



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:	Effective Instruction & Leadership Spoke Committee				
Date:	11/2/16	Time:	10:00-2:00	Location:	6000 East Evans Ave, Denver; Building 2; Suite 100
Meeting Lead:	Colleen O’Neil, ED, Educator Development, Licensing & Ed Effectiveness Jennifer Simons, Title II Coordinator				
Meeting Participants:	Mary Bivens, Karen Martinez, Sue Sava, Chris Selle, Kerri Dallman, Christin Walls (until 11:00), Ty Valentine, Theress Pidick (phone), Heidi Frederiksen, Jodie Cantrell, Sarah Almy, Mark Rangel, Jessica Cuthbertson, Randall Peterson, Jill Lewis, Mike Gradoz (phone)				
Meeting Objectives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Discuss para-professionals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance Document ○ Recommendations from para-pro working group ➤ Early Childhood Educators suggestions ➤ Recommendations for CDE on recruiting and supporting educators ➤ Preparation for December 12, 2016 HUB and December 14th/15th BOE December presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Learning Policy Institute Report explanation ○ Process Flow Charts & Licensure Pathways ○ Our recommendations, rationale and messaging ○ Spoke Members joining presentations 				

Agenda

Time	Agenda Item	Notes & Next Steps
10:00	Ground where we have been in ESSA process and where we are headed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Spoke Meetings, 3 Working Groups, 3 Hub Meetings • 3 State Board Meetings; scheduled 90 minutes every month moving forward • Objectives for today and December Presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Colleen provided synthesis of the work thus far ➤ This Spoke will go to the Hub again in December

10:20

Para-Professional Conversation

Working Group of Randall, Ty, and Jill. Report out on various conversations with stakeholder groups.

Synopsis and recommendation shared with full Spoke Committee:

The three of us have reviewed the current standards and past requirements under NCLB as well as the statutory requirements under Section 1111(g)(2)(M) of the ESSA. We have also all independently reached out to stakeholders within our respective communities and networks, have met and consulted together, and agree on the following:

The standard for paraprofessionals working in Title I programs under ESSA should remain

UNCHANGED. That standard is that Instructional Paraprofessionals who teach in or receive funding from a Title I school must:

1. Possess a high school degree and its equivalent; AND
2. Demonstrate subject matter competency by:
 - a. Earning an Associate's (of higher) degree; OR
 - b. Completing at least two years (48 credit hours) of study at an institution of higher education; OR
 - c. Passing a formal assessment measuring one's knowledge of and ability to assist classroom teachers in reading, writing, and mathematics. CDE should continue to set guidelines on acceptable assessments.

This recommendation has two noticeable benefits:

- a.) It prevents any lowering of standards for the crucial role played by paraprofessionals who partake in the direct instruction of students; and
 - b.) It continues to allow school districts to institute higher standards if desired, such as requiring all paraprofessionals, including those not in Title I schools to have obtained subject matter competency.
- Randall: 75% of ESP Presidents via CEA poll have responded with a desire to continue with current qualifications
 - Jill: 19 responses from ASCD Presidents: Not much commonalty across regarding requirements and pay
 - Ty: CASPA: Half of our districts: All paras held to old HQ requirements; Other half: Only those under Title funds are held to these → consensus that keeping the requirements the same are fair

***Note:** SBE does not license or authorize paraprofessionals; CDE provides guidelines regarding assessment 2c above (passing a formal assessment).

Question: How do we refer to the requirements here for paraprofessionals? Some do not want to use "highly-qualified" because this does imply a sense of tighter or rigid framework

- Qualifications to be a Title I paraprofessional → Qualified Title I para professional

Consensus vote: Group has consensus about this recommendation moving forward to the Hub

How do we expect paras to have 48 credit hours when they are paid low wages?

Discussion points

- We have been requiring this already
- This goes back to equity issues – and access to quality teachers for all students

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the lens of equity for our students • → We need more funding to pay our paraprofessionals better • If we move back to high school diploma only, the group felt that we would be moving back and opening the door to more inequity • More conversation about districts' support for paraprofessional development • Themes of our spoke: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Equity: Having standards for paras to meet the needs of students ➤ Flexibility: Does not mandate an Associate degree ➤ Support: How can districts support development of paras • We are charged with standards for the profession in Colorado, not for commensurate compensation or rural hiring issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Those challenges must be met through other means <p>Discussion about the challenges in hiring paraprofessionals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as difficult because there are not many positions – we have applicants in more rural areas • Larger districts: Every day we have unfilled para positions; Is that a reason to sacrifice equity?; DPS starting to see paras as a pipeline to grow teachers for the district • The field had a consensus that the standards have been reasonable, attainable, make sense • CASPA had an initial reaction to lower the bar; upon additional discussion, did not want to do so in light of equity for kids
10:50	<p>Early-Childhood Recommendations</p> <p>Colleen synthesizes conversations up to this point with CDE's ECE experts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are multiple agencies/requirements for ECE teachers/directors (e.g., fingerprinting requirements) → Recognition of complexities of the system as a whole <p>Clarification questions:</p> <p>When do candidates need both CDHS and CDE licensure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public-private • P-6 public contexts • Mentors for alternative candidates <p>Any licensure requirements for CPP or Head Start?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not from CDE • Yes from CDHE <p>Under #5: If SEA plans to use funds to improve equitable access to effective teachers → Will we? If so, how? → Who will answer this question? Is that us?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How should CDE support equitable access to teachers? What Title II funds might be available? • There will be multiple spokes that weigh in on this with regards to ECE <p>#5, #6, #7: Bigger than just ECE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shift from compliance to measuring impact of professional learning • Where are these going to show up in the plan? • Current thinking is that we will provide concepts in the plan → not the details as much; we will focus on equity and flexibility (not specific curriculum or detailed actions) • Goal: Building capacity of paras, teachers, and leaders (and state could provide support,

	<p>guidelines) → where will this show up in the final draft report?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Template from DoE does have questions on performance management that could be helpful – and we can provide existing strategies in Colorado’s equity plan as an overall approach <p>Are there any implications for licensure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to add an educator preparation expert to any work with licensure <p>Definition of ECE includes birth through 8 years old</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If CDE is responsible for pre-K when it is attached to a school, but not responsible for others → how will Title II funds be handled in equitable ways when we have entities in 2 different categories? Would private be taking funds from public? • CDE does not have an ECE unit; there is a grant that has supported ECE work and people <p>What are reporting requirements for early childhood teachers in preschools? Who gets put into the pool?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECE colleagues have suggested the need for an ECE degree to teach kids who are 0-8 years old – which is what is affecting their recommendation with regards to “inexperienced” • Need to align definitions of inexperienced • Reporting on vs. support of early childhood educators • And: where is the money going? <p>Larger issue: Birth – 5 expertise; 0-8 and K-6 → what are overlaps? Do we separate the age groups?</p>
11:15	<p>Recruiting and supporting educators</p> <p>How might we develop a holistic plan for how CDE can recruit and support the development of educators around the state (not just legislative asks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culturally responsive training • Whole child support – social emotional development, mental health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mental health first aid training would be beneficial • Teacher cadet programs – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a need for more support from CDE in helping districts develop their own programs <p>Clarifying question: Is this a level of specificity and detail that we want to include?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft language could talk about a focus on culturally responsive practice (rather than provide trainings) • If funding stream is identifiable, we could provide some details • Could a direct offering be more about guidance documents (for culturally-responsive instruction, for meeting the needs of the whole child) (for evaluating the investments districts are making with regards to professional development) <p>Recruitment tools and strategies that would be helpful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource bank for the Self-assessment for healthy human capital systems • Job board for rural positions <p>Context from Colleen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to have a job board in licensing; historical evolution over time – HR systems, CASE, various hosts, social media accounts, etc. • Holistic concept for CDE: Supporting teacher cadets at district level (grow your own); matchmaker at a deeper level between pathways and the field [e.g., K-12 Colorado Talent

	<p>Center; other states engaged in some of this work]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job fairs? Could CDE sponsor one? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May not be the most effective strategy • What does it mean to reach the millennial generation? There is a need to market teaching in Colorado toward their desire to have work-life balance. • Site: Teach in Colorado <p>Are we focused on the symptoms? What are the root causes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working conditions • TELL survey • Principals' use of data • Retention needs to be a focus (keeping teachers on the job) <p>Root causes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher preparation enrollments are down – pipeline problem • Perceptions and realities of teaching • Perceptions of Colorado <p>Note: See policy recommendations in the Learning Policy Institute report (p. 6 of full report) (p. 12 of PDF) for recruitment, preparation, retention</p> <p>Potential recommendation to assessment spoke:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In light of reasons that teachers leave the profession (see p. 50 of A Coming Crisis in Teaching report), consider reduction of the assessment of every child – every year
<p>11:45</p> <p>LUNCH</p>	<p>Preparations for HUB/SBE Presentations</p> <p>Context: Focus on our three main themes (Equity, Support, Flexibility)</p> <p>Spoke has considered various perspectives and we did not want to sacrifice equity.</p> <p>What do they need to understand? What is foundational?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building stories (as examples) (lens in each area) • Diverse stakeholder engagement – lots of people engaged, across many groups <p>The Learning Policy report came out the day of the spoke committee presentation to the hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado as higher percentage of unlicensed teachers in report - charter schools – waiver of licensure • Sometimes the most effective teachers is one without a license (and how to do this when the person is a coach and does other things) • Hiring decisions are sometimes made independent of license • Hiring decisions apart from reporting requirements <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal government has said that license is of value • There are multiple pathways into the classroom (e.g., alternative license, sub license, emergency, adjunct, etc.) • If no equity student gap → then there are no concerns • We write recommendations for the common good – not for exceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can't set policy for lowest common denominator or for exceptions • We have state legislation around effectiveness and accountability → there are multiple ways to

	<p>support a person out of the profession (whether has a license or not)</p> <p>Local Process Flow: Visual for meeting teacher qualifications in ESSA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “does not pose an equity concern” → change to “will not contribute to disproportionality” <p>Licensure options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative teachers: This teacher is in an alternative program but does not have a license; assumption: alternative license at end of program; need to be clear that candidates has alternative license from the start • Authorizations: Candidates are in a program heading towards initial or professional license (alternative principal, TEE); for federal reporting purposes: these candidates are not in-field • Sub authorization is different <p>Be prepared for a possible interpretation of growing alternative numbers and lessening college-prepared teachers</p>
1:45	<p>Closure and Next Steps</p> <p>Reconnecting post December presentations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ask members to send a list of the stakeholders with whom they have engaged to Mary for compilation ➤ Draft of state plan for public comment: December 19th ➤ Governor’s office has 30 days to respond to draft ➤ Optional March submission and mandatory July → SBE has asked for March submission