‐mail, flyers.

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

* We have put together a local ESSA team, and did some training in Rockville, MD with other teams from around the country. We will now work to educate our members and also members of our community about the opportunities of ESSA, as well as the challenges, the work being done by various groups, and the timeline for implementation. It is my hope that as people learn more they will want to be more actively involved in the process.
* Have information posted or handouts in my office, be informed on the new changes and be able to talk about them with parents

### Why were you unable to attend the ESSA Listening Tour session?

* Found out about it too late to clear schedule so we did virtual listening tour. We felt it was very well done.
* For the reasons stated in my answer to the first question.

### Do you plan on attending a different ESSA Listening Tour session in the future?

* If the content is different.
* If any are planned, I will try to make it one. I am also on the state implementation team organized by CEA, which is also working collaboratively with CASE/CASB/PEBC/CEI and other stakeholder groups. I believe that will help me to stay up to date on what is happening.