



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
November 12, 2014, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 12, 2014,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman  
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman  
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Debora Scheffel (R)  
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come  
2 back to order. Staff, please call the roll. And I will,  
3 for the record, point out that we have unusually  
4 challenging travel conditions this morning. It is now 24  
5 minutes behind the appointed hour and we have just  
6 collected a quorum, so please.

7                   MS. BURDSALL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

8                   MS. BERMAN: Here.

9                   MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff.  
10 Paul Lundeen.

11                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Present.

12                  MS. BURDSALL: Pam Manazec.  
13 Marcia Neal.

14                  MS. NEAL: Here.

15                  MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Sheffel.  
16 Dr. Schroeder.

17                  MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

18                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Who would --  
19 Peter, would you like to lead us in the Pledge of  
20 Allegiance?

21                  ALL: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of  
22 the United States of America and to the Republic for which  
23 it stands. One Nation under God, indivisible, with  
24 liberty and justice for all.

25                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.



1 Before we push too much further --  
2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)  
3 Schroeder --  
4 CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Pardon me.  
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. Sorry.  
6 MS. NEAL: Well, we might as well do the  
7 (indiscernible) and --  
8 CHAIRMAN DUNHAM: Yeah.  
9 MS. NEAL: -- 'cause nobody listens to it  
10 anyways --  
11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let's -- let's -- let's  
12 -- I'm looking for a motion to approve the agenda and then  
13 we'll get to the --  
14 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, I move we approve the  
15 agenda as published.  
16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And seconded by  
17 Angelika.  
18 So then on to the consent agenda, please.  
19 MS. NEAL: I move to place the following  
20 matters on the consent agenda. 13.01 regarding  
21 disciplinary proceedings concerning a license charge  
22 number 2012EC1108, instruct Department staff and the State  
23 attorney general's office to prepare for the document --  
24 to prepare the documents necessary to request a formal  
25 hearing for the revocation of the license holder's license



1 pursuant to 24-4-104 CRS.

2 13.02 regarding disciplinary proceedings  
3 concerning an application charge number 2013EC11980  
4 instruct departmental staff to issue a notice of denial  
5 and appeal rights to the applicant pursuant to 24-4-104  
6 CRS.

7 13.03 regarding disciplinary proceedings  
8 concerning an application, charge number 2013EC2258,  
9 instruct Department and staff to issue a notice of denial  
10 and appeal rights to the applicant pursuant to 24-4-104  
11 CRS.

12 13.04 regarding disciplinary proceedings  
13 concerning an authorization, charge number 2013EC2272 --  
14 thank you, Bizy -- instruct the commissioner to sign the  
15 settlement agreement.

16 13.05 regarding disciplinary proceedings  
17 concerning a license, charge number 2013EC2752, instruct  
18 the commissioner to sign the settlement agreement.

19 13.06 regarding disciplinary proceedings  
20 concerning an application, charge number 2013EC2831,  
21 instruct Department staff to issue a notice of denial and  
22 appeal rights to the applicant pursuant to 24-4-104.

23 13.07 regarding disciplinary proceedings  
24 concerning an application, charge number 2014EC251,  
25 instruct Department staff to issue a notice of denial on



1 appeal rights to the applicant pursuant to 24-4-104.

2 13.09, approve four initial emergency  
3 authorizations as set forth in the published agenda.

4 13.10, approve Mt. Evans BOCES teacher  
5 induction program as set forth in the published agenda.

6 13.11, approve Global Village Charter  
7 collaboratives teacher induction program as set forth in  
8 the published agenda.

9 13.12, approve University of Colorado at  
10 Boulder to serve as a designated agency for an alternative  
11 teacher preparation program as set forth in the published  
12 agenda.

13 13.13, approve Global Village Charter  
14 collaborative to serve as a designated agency for  
15 alternative teacher preparation as set forth in the  
16 published agenda.

17 14.01, approve (indiscernible) Poudre  
18 School District R-1 request on behalf of Fort Collins  
19 Montessori School for a waiver from State statutes as set  
20 forth in the published agenda.

21 14.02, approve Adams Five Star School  
22 District, number twelves request on behalf of the Global  
23 Village Academy North Glenn for a waiver from State  
24 statutes as set forth in the published agenda.

25 14.03, approve the 12, 14, 15 school health



1 professional grantees as set forth in the published  
2 agenda.

3 15.04, approve the appointment of Joanna  
4 Peters to the State Advisory Council for parent  
5 involvement in education as a member representing career  
6 and college guidance counselors.

7 This is the end of the consent agenda.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That is a proper motion.  
9 Is there a second? Second. Any objection? Hearing none,  
10 motion carries.

11 Ms. Markel, do you have a report?

12 MS. MARKEL: Good morning, Mr. Chair,  
13 members of the Board, commissioner. In your packets this  
14 morning, you have the updated events calendar and your  
15 updated expense reports. In sections -- Section 7 of your  
16 packet, you have (indiscernible) it's a PowerPoint  
17 (indiscernible) you have rules of administration  
18 (indiscernible) education (indiscernible) you have a copy  
19 of the rules and the school (indiscernible) leaders  
20 development program (indiscernible) later this morning.

21 In Section 12, you have a number of --  
22 number of sets of rules. You have the rules of the  
23 administration (indiscernible) Colorado online program  
24 along with the comments the staff has received to date.  
25 You have a copy of the rules of the administration



1 (indiscernible) of (indiscernible) statute and rule. You  
2 have a copy of the rules of the administration on the  
3 English Language Proficiency Act along with the comments  
4 staff has received to date.

5 And finally, in Section 12, you have a copy  
6 of the rules governing (indiscernible) energy efficiency  
7 (indiscernible) program along with comments  
8 (indiscernible) to date regarding those sets of rules.  
9 And all of those will be before you for permanent rule-  
10 making hearings later today.

11 In Section 14, you have a copy of the  
12 (indiscernible) '15-'16 school health (indiscernible)  
13 recommendations. In Section 15, you have a copy of the  
14 emergency rules for the (indiscernible) grant program.  
15 Staff will be bringing permanent rules back to you in  
16 December so this morning, you only have the emergency  
17 rules that deal with the grant program and thus the reason  
18 why it -- it is an excerpt of the greater body of the  
19 rules.

20 Also in Section 715, you have a copy of the  
21 emergency and permanent rules for the Colorado school  
22 awards program. In Section 16, you have a growth model  
23 fact sheet along with PowerPoint federal minimum  
24 assessments multi-state review. And for tomorrow's  
25 meeting, you have a copy of your proposed legislative



1 priorities which will be before you for discussion and  
2 possible decision action tomorrow.

3 And that's the end of my report unless  
4 someone has questions.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My only question is I  
7 need tech support, please.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Tech support. Tech  
9 support.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I haven't even turned  
11 mine on yet.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, then. The next  
13 item on the agenda, then, is a review of the Department  
14 recommendations concerning District plan-type assessments  
15 -- I'm sorry -- assignments -- I have assessments on the  
16 brain, folks -- and District accreditation ratings under  
17 the Education and Accountability Act of 2009.

18 Mr. Commissioner.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
20 (indiscernible) Alyssa (ph) Pearson will make a  
21 presentation as we do to each year on District  
22 accreditation ratings after we have gone through them,  
23 work with school districts, and so we'll start with that  
24 presentation.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good morning, Mr.





1 Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So today we get a  
4 chance to talk with you about the 2014 District  
5 accreditation ratings. And so we've got a fairly  
6 comprehensive agenda that we're gonna cover in the  
7 PowerPoint that I think you should have in front of you.  
8 We'll also display it on the screen over here as well.  
9 Alyssa and I will tag team this presentation. We're happy  
10 to take questions, Mr. Chair, as you feel appropriate or  
11 we can wait 'til the end as well.

12 So every year the Education Accountability  
13 Act of 2009 requires an annual review of District and  
14 school performance. So all districts annually receive a  
15 District performance framework, which you'll hear referred  
16 to as a DPF. This determines their accreditation rating  
17 for the year.

18 All schools annually receive a school  
19 performance framework which you'll hear referred to as a  
20 SPF. This determines their school-plan type. For  
21 Districts, the Department makes a final determination of  
22 the credit -- accreditation ratings and the commissioner  
23 affirms those. For schools, the Department makes a  
24 recommendation to the State Board. The State Board will  
25 make a final determination of the school-plan types at



1 your December meeting.

2 For all districts and schools, the purposes  
3 of the DPF and the SPF and the district performance  
4 frameworks, the school performance frameworks is to  
5 provide a state-wide comparison performance. The  
6 highlights where students and schools and Districts are  
7 doing exceptionally well and also that highlights and  
8 points out where there can be improvements. Another  
9 purpose is to make sure that we're identifying districts  
10 and schools that support some of our lowest performing  
11 students in the state and look at how they're progressing  
12 toward state goals for achievement, and also making sure  
13 that we direct resources in intervention as appropriately.

14 The other piece that we'll talk about today  
15 is we get a chance to identify where there's success  
16 happening and where students are making great progress and  
17 districts are seeing that as a result. And we do a  
18 recognition every December of those schools and districts  
19 in the state here across in the hallway, and that's coming  
20 up in December for all of the schools and districts in the  
21 state around the awards that we give out. And we'll have  
22 a little bit of an opportunity to talk about that today,  
23 too.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: What's the date on that,  
25 Keith?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: December 3rd. It's a  
2 Tuesday. I don't have my calendar with me. Is the 3rd --  
3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But prior to the next  
4 Board meeting?  
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.  
6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay (indiscernible)  
7 correct.  
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's December 2nd.  
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's the 2nd,  
10 yeah.  
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it a Tuesday?  
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.  
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. December 2nd.  
14 So with that, let me just do a quick reminder of the plan  
15 types that we have for districts that they can be  
16 accredited at. So the highest rating is accredited with  
17 distinction. The second rating is accredited. Accredited  
18 with an improvement plan, accredited with a priority  
19 improvement plan, and accredited with a turn-around plan.  
20 You might make note, we've talked about it quite a bit,  
21 the last two lower categories are what's considered to be  
22 on the accountability clock in the State, priority  
23 improvement and turnaround for both schools and for  
24 districts.  
25 So we want to talk a little bit about the



1 request for reconsideration process which also helps us  
2 finalize the district ratings, and so districts had until  
3 October 15th to submit additional evidence to the  
4 commissioner for his consideration. The CDE supported  
5 districts by reviewing drafts submitted by -- before  
6 October 1st and providing detailed feedback. We had 19  
7 districts this year submit request for reconsideration.  
8 The local Board of Education can submit an appeal to the  
9 State Board of Education if they don't agree with what the  
10 commissioner decides. That happens within 10 days of  
11 final notification of the official rating from CDE. The  
12 State Board office coordinates with local school boards to  
13 schedule hearings, and you might remember we've gone  
14 through a few of those in the past few years and that  
15 takes a little bit of time and the process works its way  
16 over into February and March sometimes of each New Year.

17 I'm gonna let Alyssa Pearson who's our  
18 executive director of accountability and data analysis  
19 talk a little bit through the request for reconsideration  
20 process and the decisions that were made around those 16  
21 districts that submitted this year -- or 19 districts that  
22 submitted. And the other thing that we might highlight is  
23 in your packet you'll see a detailed list of those  
24 districts and some comments on the decisions that was made  
25 for each district, okay.



1 Mr. Chair, if it's okay to let Ms. Pearson  
2 --

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

4 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Good morning. So we  
5 had 19 district requests to reconsider this year. Of  
6 those, we were able to approve 16. We have guidance that  
7 we out beginning -- in the middle of the summer before  
8 people give their (indiscernible) around the reasons why  
9 you can submit requests and the guidance for how to do  
10 that.

11 So of the 16 that were approved, five were  
12 based on looking at the performance of students in the  
13 alternative education campuses and the AACs. This was  
14 based on legislation that was passed two sessions ago. We  
15 put the Board rule into place last March. And based on  
16 that, if a District -- if their alternative education  
17 campus -- if their AAC moves to the AAC performance rating  
18 and removing a student from the AAC changes the district's  
19 rating, if it moves it up a level, then we approve it. So  
20 we had five districts that met that criteria. We had  
21 three districts that were approved based on using a  
22 single-school rating for the district. There's another  
23 State Board rule that says if you're a small district, you  
24 only have one school, the district can be accredited with  
25 the school rating, so we have three in that --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, I might  
2 just add on that one, too. That has I think been a result  
3 of work that we've done with the rural education council.  
4 And hearing from some small rural school districts around,  
5 the best choice of school codes for them and how that  
6 plays out for their district accreditation ratings, and so  
7 Alyssa and her team have done a lot of work with small  
8 rural school districts trying to figure out how to help  
9 better support the data and how that reflects in the  
10 accreditation ratings so why I'm mentioning that is that -  
11 - that's a direct result of work that we've done with the  
12 rural supports in the state.

13 And it helps -- the history there as we've  
14 got some rural school districts that are one building, but  
15 have three different school codes for an elementary  
16 school, a middle school and a high school that just  
17 historical hold over. What we've done is been able to  
18 work with some of those school districts and say you're  
19 really just one school, you've got one principal, you've  
20 got all your kids in one building. One school code let's  
21 you have a higher end count for your kids and it helps  
22 provide some stability to your rating over time, and so  
23 they've dropped those school codes down into one and  
24 that's allowed us to then get them some more stability.

25 They're going through a process. We've



1 done a lot of outreach with some of the smaller school  
2 districts around the state specific to that piece, but I  
3 just wanted to call that out because that is a unique one  
4 that we've been working on over the years.

5 MS. PEARSON: Thanks.

6 We had four districts that were approved  
7 for higher rating, including their CMAS, science and  
8 social studies data. You all probably remember we made a  
9 decision not to use that automatically in the frameworks  
10 because we knew it was a new assessment and we wanted to  
11 take and we knew the results would impact the regular  
12 timeline for accreditation so we decided not to use it  
13 automatically. But when we got the data, we were able to  
14 run the percent -- or strong and distinguished command on  
15 science and social students, and if it would've helped a  
16 district or a school, we notified those districts and  
17 schools that would've helped them and then they can  
18 (indiscernible) a request to consider. So we had four  
19 districts based on that.

20 We had two districts that were raised  
21 because of the impact of closing their low performing  
22 online schools. Those districts made choices; they knew  
23 the schools weren't best serving those students and chose  
24 to close them. As a result, we removed the results from  
25 those closed schools from the district ratings and the --



1 the district moved (indiscernible) levels.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I might just  
3 mention that you talked to both of these districts last  
4 year and I think had a direct impact in your conversations  
5 with them as well as the commissioner's conversations with  
6 both of these districts about two very small rural  
7 districts trying to set up online schools for kids all  
8 over the state and not really having success in serving  
9 those kids. And so their decisions to close those or  
10 partially close those have allowed them to really focus in  
11 again on what they're doing really fairly good work with  
12 which is their brick and mortar schools. And so this is I  
13 think a good example, too, of the accountability clock  
14 putting some pressure on systems that were happening to  
15 make better decisions.

16 And again, got two examples of small rural  
17 schools that are not doing that or doing it to a much  
18 smaller degree now and being more successful at it.

19 MS. PEARSON: We had one district approved  
20 based on test participation due to misadministration.  
21 They had a very innocent mistake. They left spelling word  
22 cards up on the walls in their classroom during an  
23 assessment. Because of that they had to miss  
24 (indiscernible) misadministrations (ph). Those students  
25 didn't count as participants. They're a very small





1 district so it put them under the 95 percent, but  
2 historically they had been above 95 percent. At their  
3 three year, they were there so we approved that one. And  
4 then there was one district based on a body of evident,  
5 they were looking at a C-impact, they were looking at K-3  
6 data that we don't have in terms of growth and K-2 data in  
7 terms of achievement and looking at all those pieces  
8 together, moved them to a higher rating. So those were  
9 all the approvals.

10 Then we had three districts that we weren't  
11 able to approve based on the criteria we've set out and  
12 the data that they submitted. Two districts sent  
13 additional student performance data for us to look at and  
14 the results from that were very mixed and it wasn't enough  
15 to move them to another rating or another higher rating.  
16 And then there was one district that didn't meet the  
17 criteria of that AAC impact rules that are in the Board  
18 rules and so we weren't able to approve them. The five  
19 that were approved all had their AACs at the AAC  
20 performance level and were doing well enough. Board rule  
21 also allows for districts with alternative education  
22 campuses at the AAC improvement level as long as those  
23 schools are improving, and so that was the situation for  
24 this district, but that school was not showing improvement  
25 so we weren't able to approve it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You might -- yeah,  
2 sure. Mr. Chairman, might mention here, and I think this  
3 is an overall (indiscernible) it's kind of an overall  
4 shift of performance since we've had consistent frameworks  
5 in the state 2010 to 2014 so you get kind of a nice view  
6 here over those -- that five-year period.

7 The performance in the state; and so what I  
8 just want to mention here is with -- with all of the work  
9 that school districts are doing and schools are  
10 participating in and all the challenges and changes that  
11 are facing them as we've transitioned to new -- as we're  
12 transitioning to new assessments, as we've looked at new  
13 evaluations for teachers and principals, as we've looked  
14 at the implementation of lots of statute that took place  
15 four or five years ago, what -- what I think excites us  
16 when we look at this is we're seeing improved performance  
17 across the state even under -- under extreme challenges I  
18 would say that's happening in schools and districts that  
19 we're seeing good progress. If you look at the overall  
20 distinction category and see the improvements and the --  
21 how that's been making a mark upward tick over the last  
22 five years, you'll see going from seven -- point seven to  
23 14.8, almost a doubling a number of the districts that are  
24 accredited with distinction.

25 You'll see that accredited has moved up



1 slightly, but that improvement has shown some  
2 stabilization over time, but the two categories that  
3 really have shown marked improvements is -- and decreasing  
4 is turn around going from seven in 2010 to one now and  
5 over 17 priority improvement districts in 2010 to '09 now.  
6 And so what this shows us over time -- again, with pretty  
7 common measures and pretty common frameworks is that  
8 schools and districts are making progress.

9           What I think is a unique challenge is  
10 looking at the overall achievement data that we talked  
11 about last month is how does this happen with that, so I  
12 think we want to talk a little bit through that. Keep in  
13 mind that that's a part of the accreditation ratings for  
14 schools and districts, but there's also postsecondary  
15 measures that play into how we accredit the districts and  
16 also how we accredit the schools. And we've seen really  
17 good improvements over graduation rates in the state and  
18 also dropout rates which are a huge part of the PWR  
19 measures that go into the accreditation framework.

20           We also have a strong component of growth  
21 in our accountability system, and that growth is playing  
22 into this improvement that you see over time as well. So  
23 couple of unique things, but I -- I think it's important  
24 to note that there's a lot happening in our schools and  
25 districts in the state. They're working extremely hard on



1 implementing some very challenging legislation I think  
2 that's been passed for the last four or five years. And  
3 overall, we sometimes focus in on the ones that are  
4 struggling or not making us as much progress as we think  
5 they should, but there is I think good evidence here that  
6 districts are making good progress across the state.

7 The next one we wanted to talk about is  
8 just another visual representation of that. It's kind of  
9 showing how each of these categories have shifted on a bar  
10 chart over the last five years so it's another way to look  
11 at it and I think it's a good visual representation, too.

12 So Alyssa is going to talk through one of  
13 your favorite charts and I'm gonna have her do a little  
14 bit better explanation of this, but there are some things  
15 I think to be learned, too, as we look at how our students  
16 are doing in relationship to the accreditation ratings and  
17 how under -- historically underserved kids are performing  
18 and how that plays out through district ratings across the  
19 state.

20 So Alyssa, you want to talk a little bit  
21 through that?

22 MS. PEARSON: Sure. I think you all have  
23 seen this chart before. It's a complicated one so let me  
24 give you a little refresher on it. Above the X-access,  
25 those bars above, each bars represents a school district



1 in the state. They're color coded -- and sorry, the  
2 color's not working so well up there. They're color coded  
3 by the accreditation rating the district received. The --  
4 the Y-axis there shows the percent of points earned  
5 though and the line across shows the performance cut line.  
6 What's below the X-axis is the percent of students that  
7 are eligible for free or reduced lunch. And the districts  
8 over on the left-hand side is low poverty districts and  
9 moving to the right are the higher poverty districts. So  
10 we think it's really important to look at our data and  
11 talk about it in terms of the context of the districts and  
12 the demographics of students within the district.

13 One thing that we are really excited about,  
14 this looks a little different than it has in past years.  
15 The highest poverty district in the state -- this one on  
16 the end here -- is green. So, and that's Center School  
17 District. They have 92 percent of their students eligible  
18 for free or reduced lunch and they have slowly and  
19 steadily moved up on the frameworks and now are earning a  
20 performance rating or an accredited rating.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And talking with  
22 Superintendent Welsh last week, the -- the work with that  
23 community and the ratings and performance that they had  
24 even four or five years ago and where they're at today,  
25 and if you've had a chance to go to Center, if you've had



1 a chance to go see some of the work they're doing with the  
2 -- a strong ELL population as well, and this type of  
3 poverty, I think it's just a good example, too, of -- of  
4 some of the challenges that some of our districts face,  
5 some of the work that they're trying to do and then how  
6 they're overcoming that. So it's another great example I  
7 think of performance in relationship to poverty.

8 MS. PEARSON: So we know that there's  
9 additional challenges for kids, but what's really exciting  
10 is that they're -- it's not all green down here, but there  
11 are a lot of examples of districts that are yellow and  
12 green with high poverty populations. We have Centennial  
13 is the third highest poverty district. Holly, Mountain  
14 Valley, (indiscernible) Revere, Manzanola and Harrison  
15 that are all in that high poverty area.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika has a question.  
17 Go ahead.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Rather than going back to  
19 this later, on the right-hand side, do we have any large  
20 districts that are kind of beating the odds and --

21 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Denver's in there.  
23 Denver's accredited with an improvement plan. The largest  
24 district --

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Is that yellow? That's



1 yellow, right?

2 MS. PEARSON: That's yellow.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

4 MS. PEARSON: The largest district that's  
5 accredited in the green is Harrison. And so they are,  
6 like, the -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seventh,  
7 eight district that's green down. This will be posted on  
8 the website. It's interactive so you can rollover and see  
9 the district --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, you can. Okay.

11 MS. PEARSON: (indiscernible) and all that  
12 and play around with it, so.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. And I have  
14 a question on the other end of the chart 'cause you've got  
15 two red bars here which I'm assuming are accredited with  
16 priority improvement. And those look like very low  
17 poverty districts. Can you share with us what districts  
18 those are?

19 MS. PEARSON: The yellow and the orange at  
20 the end?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, the -- the two  
22 reds. There's two reds. There's a red that's really at  
23 the end --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And yellow --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And yellow. And then



1 there's a red --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep, you've got 'em.

3 MS. PEARSON: So there's -- one of them --  
4 I think they're the BOCES and I think we should actually  
5 probably pull the map 'cause I think that we're just not  
6 getting good free reduced lunch data on them --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh.

8 MS. PEARSON: -- is what it is. So we'll  
9 fix that before we put it on there. And I can pull it up  
10 for you. When we turn it over to him, I'll go  
11 (indiscernible)

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you explain -- can  
13 you explain, please, the BOCES piece? I'm a little -- I  
14 mean, Center is part of a BOCES, but that BOCES also got a  
15 rating? I'm --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) Mr.  
17 Chair --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- confused.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so the -- the BOCES  
20 what you saw is a rating and I think you'll see later on  
21 they -- they choose to run like the San Juan BOCES, they  
22 choose to run an online school and so that online school  
23 gives them a district rating as a BOCES. And so that's  
24 what --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.





1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it's basically not a  
2 -- in the sense of a traditional district, but they --  
3 that accountability pulls up to the district and I think  
4 there's another --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that the case for  
6 all of -- all of the BOCES?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's only two,  
8 maybe three BOCES in the state that have schools attached  
9 to 'em. There's I think expeditionary BOCES which is a  
10 metro-area BOCES. It's --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) BOCES  
12 --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) BOCES  
14 and San Juan BOCES. I think there's just --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And Colorado digital -  
16 -

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was gonna say there  
18 are -- there are 178 districts and 182 --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it must be the --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- votes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there's a few --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be -- I would  
23 find it helpful to have that clarified so I get the -- get  
24 what it is that the BOCES are doing 'cause I remember  
25 reading that thinking --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- you know, knowing  
3 about Center, et cetera, and then seeing San Juan. That's  
4 the same BOCES -- I mean, that's the same --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. Am I in the wrong  
7 place?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, Center -- Mr.  
9 Chair, Center is a -- in the San (indiscernible) Valley  
10 and San Juan BOCES is set up in the southwest corner.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Angelika needs a  
12 geography lesson. Thank you very much.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, exactly.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Onward, then.

16 MS. PEARSON: Okay. And then we'll keep  
17 going with these other slides and you'll be able to access  
18 them on the website, too. We looked at the relationship  
19 with minority status for minority students which is in  
20 this slide. We ran the correlations to see the  
21 relationship between percentage points earned and the  
22 demographics and it's interesting poverty is -- the  
23 correlation is .34 and for minority it's actually .54. So  
24 they both been -- the correlation's been getting smaller  
25 over time, but minority's been a stronger correlation than



1 poverty has.

2 And then we also look by English language  
3 learner, and that's much more (indiscernible) by that  
4 population. Then we wanted to talk a little bit about how  
5 things have changed from 2013 to '14 for specific  
6 districts. In the beginning (indiscernible) talked about  
7 how we seen changes over time, but we want to talk about  
8 those from individual districts from 2013 reading to 2014  
9 reading.

10 So the majority of our districts came the  
11 same rating as they had earned in 2013, about 73 percent  
12 of them are 133 districts. 22 percent of district,  
13 though, increased at least one level. That's 40  
14 districts. One thing that I wanted to look at very  
15 carefully when we were seeing these trends and of the  
16 improvement in districts is how much of that was impacted  
17 by the request to reconsider process. Is this because  
18 we're looking at additional criteria that we didn't look  
19 at additionally? And of those that increased at least one  
20 level, 16 of those were because of requests to reconsider,  
21 but that left 24 that have earned their way up. We have a  
22 good handful of districts that you've just seen really  
23 nice strong steady progress year after year. We've seen  
24 that in Center, we've seen that (indiscernible) Center and  
25 Denver and Rocky Ford and the school that Mountain BOCES



1 runs. They've just been making this really nice steady  
2 steadfast improvement. We had nine districts that moved  
3 down one level this year as well.

4 And we just wanted to quickly highlight  
5 some of the -- the districts that were accredited with  
6 distinction. Again like we talked about that'll --  
7 they'll get recognized on December 2nd, but we have 27  
8 districts this year that are at distinction. To get to  
9 that distinction level, it's based solely on earning  
10 points in the frameworks and meeting the assurances. And  
11 so if you meet -- earn 80 percent of your points or more,  
12 then you're accredited with distinction. We have a few  
13 districts in there that were moved to distinction based on  
14 the request to reconsider process. One was that was  
15 (indiscernible) administration, one was the  
16 (indiscernible) impact and one was closing schools.

17 And we just wanted to quickly again  
18 highlight just how these districts do. Overall, they're  
19 doing -- earning meets or exceeds ratings on all the  
20 different indicators in the performance remarks. So  
21 (indiscernible) show that.

22 Distinction is one area that we've been  
23 talking about and we'll bring back, talk to stakeholders  
24 and bring back to talk with you all, too, about if we want  
25 to look at different criteria in our next (indiscernible)



1 of frameworks. Right now, if this purely based on the  
2 percent of points earned, are there other things that we  
3 want to put in (indiscernible) a district with  
4 distinction, that's a -- that's a weighty title to have  
5 and we might want to think if there's other criteria you  
6 want to consider before we assign that title.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, yes,  
9 please.

10 And the other thing I might note is we'll  
11 be -- we'll be recognizing these districts at the December  
12 2nd event. And historically we have good turnout from the  
13 districts that do come up for that.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Angelika.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, it just makes sense  
16 to do it now.

17 My understanding with the original passage  
18 of the law on accountability was that the more you were  
19 providing a strong education for your community the less  
20 interference, the less requirements you have. Can you  
21 articulate how that, you know, what is -- besides from  
22 bragging rights and the fact that communities want  
23 districts with distinction, what are the things that we're  
24 doing to help them have less compliance or is it just the  
25 other way on the bottom (indiscernible)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can speak to a few  
4 things that are differentiated based on performance. And  
5 so school districts that fall into the priority  
6 improvement and turn around categories, they have fewer  
7 requirements around UIP dates, mandatory submissions,  
8 reviews, those types of things, the unified improvement  
9 planning process. They also have some ability when it  
10 comes to public accountability around those results and  
11 holding meetings and their district participation in those  
12 meetings, there's some flexibility with that. So it's  
13 differentiated a little bit. I don't think it's to the  
14 level that people may be would've intended or hope for,  
15 but that didn't really get called out in any of that  
16 legislation as far as specific requirements that they were  
17 freed up from as a result of being -- I think you're  
18 probably talking about being like accredited with  
19 distinction earns a certain amount of freedom. But that's  
20 certainly something as we move forward with adjusting the  
21 DPFs going into 2016 that we can throw to our committee  
22 that we're getting ready to -- to pull together  
23 accountability work group and discuss that there, but we  
24 ultimately will be bringing that information back to the  
25 State Board.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a good  
3 question. And I think one of the things that changed last  
4 year with unified improvement planning through legislation  
5 was some flexibility on year-to-year submissions and  
6 that's tied to performance as well so small rural  
7 districts under a certain size, they are allowed to do  
8 unified improvement planning every other year as long as  
9 they're at a higher performance level. And I think that's  
10 an example of trying to give some freedom based on  
11 performance.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I think -- I  
13 think there's a push to limit compliance work when things  
14 are going well when the districts are transparent with  
15 their community and so I would be grateful for any  
16 thoughts. And I don't know, we might open it up to  
17 districts to provide some input on what their thoughts  
18 are. If they are district with distinction what are the  
19 things that would help them maintain, but also recognize  
20 that they're providing what we're asking for here.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay (indiscernible)  
22 Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, please.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So why don't we  
25 talk a little bit about the districts that are also



1 accredited with priority improvement plans and turnaround  
2 plans. So there's only one district this year that's  
3 being accredited with the turnaround plan. That'll come  
4 up next -- on the next slide. But for this slide, here  
5 the district's being accredited with priority improvement  
6 plans. And you can see that there's about six I think  
7 that are going into year five. You had a chance over the  
8 course of 2014 to have conversations with all of those  
9 districts that are going into year five and to meet with  
10 their board presidents, with the superintendents of those  
11 districts and to really I think have a better  
12 understanding of the work that they're trying to do and  
13 the supports that they're trying to put in place for  
14 students.

15                   And I think that's gonna be important  
16 context for you as we move forward because going into  
17 2015, these -- each of these districts do have an  
18 opportunity to move out of this category. All districts  
19 have an opportunity to move going into 2015, but this  
20 rating right now is the basis of starting that  
21 conversation for 2015. And so as we move into this  
22 upcoming school year, if a district that's going into year  
23 five on this list doesn't make enough progress to come off  
24 of that, you'll be having to have a conversation with that  
25 district, with that board, with that superintendent about





1 conditions that you would place on that district in order  
2 to reinstate accreditation. And options that you have in  
3 front of you specific to those districts and then working  
4 to find solutions that are agreeable to you and to the  
5 district to get that done.

6                   So as we move into 2015, one of the focuses  
7 that we want to have, we want to continue conversations  
8 with you and school districts, our next round is going to  
9 be focusing on districts that have clusters of schools  
10 that are going into year five so that you can also have  
11 that same opportunity to interact with them. Some  
12 similarities here, there's some cross over. Some of the  
13 districts will be the same, but you'll also get a handful  
14 of new districts that have schools entering year five that  
15 you haven't had a chance to have conversations with. So  
16 we want to make sure that that's clear going forward. The  
17 conversations that are expected to take place, and I think  
18 there was great value, at least I heard from most of you  
19 that you felt that there was good value in having those  
20 conversations last year. And I think you'll appreciate  
21 hearing from the district specific to their schools now  
22 because that's another category when we come in December  
23 that we'll talk through is you'll have a handful -- I  
24 think there's 10 -- potentially 10 schools that will be  
25 entering year five of turnaround and there's some



1 additional ones for priority improvement that you're going  
2 to have some conversations with those districts.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is the points earned  
6 50? Is that what gets -- I mean, what's the -- remind me  
7 the point structure 'cause I don't --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 52, isn't it?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, it's 52.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was there movement  
12 among any of these that you -- that -- what we heard from  
13 them when they came is that they are engaged in some  
14 pretty serious efforts. Did any of them feel that at  
15 least that -- those efforts brought fruition some  
16 movement, significant movement?

17 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair.

18 There's a few of them that had some  
19 positive movement in there and then I think you guys have  
20 a big spreadsheet that'll show the percent of points  
21 earned over time. We can pull out these guys and show you  
22 that --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that  
24 spreadsheet's a killer.

25 MS. PEARSON: Is it a killer? Okay. I'll



1 put out the (indiscernible) and we can just give you these  
2 -- the few that are on the clock and show what they've  
3 done over time. Make a little chart over it. There were  
4 some movement on a few of them, but not as much as we'd  
5 like to see.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So here's what would  
7 help on that spreadsheet. If you would again put the  
8 names of the schools on the right-hand side --

9 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- because when you're  
12 looking at it on the screen, there's no way to get all the  
13 way across --

14 MS. PEARSON: I'll show you --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I mean, I figured I  
16 had highlight.

17 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I was still --  
19 turned out I was still off.

20 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --

22 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- help me through --  
24 I mean maybe on paper I would do better, but --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or some tricks would  
2 be fine.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll show you a trick  
4 with Excel you can freeze it so that the names stay there  
5 and it doesn't move.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, that'd be very  
7 helpful 'cause I was actually looking at that yesterday.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's Excel 102.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So geography, Excel --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're gonna keep  
15 moving. Just a quick overview again of the accountability  
16 clock. So districts that fall into priority improvement  
17 turnaround, they're required to submit an improvement  
18 plan, and those come in in January and April 2015. We  
19 review -- the Department reviews all the priority  
20 improvement turn around plans and we are finishing up an  
21 RFP process to have somebody independent starting in  
22 hopefully January do State review panel reviews of  
23 turnaround groups. That will be -- again, we talked about  
24 this in Grand Junction, but this an opportunity to hear  
25 from somebody kind of third party about the progress of



1 schools that you'll be discussing and districts as they  
2 enter year five, finish up year five on the clock. You're  
3 required to take action with these schools and districts.  
4 It'll give you another piece of information outside of the  
5 Department reviews to consider as you make decisions,  
6 okay?

7 Want to go to the next one?

8 I think we hit on these. Keep in mind that  
9 you do have the ability to take any type of early action  
10 for districts that are on turnaround, which you have one  
11 in the state, and for schools that are on turnaround. And  
12 that early action sometimes there's misunderstanding what  
13 early action means, but essentially if you felt like --  
14 and we'll make recommendations if we see an opportunity.  
15 We'll be talking about that specific to schools. You've  
16 got 10 -- potentially 10 schools coming to the State Board  
17 December that'll be entering year five on turnaround.

18 We'll have to -- we'll have a discussion  
19 about our thought process as we went through a  
20 recommendation to you about whether we would recommend  
21 early action on any of those schools. But ultimately our  
22 -- our recommendations is you still have the ability to  
23 say, well, appreciate your recommendation, but we want to  
24 talk about a specific school or a specific district that's  
25 a turnaround, you do have that discretion and that ability



1 to pull up options and force conversations with those  
2 districts and schools if -- if you choose so.

3 The State review panel will also be  
4 providing recommendations in the fall of 2015 if we don't  
5 do early action on those schools and districts that are  
6 entering that. That'll be again that other piece of  
7 information for you to consider.

8 I wanted to talk a little bit about some  
9 things coming up.

10 MS. PEARSON: And we just wanted to talk a  
11 little bit about transition 'cause there's been a lot of  
12 confusion in the field when we talked to people about two  
13 2014 ratings and what that means for 2015 and are these  
14 ratings that we're presenting to you what they're gonna  
15 get next year. So the way the legislation worked is for  
16 2015 district accreditation ratings they're gonna be first  
17 based on their 2014 rating, but that's just the starting  
18 point. We'll then look at the 2015 assessment  
19 participation rates. The accreditation assurance of  
20 safety and finance and finally we'll have an optional  
21 process with -- through the request to reconsider for  
22 districts to submit more recent the 2014, '15 student  
23 performance data that's aligned with the Colorado academic  
24 standards or postsecondary workforce data. So just like  
25 we do now with request to reconsider process, they'll be



1 able to (indiscernible) additional data. Next year it'll  
2 be more important and we'll have less data as we're  
3 waiting for the new assessment results as we're learning  
4 what the results really mean for them to be able to put  
5 forward what they've done over the course of the year. So  
6 this is just a little example we put together of what it  
7 could look like. So for a district (indiscernible) right  
8 now in 2014 (indiscernible) they meet participation rights  
9 next year, they meet their finance and safety assurances,  
10 they don't choose to submit any optional data, they'll  
11 have a 2015 rating of accredited.

12 Another district -- the next line -- if  
13 they are started accredited now, but don't need  
14 participating ratings next year, they meet their  
15 assurances, don't submit any additional data, they'll be  
16 able to submit additional information about participation  
17 if they would like to that district would get lowered to  
18 improvement.

19 And then finally if a district's like in  
20 priority improvement right now, they meet participation,  
21 they meet the assurances, they put forward additional  
22 performance data that shows that their students are  
23 performing at a higher level more aligned with the  
24 improvement level (indiscernible) so just a little bit of  
25 background of what is coming next year so that we're not



1 approving 2015 right now (indiscernible) about 2014.

2                   So we'll do the request to reconsider  
3 process like we do now, but we're gonna make it -- we're  
4 gonna need to extend the timeline and we're gonna help  
5 districts with additional assessments that they may be  
6 using and how to submit those. Right now, we have the  
7 first three assessments that were approved by the READ Act  
8 and then the five most comment interim assessments that  
9 districts are using. We're gonna build that out as we  
10 know other districts are using other assessments and they  
11 want be able to submit that data. We want to be able to  
12 have some (indiscernible) and understanding  
13 (indiscernible) State expectation's on those.

14                   We'll be helping districts through. This  
15 year, we asked -- asked for intents by September 15th and  
16 then they submitted an intent and -- and chose to submit a  
17 draft to us by October 1st, then we got feedback to them  
18 within a week on how they could strengthen their request  
19 with data we didn't understand (indiscernible) improve  
20 upon it. So we'll do that same kind of (indiscernible)  
21 assistance process next year, it'll just -- we'll  
22 anticipating that we'll get even more requests  
23 (indiscernible) extend the timeline.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair  
25 (indiscernible) go back to the example (indiscernible)





1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So one of the things  
3 on this example that we're talking with school districts  
4 about is there's a possibility with the window next year  
5 for bringing information to you that districts that fall  
6 into that first category of they look at their data, they  
7 met all the requirements, that we might bring a wave of  
8 districts and schools to you early to approve that met  
9 that assurance and they're done. And then the second  
10 piece will take extended time to get approval because  
11 we're gonna have to do the individual work that Alyssa's  
12 talking about with the request for reconsideration  
13 process, looking at additional information, waiting for  
14 information to come back.

15 And so we might bring this to you in two  
16 segments next year, we're still working out the details,  
17 but whatever we do, it's gonna be later than normal  
18 because of the transition and the new assessments. So I  
19 just wanted to give you some kind of heads up about the  
20 way that's gonna roll out next year is that it's going to  
21 be a little more complicated, a lot more personal and  
22 involved with personnel in the schools and the districts  
23 and so the teams trying to gear up and we're gonna have  
24 to, you know, staff up some additional support from other  
25 areas during that transition time to help support Alyssa



1 and our team.

2 We can get through it, but it's going to  
3 take additional time next year based on the volume. If --  
4 vast majority of schools and districts fall into that  
5 category of A, it's not as intense, but if a lot choose to  
6 go into the B, C kind of where there's more individuals  
7 attention to them, it will take more time and so just kind  
8 of a little bit of a idea of how that's gonna work next  
9 year.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And as part of that in  
13 the time that Keith is talking about, when some of these  
14 districts are facing -- and we don't know that until the  
15 testing's over with -- low participation, it varies across  
16 the state. Primarily the -- some of the districts in the  
17 front range. We -- we've sent out guidance of that and  
18 we've also told those districts if that affects your  
19 ratings, we will -- we'll give that in the reconsideration  
20 because that -- that's a fair way to do that, but we --  
21 it's so individualized on the documentation how we work  
22 with them, but we will because we know it's a challenge,  
23 especially when we have testing going on the twelfth grade  
24 this year. And that -- that's problematic in some regards  
25 and we've also promised that we'll be looking at that and



1 (indiscernible) taskforce as well.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam, go ahead.

3 MS. MANAZEC: I don't know if this is the  
4 time to ask, but will we be able to reconsider the twelfth  
5 grade CMAS test?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Great question. Go  
8 ahead.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it is a very  
10 great question. And that's -- we're hoping that's some of  
11 the guidance that comes from House Bill 12.02 taskforce.  
12 Right now, that is in (indiscernible) we do know -- and as  
13 I have been on record saying that, you know, I as a  
14 commissioner believe that as we look at these and the  
15 burden that we do have in testing the state that I am  
16 supportive of taking it down to the minimum -- the federal  
17 minimums, including social studies, right? We'll make no  
18 mistake I'm supportive of social studies.

19 And when you do that what that does is free  
20 up time that you can move, we believe, the testing that is  
21 occurring in the twelfth grade now back a grade. When we  
22 surveyed superintendents two years ago, around that time,  
23 and people forget and that's okay, you know, there was not  
24 much, I mean, nobody wanted to have that happen, but there  
25 wasn't much choice to test in the -- given the cycle of



1 testing and how it works 'cause you cram so much in the  
2 eleventh grade, test the kids, consider important such as  
3 A.P. you didn't cram all that together in the eleventh  
4 grade so it forced those tests in the twelfth grade.

5 But then what we run into a lot of our high  
6 school kids right now, you know, finding the relevance of  
7 that where some of may graduate a semester or just sheer  
8 relevance, and then there's many factors with high school  
9 kids in twelfth grade. It's posed an issue in some  
10 districts, not by all by any chance, but those that it has  
11 impacted, it has. We don't know to what extent yet until  
12 the testing window was done. We've just said we will work  
13 with districts to the extent we can. It's kind of a two-  
14 way street here, but I suspect you'll see that change, but  
15 I can't promise that, but we're all aware of that and want  
16 to see that happen if at all possible.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I promise I'll  
18 try to change it.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)  
20 probably --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Have you gotten to the  
22 end of the presentation and then we'll --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very close.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Let's let him get  
25 through the end of the presentation then we can come back,



1 pick up some questions here.

2 MS. PEARSON: So we've already talked about  
3 this a little bit, but just with the --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 MS. PEARSON: -- accountability clock and  
6 the transition that clock does not hold so we'll look at  
7 ratings. If a district ends up on priority improvement  
8 again for 2015, they'll enter another year on the clock  
9 (indiscernible) July, so there's no freeze in the  
10 accountability clock, it's gonna be moved forward.

11 What you all do have based on the  
12 legislation that was passed last spring is a little more  
13 flexibility in the actions you direct for schools, you  
14 have the flexibility with districts already and now the  
15 legislation provided you with a little more flexibility  
16 and what actions were recommended for schools in the  
17 clock.

18 And then finally, while we're in this  
19 transition time, we're really taking an opportunity to  
20 reflect on the performance rating (indiscernible) what  
21 pieces of them have worked well, what areas and data that  
22 we have can be more actionable, we can adjust so that it's  
23 better used for improvement planning that you can have  
24 something more concrete there so we're getting a lot of  
25 stakeholder feedback. We've already done a statewide



1 survey of all districts. We had 113 districts respond.  
2 We've been doing focused groups based on that to get a  
3 little deeper in terms of the rural community, technical  
4 measurement people and advocacy groups to dig deeper.  
5 We're gonna have a report coming out probably in the next  
6 month or so that kind of summarizes the feedback we're  
7 getting from the field about what -- what's working well  
8 and where we can strengthen the frameworks. We're digging  
9 into the post-secondary workforce readiness indicator  
10 pretty deeply. We have right now, that's just a dropout  
11 rate, graduation rate, desegregated graduation rate and  
12 Colorado ACT and we know that there's other measures that  
13 may be good to add in to really understand postsecondary  
14 and workforce readiness. So we had a team that's been  
15 culling the research of what data we could use and if we  
16 have it available in Colorado and we'll come up with some  
17 recommendations as well. So those are kind of the things  
18 we're thinking of.

19 We're also putting together an  
20 accountability work group with superintendents, regionally  
21 represented superintendents across the state and district  
22 staff members so that we can really start having a work  
23 group to say can we have this idea, this is what the data  
24 looks like if we didn't get feedback, take it out to get  
25 broader feedback and bring it back to the group again. So



1 we'll be working on that over the next year. By the end  
2 of the summer, we hope to have a pretty solid in what  
3 we're thinking for the next (indiscernible)

4 And then finally, one thing that we'll need  
5 to do also with the new frameworks and the new assessments  
6 is set performance targets. Every November, we come to  
7 you all with those cut points for the framework, what does  
8 not meet (indiscernible) approaching with meets and with  
9 exceeds. We're not bringing those to you right now  
10 because we know we're gonna have new assessments and we're  
11 gonna need to use the results of the new assessments to  
12 propose targets for you. So that'll be coming in the  
13 future, but we will need to wait until we have new  
14 assessment data for the (indiscernible) to do that one.  
15 So I just wanted you know why that's not -- why you're not  
16 seeing it this month.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Questions,  
18 comments, from -- from this side of the panel?

19 Dr. Sheffel, go ahead.

20 DR. SHEFFEL: Thanks for the presentation.  
21 What kind of call do you get to re-examine the formula  
22 that sits behind the points? So, I mean, we have  
23 longitudinal data which is helpful. I know when you  
24 change the formula the longitudinal data is less  
25 meaningful, but I just -- I wonder if -- if some districts



1 request that and what the cycle is for looking at that  
2 again.

3 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair.

4 So the main thing that we've heard about,  
5 the points is one that we need to align the school cut  
6 points with the district cut points because they were norm  
7 based on schools and then based on district, but those cut  
8 points were different --

9 MS. SHEFFEL: Right.

10 MS. PEARSON: It leads for those small  
11 districts to sometimes (indiscernible) so when we do 2016  
12 and bring those points to you, I think we're gonna work  
13 with the field to figure out do we norm in on schools, do  
14 we norm in on districts, do we pick an in between point,  
15 but we want something consistent throughout and that's a  
16 very strong -- a strong feedback we've heard from the  
17 field.

18 The other thing that we've heard pretty  
19 strongly from the field and have noticed ourselves is the  
20 way the one-year and three-year rollups work. They get  
21 the one-year framework or the three-year frameworks and  
22 the amount of data that they have in each. Right now, the  
23 way it works is you can have a school that only had  
24 dropout-rate data for post-secondary workforce readiness  
25 and that counts as having post-secondary workforce





1 readiness data. They might have that for their one year  
2 if your three year has a lot more data in it, and that's  
3 probably more reflective if you use the three year so we -  
4 - we're gonna work with our stakeholders and with that  
5 accountability work group to really figure out how to do  
6 those rollouts between on year and three year and what do  
7 when there's limited data.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

9 MS. PEARSON: Oh, yes. That's a good one.

10 The other thing that we've heard a lot of  
11 feedback on and we really want to look at both in terms of  
12 that feedback and making data more actionable is how we  
13 look at adequate growth. Right now, it's that comparison  
14 between the median and the adequate growth. And those are  
15 things to do when you're doing your improvement plan.  
16 It's hard to set targets around this adequate growth  
17 percentile and so we're looking at -- do we look at some  
18 different metrics, do we look at the percent of students  
19 catching up and keeping up, something like that, 'cause  
20 that's a little bit more actionable and tangible.

21 Those are the big things. And all of that  
22 will get looked at. When we put out the frameworks in  
23 2016 that's when we'll make those changes, but we'll get  
24 all the feedback, stakeholder input up to that to make  
25 sure, bring it to you all, of course, as well.



1 MS. SHEFFEL: When you look at the schools  
2 that are in priority improvement or turnaround, as I've  
3 looked at them, but somewhat superficially, right? It  
4 seems like there's a constellation of characteristics that  
5 define those schools differently than the other schools.  
6 And that suggests to me that there's kind of a consistent  
7 bias in some respect inside the formula. Do you have that  
8 sense when you look at those schools as well?

9 MS. PEARSON: We can bring the school data  
10 to you later. We definitely have higher correlations for  
11 high schools with demographics with poverty and minority  
12 percentages. The high school waiting is different -- and  
13 the district waiting, those are different than the  
14 elementary and middle. Those are 50 percent growth  
15 whereas the elementary middle schools have 75 percent of  
16 their framework points coming from growth. We asked in  
17 that survey if districts think we should align those two  
18 and have the same waiting. They did not want us to change  
19 the elementary and middle waitings. So I don't know. The  
20 statute says that growth and post-secondary workforce  
21 readiness needs to weighed the most. We can play around.  
22 It's definitely a conversation we'll have with our  
23 stakeholder groups about the waitings and if we should  
24 look at that again, but yeah.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)



1 MS. PEARSON: I'm trying to think if  
2 there's anything else. But we'll bring -- like we showed  
3 the demographics, we'll bring that to the -- to the  
4 December meeting as well.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And size.

6 MS. PEARSON: And size, yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we do the event  
10 on December 2nd, I hope we're planning on recognizing the  
11 schools that are beating the odds in terms of poverty and  
12 kids of color and so forth. Is that part of the -- the  
13 current thinking?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, you bet.  
15 So we have different categories of distinction. We also  
16 have categories for growth and then we have high poverty,  
17 high growth awards for schools so we'll -- we'll roll out  
18 all of those awards. There's a good mix of performance.  
19 And for the first time, we'll talk a little bit about --  
20 later we'll have some awards based on sizes of districts  
21 for growth, size of schools for growth that correlate with  
22 (indiscernible) there was some legislation passed last  
23 year that puts in front of the schools based on size their  
24 performance around growth and so we'll be bringing some  
25 emergency rulemaking on that later in the day for you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Great. Thank  
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Sheffel, go ahead.

4 MS. SHEFFEL: I'm sorry, I just had a  
5 follow up. So when we look at the achievement data and  
6 then we look at these data, there's a bit of a disconnect,  
7 right, between somewhat flat achievement data and then  
8 schools moving off of making improvements. Is it your  
9 sense -- I mean, can you -- how do you think about that?  
10 I mean, we know what systemic change that there are  
11 changes that are proceeding the actual impact on the  
12 ground, in the trenches and student achievement, but  
13 certainly there's, you know, you don't want to have that  
14 caveat running indefinitely because they really need to  
15 align mostly. Is there a target for that alignment or do  
16 you have a sense of -- how are people thinking about that  
17 disconnect?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

19 So it's a good question and one of the  
20 things that we talked about earlier was the makeup of the  
21 performance frameworks is heavily weighted, especially at  
22 the high school, and then that carries over into the  
23 district rating on post-secondary measure -- post-  
24 workforce measures -- post-secondary workforce measures  
25 and that includes dropout rates, graduation rates, and



1 those we have seen improvements on. And so when you think  
2 about how those points play into the district performance  
3 frameworks and the high school frameworks that accounts  
4 for some of that improvement, a big portion of that  
5 improvement that shows some disconnect there.

6 The other piece is growth in the way  
7 Colorado has growth injected into our performance  
8 frameworks. One of the things you'll see a little bit  
9 later in a presentation I think at the end of the day that  
10 we're gonna talk about some comparisons of states  
11 (inaudible) the way they use assessment data, the way they  
12 use growth is Colorado's a real heavy user of growth and  
13 that also plays a little bit different picture when you  
14 look at the overall achievement. So those -- those are  
15 the pieces that as we peel that back that we've identified  
16 as some of the reasons for the differences in the overall  
17 achievement levels versus the district performance  
18 framework levels and the school framework levels.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

22 MS. GOFF: Yeah. This may not be the most  
23 relevant point to ask this question. Does any -- does any  
24 of -- do any of our accreditation factors overlap with  
25 higher eds performance plans? I'm just -- today I'm



1 thinking about the remediation rate, particularly that one  
2 I'm -- right now, I'm not seeing where the others might  
3 come into play as much as that one does. Just curious  
4 about if -- if at some point there have been or there will  
5 be some conversations with higher ed about aligning in  
6 this way as well.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

8 Alyssa, do you want to talk a little bit  
9 about the post-secondary group and the work that they're  
10 doing? They're absolutely considering remediation rates  
11 as something that we heard from our superintendent's  
12 advisory group accountability last year and it'll be a  
13 topic on our accountability workgroup going forward.  
14 There is some challenges to that. It's not necessarily  
15 uniform agreement around using some of these additional  
16 measures, but you want to update kind of just based on  
17 where we're at with that group?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, that group has dug into  
19 additional measures and metrics and remediation rates are  
20 one that have kind of risen to the top of something we  
21 have. We are still trying to figure out 'cause right now  
22 I believe we only have remediation rates for students that  
23 are in Colorado --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

25 MS. PEARSON: -- so then you get, you know,



1 kids that are going out of state for schools, you're  
2 getting kind of a skewed result, but we're looking to see.  
3 We're gonna apply it. This spring we're gonna spend some  
4 time applying that data into the framework and see what  
5 would happen and what kind of information it provides us,  
6 but it definitely seems like an important measure to have  
7 kind of along with graduation rates 'cause kids graduate,  
8 but then what happens when they go --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

10 MS. PEARSON: -- and are they ready or not.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair --

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible)

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- we've also been  
15 working closely with Rebecca Holmes and her team around  
16 the grad requirements and using that -- they're heavily  
17 involved in this workgroup going forward to try to figure  
18 out ways to have better measures of college and -- and  
19 really postsecondary readiness, workforce readiness kind  
20 of measures that we can utilize in our framework, too. So  
21 good -- good collaboration going on between those two  
22 groups.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine.

24 MS. BERMAN: So my question has to do with  
25 the impact of the size of the district on their



1 accreditation rating and that if you -- if you hold for  
2 the poverty rating -- I mean, it looks like the largest  
3 districts that are doing the best have very low poverty  
4 rates, but the smaller districts are able to do better  
5 regardless of poverty rate because they're small. Is that  
6 an accurate statement?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

8 Alyssa, do -- might be a good question for  
9 Alyssa to talk through a little bit. We studied this on -  
10 - in size with the Center for Assessment and really looked  
11 at some of these components. And I think one of the  
12 things that happens when you get more information about a  
13 school district, especially the information that we get on  
14 assessment, the larger that in size is the more reliable  
15 and predictable it is and valid it is. I think the  
16 smaller sometimes you get it is more easily adjusted, but  
17 it's also can -- can vary -- the variance is -- is heavily  
18 influenced by that size.

19 That being said that gets down into some  
20 very small in size that fluctuates the highest. And when  
21 you get even, you know, I think 500 to 1,000, you're  
22 starting to get a bigger number that helps support that  
23 specific rating, but do you want to add on her specific  
24 question?

25 MS. PEARSON: And I think -- I think you





1 said mostly -- most all of it. We tend to see smaller  
2 districts details and we tend to -- even more than that we  
3 see when -- when districts are -- when you look at change  
4 over time, the smaller ones tend to make more change over  
5 time because they just have fewer numbers and it's just --  
6 it's a fact of statistics. You can do it in education,  
7 you can look at it in sales, you can look at it anywhere  
8 when you have smaller -- the smaller in size, the smaller  
9 subsidy (ph) then your data's more variable. I think  
10 that's one of the main reasons why we've used the three-  
11 year framework and have that, one of the reasons why we  
12 want to look at how we determine when we use the one year  
13 versus the three year 'cause that three-year data when you  
14 get more data when you can -- you can kind of see a little  
15 -- you have more stability there with it.

16 And also why the request to reconsider  
17 process is so important so that the smaller districts if  
18 they're being influenced by just a couple of kids like  
19 that district that didn't make participation by just  
20 (indiscernible) few kids having that (indiscernible)  
21 administration that there's a way to adjust for it or to  
22 look at it and take it into consideration.

23 We could make those graphs with district  
24 size on them, too, so you could see where the color-coded  
25 --



1 MS. BERMAN: So -- so I'm not sure I'm  
2 gonna be able to -- let me try this. So you take a  
3 district like Denver which has high concentrations of  
4 poverty, but also has a substantial number of middle to  
5 higher income families and students so if you average it  
6 the -- the wealthier students may be bringing up the more  
7 -- the low income students so then you get the average for  
8 the district versus a district like a Sheridan that has  
9 only low income students and doesn't have the ability to  
10 average the two.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want to talk a  
12 little bit about the -- she's -- I think she's --

13 MS. PEARSON: (indiscernible)

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) study  
15 the -- that we did about the district (indiscernible)  
16 poverty relationship to the (indiscernible)

17 MS. PEARSON: So we've looked at that and  
18 we can share the 2014 results as well of schools --  
19 districts, what their district rating would be if we only  
20 took their high poverty schools with the students and  
21 their high poverty schools that we looked at their  
22 performance. And there is still a lot of variable  
23 performance between if you're just looking at high poverty  
24 schools between districts. I think we had the 2014 data  
25 run so we can share that with you all.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's really  
2 important data.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, we could  
4 potentially bring that back at the December school  
5 conversation that we have you around the school ratings.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Actually thank you. You  
10 answered a lot of my questions. There was just one that  
11 may be I didn't listen carefully, but well first of all I  
12 want to say that I really appreciate the appeals process  
13 'cause I think it does demonstrate that this is a set of  
14 rules, et cetera, and sometimes they just don't make sense  
15 and I appreciate the fact that you're looking at it  
16 carefully and -- and looking at student outcomes is the  
17 priority and I share that with you.

18 I kind of missed the part of the appeals  
19 for I believe two -- two or three districts that use the  
20 scores on the science and social studies assessments.  
21 They weren't required to be a part of this, but they chose  
22 that and they demonstrated what places --

23 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: -- I just missed that or  
25 else --



1 MS. PEARSON: No problem. We kind of  
2 skimmed over the detail part of it. So we looked at the  
3 achievement results on CMAS fourth grade, fifth grade,  
4 seventh grade, eighth grade science and social studies  
5 assessments. We ran distributions just like when the  
6 initial cut points were set for reading, writing and math  
7 and science the fifteenth percentile of schools, fiftieth  
8 percentile of schools and the ninetieth percentile of  
9 schools, and that's where they set the cut point between  
10 does not meet approaching -- approaching (indiscernible)  
11 so we use that same formula set cut points and then looked  
12 at the results from their latest assessments of science  
13 and social studies against those cut points. Then we  
14 applied points to those additional content areas to  
15 science and social studies based on the cut points and  
16 rolled it out to see if it would make a difference --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: And that -- that was a  
18 choice of those districts that appealed.

19 MS. PEARSON: We let those districts know.  
20 We ran the data internally and then some of them had  
21 already said we want to look at science and social studies  
22 when it comes out and see what impact it has. We just ran  
23 it comprehensively for the state for all districts and all  
24 schools to see if it did make a difference for them and  
25 notify them if it did so then they --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Okay. Thank you --

2 MS. PEARSON: We didn't include it  
3 automatically. It would've, you know, have brought up a  
4 lot of districts. It would've lowered some districts and  
5 schools as well. Those guys we just left alone 'cause of  
6 that, you know, we made the choice not to include science  
7 and --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

9 MS. PEARSON: -- social studies this year.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So this is to -- to  
11 Deb Sheffel's point and I think you made it also. We need  
12 to be careful about the disconnect that we sense right now  
13 with flat scores and with concerns about the scores on the  
14 new assessment and yet seeing that what we're asking  
15 districts to do, which is to demonstrate growth, close  
16 achievement gaps, et cetera, that movement is occurring in  
17 the state, graduation, et cetera, so I think we have to be  
18 really clear in how we explain that because it doesn't --  
19 it didn't automatically make sense to me when I first read  
20 it. So thank you very much. Good report.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair.

22 MS. NEAL: I would just add to what  
23 Angelika had to say. I think the flexibility that we  
24 demonstrate I think it's very important and that the  
25 schools recognized that we're not hard and fast, you know,



1 you didn't hit it, you did. I really appreciate that and  
2 I would imagine hopefully that the districts do also.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So I've got four quick  
4 questions and we can follow 'em up offline if necessary.  
5 The first one is kind of a -- and I realize this is a  
6 school and district conversation, but you know, the focus  
7 on students is always the key. It's always what we're  
8 after. So like on slide 11, I would be very interested to  
9 understand, you know, we're looking at percentage and  
10 movements delta among the districts. If we could see the  
11 impact that has across the number of students affected  
12 that would be an interested metric to look at from my  
13 perspective so I'd be very interested in that.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So this particular slide  
16 is talking about trendlines, but the trendlines are based  
17 on number of districts that move and I'd like to know the  
18 number of students that move. So I think that would be  
19 helpful or interesting data to have.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be a lot  
21 because we're adding bigger districts in that --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Very possibly. Very  
23 possibly --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very possibly --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- but that's, you know,



1 that speaks to the question of what we're trying to --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that possible,  
3 Alyssa?

4 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, absolutely we can run  
5 that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, we can also  
7 do it for schools so we'll bring that back to the school  
8 conversation to show the schools --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Number of schools in  
10 motion, et cetera. That would be helpful, you know, the  
11 more granular we can make it in some ways it makes it --  
12 it aggregates it, but in other ways it makes it more  
13 granular so it would be very interesting.

14 Another question is around this  
15 reconsideration process. I -- I'm pleased to hear that  
16 you are anticipating a challenging and very vigorous and  
17 active reconsideration process this next cycle. I think  
18 communicating that is -- is appropriate because there is -  
19 - at the schools there is concern and kind of a -- little  
20 bit of a -- perhaps in some cases a misunderstanding, but  
21 the misunderstanding there is not as great as the  
22 misunderstanding is among parents. Many parents and  
23 students, specifically with regard to this testing of the  
24 seniors, are very concerned and they're getting, you know,  
25 they're having conversations, some of the conversations



1 are probably helpful and healthy and other conversations  
2 are perhaps maybe not as helpful nor as healthy as -- as  
3 they should be from the districts and the schools to the  
4 parents so they can actually understand, you know, what  
5 each interest in that conversation has a right and  
6 responsibility to -- to interact with. So, but in terms  
7 of CDEs engagement on that anticipating a significant pig  
8 in the python if you will on this reconsideration process  
9 next year, I think it's an important that you're planning  
10 ahead to that.

11 This is one that we're not gonna -- yeah,  
12 I'm not expecting an answer here, but it's something where  
13 I would like to get an answer and that it's this question  
14 of the intention of the law was to allow the high  
15 performing districts some measure of freedom, and you've  
16 heard me use the phrase before earned flexibility. And I  
17 heard Keith in answering the question, I think Angelika  
18 raised the question earlier that some administrative  
19 relief, but I would be curious if there's more meaningful  
20 relief that might be available, and I would say there's  
21 probably two parts to that conversation as there are in so  
22 many of the things that we encounter in this Boardroom.  
23 There's a -- there is a regulatory part that this building  
24 has some affect and influence and control over and there's  
25 -- there's a statutory or a legislative piece so kind of





1 bifurcating those or separating those so we can understand  
2 what can we do within this building to provide earned  
3 flexibility, well, let's do all of that we can possibly  
4 do.

5                   And then there's a question of, you know,  
6 what would the districts like to hear. And I think you  
7 can be the first part of this conversation, gather the  
8 data, pull information in from the districts, where would  
9 they like to see flexibility, I mean, there are schools or  
10 districts that have been knocking it out of the park year  
11 over year over year. What are we doing to honor that --  
12 the fact that they have demonstrated they know how to  
13 manage their district, they know how to manage their  
14 schools, let's give 'em some flexibility to do that.

15                   So if you can gather that data, figure out  
16 what can be done at the regulatory basis and then help  
17 them perhaps bring the policy conversation across the  
18 street to where they might seek out some additional earned  
19 flexibility that would be a useful process for CDE to  
20 bring into that equation.

21                   And I'm sorry, we're so far behind on time.  
22 I'm not givin' -- I'm not even -- I'm not breathing nor am  
23 I giving you an opportunity to breath and respond, but I'm  
24 gonna throw the fourth -- fourth thing that I have out  
25 here, and that comes back to the question that Dr. Sheffel



1 raised and it's a process question for me. I'm coming at  
2 it a slightly different way is this time frame for the  
3 review of the formula. Where's this formula come from?  
4 To what degree does CDE have control over the formula, to  
5 what degree (indiscernible) into statute? When is -- this  
6 is a data question I need to know. When is the prescribed  
7 time for re-evaluation of this formula so that we can  
8 reinterpret as appropriate the formula? So there I just --  
9 -- I'll give you those questions --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- if you want to give  
12 some summary answers back or if you want to push  
13 information back down to the Board following, I'll take it  
14 either way --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can give you a one  
16 minute (indiscernible)

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

18 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, on the last  
19 question, you asked in terms of timeframe, there's little  
20 in the statute on formula. The -- the most that's in the  
21 statute is that growth and PWR need to be weighed the  
22 heaviest. It's pretty much what it is. It tells you what  
23 --

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But it doesn't say X  
25 percent, Y percent --



1 MS. PEARSON: No, it doesn't say any of  
2 that, and so that was developed by stakeholders with the  
3 Department (indiscernible) back in 2009, 2010. That's  
4 what we want to look at now because there's no prescribed  
5 timeline for when you relook at things, but it seemed like  
6 with the new assessments this is a natural time to do it.  
7 We wanted to keep things steady enough so that we could  
8 compare year to year and see how schools and districts  
9 change over time. Now we're at a good place to be able to  
10 really look at it again, rethink is -- are these the right  
11 (indiscernible) reconfirm or change them if we want --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So I'm hearing there's a  
13 large degree of flexibility or control over that issue  
14 within this building?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, and that comes  
16 back to you. Uh-huh.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, and I think  
18 one of the things that we over the course of the last four  
19 years that we've heard, too, from school district  
20 superintendents is, you know, this desire to set down, we  
21 get a diverse group of people on our 163 work group and we  
22 talk through some of the changes and the waiting and --  
23 and -- and what would you want to do. And after running  
24 some scenarios, it's interesting to get that group back  
25 together and they're like don't touch it. And so it's --



1 it's one of those pieces where I think we need to push on  
2 it, explore it, really look at what is helpful, and I  
3 think a five-year period of time seems to be about right  
4 because you get some historical ability to look at who's  
5 progressing in the system, and I think absolutely when we  
6 get this back in front of the work group and bring it back  
7 to you, this is the right time to have that conversation.  
8 And then understand the ramifications of those decisions  
9 and the consequences of those so that nobody's caught off  
10 guard. And that's a huge thing with some districts, you  
11 know, they specifically love growth at all levels, it  
12 helps them in the frameworks and some feel like that their  
13 high achievement is -- is really carrying them and they  
14 don't need that piece weighted as heavily and that  
15 conversation trying to find that -- strike that right  
16 balance will be a challenge for us, but I think we have  
17 enough information now to be able to do it in a thoughtful  
18 way.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely. And I could  
20 go on, but we're way out of time on this.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I just want to  
22 take the opportunity to agree --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh my gosh. I think I'm  
24 gonna have a heart attack here.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 'Cause I think we've



1 heard it from -- from -- to -- from Angelika and from our  
2 chair, but this whole concept that if a school district is  
3 doing well over time we should loosen the reins and I  
4 don't know if that means they don't have to go through the  
5 accreditation process as frequently, but it would be -- do  
6 you have any ideas that maybe it could bring back -- if  
7 you don't have them right now, could you bring 'em back in  
8 December so the chair and I can get excited since we won't  
9 be here after December --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: One last time. If we  
11 could leave on agreement. That would be wonderful.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But -- but I -- yeah,  
13 I think you -- I think there'd be strong consensus on the  
14 Board that it would be great even from a staff perspective  
15 if you could focus your efforts on the schools that need  
16 it the most and the schools that don't need it the most,  
17 you know, we give a little bit more free rein. And that's  
18 what --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: What I hear --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- districts should be  
21 doing, too, but -- but I know it's hard to --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We don't have time. I  
23 was gonna tease you and -- and talk about assessments and  
24 how we're coming together on 'em, but let's just move on.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's later this



1 afternoon.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was a great  
4 report.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great report.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We have the next item is  
9 -- oh shoot -- we've got another rules hearing and then  
10 public comment. Do we have an indication of how many  
11 people braved the weather to come for public comment?  
12 We've got several. Okay. All right. Fair enough. Just  
13 want to check in with you, let you know we're grateful  
14 you're here. We are clearly running behind, hang with us  
15 and we'll get there.

16 Are we timed on the --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are on the -- on  
18 the rulemaking hearings.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So we're already  
21 behind on this first rulemaking hearing, but I guess we  
22 just --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's fine. We just  
24 can't be early.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Oh well --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which we're not.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- believe me, we're not  
3 gonna be early on anything today. That -- I'm confident  
4 of that.

5 All right. So we kind of didn't really  
6 have an opportunity to settle in as a Board. I guess I  
7 would take a minute break, but before I do that I would  
8 like to give some of my colleagues perhaps an opportunity  
9 to make a personal comment or two.

10 I would like to pause and acknowledge Val  
11 Flores from CD1 who was elected in this last election,  
12 congratulations, and will be joining the Board in January.

13 Jane Goff of course was -- was re-elected  
14 and Marcia Neal was re-elected. So I would offer the mic  
15 for a moment or two if you either of you want to make a  
16 comment. Jane --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jane.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, please, go ahead.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 MS. GOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And  
21 congratulations to you --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, thank you.

23 MS. GOFF: -- as well. I am very grateful  
24 to be back here today even though it took me two hours to  
25 get down here. I kept thinking I'm glad I have that place



1 to go. It would be my pleasure to serve again in the same  
2 spirit of moving our schools ahead. I'm looking forward  
3 to that. I think we have a lot of challenging, hard, but  
4 potentially very fulfilling work ahead of us during these  
5 next six years and I'm -- I'm very grateful to my  
6 supporters and to the people that I have the pleasure and  
7 honor of working with including our staff.

8 My fellow Board members of course and the  
9 wonderful people that -- that I represent in Congressional  
10 District 7. So thank you and best of luck to all of us.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent.

12 Madam Vice Chair.

13 MS. NEAL: Yes, thank you. Jane, I would  
14 echo what Jane said, that I'm very grateful particularly  
15 to all of my fellow Board members who were very supportive  
16 and found it, you know, very invigorating that this  
17 happened.

18 Val and I had a chance to have tea and  
19 crumpets yesterday afternoon in the lobby of the Warwick  
20 and I'm looking forward to working with Val.

21 I'm also very grateful for the vote, very  
22 grateful indeed. It's been a rather strange year for me  
23 because I had a primary opponent who didn't think I was  
24 partisan enough and then I ended up with some other  
25 opponents who thought I was too partisan. I didn't seem





1 to land on the right place for anyone, but as most of you  
2 know, there was a lot of money directed against me, a lot  
3 for a State Board of Education. And -- and it was -- it  
4 was pretty negative, and I am just so grateful that people  
5 saw through that and -- and voted for me.

6 I think that there probably was a real  
7 rejection of that kind of negative campaigning on the  
8 State Board. And so I'm just so grateful that -- that  
9 people for whatever reason chose to vote for me and to  
10 ignore that very negative campaign.

11 So I look forward to moving on and I think  
12 we're gonna miss Elaine and we're gonna miss Paul and --  
13 we're not losing anybody else, but look forward to working  
14 with Val and whoever replaces Paul I guess is an upside  
15 question. But we'll have -- we'll have another  
16 interesting year going ahead and thank you all. So many  
17 of you been so kind and -- and supportive and -- and I  
18 appreciate that and thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So with that we'll take  
20 one minute. Let's be -- let's be - I --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) get  
22 our things done. We can run in --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Exactly. One minute and  
24 then we'll be right back. We'll come back to the -- the  
25 Adult Education Literacy --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- Grant Program

3 Hearing. There.

4 (Meeting adjourned)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and Notary, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such were reported by me or under my supervision, later reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true and correct transcription of the original notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 5th day of April, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright  
Kimberly C. McCright  
Certified Vendor and Notary Public  
  
Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC  
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165  
Houston, Texas 77058  
281.724.8600