



Vision

All students in Colorado will become educated and productive citizens capable of succeeding in society, the workforce, and life.

Goals

Every student, every step of the way



Meeting Logistics & Desired Outcomes

Meeting:	ESSA Hub Committee Meeting				
Date:	October 10, 2016	Time:	12:00pm - 4:00pm	Location:	201 East Colfax Avenue, Denver, CO 80203 - Board Room
Meeting Lead:	Nina Lopez (HUB co-facilitator), Katy Anthes (HUB co-facilitator),				
Meeting Participants: <i>(Who most needs to attend?)</i>	<p>CDE Representatives: Patrick Chapman, Lynn Bamberly, Joyce Zurkowski, Nazanin Mohajeri-Nelson, Alyssa Pearson, Brad Bylsma, Colleen O’Neil, Jessica Hollingshead, Jennifer Simons, Barbara Hickman, Rachael Lovendahl</p> <p>Members of HUB Committee: Steve Durham, Angelika Schroeder, Rep. Brittany Pettersen, Rep. Jim Wilson, Evy Valencia, Jim Earley, Ross Iazard, Luke Ragland, Kirk Banghart, Dan Schaller, Ken DeLay, Lisa Escarcega, Don Anderson, Linda Barker, Diane Duffy, Jesus Escarcega, Sean Bradley, Linda Barker, Jeani Frickey Saito, Ernest House, Jr., Carolyn Gery</p> <p>Special Guest Speaker: U.S Representative Jared Polis</p>				
Meeting Objectives: <i>(Is a meeting necessary to accomplish the objectives?)</i>	<p>ESSA – 3rd Hub Committee Meeting</p> <p>Updates on ESSA progress, Closer Look at Assessment and Effective Instruction & Leadership in ESSA state plan development</p>				

Agenda Items and Next Steps

Time	Agenda Item	Notes & Next Steps <i>(be sure to include communication to those not at the meeting who need to know the results)</i>
12:00pm	Lunch	<p>Updates and Check in from Hub Committee Members:</p> <p>Question from Hub Member: Is there a plan to include programs that target foster children, homeless, military programs. Any notifications for school districts that are critical that addresses the changes?</p> <p>To Do Item: Include item to discuss during November Hub – Title Programs – reporting and funding aspects</p> <p>Comment from Hub Member: participation in accountability Spoke, sub spokes, focusing on comprehensive and targeted school definitions</p> <p>Comment from Hub Member: Update from Charter School Summit – had great attendance, only scratched the service, discussions regarding what 5th</p>

		<p>indicator might be, 95% participation requirement, hope to have a follow up to dig into more issues.</p> <p>Comment from Hub Member: Colorado BOCES Association fall meeting – CDE came to share ESSA plan as it is moving forward. Executive Director went to Washington, DC to attend the Association of Educational School Service Agency Conference and met with CO Congressmen to discuss ESSA. Congressmen assuring that there is flexibility in the law. One concern at CBA is that state laws might not going to coincide with federal law and how might we handle that within the plan?</p> <p>Interim Commissioner, Dr. Katy Anthes speaking: Action Item: September minutes approved. No amendments to September minutes – all in favor</p>
12:30pm	Representative Polis	<p>Congressman Polis Speaks to Hub Committee:</p> <p>Thanked everyone for serving on this committee – great to see a variety of stakeholders, impressed with composition of committee.</p> <p>Polis has worked with the Education Workforce Committee that helped craft the law. The final package is not perfect in the view of any particular legislator. It’s not a republican or democratic bill, but represents a compromise not just between parties, but members who have thought this out. Member unanimously agreed that this better than NCLB. New version does a lot of great things, such as investment in early childhood education, more flexibility around testing, evidence-backed education, and innovation in education.</p> <p>Federal perspective: truly sees ESSA as a <u>civil rights bill</u> – commitment to civil rights. To ensure that states and districts are held accountable for outcomes for all students regardless of income, geography, race, background, or gender. We hope that this is a more workable framework than NCLB.</p> <p>Accountability provisions offer a framework for states to follow. Happy to answer any questions regarding new flexibility that committee may have. Most of Representative Polis work has been centered on the drafting and input on the rule-making process that is now occurring at the executive branch. Now baton has been passed to the Hub. This committee has a very important voice in determining what will work for Colorado. The waivers that Colorado filed with NCLB would also comply with ESSA. That doesn’t mean that Colorado has to stick with those proposals under NCLB that were approved by the Dept.</p> <p>Issues and areas that this committee should look into:</p> <p>1) 95% Participation Rate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What happens when districts do not meet the 95% compliance rate? - Under NCLB there were federally oriented solutions (notifications were sent to schools and parents), but now will be left up to states to decide what happens to districts who do not comply (in terms of

notification, assurances, etc.). States need to make sure that no students are being swept under the rug.

2) Educator Pipeline

- Will no longer have the single federal definition of “highly qualified”
- Gives opportunity to the state to raise the bar on educator quality and make available new pipelines for educators from the military, business, and other professions such a law and medicine.
- Should be a thoughtful area for state to look at
- Everyone should provide guidance and feedback to the US Dept. of Education as draft rules become finalized around this issue

3) Testing

- Colorado has always had significantly more testing than what was required by NCLB. Always been the case in Colorado. If this continues to be the desire of the state, then Colorado is welcome to have that. Colorado did not used all its flexibility and waiver under NCLB for Colorado has made the point that it wants accountability and want more test. That is the direction of Colorado – going above and beyond NCLB.
- ESSA has created more discretion at the state level. Relevancy of testing is important to districts, students, and parents.
- What does the state want in measuring student outcomes

4) Funding Levels Associated with ESSA

- Handout was given to the HUB committee:
<https://www.nea.org/assets/docs/FY2017-House-Appropriations-Committee-Bill-Compared-to-ESSA-Authorizations.pdf>
- Question posed ahead of this meeting: What are the actual funding levels associated with this bill?
- ESSA is an authorized bill – meaning that its funding levels are authorized for a wide variety of programs. In Nov-Dec, omnibus bill will be passed and dictate funding levels for the next year.
- Senate and House budget levels are different for every line item – Senate is usually higher

Question from Hub Member: What recommendations would you offer us when it comes to the 95% waiver?

Response from Congressman Polis:

- Side issue: NCLB only 1% of students could be given an alternative assessment, ESSA maintains that 1% cap, but established a waiver procedure where the state, in a thoughtful way, can say it is around 1 and a half percent based on objective criteria (special education).
- At site level, districts are in charge of getting into compliance and states are in charge of getting district level compliance. We are aware of the difficulties across districts associated with this.
- There are logistical issues – online schools, etc.
- States to see what they can do to work with districts - ensure that they have some sort of plan
- This is a civil right bills – need to make sure that all students count
- Transparency

		<p>Question from Hub Member: There was some pushback on some of the draft rules that were provided by USDE, have you had a chance to review those? Are there areas where you agree or disagree?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rep. Polis has not had a chance to look at comments made by CDE. - To Do: Send Rep. Polis CDE’s and State Board’s letter to USDE. <p>Comment from Hub Member: Concept of being able to use a dashboard of multiple measures – but still have to take it down to a single score.</p> <p>Response from Congressman Polis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SB186 – own system for evaluating schools - Colorado can still do what it wants - Single score is for federal purposes - Colorado has always gone above and beyond what is federally required - We know it’s not just about one number, we care about many issues - Targeted responses – underperforming or lower performing sub groups <p>Question from Hub Member: You are aware that there is a shortage of teachers getting into the profession. There was a grant program to support teachers available previously, but is now being reduced, will there be more opportunities of helping teachers get into the profession and supporting them?</p> <p>Response from Congressman Polis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From a regulatory perspective, no longer having a single definition of “higher qualified” allows states do to this more deliberately and thoughtfully to address this need. - Does this need to be done administratively or legislatively – or both? - Was an area where there was no flexibility, now states have flexibility - We want more into the profession, without decreasing quality - Professional development opportunities – want to see more scientific rigor addressing what works and what doesn’t – what is relevant - Need to improve morale - Funding is largely state and local for teacher compensation <p>Question from Hub Member: Proposed rules are not always aligned with intent, can you provide any insight if you expect any rules to change in the near future?</p> <p>Response from Congressman Polis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This was a compromised bill – leaves it to the department to interpret the bill - Election might change things - Nothing came as a surprise in draft rules – see it as civil right bills - Want meaningful accountability - Supplement v. supplant – example - Defend Colorado’s fiscal practices <p>Comment from Hub Member: Regarding the 95% participation rate, can you comment on how those arguments developed as bill was being passed? We</p>
--	--	--

		<p>still give a 9th grade assessment – that ESSA does not require – any thoughts on whether or not we should keep this assessment?</p> <p>Response from Congressman Polis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colorado has always had significantly more assessments than what is required - Entirely up to the state on what they want to know. Do you want to know how your 9th student are? - This state has always had the desire to want to know more about its students. - Civil rights – want to make sure that all children are accounted for - No more federal sanction if districts don't reach – they want a plan from the states to ensure that lack of achievement is not disguised at site level <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Has the actual level of funding varied with the levels of poverty as poverty has increased around the country? Or is it diluted?</p> <p>Response from Congressman Polis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With increased poverty, the money is diluted - Title I is appropriated each year at a certain level then divided between the kids that need it. - Is there any data that has been monitored over the last 10 years? - Need to include this particular element when discussing funding in Colorado
12:45pm	<p>Follow-up items and updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hub Member Updates - Review and Approval of Minutes from September meeting - Update on Spoke Committee progress and timeline 	<p>Katy introduces Nina Lopez, their respective roles, and facilitation process</p> <p>Nina offers themes/guiding principles that she wants the Hub to think about as the plan develops and completing this important work (gathered these from August's meeting)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Colorado's kids should be at the center of our decision making 2) Equity – every child has opportunity 3) Improvement for our most challenged schools 4) Transparency for schools and districts 5) Flexibility 6) Practicality 7) Efficiency <p>Comment from Hub Member: Great list and reflective of what was talked about, but would like to call out to excellence – with success being part of the title of the legislation – keep our eyes on it</p> <p>Add excellence to list of themes? Revisit it. Does it serve or fit in Colorado's vision?</p> <p>(1:01pm) Comment from Hub Member: Not sure if opposed to adding excellence to themes. Would only point out that ESSA focuses on a particular group of kids – low performing students – and that the higher performing students are left to school districts. Does this topic belong in an ESSA conversation?</p>

		<p>Emphasized: Hub Committee Members to fill out feedback worksheet from meeting. For November's Hub – what is needed from Spokes, information or questions, to make decisions next time.</p> <p>To Do: Send electronic version to Hub Committees</p> <p>To Do: Post updated PowerPoint with new slides for listeners</p>
1:03pm	<p>ESSA state plan development requirements and decision points: Assessment</p>	<p>Presentation Lead by CDE Representative</p> <p>Spoke Committee has not met yet, but has presented this to Interim Committee already – first meeting coming up</p> <p>During presentation want to cover – talking points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is actually required under ESSA 2) Look at Colorado's participation trends 3) Key ESSA changes from NCLB 4) Proposed regulations regarding the innovative assessment demonstration authority <p>For assessment, ESSA covers two pieces of information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is required to be included in the state plan 2) Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority <p>Required of Assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality, valid, reliable, fair - Approved through peer review - Single assessment for all students, except for those with cognitive disabilities (alternative assessment – IDEA) - Must be aligned to the full breadth and depth of the Standards <p>High School requirements – 9th grade?</p> <p>Consortium assessments – needs to be investigated</p> <p>Reference to parent excusal</p> <p>Keep in mind of Standards Revisions timeline</p> <p>Participation Trends</p> <p>Colorado has historically had high rates of participation – almost at 95%</p> <p>Parent excusals</p> <p>Coding issues</p> <p>Science – low participation compared to other subjects – challenge for Colorado</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: What about 2016 data?</p> <p>Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coding issue - Grade 10 – shift – due to CMAS PARCC – ELA and Math assessments Changed to PSAT 10 – participation jumped <p>*Indicator that students and parents realize the relevance of the testing to their lives - college</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: What are the actual numbers?</p> <p>To Do: Need to send data to Hub Committee</p> <p>Key ESSA changes from NCLB</p>

		<p>Keep in mind for Colorado - comparison point should not be NCLB – as much as it should be our waiver Flexibility – need to take that from a waiver perspective Example: 8th grade algebra assessment – ESSA more restrictive than what we had – Colorado waived at 7th grade. Advanced math assessment in middle school/high school – needed in all districts, not just select few Equity issue regarding access and opportunity</p> <p>ESSA Change from NCLB: First year in US – would not have to participate in Language Arts testing – Colorado required participation, but districts decided – there is a divide in the state Under ESSA, need to come up with universal expectation for all districts while honoring flexibility</p> <p>Pause to debrief: CDE Representative asks if Hub Committee has any questions.</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: What is best for kids – what was the reason for not testing them? Problematic for students or adults? Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First in the US cannot contribute to the test in a meaningful way - Lack language skills to engage in the test - 3rd and 4th grade English Language Arts test offered - Districts consider what is the right approach for testing? - Growth information is meaningful to districts – how much has the ability to read and write in English shifted from year to year two - <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: What time of year is the test offered? Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - March/ administered in April <p>Comment from Hub Committee Member: Tested in second year for growth – and tested in third year for proficiency</p> <p>(1:24pm) (1:05:21 on recording) Question from Hub Committee Member: How do districts decide they are going to participate in testing? Is it yes test or no test – can you explain the nuance there? Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Colorado thought that all districts would agree to test, but in the end they did not. - Some kids walk in the day before testing, and according to law, they are supposed to test. However, districts felt that they don't have to test. <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Does the department have a notion of what percent of kids need to take the assessment? Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Importance is representativeness of samples in testing Which students are included and participating and not participating? What is more usable?
--	--	--

		<p>Have extra layer to look at – look deeply into results from grade level to grade level Does make comparisons across districts more challenging when they decide not to test Attempt to honor local control and understand local context</p> <p>ESSA Change from NCLB: Format of assessment has shifted ESSA will allow Colorado to move into a direction that offers interim assessments that will result in a single summative score to be reported at the end of the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How do we do this so that comparisons can be retrieved across districts and in a way that is fair? - Adaptive assessments – keep proficiency in mind <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Based on that, what is the measure for 7th graders if taking an assessment meant for 8th graders? Math for example Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider context – geometry v. algebra - Math has jumps and holes across time - Makes it more challenging <p>ESSA Change from NCLB: LEA selected nationally recognized high school assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nationally recognized test already in Colorado – 11th grade - Has to be reviewed by the State - Acknowledge that there is more flexibility under federal law – not in state law - Has to be peer reviewed and approved by Feds <p>Requirements for State Plan Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority Opportunity to pilot new approaches to assessment. Limited to seven states can apply for this Intent - Allows state to test new approaches as they come to scale - down the road a single assessment system Only ask if state is developing a new approach, start small with few districts and gradually scale up, and state plans to use for accountability and reporting during scaling up process. In a unique position – Colorado will apply regardless if will do all three of things at once. There is a qualifier Will be separate from state plan Don't want to take anyone by surprise when we decide what to do.</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Because any state can do this right now, am I understanding this correctly, the reason why we have this here because students would not have to participate in current state plan? Response from CDE Representative:</p>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In part, for a period of time, there will be two systems running at the same time – the current system and subset of LEAs running pilot - Not quite true regarding participation – need to be assessing all students using state wide system – at least once per grade span - Students double testing or take a significant portion from regular assessment to include in pilot – but don’t know how to do that well - Innovative assessment should be different – include a performance-based section - Think about testing burden v. technical point of view - Another option: State determined method that provides an equally rigorous, statistically valid comparison for all students and subgroups <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Just to clarify, is the intent of the pilot that any alternative assessment will ultimately replace the existing state-wide assessment or is this just a requirement of the legislation?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is a strong expectation that eventually this innovative assessment will be adopted as the new state’s assessment - Needs time to evolve, grow, mature, come to scale - Timeline: a state can apply for Demonstration Authority to scale over a period of five years. If the state still has not implemented the authority after the five years, a state can request a two year extension, then a state can take a year to get assessment peer reviewed – up to 8 years total to implement - need to see what finals rules say <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: What is the definition of equally rigorous? To what are we equally rigorously to?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Historically, look at how rigorously is defined for peer review - Content similarity - Depth and breadth of Standards – make more closely aligned with instruction? - Need to make more authentic and project based - Has to correlate with Standards <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Funding, the costs, is there any incentive for districts to participate in the pilot? Is this something that CDE can handle or will this be referred to an outside vendor to help?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As the state engages in conversations regarding demonstration authority - Key points: How are we going to come up with these assessments and get agreement across districts? - Need to score them in a way that is the same across all districts - How do we support districts and make sure that they have appropriate professional development activities to not only know how to administer the assessments, but to score them accurately. - Rotate to make sure all districts are scoring in a similar way - Complex – still question how assessments are meaningful to child’s classroom experience
--	--	--

		<p>(1:50pm) (01:31:57 on recording) Question from Hub Committee Member: How long does it take to normalize a test and retrieve validity measures? Comments from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About 5 years <p>Comment from Hub Committee Member: We started off talking about our themes – kids at the center, equity, improving our challenging schools, transparency, flexibility – to me this seems like the opposite if we think ESSA is going to help our students, schools, and teachers. Especially around proficiency. We need to think about if this is truly making a difference for students in the classroom.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it a completely legitimate instructional approach to have these types of assessments in our classrooms? Absolutely - If we already had 100% of our classrooms who already knew how to do this and do it well, leveraging the work and making it part of the state system would be feasible. Trying to make sure that we come up with a way to engage in these activities while respecting local control. At a very intimate level we getting involved. This is not an instructional endeavor – rather an assessment point of view. Wish could make it instructional point of view. Bang for your buck - will see meaningful change in terms of student achievement. <p>(1:53pm)(01:34:28 on recording) Comment from CDE Representative: We have talked a lot about this knowing that this is a valid approach. We need to think this from a policy perspective as a policy person – be careful what you wish for. As soon as you put this instructional practice piece into the assessment system that is tied to state accountability, that is tied to all of the rules there in, need to think about the tradeoffs your making. Some of the things folks wanted and we heard loud and clear – we want it more timely, we want it tied to instruction, we want it more driven at our level – as soon as you make that your state assessment system you might have some unintended consequences. This is a good thing to do in terms of practice, and in terms of thinking about a full balanced assessment system for districts, but what does that look like? How can we help support this assessment literacy and assessment development? How much do you want it in the state assessment system versus the local assessment system?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We can learn and leverage from this – example: graduation guidelines has local control – reference to cross district developed assessment serving as an indicator that the student has met the expectations needed to graduate. <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Against the landscape of competency based, that is where we are moving next year with 9th graders – how does this integrate with that first of all; and secondly, we have been focusing on formative assessments that don't have the exact component like LEA and Math – for science and social studies look at capstone projects for example – how is that going to be surfaced to inform this discussion as well?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grade level standards - There may be areas where we can learn from with competency based.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We have to make sure we are not leaving some kids behind – some competency based systems say to move at your own pace, which sounds really good, until you have a group of students who are moving at a rate very different from other students but they all look the same? In the end, we all need to reach some goal – whatever that goal is. - How do we not poison that work? Ongoing conversation –we don’t have answers right now. <p>(1:57 pm) (01:38:56) Comment from Hub Committee Member: Still worry that we are mixing apples and oranges. Instruction is instruction and assessment and accountability is assessment and accountability. It strikes me in what we are trying to do and have been trying to do is drive the two together. There is a frustration at the educator level – why are we taking these assessments that don’t matter for instruction? They don’t matter for instruction because they are accountability assessments. I wish we could get more focused on what we are doing and why we are doing it – maybe we can make do with a lot fewer accountability assessments and focus on instruction as instruction.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think it’s fair to say that across our state there is very different levels of what I am going to refer to as assessment literacy – even though might not be the right phrase to use. - Some people can say that this is what I want for my teacher driven classroom assessment experience, this is what I want from the school driven perspective, this is what I want for my district and the state and everyone is trying to mush those together. - But then it sounds all good then to have just one assessment that serves all purposes. We don’t know how to do that and do it well. – A challenge <p>Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority: Comparability between state assessment and Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority. Need to make sure that we are providing for the participation of all students and make accessible to all students. Think about all students – visually and hearing impaired, English learners – can’t just think about upper middle class Caucasians males.</p> <p>Think about assessment priorities What can we do without Demonstration Authority? Unique Colorado assessment Colorado can change our assessment system What can we do with Demonstration Authority? We can have two comparable assessments administered at the same time under Demonstration Authority while Colorado scales up – used to create a single accountability system. Multiple assessments long term do not seem to be allowed Has to be nationally recognized Off grade level without grade level determination does not appear to be allowed</p> <p>What are we hearing from folks who would not require Demonstration Authority?</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Is there a way to increase the perceived student relevance our 9th grade assessment? What can we learn from 10th grade that could be applied to 9th grade? Is there a way to shorten the current CMAS tests? Short term solution. Look at an abbreviated test perhaps. Social Studies – state requirement – does not need Demonstration Authority</p> <p>Options that would require Demonstration Authority: High school science is problematic – is there a way for students who are already taking a science assessment such as AP, IB, SAT Content test, etc. that they could utilize those tests in place of the CMAS science assessment. But that may violate regulations and possibly ESSA itself. For Colorado, that may be something we want to talk about. Consider piloting, we don't know.</p> <p>Interim or benchmark assessments: Can districts use their interim system, STAR, NWEA, AQUITY, etc. Under ESSA there needs to be single interim assessment system. Advantage would be a reduction in testing. However, the challenge is the intrusion on local control. The state now has to choose and determine what the interim assessment is going to be. Graduation guidelines – common performance based assessments Grade-level assessments – shift assessments to different grade levels</p> <p>(2:06pm) (01:47:05 on recording) Question from Hub Committee Member: Demonstration Authority and Assessment Pilot – is it possible do one and not the other? Response from CDE Representative: If Colorado applies for the Demonstration Authority under ESSA, Feds do expect that will turn into our long-term assessment. Pilot will be scaled up across time. Only apply for Demonstration Authority when ready with all three pieces: 1) Innovative Assessment 2) Starting with a small group 3) Want to count it for accountability</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: What are the procedural requirements for us to receive Demonstration Authority? Response from CDE Representative: - Yet to be defined – after rules are determined - Will be an application – haven't seen yet</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: 1234, are we regardless of whether we meet these criteria, wouldn't we have to repeal that in order to not apply for Demonstration Authority? Response from CDE Representative: - When we are ready we will go - Will look that up and get info back today</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Don't answer now, but please bring back – If the state were to move to a 9th grade PSAT – is there a growth model available and how might that work in part with the SAT?</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Would it be possible to get data from districts who tested the first year versus who waited the second year to see what that looks like?</p> <p>Comment from Facilitator – please provide feedback and or questions for Assessment on form</p> <p>BREAK: 2:08pm (01:54:00 on recording)</p>
2:15pm	ESSA state plan development requirements and decision points: Effective Instruction and Leadership	<p>Meeting resumed back at 2:23pm (02:05:11 on recording)</p> <p>Presentation Lead by CDE Representative Spoke Committee Work</p> <p>Focused on specific educator talent pipeline and development initiatives Broke out into individual working groups</p> <p>Had very critical questions to address: One involving, the transition out of highly qualified – think of it as the essence of highly qualified How do we define effective and ineffective educators? How do we identify experienced and inexperienced educators?</p> <p>Work was centered on identifying educator definitions for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Experienced and inexperienced educators 2) In-field and out-of-field educators (essence of highly qualified) 3) Effective and ineffective educators <p>What makes an educator highly qualified? How is content knowledge demonstrated - endorsement in content area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Content assessment 2) 24 credit hours specific to content area 3) Degree <p>Other decision points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The use of Title I and II funds for districts - how to use funds to support districts - Improve educator preparedness that also supports principals and leaders - Implement educator evaluator systems – waiver SB191 - Definition of a paraprofessional and standards <p>Recommendations to Hub</p> <p>Definition of Inexperienced</p> <p>Spoke recommends to define inexperienced as teachers with 0-2 years of teaching in any educational setting. Traditionally, 0-3 years was identified as inexperienced.</p> <p>No student under the lens of equity can be taught at a higher rate by an inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field educator without academic achievement.</p> <p>Looking at lens of equity when reporting.</p> <p>(2:33pm) Question from Hub Committee Member: Story on NPR this morning</p>

Discussed statistic that there is a substantial amount of inexperienced teachers in Colorado, not just nationwide, who are teaching in schools that are predominantly students of color. So how in this space can we address the large populations of students of color being taught by these inexperienced teachers?

Response from CDE Representative:

- CDE is investigating the data that was released in NPR report
- The numbers do not reflect CDE data
- USDE provided 2014 data that schools in high minority quartile consist of teachers in their first year is at 6.8% - low minority quartile is 4.8%
- NPR report was 10% in first year and 18% overall
- CDE will address the disparity in the data
- Need to explore the equity around this concern

Overarching themes:

- 1) Equity – how do we ensure that all students have experienced, effective, and in-field teachers who provide access to high quality instruction and support?
- 2) Support – How can CDE support educators, educator prep programs, schools and districts to increase access to experienced, effective, and in-field educators
- 3) Flexibility – how do we leverage the new flexibility in ESSA in a way that maximizes the ability of schools and districts to make the best possible decisions in their local context while still promoting equity for all students

Conversation around the difference between brand, brand new teachers and early career teachers – something that Colorado has not defined aggressively. Only two qualifications: experienced and non-experienced. This is not true – all teachers are on a continuum on educational endeavors.

For the purposes of ESSA and the reporting, the Spoke recommends 0-2 years as inexperienced and 3-5 years of experience as “early career.”

Teaching experience defined by :

- 1) 0-2 years – intense support
- 2) 3-5 years – “early career” - less intense support
- 3) 5+ years – identify career pathways and pipelines

Traditionally defined as 0-3 years because of initial teacher license (first 3 years) and then move over to professional license.

Question from Hub Committee Member: Are there teachers who are making recommendations?

Response from CDE Representative:

- Yes, speaking with teachers, along with Colorado Education Association helping to collect teacher feedback, professional learning networks collecting feedback, etc.
- Part of feedback so far is trying to move away from the term “inexperienced” because the word has a different connotation when someone has a professional license that they worked on for 4-5 years. Ineffective is the same way.

Recommendation to Define Infield

Infield is defined as holding a license with an endorsement in the subject area in which the teacher is assigned to teach.

This is controversial

The actual law in Colorado Statute today states that all teachers need is a license. There are two way to get a license:

- 1) Alternative License – one of the most open pathways in the nation
- 2) Traditional pathway through institutions of higher education – 4 year degrees

Right now, to identify who is infield, today, the committee is recommending above and beyond what statute allows for. Under law, any subject can be taught as long as have a license. Committee is recommending the teachers have an **endorsement** in subject area that they teach. What nobody has recommended yet is how? What are the exact pathways to get there? Under the essence of highly qualified, 24 credit hours, degree, or content assessment. Today, the Spoke agrees that those are good indicators of content knowledge to be able to teach, but how long as a teacher would they have to demonstrate that? There was a 50/50 split among stakeholders who agreed with this decision mainly because we have a teacher shortage. We need teachers who are passionate and talented, but on the other end, we need teachers who demonstrate content knowledge, especially at secondary level and math and science at elementary level. Want honest feedback from Hub.

Question from Hub Committee Member: The people among the 50% who are against the requirement, came from rural side of state?

Response from CDE Representative:

- Yes and no
- Rural educators value their training and it in their colleagues
- There are a multitude of pathways – some of this blurs with the pathways to becoming an educator
- There are many pathways in Colorado – from emergency authorizations to alternative to 4-year degrees.
- There is a rural need to have educators

Comment from Hub Committee Member: I've never met an educator that would willingly put someone in a classroom if they didn't think they had the qualifications unless they had no other choice. I wonder, does this need to be in rural?

Response from CDE Representative:

- What is going to solve our teacher shortage and academic crisis – how are we going to get more teachers in? How do we sort them out? Do we open the door in a different way?
- Lots of conversation to have – is ESSA the place to have this conversation?

(02:28:22 on recording) Question from Hub Committee Member: Curious to know from committees perspective, seems like an area that is not right for an either/or situation and that this is an opportunity for the state to look at what other ways to define in-field and out-of-field. What further context areas

		<p>were discussed in which the committee came to their thoughts and other mechanisms besides licensure when deciding this?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The conversation came back to what highly qualified used to be, which was separate from licensing, in the grand scheme of things - Demonstrate content knowledge not just licensure <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Maybe you can't answer this, but do you know why they dropped highly qualified from ESSA? And was there no intent to have some flexibility? Do you know the background on that?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do not know the background on that - When asked, it was deferred to state law. - Want states to make own decision on what that may look like - Many states already have endorsement requirement in their state law <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: We have a problem, a supply problem. So in the Spoke Committee, have you discussed why we aren't having a flood of applications to teach in Colorado – for example, cost of living is a problem. Did you discuss that?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are many societal implications - From publicizing our educators to what we are paying our educators - 4-year graduates with \$60,000 debt are earning \$26,000 a year their first several years - No housing available in rural areas - Also explored how we prepare and support educators - In ESSA, can't solve preparedness in the educator pipeline - Rural educators and districts want to make sure that none of these definitions limit their ability to bring teachers in to fill positions. - Teachers can teach without an endorsement, but will have to report as out-of-field <p>(2:53pm) (02:34:44 on recording) Comment from Hub Committee Member: Appears to me that the legislature has spoken on this topic and that to try to circumvent their current position the compliance requirement with federal law is in appropriate. If the legislature wishes to adjust its requirements for licensure, that is a decision that they should make. I don't believe we should be involved in that. Legislature's decision.</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: So what are the accountability issues around endorsement?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From an accountability stand point – still having those conversations - We just need to submit this plan – office of civil rights issue - Superintendent reps worry if they will get dinged if hire educators that do not demonstrate content knowledge or have in-field experience - What the reporting does, allows us to ensure that low-income and minority student are not taught at higher rates than their peers by ineffective, out-of-field, inexperienced teachers. It allows us to do that
--	--	---

		<p>analysis of where gaps exists. What ESSA says, the state has an obligation to provide support where those gaps exist. Need to provide districts with support. Looking at the access that students have to really great teachers. We need to increase that access in any way we can and identify distribution of teachers and how categories exist.</p> <p>(02:38:49 on recording) Question from Hub Committee Member: So if we're going to make a decision on these three things, I just want to make clear the goals of each of those categories is to make sure the measurement is the right one. To put a point on that, we don't want to put inexperienced teachers in – the measure used is time. If it's effective – we have a unit to determine that. In field, is that literally content knowledge in a specific area? Can you help me understand the goal of in-field?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No definition provided by ESSA on in-field – refers to state agency - Colorado has no definition because we used the term highly qualified only - Went back to what highly qualified really means - Can we define it as just content? And not license? - Best definition: from Dept. of Justice – when looking at Office of Civil Rights Issues – do you have a teacher who has demonstrated a license and endorsement in that area – that has been the lens that USDE has indicated to Colorado as an in-field educator - Goal: Endorsement defines content – I know that content <p>Comment from Hub Committee Member: Can you get an endorsement without a license?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No <p>Questions from Hub Committee Member: When we talk about comparing these schools who have disproportions of teachers who are inexperienced or out-of-field what are we comparing them to? Statewide, geographic area, districts?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One thing they look at is quartiles of poverty schools – lowest v. highest poverty schools - Title I schools <p>Question/Comments from Hub Committee Member: what about rural areas and Metro Denver? Isn't it higher? The NPR story said just Colorado, it didn't specify which areas. These numbers are real and are affecting students who are going to these schools. Let's not ignore this challenge and do something about it. Even though CDE has acknowledged this, nobody know what the numbers are.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We will get clarification on data – don't want to speculate on where data is going - In CDE's equity plan that is submitted to USDE CDE acknowledged that minority students are being taught at a higher rate than non-minority
--	--	---

		<p>students. Same with student of poverty. CDE will follow up with NPR story.</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: When we talk about reporting on this, where is it being reported? Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Districts report to Colorado Department of Education then Colorado Department of Education reports it to United State Department of Education - All is publicized <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: When looking out our goals for ESSA - outcomes for kids – wondering if the decision to make teachers have an endorsement was based on research? If so, can that research be shared? Research does not show a clear connection between whether or not you’re licensed and the results being produced for kids. Which I think should be the goal.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We can provide research for both sides - It’s not about the license itself – it’s the culmination events of professional learning – it’s about how do they get there - It’s the professional learning path that increases one’s ability to work with students - This is the bottom bar to educate students effectively - Need to look at equity plan – we now there is gap – but to what extent is what we are questioning today - Hub members wants a direct correlation or causation in Colorado - will be difficult to determine - Need to go back to Spoke with more data <p>(3:11pm) (02:53:00 on recording) Comments from Facilitator: make sure to get feedback that you to the spoke committees so that they can report back. Will spend rest of time for this meeting on clarifying questions.</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Why is the current definition of highly qualified not acceptable to use moving forward? We could keep that definition, we don’t necessarily have to reinvent the wheel? Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly qualified mimics our endorsement rules by law - Demonstration of professional competency <p>Comment from Hub Committee Member: Under highly qualified, charter schools can hire teachers without licenses, but the teachers have to demonstrate content knowledge in one of three ways: content assessment, 24 credit hours specific to content area, or degree. However, what I see goes beyond highly qualified. It’s an “and” not an “or.” Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Goes about what our statute says - Even setting highly qualified as the bar goes above state statute at this point. Going above a license.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not portable – certain districts might not honor qualifications <p>Comment from Hub Committee Member: Struggling with this conversation, rural schools are going to be impacted. Why does it become the state’s department task to make a teachers qualifications portable? Why can’t school districts have whatever qualifications they want for their teachers? If we are going to report to USDE, there will be requirement embedded that we are setting up that we will have to live with. Rural school districts are not the same when it comes to personnel compared to the districts on the front range. The struggles that they have do not need to be magnified by a rule.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It does matter for Accountability measures and purposes - OCR impact <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Just wondering for your committee, did teacher mobility come up as a topic or concern?</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher mobility and pipeline came up every day - Is it in our best interest for kids in the lens of equity to lower the bar for teachers and not allow them to be portable if they want to move? Is it in our best interest to have our educators without licenses and endorsements and can move? - There are outliers on both sides of this conversation - What is the middle ground for the kids and for equity <p>Comment from Hub Committee Member: The shortage that rural schools are facing, if we create processes through the rules, if we expedite that problem that rural schools are facing, then it really is an equity issue. Forcing districts into a box. Need to think of it in terms of flexibility. We are a local control state and decisions need to be made locally. We are struggling with licensure being a barrier when offering access, we need to look at lowering barriers. Economy size makes it look different. We are meeting the need for at-risk students. Need to provide opportunities for kids. Let’s not put a barrier in place like NCLB. Accountability comes down to local decisions. Need to be mindful of flexibility.</p> <p>Response from CDE Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We want all teachers to demonstrate content knowledge eventually - How can we help teachers professionally to reach that? Especially for Science and Math. - About time – how long? <p>Did not get to all recommendations from Spoke – please contact Spoke if have more questions and deeper inquiry.</p> <p>(3:27pm to 3:41pm)(03:09:33 on recording) Hub Committee took 5-10 minutes to captures notes and comments in teams of two. Spoke will collect comments after discussion.</p>
3:30pm	ESSA state plan development	Resume meeting at 03:22:25 on recording

	<p>Overview: Title Programs</p>	<p>Last subject of the day: Title Programs Just a small overview Coming back to present in greater depth in November Refer to one-page fact sheets provided</p> <p>Introduction to Programs How much money flows to the programs and districts For ESSA, programs that we need to make a case for Reporting requirements</p> <p>Will put name of specific coordinator on slides for different Title programs to contact in case people have questions.</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Just curious if Title II is going to face reductions Response from CDE Representative: - Yes, Title II will have funding reductions - Formula will be used to make funding available</p> <p>Question from Hub Committee Member: Can come back with information on Title I programs and what other resources will be available to help fund certain programs? Response from CDE Representative: - Yes</p>
3:45pm	<p>Concluding Remarks</p>	<p>Wrap Up Fill out Feedback forms. If didn't get the chance, will be emailed and collected.</p> <p>Future Meeting Dates: Decided to add additional Hub Meeting February 6, 2017 Decided to change time for January 9, 2017 Hub meeting from 12:00pm to 4:00pm to 10:00am to 2:00pm Decided to change time for February 6, 2017 Hub meeting from 12:00pm to 4:00pm to 10:00am to 2:00pm</p> <p>Times confirmed.</p>
4:00pm	<p>Meeting Ended</p>	<p>Thank you - Meeting adjourned at 4:04pm</p>