



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
April 19, 2016, Acct Clock

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 19, 2016, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Steven Durham (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Joyce Rankin (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we're gonna --
2 I'm gonna come to order, this is a -- not a formal meeting
3 of the Board, we're going to -- we're going to use --
4 there's study session, we're gonna rely on staff to walk
5 through all the points, and what I'd like to do is if
6 (inaudible) I presume talking points. If possible, we can
7 hold questions from the Board until we get to the end. We
8 find a appropriate break point, that point, we'll go for
9 questions, then we'll resume, and so time -- I need it to
10 go faster that way. I know we have a lot of material to
11 cover. So let's give that a try. So we're going to start
12 with --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, exactly
14 (inaudible).

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who wants to start?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we get the mic over
17 there?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good afternoon
20 everybody? Thank you all for taking this time, I know
21 (inaudible) to keep at it (inaudible) I know there is so
22 much (inaudible) than you usually do (inaudible) extra
23 time. All of you (inaudible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. It's okay. Thank
2 you. Sorry to interrupt, some of you know that Members,
3 Dr. Scheffel and Ms. Mazanec are present via the phone.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if you all
5 (inaudible) or if you need (inaudible).

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. So our agenda
7 for today comes from the overview the Board about areas
8 that will help clarify, that will (inaudible) So we have an
9 overview (inaudible) we may not (inaudible) right now,
10 (inaudible) how do we wanna go, how do you want to go about
11 being that (inaudible) local Board. So we've got a
12 standard process (inaudible) together, (inaudible) that we
13 want to do that. Then, we (inaudible) what do you need to
14 do, follow up in a (inaudible) how although pocket law
15 (inaudible) Kind of plastic scenario about (inaudible)
16 need to do that today. We think it may be helpful at some
17 point to do that (inaudible).

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. (Inaudible).

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I will -- I will
21 just at this little pressure for the context today and make
22 sure that we have the basic. We are gonna actually go
23 briefly through the over view and go more in-depth at each
24 individual person. In that way, I think we can get a
25 little bit more deeper on some of those questions on what



1 the management needs, innovations (inaudible) and what
2 those options look like. So I'm gonna go quickly through
3 the over view side and am turning over (inaudible).

4 All right. This is just a reminder of the
5 accreditation ratings category that came out of FE153 and
6 so when the school performance framework and the district
7 performance framework come out, typically in the fall that
8 determine the accreditation ratings and the school planned
9 (inaudible) and so when the school district are in the
10 bottom two of (inaudible) turn around that they then become
11 a (inaudible) class and we call it the class (inaudible) a
12 district school may not remain entirely (inaudible) for
13 longer than five consecutive years. And so once a school
14 district picks one of those bottom two categories, they're
15 on the clock.

16 That's year one and if they get a
17 improvement rating in the next year they come off the
18 clock. But if they get five years in a row at one of those
19 bottom two ratings then that's where FE153 Education
20 Economy Act then kicks in. We have some another set of
21 concepts (inaudible) year five. Schools and districts are
22 just now coming to the end of that clock. So this is some
23 kind of big picture overview of (inaudible) first time you
24 get (inaudible) turn around you're getting your (inaudible)



1 school performance district (inaudible) fall than there
2 were any this past year due to the accountability clause.

3 They will resume again this coming September
4 and then July 1 will be when that rating goes into effect
5 and the end of year five is the process that we are going
6 to talk about today. So looking at rules on the clock,
7 current overview. We're looking right now at the 29
8 schools in year five. You can see that we've had numerous
9 others schools on this one before as well. And in terms of
10 districts, you had eight districts on year five, we had one
11 district in year one and one year four. And these are
12 handouts that I believe you can check out as well.

13 Okay. So we will have a handout that will
14 be passed out and that will have the list of schools and
15 districts in year five so you guys can have a hand on it
16 and as well as some few kind or recommendations. So we'll
17 get to that in a sec. So once again zoom in on year five
18 timeline. So July 1 2016 again of that accountability
19 clause those schools that entered year five last July 1 all
20 remain in year five this July 1. So this fall is when we
21 were getting school plan type on the account of them
22 relating within the rules and so if a school district
23 receives the same priority turn around ratings this coming
24 fall then they are going to remain in, on the clock until
25 that season comes from year five moves in to year six.



1 It's the last (inaudible). If a school were to get a
2 (inaudible) plan type of rating this fall then they would
3 come off the clock and come off that list as year five
4 (inaudible) and commissioner recommendations and state
5 review panel reports to you all and also appearing from
6 districts.

7 The set in district presentation timeline
8 will be somewhere between the fall and June 30 when the
9 deadline is for you to direct acts for those school
10 districts that are in year five. So we thought you know
11 window from around this fall through May will be really
12 kind of like superior to district contribution and add
13 (inaudible) to schools in districts. So, this is that
14 overview (inaudible) showing you a couple of times which
15 just highlights a few components of the (inaudible)
16 process. So this is what is triggered when a school from
17 district comes to year five (inaudible) or turn around
18 status. The law does also allow this process to be picked
19 of for a turnaround school in a district at any year on the
20 clock. So we like to keep that in there and remind them
21 that that is an option as well. And the component of the
22 process of the commissioner of recommendation the state
23 review panel report and those two are required under the
24 law. The district proposal we have on the current chart is
25 that (inaudible) we are encouraging districts to come



1 forward with their proposals so that they can tell us what
2 they prefer their passing should be and how they envision
3 their reaction to what this given panel is recommending as
4 well.

5 And then they can still consider those
6 recommendation as a consideration. The State Board of
7 Education need to know what directs the local Board and the
8 pooling district at that point will receive ongoing
9 monitoring and support. We're going to get into the study
10 session into little bit of what that could look like. What
11 actually could that -- that private monitoring and support
12 was like and we're going to run idea buy you on that piece
13 as well. We have a lot of decisions to be made about that.
14 I just wanted to briefly remind you what we envision going
15 into the commissioners recommendation report. We did
16 receive one report so far for Aurora Central High School.
17 But we still have the vast majority to come forward to you.
18 And so these are the components we included in the work
19 central report and we're kind hap -- continue to get your
20 feedback. You know what you wanna see included in that
21 report. This will be faced off of the sitting staff
22 analysis of the district proposal and plan, if they have
23 one. So for example if a school is pursuing innovation we
24 would review that innovation school plan and actually
25 provide some back usage.



1 See how we've evaluated that innovation
2 plan. We would review the State review panel report as
3 well. We've been already asking for that. We would look
4 at key supportive engagements, that could be grand, that
5 could be staff support, problematic support, as well as
6 review if they had a student plan, review their data and
7 then ultimately if we believe the kind of recommendation
8 used could have desired effect. The other major component
9 on that flow chart was the state review panel and am gonna
10 turn this over so that we can divert our minds our effort -
11 - coordinate our effort around the state review panel and
12 she's gonna go into a little bit more depth around that.

13 Hello. So we (inaudible) about (inaudible)
14 a quick reminder (inaudible) is that we talk about
15 (inaudible) and that would enable them to actually have a
16 sense of command (inaudible) have a list of that very last
17 column (inaudible).

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Did you (inaudible)?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I did not.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: You did not?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. (Inaudible).

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I can add that in.
23 (Inaudible).



1 MS. SCHROEDER: No, it's fine. The fact it
2 isn't working. I just, go. Yeah, I would like to know for
3 some guys, school renovations that are on site, right?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right. Example,
5 and it could be the one, (inaudible).

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I have another question but
7 that would be given as well.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) in terms of
9 different partners. Different partners. (Inaudible) So
10 we are working with them on how to check the (inaudible).
11 So (inaudible) if that makes sense.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Thank you. So
13 I'm gonna continue and I know responses are small and if
14 you have other questions, you're free to ask them.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) But what
16 you're telling me is and (inaudible) working on that?
17 Because these schools are (inaudible).

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we are working with
19 them on how to check them or (inaudible) going on. So I
20 talked with (inaudible) if that makes sense?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).



1 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible) That one I can
2 see. That one I can see. The other one, I'm a little --
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
4 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible) about.
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)
6 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I do.
7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).
8 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible)
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Within the next section,
10 we're gonna walk through some of these (inaudible).
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're -- where
18 (inaudible).
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).
20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -were their shade of
21 blue that indicate (inaudible).
22 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible).
23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible). Thank you.
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) All right.
25 MS. SCHROEDER: I think (inaudible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Let's move
2 forward please. So we know that -- we know that --
3 (inaudible) Does anyone on the (inaudible) have questions
4 about that?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, no. I'm fine. Thank
6 you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, this is
10 predetermined for those on the phone and we're moving on to
11 slide 13. So could you -- could you track where we are?
12 So we know that there a lot of work happening in the
13 schools, in all these schools on the list, and all the
14 others (inaudible) in most cases, we're aware that those
15 schools are in (inaudible) and so this next question, we'll
16 talk a little bit about the -- the statue (inaudible)
17 pathway. Of whether if some of the options of ways that
18 beyond are the District's intervening or the State Board is
19 intervening talking about?

20 So hopefully, this slide will look familiar
21 to you but to remind you that the State Board must select
22 one of the -- sorry. Schools that's on the clock , must
23 select one of these actions on the right hand column, and
24 for District, you may select some of those on the left
25 hand, but you might be able to go beyond that. There's



1 more flexibility that has been created. So rather than
2 walk through each of these in detail, there are as you can
3 see on (inaudible) I'll refer, there are a number of them
4 that are coming up, and so I really wanna try to focus a
5 little bit more on the management pathway, around the
6 innovations pathway. I'm happy to dove any of them, or
7 have the questions about any of them, but those are the two
8 as you can see on that list that are coming up the most.

9 So just very quickly, the District's
10 reorganization is outlined three -- in detail in our
11 statue, and really, is typically good news for
12 consolidation or -- or expansion of the district
13 physically, throughout the State in a geographical. So
14 it's a fairly extensive process and you can (inaudible) to
15 that. So, let me step forward into management, and
16 (inaudible) question. We've thought a lot about
17 management, we've consulted with (inaudible) on this, and I
18 believe that there is a fair amount of flexibility. I
19 think on one end of this spectrum, the perspectives of
20 management was just (inaudible) him, organization comes in
21 and fully takes over a school entirely, and I think that
22 there's a lot more flexibility around that, and so this
23 slide helps articulate that a little bit more.

24 The way that we wanna encourage you to look
25 at this management pathway is to say, what would be some of



1 the systems, or whether they're sort of systems or really
2 targeted systems in a school that need intervention. Or
3 where the school or the district is not able to manage it
4 well. So some examples might be -- that that might be in
5 an academic and a -- and a local assessment cycle. Maybe
6 the way that they're using data, to really (inaudible)
7 those questions. Maybe it's around the high end
8 (inaudible) and is not being able to get quality features
9 into their building.

10 So we believe that is if -- if you were to
11 focus in on really identify what some of those -- again,
12 systems, or targeted areas in a -- in a school lot, that
13 the management pathway could be engaging with the partner,
14 some sort of an external organization that would really
15 target in making them an expert in some of those areas. So
16 rather than them having them organizations if they go over
17 100% control of the school that it might be more of that
18 they start up managing partner, that they work with in a
19 very discrete and sort of defined way.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible).

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So they may be the
22 organization that again, let's proceed on the local
23 assessment. That we work with the Achievement Network for
24 example, a number of our expansive schools, then
25 (inaudible) work with them. So they -- they bring to



1 school a series of assessments throughout the year that
2 will inform assessment, that are -- are driving towards the
3 standards that if we can, so perhaps the -- a school might
4 partner with an organization like that -- that would really
5 sort of ensure that that assessment that's an exceptional
6 cycle. It's solid, it's responsive and is getting these
7 (inaudible) results (inaudible) their students.

8 There might be one of the above. There
9 might be organizations that are really strong and their
10 creating, selecting higher maintaining staff. Typically, I
11 would have (inaudible) in school. And so there may be an
12 organization that we might partner with around that. So we
13 -- so around that management pathway, we would expect that
14 -- that school, or if it was the district, would sort of
15 negotiate, would engage in some sort of an external
16 partner, again, in a -- in a very targeted way. That would
17 be -- what would be necessary there, would be for -- for
18 you all, and for the Department, and for the District, to
19 agree on what is -- what is targeted needs are and --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: How do -- how do we know
21 these (inaudible)? (Inaudible) in -- in certain program.
22 How do we know the (inaudible)?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. That's a great --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we know that?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That's a great a
2 question. And I think we have a various -- we have various
3 -- these offices and what not in the department, that will
4 be engaged with partners, I know -- I work (inaudible)
5 programs but there are -- there are a lot of different ways
6 that one could determine that. I think there are also
7 interesting ways that in this management pathway we would
8 look at, supporting districts with performance contracts,
9 to say, rather than just establish an open ended
10 relationship with a -- with an external group, how can we
11 set up really clear performance contracts with those
12 organizations? To say that, hey, we -- we would expect
13 them to get the results that we wanted, and if we don't,
14 that they would sever ties, and or move on to a different
15 organization.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: I think it would be very
18 difficult for a third party outside the -- outside the --
19 the state to come in, and really know what's going on.
20 It's hard enough to have people who are in the state, who
21 maybe had had lots of years of experience, to come into a
22 school and really understand what's going on. I mean, I'm
23 speaking specifically about hap -- what happened to
24 Godsman, that -- in Denver Public Schools where I taught.
25 Or the school district had already savaged, you know, and



1 cut really Members of the school, that were very capable of
2 delivering, I mean also, bilingual program. And then, you
3 have outside people, which were the state tenure. Who were
4 clueless. These were bumbling fools, who came in, didn't
5 know anything about the program, asked questions, I'm sure
6 that we're alumni. How long have you -- didn't even ask
7 that.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me -- I was teaching
9 in kindergarten I remember and so -- well, you think that
10 if parents had this small talk with -- this was going on,
11 if you send a weekly whatever, then third grade, would be
12 on target. And I thought, "Well, my third graders, I mean,
13 my kindergartners are just in first grade. They're not in-
14 -- they're not in third grade. And this is after all the
15 kindergarten, and first grade back in (inaudible) So I
16 mean, I've been into schools, I've done a part where you go
17 in, you are about to close the school. This was in another
18 state, and I had that experience. I know what -- what's
19 working, what's not working and I -- I'm doubting that
20 these people were -- were unbelievably not aware of what
21 this school, this community was planning to do. So I don't
22 just understand how a third party, unless they're willing
23 to have years of experience, could really understand.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you've asked a
25 clarifying question for minutes. Two -- two parts. Number



1 one, as you've been monitoring folks that are recommended
2 for (inaudible). How many of them have said yes, the
3 school wants to pursue that path? Across through the
4 recommended (inaudible)?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a good question.
6 I mean, I think we have some -- I think we have some
7 districts. I would say like Cortes comes to mind.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And then, here's
9 -- here's the very question. Is -- is a little subscribed.
10 They don't -- they don't have to take over the school, they
11 can come and -- maybe they just --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not talking --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- don't know what we
14 are talking about.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: -- about taking over the
16 school, I was discussing, when they come in for a week.
17 This is after.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You've got to do that
19 little hot parachute in, parachute out.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Exactly.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that doesn't work?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're talking about a
2 monster relationship but it can be for one component or be
3 multiple components.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. Correct.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) very long
6 term.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: In term, when you say
9 Cortes, what do you mean?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, Cortes is engaged
11 with the University of Virginia, which has been a three
12 year engagement and so they have -- but they've brought to
13 us the notion that -- that UVA might be a sort of a
14 management partner with them, and some of the work that
15 they are doing.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: In Virginia?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, the UVA has the
18 big turn around, I know from last (inaudible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) It started
21 with Cortes, (inaudible) others, they have the Nation's
22 first role to Boston, to leadership turn around programs
23 (inaudible). So we have several GPS clauses to work on
24 Cortes I was very impressed that you -- that you are
25 working on in Colorado.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- I think your
2 questions are -- are valid. I mean, I think they are al l-
3 -- there are examples where -- where organizations have --
4 there are lots of examples where organizations have
5 partnered with districts that have not been effective and
6 have -- have been just that sort of drive by and then they
7 leave and sometimes with turmoil in the -- in the
8 tailwinds. I think, as Commissioner Cordial is suggesting,
9 we're -- what -- what we believe the -- the opportunities
10 in this management pathway are really sort of long term
11 relationships.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But knowing that there
13 are a lot of variables in these kind of relationships and
14 we would -- we've began to develop some rubrics to say how
15 would we support a district with establishing the right
16 kind of relationships to be sure that -- that partnership
17 is targeted and that there are clear expectations about
18 what would come out of that. So that if we don't sink a
19 lot of time, money and effort into something that may not
20 pay out. But the decision would be up to you all. If you
21 felt like a management relationship for a district or for a
22 school would be appropriate or not. We'd certainly be able
23 to support you with -- with some of the criteria and some
24 of that decision making process.



1 MS. GOFF: Did the district just say they
2 are not coming in tonight? Is it my district?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

4 MS. GOFF: I'm still processing parts of the
5 ESSA. Is schooling equip used to be or is still is the
6 school improvement grant type could help through ESSA.
7 Would this apply to that? If -- and how do we -- how do
8 all these schools that are listed here, tie in with what we
9 have as a list changed a lot of our low coming schools and
10 how is that tying in with what we're -- if we are going to
11 pursue any grant money that's available for them? You
12 know, we have another history of school improvement grants
13 that -- that we have to carry with us, but I'm just curious
14 as to how, for example, the criteria for grant money.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does the same criteria
16 hold for the grantors or the companies that might be
17 applying for granting Colorado schools as the schools
18 themselves in getting grant money? I'd just like to know,
19 eventually with time that is, but where is the alignment?
20 How is that, how is that line up? Can it make sense to
21 people when they hear this is the route we're going? And
22 then the other thing on, on this is, I would think you, you
23 would all help the other on this records of this. How many
24 of these particular schools have used such a service?



1 One component or another. Right now, I'm
2 talking about the cultural part of it and who has used it
3 and what do they say about it? Who's abandoned it? What
4 their reaction to it was? We- -- we have that going. It
5 might be a head start in eliminating what didn't go well no
6 matter who -- what school it is and -- and what was
7 promising. Even -- even more so who's still using in
8 particular the management -- component management group in
9 their work so far?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane, are you -- are you
11 talking about something like (inaudible) that had a cig?

12 MS. GOFF: Yeah, but the tool is separate in
13 my mind right now. We're starting fresh with local
14 priority schools money help, but it's still the same idea
15 of money available somewhere for a purpose and then it
16 could be a composite purpose, but I'm just curious. I
17 think we already have a some record of the achievement in
18 this or lack thereof. And -- and if we could get our hands
19 on some of that, you can just sample a random sample of
20 some of these schools that have used someone. Where they
21 are with it so far. That other money is different.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: It shouldn't be different.
23 It was the -- it was the time.

24 MS. GOFF: Well, it is. It was whole
25 different -- to me it was a whole different time in



1 history. It was -- it was before we had this big change in
2 the federal law and so depending on how -- what their
3 perspective is, prospective as well, on this new money for
4 this purpose, how can we make it really work for us if we
5 are gonna go forward?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's a really
7 good point to bring up. Yes, it is really different from
8 what -- how it is right now, (inaudible) but right now it's
9 set aside, how the money is set aside for school
10 improvement grants is if -- is just this set aside from
11 Title I. There is none of those turnaround transformation,
12 those models that had the Title 3 grant program, the
13 section and the law that came up. So that does not answer
14 that, there is a lot more discretion of the -- the state
15 districts on how to spend -- spend -- set aside for school
16 improvement.

17 Doesn't have to follow this very secluded
18 model. If the state wanted to choose to do that they
19 could, I think the US Department of Ed could choose to do
20 that in it's place. Then they would get a lot of push back
21 -- decided to regulate that much. There's a lot more
22 freedom there and then your other question about our common
23 about the alignment of these schools that might get
24 identified with ESSA. We've heard very clearly from the
25 field that we wanna think of this, done as much as



1 possible. Funds we want to sacrifice for Colorado
2 (inaudible). You want a single system. So as much as we
3 can align the schools that will share on priority
4 equipment, there's comprehensive identification in the day
5 that matters. So I think we'll be able to match it up
6 pretty well, and that's the goal that we've had from
7 stakeholders, they were like --

8 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me. This is Pam.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Go ahead.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Can you hear me?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, ma'am.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Apologies, but I'm gonna have
13 to leave here before 4:00 p.m. I was just wondering if we
14 can get back to going through the entire presentation
15 before we have a lot of questions about --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, let's --

17 MS. MAZANEC: -- this is mostly about how
18 we're going to go about deciding, you know, the template,
19 right?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Good suggestion.
21 We'll try and minimize the questions going forward. Pam,
22 thank you.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. So we'll move
25 on, on just very briefly around charters. Charters are --



1 schools are -- of course, public schools in Colorado they
2 can be authorized either by a district or through the
3 Charter School Institute. Charter schools are typically
4 generated or initiated by local organizations, groups of
5 people or individuals or by charter management
6 organizations. So one of the factors around conversion to
7 charter are whether there are ideas, individuals,
8 organizations that are -- that are coming forward or that
9 are willing to come forward with ideas for charter schools
10 but I think you're probably all pretty familiar with
11 charter schools.

12 Around the innovation pathway, again, the
13 idea here with innovation schools and you all have -- have
14 approved many innovation plans in the past. There's a --
15 there's a distinction between improving innovation plans as
16 simply as an innovation plan. And at this point what where
17 we're referring to our innovation as an accountability
18 pathway. So looking at it from a different lens, perhaps,
19 because it's coming toward you for different purposes,
20 innovation schools seek waivers from local school districts
21 and from the state as to allow them more flexibility or to
22 be able to give them flexibility from local policies and
23 statute to allow them. And again, those should be -- those
24 waivers should be selected in a really targeted way similar
25 to the management pathway to say what are the challenges



1 that you're facing and are those waivers necessary for you
2 to be able to solve some of the problems that you have.

3 As I mentioned for schools that are seeking
4 innovation status as an accountability pathway, we've
5 realized that we would need to look at those paths -- those
6 plans in a different light. So we've developed a rubric
7 that by which we would look at sort of those plans with
8 qualitative lens to say, "Hey, are these going to be not
9 only did our -- our -- sorry, I'll back up for a quick sec.
10 As innovation plans come through they are reviewed by -- by
11 -- through Gretchen Morgan's office. They're reviewed for
12 compliance to ensure that those waivers are technically
13 correct but they're not necessarily reviewed to say, "Is
14 this -- does this really rigorous enough to turn that
15 school around?" And so the rubric that we've developed,
16 that we have used in a couple of different instances at
17 this point as a pilot are to be able to say, do we think
18 that those innovation plans are rigorous enough for the
19 turnaround plans, for accountability pathway especially for
20 schools that are in year four or five.

21 So we'll share that rubric with you this
22 afternoon so you get a chance to look at it and see if some
23 of the -- be able to see some of the pieces that we've been
24 looking at. And then lastly around school closure and I
25 think school closure speaks for itself. Different ways



1 that you might look at that -- that might be a hard stop,
2 that might be we are gonna close certain grade levels or
3 portions of the school or insert those kids in different
4 ways or that maybe it's a phase out. So maybe it's a
5 school closure that takes place over a number of years. So
6 you know, it's sort of end to grade level and it fades out
7 that way. All right.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I have -- I have -- sorry,
9 Pam, but I have to ask. I think it's germane to- -- are
10 the ones listed here with recommendation as closure, are
11 there any of those that have been already turn into anyway
12 or other reasons? That there had been a local decision
13 already made?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. All right.

16 MS. MAZANEC: At this point, I want to talk
17 -- close direct recommendation. My -- (inaudible) and
18 you'll see that those are also some of the things that
19 (inaudible) from closure for -- and for elementary would be
20 one. The other would be (inaudible) and then (inaudible).

21 MS. SCHROEDER: And that recommendation is
22 based on all six criteria, the total. Okay. Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who's next?



1 MS. PEARSON: We're going to go to the next
2 section of the agenda which is in regards the decision
3 making process and procedures. The goal for this part of
4 our discussion are to discuss and decide on the safe work
5 procedures for directing actions for local Board. So we'd
6 like to gather your questions that you have called for us
7 and also for the Attorney General's office. Tony is out
8 sick, was not be able to be here today. We've been in
9 close communication with him. We've been bouncing
10 questions off with him the last couple of weeks. And
11 really wanted to turn the next step as well. And so just
12 to kind of frame this in a more specific terms, what -- the
13 procedures that I'm -- I'm talking about are really the
14 administrative procedures that are gonna guide the
15 discussion.

16 When you have a district coming forward,
17 it's either on the clock itself or its schooled on the
18 clock. And so you've all been through charter appeal or
19 just an accreditation appeal. And so while it wouldn't be
20 structured quite the same way, we want to put some
21 structures and parameters around it so that, for example,
22 you could say and this is just -- I'm just throwing this
23 out here as a sample of options on screen, but we could put
24 parameters that say, X weeks submitting three weeks before
25 a state Board meeting. The reigned copy of the -- the



1 formal report from the state review panel and from the
2 Commissioner's recommendation will be delivered to both the
3 state Board and the District.

4 So that there is ample time for review of
5 those documents prior to the state Board meeting with the
6 district will be present. So we would have the same amount
7 of time for everyone. Every district will get the document
8 at the same time ahead of the Board meeting. And the
9 District proposal could come to you at that time too if
10 they choose that's optional but perhaps, they would send it
11 to you. A formal plan for management where they would lay
12 out what external partner they're going to partner with and
13 then what functions. Then once the state Board date comes,
14 is actually a day up. You could say, "All right. We're
15 going to hear 30 minutes we're out of time. We're going to
16 set it. We're gonna have 30 minutes for the district to
17 present, then we're gonna have 30 minutes for CDE staff to
18 present the Commissioner's recommendation report. There's
19 going to be 30 minutes of question and answer. At the end
20 of that, there's going to be deliberation and directed
21 action."

22 Then potentially a progress monitoring
23 contract is signed and we are getting to that part. In the
24 study session, we have a contract we want you to discuss
25 and review. So we'll get to that part a little bit later.



1 But I want to kind of focus on the -- the procedures before
2 that and get your thoughts and feedback on it. This is
3 again, entirely up to you. How you want to run these
4 meetings. What kind of procedures you want in place. Use
5 one option. Another would be for you to hear district's
6 presentation in one meeting and deliberate and think about
7 it and actually direct action at the next state Board
8 meeting. So there's -- it's up to you to pre develop these
9 administrative procedures. And specifically thinking, you
10 know, is there preference for deciding within one meeting?
11 Is their preference for actually adopting a formal Board
12 policy? Bizy, Tony and I can work on that with you all.
13 Yes, Mr. Crandall.

14 MR. CRANDALL: So a really fast question.
15 I'll speak loud so everyone could hear. The state review
16 panel recommendations, what has been on practice in the
17 past, is first -- what did we do last year, as soon we
18 received it and reviewed it --

19 MS. GOFF: We've been throwing it down the -
20 - we haven't been doing it.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: We -- we definitely have to
22 do one. Go ahead Eliza.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) So -- so
24 again, as for my independent body, so Phoebe did not review
25 reports on purpose. They were finalized and sent to the



1 commissioner which at the time was Commissioner Kelly Allan
2 and he sent them on directly to the Board. And then as a
3 result we then forwarded them on to the districts
4 themselves because they had not received them either and
5 then we kind of hosted there because we're (inaudible) so
6 that -- that's as much of the procedures we've had so far.

7 MR. CRANDALL: So right now do all districts
8 have their state review calendar reports?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 MR. CRANDALL: Okay. (Inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, the 20 -- yeah,
12 for last year.

13 MR. CRANDALL: Okay. So there's a hand full
14 at their jobs.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are. The only one
16 that doesn't have theirs and they didn't do it last year
17 and that was on August 14.

18 MR. CRANDALL: Okay. Theirs is next week.
19 I think that we got to --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 MR. CRANDALL: Okay. So (inaudible) ask
22 that recommendation that we send the report to Executive
23 State Board of Education. So many weeks before there to
24 come. If there not gonna be coming for six months, I -- I
25 -- I think it's in our best interest though, we get it in



1 their hands as quickly as possible. The student state
2 Board whether or not be a Board meetings scheduled or not,
3 the district deserves to see that report at the same time
4 the Board. I mean, it's my recommendation. (Inaudible) I
5 think.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: You're saying three weeks is
7 not enough because they may not have a Board meeting
8 between then and --

9 MR. CRANDALL: Well, they -- we've had their
10 -- we've had the follow-up visit and then they say, "I'm
11 not coming until April, 2017." But their businesses gonna
12 be much, you know, several months before that. We were,
13 you know, they were looking for X number of weeks. I'm
14 saying now. Let's talk to the dealer. Let's get it in
15 their hands as quickly after the review as possible. So
16 that question is to be send to the Board first and give it
17 to them for a week before we send to the district or we
18 send to the Board and district at the same time?
19 (Inaudible) are doing the same.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I realize that's
21 really a good point. I think we could think about this
22 separately. The state review cannot go as soon as we get
23 it, so the district would have it all that and then with
24 timeline for when the Commissioner report comes in here a
25 little bit quicker.



1 MR. CRANDALL: Correct, because the
2 Commissioner will involve me doing this until that -- until
3 the district has scheduled their time and they're gonna
4 come in, then that's when we'll be doing our parts.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct. Yes.
6 That's not how I would envision it as well as. Absolutely
7 makes sense to get in the center review panel report. I've
8 seen it that -- that issue.

9 MR. CRANDALL: Actually that point, only one
10 has been done so far and it's on our war who will be coming
11 in May. And we have Commissioner based in Denver.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you want us to cover on
13 this or do you --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: -- wanna keep going through
16 here?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's good.

18 MR. CRANDALL: Let's get going, from Ken.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Try to remember.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible). And then
21 you go to this question (inaudible).

22 MR. CRANDALL: We need to (inaudible) just a
23 little. Just a little.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They already discussed
25 on this question.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. We are gonna
2 circle back to this question but the next section is
3 directly related to this. So yes I do. I would like to do
4 that when we can get through the template. Let's look at
5 that and then we can have a full conversation around the
6 procedures that you all want for the district presentation.
7 So the district presentation template is -- I'm gonna pull
8 over to Peter. You do have it as handout for sure. Okay.
9 Yes.

10 MR. PETER: Great. So our goal here is just
11 to help determine what kind of tool would be useful for you
12 all to support you in this decision-making process. We
13 know that -- we know that it's complicated and after that,
14 I believe it was the March Board meeting. Joyce came
15 forward and wanted to work with us on this. So Brenda and
16 I have met with Joyce a couple of times over the last month
17 or so and Joyce developed this template and put this
18 together that you have in front of you. And we thought
19 that it sort of tracked some of that potential proposed
20 protocol that we talked about up there, that this might be
21 a way to be able to post questions to folks as they're
22 presenting. So Jo -- Joyce, do you wanna speak to it a
23 little bit?

24 MS. RANKIN: Right. I -- I thought about
25 this an -- and Angelika agreed that we might have a



1 template and so I called CDE that's how we got involved and
2 I said, "Whoever is doing it, I'd like to be involved if I
3 could be." And I -- I kept trying to emphasize keeping it
4 simple, keeping it understandable on our side. These are
5 not the only questions we can ask. I mean, we could ask a
6 thousand on each one and still have difficulty coming to a
7 -- a decision or a conclusion. But basically, what it says
8 is what's been done before, what are the barriers, you had
9 to accomplish what you need to accomplish and what do you
10 see as the future. Those are things I think are pretty
11 basic that we all would be interested in knowing.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of the things that I
13 thought should be included is the local school Board and I
14 know that it's difficult because some of them can't take
15 off work or they may have other reasons they can't be
16 involved. But they are big decision-makers, and if they
17 have a school or a district that they are in charge of or
18 overseeing and they are in a turnaround status, I think
19 they would want to be included. I think the more people at
20 that level and district level, I think the better. So
21 these are just the basic questions as I -- as I -- said I -
22 - we -- we had three meetings. I came up with some, they
23 came up with some, we form apart, come back together and
24 these are just the -- the basic ones.



1 I also at the bottom, this was for the State
2 Board of Education. I -- I have been in touch with one of
3 my districts that has several schools that are involved in
4 the turnaround and I've spoken with Superintendent School
5 Board Members and I have appeal for it a little better.
6 That's why I have done with the schools in my district if
7 someone to spend some time there and understands their
8 schools situations. I -- I really would like to hear from
9 them on the Board. I -- I think that's -- that's a lot of
10 weight especially if we can't come to a conclusion. So
11 that's pretty much what this is. Pretty self-explanatory.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I just add a little
13 bit, some of the discussions we had turnaround recommended
14 accountability clock pathway column? Is this something
15 that you -- you could even get pretty populated so you
16 would know the State Review Panel recommendation, the
17 Commissioner's recommendation and the district preference.
18 And then that would just be right there in front of you.
19 So you just have that be easy to see and then you would
20 ultimately consider a lot to make your own exchange.

21 MS. RANKIN: Now?

22 MR. PETER: I just want ask this and maybe
23 just merge that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. I mean I think
25 this is a big bulk of -- we allocate a lot of time on



1 agenda for this. We'd love to have a discussion about this
2 and the previous question as well so then the whole process
3 of how do you -- what would help support you and me
4 comfortable with making a decision.

5 MS. RANKIN: So I'll come in. I -- I like
6 the notion of the template because I would -- and I
7 appreciate the fact that this was about what -- what do you
8 think is gonna happen and I want it to be student centered.
9 I recognize we've had districts come talk to us about the
10 challenges within their community and I appreciate that,
11 but that doesn't help me know what -- based on the
12 challenges in their community. What is it that they feel
13 they can do to improve the outcomes for them. If we can
14 somehow make sure that that's the focus, that they know
15 where the buttons are, they're gonna need to be pushed in
16 order to see improvement. And that they acknowledge that.
17 I -- unfortunately, I know there are districts that are
18 pretty comfortable with where they are. It's okay where
19 they are. They aren't very many but it does happen and I
20 don't want us to get into that situation. I'd like to help
21 those folks before they come to us. Know that there's a
22 statewide expectation of a different level of success for
23 their students.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And Joyce, I'd like to
25 take that one step further and go back to your question



1 about management. If we -- we recommend management and you
2 have several recommendations for management, are they
3 proven outcome-based recommendations? Everything that
4 comes out of this office should be proven, it should not
5 be, "Let's just try this." And I'm sure that's the way it
6 is. But even if you just have three choices for us, if
7 they all are outcome-based successful choices. But that's
8 what I'm looking for and I -- I think we're on the same
9 track.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: You know, the case studies.
11 Do we have case studies of -- of districts that we have and
12 if we can stratify the districts who have large numbers of
13 second line partners and who have done that. School
14 districts who -- who have large numbers of --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And how -- how you wanna
16 use that part?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and I don't mean large
18 district setting, district school. Right? I think we
19 should look at districts in -- in a profile and see, you
20 know, what they are. I think we should be looking at, you
21 know, a case study such system. So we understand what
22 we're --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, isn't that what
24 we're asking the state review panel to do? To be looking
25 deeply. With the school district, what do they call it?



1 Peeling the onion or whatever. Looking carefully at --
2 where -- not only where they are but why they are where
3 they are. So I'm trying to figure out how along that would
4 --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm talking about that we
6 here on the Board have an understanding of each district.
7 Districts that maybe kind of iconic for and can we possibly
8 represent other districts like a whole district that has
9 certain components in there that has done wrong but it's
10 like other rural districts. And I know it's difficult.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're using it as a
12 model, which I'm trying to understand your thoughts.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. A model, as a case
14 history. How did I -- I used to use case histories. I
15 mean, case studies of districts so that students could
16 learn how, what's the takeaway at -- in this district and I
17 did a lot of work. I mean doing these case studies is a
18 lot of work but that's something that the -- the state
19 would have at their fingertips because they've been working
20 with districts and I know you don't have to put a name. If
21 a district doesn't wanna be known that they are great but
22 that these are the -- the qualities. These are -- are
23 things that they've done. I think it's very difficult.
24 One thing I know, that at least with experience, that it's
25 very difficult to understand what's going on in a district



1 that has minority students. Possibly black students and --
2 and economically kids who are vulnerable.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Economically, language,
4 where they're on English, English is the second language
5 and we're all -- where there's a mixture of this. Possibly
6 together and I just don't think that I -- I won't say this
7 because I -- I just can agree that this department in the
8 past has had an understanding of -- of how to work with
9 those districts and how to help those districts. And I
10 know, it's a big criticism and we're hoping that it changes
11 and we're hoping that ESA with ESSA, I mean programs, will
12 help. I know but I don't understand it completely. But I
13 do know that the money that are available there through ESA
14 should be going through to those kids who are having a hard
15 time in our state doing well. And -- and I hope that our
16 capacity is towards that. And sure, we want kids to do --
17 to do very well. We don't want to have --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me interrupt. I
19 came at first because we still have the Val. We still have
20 Pam's, I've been issued to try and finish but simply -- I
21 think simply put what we're looking for is if we have
22 proven demonstrable items that lead to success, those
23 should be on our suggestion list to discuss, yes.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Thank you. Okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Please proceed.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I've got other
2 sections for you to consider. If after address of action
3 has been -- actions directed to a school or a district,
4 what is the after life look like? So what are the progress
5 monitoring procedures and how can we establish a process
6 with them for that? And really also think about an avenue
7 for re-evaluation if substantial progress isn't made beyond
8 your file. So we have given you a sample contract, draft
9 agreement, progress monitoring agreement. That would be
10 between the State Board of Education and the local district
11 or the Park School Institute. Right. Great, great.
12 Thanks. All right.

13 MR. PETER: (Inaudible)

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this is intended to
15 be a formal way to monitor the progress of pathway
16 implementation. And so to that end, the contract is
17 designed to indicate -- this is the pathway that's been
18 directed to you, so you could select. In that first table
19 on the first page which pathway you've chosen and then
20 there'll be agreed upon metrics for monitoring progress
21 which on page two. We looked at some sample indicators and
22 metrics that we could ask this -- ask the district to
23 commit to providing, for collection and providing.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They would do a six-
25 month review that CDE staff would review the data on a six



1 month interim wait and then at the end of the 12-month
2 cycle, then they would be having more formal review of this
3 data and progress, and progress monitoring would be more
4 formalized at that point. If it were kind of dissolved
5 drafts for you guys to consider, but at the end of that
6 year, it's CDE staff analysis of the data which indicated
7 unsubstantial progress wasn't made, then at that point you
8 will have the option to maybe come, have the district come
9 back in, have another discussion and go from there. Ken
10 wanted to get your thoughts on this. Um-huh. Yes. We did
11 try to contact with Tony and he said that he believes
12 review of the statute provides you with authority to enter
13 into this arrangement.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So I don't remember the
15 terminology but there's this thing about called the term
16 implementation lag, does that sound right?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: How do we deal with that?
19 What is it? How do we -- how do we incorporate that here?
20 So that we're not just needing a (inaudible) out of a
21 district think because every year you don't get there and
22 then you do something else, and you don't get there because
23 of this particular characteristic of change.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure, I mean, I think
25 generally we all know the turn around is -- is a slow



1 process. If there were a magic wand that would change the
2 rating in one year that we would have figured that out at
3 this point. The way I see this so in -- in a lot of the
4 work across the department were supporting districts and
5 schools from year zero all the way up along the clock. And
6 so like for example in our turnaround network, we have
7 performance management tools that we use with those schools
8 by which we're supporting them by -- by tracking different
9 indicators around school culture around academics and
10 around talent management in particular that are showing us
11 because we know that especially with the pause this year,
12 we know that that school rating will probably be one of the
13 last things to change in the improvement of a school. And
14 so --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: These other indicators you
16 believe do -- do have a greater reaction or a shorter
17 reaction time or?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we believe there is
19 -- there -- there -- there are indicators along the way
20 that are showing progress in the right direction and there
21 are indicators that allow us to be able to course change
22 along the way. This is a -- this is not a clean science,
23 I'll just add. I mean, I know we are all engaged with a
24 lot of other states across the country that are starting
25 that struggle with the same topic. But we see this



1 contract as sort of an extension of that support process
2 that we go through, where we think that these are -- this
3 is the kind of thing that we would be able to report out to
4 you and the district would be able to report to you to say,
5 "Hey, we're making progress and we feel confident that it's
6 going in the right direction or not."

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So Peter for example, Adams
8 50 made a very dramatic shift and moved to competency
9 based. And the first like two years, three years the
10 results were -- the -- the work -- the results were not in
11 fact I think there was a drop if I'm not mistaken in the
12 student achievement, and then it began to grow and grow and
13 grow each year. Do we have data that helps us know this is
14 what we can expect in year one two or three?

15 MS. FLORES: The competency based is --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, that's just an
17 example. I don't -- I don't -- I don't wanna -- I don't
18 wanna say anybody has to do it the way Adams 50 did. I'm
19 just saying that's an example of a situation where they
20 were heavily criticized the first year after they
21 implemented it because the scores actually dropped. And
22 then over time, they began to see that the work they
23 invested in have -- have shown results.

24 MS. FLORES: But isn't that -- isn't that
25 what we're pushing? Competency based?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: No, no, no, please Val don't
2 -- don't --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not necessarily but.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that's not the --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean the position was
6 to show them, they've had five years. They haven't made
7 any progress in five years and somehow we're going to give
8 them three more on the -- on the assumption that what these
9 non-measurable criteria do.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not exactly -- Mr.
11 Durham what I -- what I would suggest is that by the time
12 districts are coming before you toward the end of the
13 clock, that it's our -- that we will have been engaged with
14 them -- with many of them. Some it should be said are not
15 -- not interested in engaging with us and some of our
16 support structures. But those that those with which we are
17 engaged, we will have been tracking this type of data along
18 the way and that -- that data will inform our
19 recommendations or the -- or the information that we'll
20 give the commissioner for his recommendation. So in other
21 words, if we felt that they were really on the right track
22 and that they needed did in fact need more time and should
23 continue with exactly what they're doing that would -- that
24 would inform my recommendation. But if we felt that there
25 was data that was really flat or showing that they're just



1 sort of spinning in circles, that that would be part of our
2 recommendation as well and perhaps that we would recommend
3 a very different direction to you.

4 Let me just say that if -- let's say -- I
5 was suggesting that, possibly we need more money so that's
6 my beginning. We need more money. Secondly, I think we
7 need teachers that are well-trained. If we go -- if we
8 let's say look at Denver, I know, Denver. Suppose Denver
9 had an idea and this idea was to really get competent
10 teachers in hard to serve schools. So again, we're going
11 to take the really top teachers in their schools, they know
12 that they deserve experienced teachers, teachers who have
13 done well. And then they place them in hard to serve
14 school. Would that be a model that you would take since
15 competency-based didn't work in this but this is really
16 outside the box, it hasn't been done before in -- in some
17 districts. And to prepare to kind of -- not prepared. In
18 fact I'm not talking about the Department of Education but
19 the legislature. I mean, the Senate and -- and US
20 legislature.

21 I believe there are a number of districts
22 that have incentivized in various ways to work in hard to
23 serve schools. I think it's a strategy and certainly
24 around the talent and instructional piece. It's certainly
25 a strategy that I think is probably seen in part. You



1 know, I would say that it's -- it's one of many strategies
2 that would need to be employed.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and also I mean -
4 -

5 MS. FLORES: Chairman Durham.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

7 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry -- I'm sorry Val. I
8 think -- I thought Val brought up a pretty point though.
9 I'm wondering what -- I could think of there going to be
10 parameters around option with districts and schools given
11 local control and I think that's what Val was talking
12 about, they will pay teachers more. That -- that ability
13 lies within the district and the -- and their local funds.
14 I mean, we can't -- we can't actually just tell them, you
15 know, to do something like that. We -- we surely have
16 guardrails around what we can actually ask them to do,
17 don't we?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think what Mr. Dill's
19 here will probably have an opportunity to discuss those,
20 those guardrails, perhaps in executive session.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And also we have another
22 that I -- I mentioned two; more money, I mentioned talking
23 to teachers, and also testing. And you know, I'm of the
24 belief that our part test is now a test that really
25 measures competency for -- for our students. So we're



1 really putting a plan in place with the test. I don't even
2 know why we're doing what we're doing right now when we
3 have weeks to months that doesn't really accomplish what is
4 supposed to do.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Still the instrument we
6 have in the legislature still has to take the best action
7 we can with the information we have, Ms Rankin.

8 MS. RANKIN: I think we have a huge
9 responsibility today. And I think we need to -- to stay on
10 task if we can. I just would like to ask this question.
11 This will be the first time we're doing this. Are we
12 allowed let's say we hear once a school district, the first
13 one is the site some of these plans need be adapted. Can
14 we do that on the fly? I mean, like for the next one, is
15 this a -- a live document that can be changed or do we have
16 to -- whenever we decide on, do we need to do it for one
17 year or? Ho -- how is this working?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Team in this template or
19 the protocol?

20 MS. RANKIN: The whole process or a piece
21 within it.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm -- I'm I am not
23 certainly I would imagine that that's something you can
24 adjust along the way.

25 MS. RANKIN: That's what I was hoping for.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think one part,
2 suppose it needs really deep surgery, I mean a lot of
3 surgery and maybe there are other ways to this.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do think, you know,
5 the task at hand, I flipped back to the slide is it's just
6 that, there are some really specifics that you all need to
7 figure out about your process and I think about, you know,
8 to whatever degree you can legally, I think you can alter
9 that process.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to speak to
11 that one question, it's very critical question. I think
12 when it comes to procedure, "Hey, next time do you mind,
13 can we get a little more information like this, can we get
14 it earlier." All that is just fine. The one caveat to
15 this piece and I think Cordial said the same thing
16 yesterday. Schools are going to saying, we came forward
17 with the same plan, the same procedures, same
18 recommendation to the Board following the same, you know,
19 general protocol in arriving at that decision. So that it
20 doesn't get out there, "Well, hey, you treated them much --
21 you were much easier with them than you were with us. But
22 as far as how you want the information, by all means, we
23 need you to -- to have at your fingertips your critical
24 decision making data.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, Jane.



1 MS. GOFF: Regard -- regardless of that, I -
2 - I don't start anything anymore. I've learnt figuring out
3 the incomplete principle, I just always work. But one
4 thing that -- that I think we're going to have to do is set
5 a tone and I think we've started pretty darn quick here,
6 about the fact that this -- the state Board, this is not
7 about taking over schools and districts. Other states have
8 faced that challenge and we -- we've always -- it's always
9 been known here, we don't do that. Let's just say our plan
10 has always been we -- we look at, we consider it carefully,
11 we recommend changes and improvements and keep checking in
12 with these districts that are going through it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But if we're not
14 careful, this goes up too soon without laying the
15 groundwork for the message behind it and especially, with
16 districts involved who have schools involved. We're going
17 to have a public perception that is -- is understandably on
18 the defensive, we're going to be asking questions. And
19 there will be rumors, and there will be all kinds of things
20 flying around up there. Unavoidable, sometimes the course
21 is very hard situation for the public to assume why certain
22 districts have a little easier time of it because they've
23 been working with it and they -- and they live with it.
24 But I'm concerned about that.



1 So as we consider the -- the parts of this
2 template, the parts of our criteria, and the fact that we
3 were going to run up against accusations of -- of taking
4 away local control. We have we have an overriding message
5 in this state that we know our communities best. We know
6 what they need, we know how to do it. So how do we get
7 them to do it? I think that's the overall question. What
8 kind of motivations are provided. Another role is
9 establishing a good sense of trust. That's -- that's
10 generally what it is. I'm concerned about too soon jumping
11 into this, this streamlined messaging that's not going to
12 make sense emotionally because I think they need to be
13 prepared emotionally. If we get into -- we're going to run
14 into issues, we expect that. I mean, I'm looking at the
15 first line on the -- this page. And it says, students
16 attendance, behavior, and discipline, teachers attendance
17 and student staff parents surveys, all that's good.

18 It just along with the formative
19 assessments, interim academic assessments, we're bringing
20 in -- they would be perceived we got more assessments going
21 on here, right? Well, we've had some of that resolved and
22 facilitated. But that's why I totally have no problem with
23 this type of thing. This is what makes for academic
24 achievement. All of it does. Let's help our public
25 understand that we're not out -- we are -- we want to work



1 with everybody. We are not setting out to work at
2 everybody. That -- that to me is gonna be so key.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's move on and come
4 back to a few questions I think.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, if I just might
6 respond to that. I mean, I think that -- I think the point
7 is well taken in the communication and that balance is
8 critical. I do believe there are a lot of districts out
9 there that are wondering what this -- what types of
10 decisions the state Board will make. And so I think, as
11 much as you want to see what they bring forward which our
12 process certainly involves and -- and we encourage that to
13 happen, I think there are just districts that are also
14 saying what -- what -- what are the parameters that the
15 state Board is setting up. But I know that we have a
16 number of districts that are I think are eager to come
17 before you and share what their plans are.

18 MS. FLORES: So I'm just wanna understand
19 this. You -- you sent this out an hour before we were to
20 be here. We haven't looked at this, I haven't looked at
21 this. And I was waiting for actually for the past stuff
22 that has been said. And you want us to make a decision?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no. There are no
24 decisions to be made today.



1 MS. FLORES: No decision but even
2 understanding. I mean there are policy papers. I think
3 that, you know, you write a policy paper on -- on what you
4 think, is presented in a slide -- a slide review like this,
5 it's a one pager, two pager, or a three pager. I mean, the
6 guy who wrote this letter he did a better job. I'm sorry,
7 but you need to be a little bit more -- this goes from one
8 thing to another. It doesn't explicate really much. And -
9 - and I can don't think this is explaining much. If I had
10 possibly had this sometime before, I could be meaningful
11 and I could be, you know understanding what you guys are --
12 are -- are stating but it -- it doesn't. It, you know, we
13 need a little bit more time even a day or two to have had
14 this before. But to come in cold not to have read some
15 policy paper on, you know, what the steps are, what we
16 going to accomplish. And if you're doing this to a Board
17 Member, what do you think will happen on May the 4th if
18 it's not really out there. I don't think people are going
19 to understand.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores I
21 appreciate your comments. As the chairman has said, the
22 purpose of this study session was literally just to have a
23 conversation, what -- as part of the mechanics.

24 MS. FLORES: But you can't have a
25 conversation without having studied something like this.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: There's nothing new in there
2 Val.

3 MS. FLORES: I though we were going to have
4 something different and this looks like the same old --
5 same old that hasn't worked before.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- I think what
7 we're doing is try to lay out as many options as we can and
8 have an opportunity to discuss those options and to ask for
9 additional options as -- as appropriate. So Joyce.

10 MS. RANKIN: On this innovation plan rubric
11 for priority improvement. Is this something that you would
12 fill out on each school or district that we are looking at
13 -- at the moment? So you would have these areas filled in?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 MS. RANKIN: And then this is just -- the
16 template is just our work sheet where we can write in,
17 although you're going to put some stuff in there. And then
18 the contract is something after, isn't pretty much what
19 this is all about?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Plus -- plus
21 again, the sort of a protocol that we turn into a policy
22 about the -- I'm not sure that there's a term there about a
23 policy about exactly how you're making decisions across
24 this as you go through.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I would just love
2 to get any -- continue having this discussion, get your
3 feedback around the administrative procedures that you
4 might want to put into place around. How long do you want
5 to hear from each party? Do you want to make a decision
6 within same meeting or do you want to schedule them out so
7 that you have time to deliberate in between meetings? Am
8 just really just discussion get a new platform on the
9 template and on the contract. Do you have any feedback for
10 us? Can you let us know how we can continue to help you
11 and support you?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Off the top of my head,
14 knowing that I have the information X number of weeks
15 before hand. I would prefer a hearing process that goes
16 straight through. I won't even --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In one session.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- Yeah, I won't even tell
19 you the memory loss that occurs to me about three hours
20 after a Board meeting, much less three to four weeks. We
21 don't want to go there. It's just -- it will be -- it will
22 be very intense. So the temptation will be to lay it over.
23 As my colleague here likes to do, lay things over. But --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of my favorite
25 activities.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: But I think if we can, if we
2 don't overdo it. I mean I would feel really up. What
3 this?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not me.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I know. It's mine. I can't
6 shut it off. I don't think I want to in a day. I think
7 intense. I think this is a people thing, and we care about
8 people. So it's not -- it's not like doing the county work
9 and counting bridges and coming up with a decision. But
10 still I worry about putting it off. I also worry a little
11 bit about the political piece that can occur in between. I
12 mean, I want the community to know what's up and be, be
13 there to support their school district. I don't want -- I
14 -- I -- I worry about making it a too much prep.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What was your
16 recommendation for the year? No, I agree with you a
17 hundred percent. I'm just looking at the X, what would the
18 X be for you? Like a month ahead tops.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Pretty close. Yeah. Pretty
20 close, okay. I mean, for me not necessarily because I have
21 the -- I have the capacity to schedule my life so that I
22 can very intensely study Board stuff for a week or two.
23 But not all of us on the Board have that kind of
24 flexibility in our schedule. So we really do need to be
25 respectful and listen to Pam and Deb for example as to how



1 much in advance it would help them. Frankly, I don't think
2 I want to be the one to say that. But yeah, several weeks.
3 Partly because we might have -- as we read it, we might
4 have some questions to bring back to you to tell the
5 district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The 30 minutes, do you
7 like that?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Pardon.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The 30 minutes.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, I have no idea. Yeah,
11 you can say a lot in 30 minutes. It's the -- it's -- it's
12 when we get to that last 30 minutes that gets ugly
13 sometimes especially if we don't get questions.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Chairman Durham.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Chairman. That's one thing, I
17 -- we -- I mean, I'm assuming we will have another meeting
18 to discuss the process further but --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

20 MS. MAZANEC: -- of the concern I have, I
21 sometimes feel like a charter appeal that's awfully short,
22 30 minutes goes by fast. So things like a very important
23 task worth taking and I -- I don't like the idea, it's just
24 30 minutes and I recognize that it could be a lot of time
25 on (inaudible). I just wanted to throw that in am



1 concerned about only 30 minutes to argue their case looks
2 like pretty fast.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam, you know, I thought
4 about that. In fact, this amount of time is identical to
5 charter school hearings, whether it's a regular appeal, a
6 regular appeal or whatever else speak to. But the -- the
7 difference I think would be that during those 30 minutes
8 during charter school hearings, we can interrupt them and
9 maybe -- maybe on this one, we consider the fact that we
10 wouldn't be interrupting anybody during their full 30
11 minutes. That might help.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, can we have a question and
13 answer period after that?

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. So it could be --

15 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, well, that's a goo --
16 that's a good point.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: That might make it a little
18 bit more.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Plus, the way -- the way
20 this is laid out, exactly like total of an hour and a half.
21 I would expect there would be significant discussion about
22 what action to be taken, which is not included in this sort
23 of this time and process and that I can easily imagine
24 going on for extended periods of time on complicated
25 issues.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Looking at the schedule,
2 the one hand out page, schedule presentation, you know, we
3 -- we only do that so much talking, this process only has
4 so much time and at the same time, the thought of doing
5 four of these.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's two a day. We have
7 two days I think.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's pretty, it's pretty
9 overwhelming.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's too much.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I totally appreciate
12 what this means for everybody including you all. But man,
13 that's -- that's a pretty heavy load, and we do have
14 history of really not being able to work much at the end of
15 two eight or nine hours to do this.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I didn't say that.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are just humans all
18 of us but I would think if we had enough prep time, reading
19 time, considering and thinking time, as you would charter
20 hearings that would be the best way to, to start picturing
21 it, I don't know. I don't know three weeks. That's
22 actually longer than we have before some Board meetings to
23 think about certain things.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I might just add, I'm
25 -- I'm just thinking I think that, yeah, certainly, if you



1 just do the math on that, I think we're -- Pam and Debra on
2 slide 33. If we were just doing the math with 29 schools,
3 that's an awful lot. I do think though that in some cases
4 there may be some fairly contentious situations. But I do
5 think that in many cases, there -- there will be -- they
6 may be easy, but where the recommendation of a commissioner
7 of a state review panel and whatever a district brings
8 forward may be very, very well aligned and that might be an
9 easy decision for you all too if you feel confident enough
10 to go along with that, those recommendations.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I'm gonna chime
12 in on that too. We are -- we are proactively engaging with
13 districts right now to see what they want, their pathway to
14 be and see if -- if you were -- rigorously evaluating that
15 we're not going along with what they say. But if there --
16 if that alignment then we would come to you and you would
17 have your -- you -- for example, your template would all
18 give the same time, the same pathway and that would make
19 things easier. And to that end too, we actually just
20 issued a new -- our appeal for a new pathway planning
21 grant, where districts may receive a small stipend to plan
22 for what pathway they want to, to be selected for them to
23 offer them to select and we would work with them with that.
24 So part of receiving the funds is that they work with CDE
25 in a consultation individualized manner. And so at the end



1 of that process to the goal of that grant is really to come
2 to you all with a plan that we think.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, we just add all
4 those. So again, this is the purpose of this innovation wo
5 -- work that we have so that, what -- what we don't want
6 for you or for districts is to come forward with innovation
7 plans saying this is our pathway and for them to really not
8 adequately address the needs of that the school. So our
9 goal as Brenda is saying is to proactively work with
10 districts and schools to say and to help them revise those
11 plans so that when they do come here, we can stand and
12 probably, you know, in most cases, say yes, we do believe
13 this is rigorous enough of a plan. Okay. All right.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In terms of the
15 template, how are you all feeling about that as a concept?
16 Is it something that will be useful?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: The template for the
18 presentation.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: That will be for exam, you
21 read it. I'd like to think about to see if there's
22 anything else in it, but what I do see I like. I think
23 it's very helpful. Again, I want -- I want to know where
24 are your kids today? What do they need to make progress?
25 And it's okay to talk about what the adults are gonna do.



1 They also have to say why this is going to account for more
2 learning or a better climate or any of the other
3 characteristics that they identify that needs to change in
4 their community.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any discussion in the or
6 among these districts about involving students in these
7 conversations at any level maybe point.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's for the high
9 school.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I'm sure that
11 that's happening in a number of districts I know. I
12 believe in overall central in that process that they have
13 been going through it. There have been students involved.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wondered if there was
15 any, a little bit of bumps-problems in that she said.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, Chairman
17 Durham.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just would like to add
20 that, I have a -- you all know I -- I don't make -- make a
21 thing of it, but I do have a lot of schools on turn around,
22 and I have visited a lot of them. And the ones that I have
23 to highlight is Lake County. Lake County, I visited two
24 times. One of the times with the parents and all the
25 teachers. Another time with the superintendent. I talked



1 to the superintendent the phone. The first thing I asked
2 is, "Did you reach out to CDE to get help?" And she said,
3 "That's where I got all my help." I reached out because
4 she said she was just scared. Superintendent said this, "I
5 just did not want to have my school at the bottom." She
6 was a relatively a new superintendent. And she said, "CDE
7 gave me the direction and gave me the help every time I
8 called them, they were there." I have had other schools
9 say to me they have not reached out for CDE and CDE did not
10 reach out to them. But I find that those schools have not
11 made progress. So I just would like to say that I -- I am
12 very pleased with having a very successful school along
13 this course and thank CDE for helping me.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good. All right for the
15 next, shall we -- were only in the presentation.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are actually through
17 the presentation. We just --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's good.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- wanted to you to
20 continue to have discussions and get your thoughts and
21 feedback. We could -- we could also take a break and maybe
22 come back and see what further discussions --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When -- when we come
24 back talk to us about this. What does all this say? Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Let's take 10
2 minutes right away and do that, come back at 10 minutes to
3 four. And the first -- the first question that was asked
4 was to -- Still yeah, there you are.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are all here.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are all present more
7 or less on the account of four is to go through these
8 criteria that are listed across the summary of the state
9 review panels. You can go through this criteria kind of
10 explain what the criteria are, and then how those the
11 ratings on those criteria yield the final recommendation.
12 So who would like to handle that as the first question?
13 Yes, Lisa.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's come back.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So thanks so much for
17 asking the question. I kind of relate that to this
18 (inaudible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Come back, come back to
21 that. So those few criteria. The first criteria comes
22 from the law. Actually, and they -- if you -- if you take
23 a closer look at them, they really do focus on looking at
24 is the leadership in place to pull off a turnaround



1 situation and then is the process there within (inaudible)
2 to pull it off. And then finally --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And these are the -- the
4 comments essentially from the state review, the independent
5 state review panels that concluded that where (inaudible)
6 the leadership is not adequate to affect a turnaround and
7 improve results.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then, just to --
9 just to explain that a little bit more, that space on
10 looking at documents that were only available to them, and
11 then also from a site visit. So based on the evidence that
12 was given to them, the rating was not effective in that
13 particular example. So this means data is the key. You
14 know, if -- if you were to be walking there today but given
15 the evidence of what they were --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's an opinion of a --
17 a team that was sent in to do that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Exactly.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so they -- they go
21 through at pace on the document of your site visit, and
22 then do a final rating on each of the six criteria. I'm --
23 I'd say that one is the most tricky, which is there is a
24 necessity that school district remaining in operation
25 serves students. Because it gets -- sometimes when you get



1 a really small isolated district, it might be that there's
2 no other alternatives in the area, or it might mean that
3 it's such a unique setting, such a unique population of
4 students that only just picked school could serve it. So
5 that's kind of what they are wrestling with. But I would
6 say that was a difficult one but certainly, one to keep an
7 eye on.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As they -- once they get
9 those readings then the state review panelists will then
10 take a look at if there's a prevalence of not effective or
11 even in developing, they will each start to look more
12 closely at recommending closure or charter. And if there -
13 - if it tends to be a little bit more on that green and
14 orange side or yellow side affected or highly affected,
15 then they probably be looking a little bit more at
16 innovation or even management. Again, because they've got
17 leadership and infrastructure in place and something like
18 innovation have a greater likelihood of taking root.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Talk to me about how much
20 they wrestled. This is the sort of thing that they are
21 kind of in agreement or do they go back and forward? Do
22 they cite examples of what they see?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So in terms of how much
24 they -- well, remember I am not there when they are making
25 their final recommendation. I don't want --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So you -- you don't hear,
2 though.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. And again, that's
4 all for good because they need (inaudible) we don't want
5 any perceptions of that CDE is swayed one way or another.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But the evident to say
8 that 0.2 is in the report that you guys have.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's, you know, that's
11 why (inaudible) reports from each school on each district.

12 (Overlapping)

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are trying to find
14 as many complicated examples as to what led them to that
15 particular sub-reading and then to their final
16 recommendation. You kind of think what- -- what I want to
17 point out is -- so while the reading -- the sub-readings in
18 school will point them to certain direction, whether it's,
19 you know, charter all the way to -- to innovation, they
20 still attain the context into consideration so that they
21 would not recommend the charter. For example, in a really,
22 tiny, isolated community where charter schools just
23 probably don't make sense.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the only school,
25 you know, that would be like their middle school, and then,



1 sort of, breaks up their entire school system, and -- or
2 they can't, hopefully, they can attract, you know,
3 (inaudible) So things like that will be taken into
4 consideration. So it's not a -- if you're all have read,
5 that will be a charter school plot out formula. It's --
6 this is where we would start to look and run the context --
7 their context and then their recommendation from there.
8 The -- the -- the local Board and leadership preferred
9 pathway also comes into consideration (inaudible) as well.
10 So there's a willingness to do, you know, for example, they
11 may actually take a closer look at that resolve.

12 (Inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: If you recommend the
15 charter, even if it's in a non-front range, not close bi-
16 place, there's the opportunity for support from either CSI,
17 or from the League of Charter Schools. There isn't
18 analogous support system with schools' intervention. So
19 you guys are it.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, ma'am.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So you got the (inaudible)
22 to really think about is, what's the level of support and I
23 don't actually know how to --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We need to get a whole
25 new reports generation (inaudible).



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, that's it. Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, Jane.

3 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Criterion 2, what --
4 is there a set rules to what constitutes the
5 infrastructure?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So good question.
7 There's -- there seemingly kind of had a set of protocol
8 with that in question (inaudible) area (inaudible). So if
9 you'd like (inaudible) protocols available to you so you
10 could feel like kind of questions they're asking, I'd be
11 happy to share this with you.

12 MS. GOFF: Well, cause we got a nice report,
13 recently. Are those in there? If they are, don't bother.
14 Don't -- yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It should be.

16 MS. GOFF: I just wondered if -- I can't
17 remember if they were.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Then, we would
19 you give (inaudible) of what's underneath. How -- how we
20 look forward to interpret (inaudible) and how to dig in
21 the prime evident of an infrastructure that's adequate to
22 support the school. You know, what's behind that? What
23 would you ask about?

24 MS. GOFF: I can't -- it's one -- it's one
25 of the -- is there something about community?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nope. There's
2 absolutely a community outburst that we'll figure out. And
3 something to wear the -- I think the panel, when it first
4 was in going that would not to call, that was not an
5 automatic focus group, and I think what they learned
6 quickly, the fact it needs to be offered as, which if you
7 gather community Members together, we've all do (inaudible)
8 because community matters.

9 MS. GOFF: Shouldn't they do a community
10 work?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, they've done that.
12 They're good at that.

13 MS. GOFF: Could you give us an example of
14 one that we should read very thoroughly, just to understand
15 the process as opposed to focusing on the recommendations?
16 Just so we understand.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there anyone in
18 particular?

19 MS. GOFF: Yeah. The one that you think is
20 a really -- a good one. You don't have to answer right
21 now.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of them?

23 MS. GOFF: Really? Any one of them? It's
24 gonna have all -- because these are all different
25 districts, so I -- my guess is, that the reports are gonna



1 be really different. So I'm looking for one that is sort
2 of a great prototype that shows a deep dive into all of
3 these concerns.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Happily go in a little
5 bit more, if you'd like. And then, they can write
6 (inaudible).

7 MS. GOFF: Let's just look at -- look at --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually, if you think
9 about it, (inaudible) I know there was that idea of doing
10 certain mock run through, maybe, but I can (inaudible) into
11 that (inaudible) go and focus in on the line. The one --
12 can you give me a little bit of criteria of what you've
13 been looking for?

14 MS. GOFF: I think it's the rustling I'm
15 looking for.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Where they're --
17 they're struggling?

18 MS. GOFF: Right. Where there is a dis --
19 included in the report is a discussion on the various
20 items. What is the evidence that brought us to this
21 conclusion? What were the concerns that we had about this
22 particular attributes? And we came- -- we came to a
23 certain point, that here's the- -- here's the weighing that
24 we did.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 MS. GOFF: I think that might help me
2 understand a little better.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll -- we'll -- we'll
4 (inaudible) a little bit, and I think I already have a
5 couple ideas.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll dig in, and come
8 to agreement in a moment the recommendations (inaudible).

9 MS. GOFF: Just wondered, for this purpose
10 rather than for the purpose of kind of looking at it and
11 looking at the results and the recommendations.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, so I was just
13 wondering if you between post, after, for instance, kids
14 that are in that district 10 years hence, and I'm sure that
15 maybe any district like Denver that would be difficult
16 because it's very large, but in small districts, the polls,
17 I believe, has been show that their kids are doing well.
18 They have good jobs. They have whatever. I think we
19 should include that. I mean, because that's -- that's what
20 you really want. You want successful citizens. Citizens
21 that are doing well. And I mean, all of this is that --
22 that they will.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we know that people
24 who are Mensa or doubled Mensa, sometimes are people that
25 are not doing well. You know, the research is out there.



1 That you may be very, very bright, but yet, you're not
2 doing well. So -- and people that have not succeeded well
3 in school are doing well. And I think we need to have a
4 quoting too that may quote the kid at the end being clever.
5 You know, a community was doing a good job and that's going
6 to show too, 10, 20, if we can. I think some -- some
7 districts can show you that. And -- and -- and I'll a test
8 score does not constitute to that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So regarding Angelika's
10 request, is there something that's broader than from what
11 we've got as the summary from the (inaudible).

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what you received,
13 the first couple pages, would be the overall summary that
14 provides their rationale for the final recommendation. So
15 those first two pages are grant or just the overall
16 summary. After that, you'll see a link to your report,
17 about 15 pages that summarizes the site with it, get some
18 ratings for that, and then provide all the evidence that
19 used for those ratings, and then a separate one for the
20 most recent document review that they've done, and again,
21 the ratings, and then give evidences to why they gave us
22 ratings. So there's -- you can go deeper and deeper with
23 those reports.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that what's in what
25 you're talking about?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have that.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're about to --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, you have that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you reply

7 (inaudible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. That's good.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so I'm -- I have to

10 find the (inaudible) e-mail.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think (inaudible) one

12 that we can pull out, and maybe, even talk about it

13 together.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that is a very

15 good idea.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then, we get to end

17 with how the kid was rustled with it, and then maybe we can

18 we talk about it in the follow up, you know, during a

19 (inaudible).

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is pretty

21 troubling. And I really need to -- I feel like I need to

22 understand that process that went on here better to figure

23 out whether to have something that's read all the way

24 across, and then have the recommendation be management is



1 thinking. What? Why? If nothing good's going on here,
2 management's not gonna come in and fix it.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean, you'd lean
4 more towards closure or charter?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Something.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's a small
7 district. So --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I guess they know
9 that there's not a necessity for it to remain open.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which, for a small
11 district, surprises me.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I know. I know.
13 I'm -- I'm --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that would be sort of
15 (inaudible) in that instance, they would have said, if they
16 think, there's some high performing schools --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nearby.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- nearby.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And that's
20 something that we should be thinking --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are rural areas
22 with transportation issues already. If I was a general, I
23 don't know this particular district but I would guess that
24 they already have kids on a bus for a pretty good period of
25 time.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I think, actually,
2 to end all of his point earlier, the council are going in,
3 looking out what is really about for a student and all the
4 adults around, and we're gonna have to figure it out. That
5 was really their (inaudible).

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, that's -- that's
7 good. That would mean the recommendation doesn't- --
8 doesn't square with -- it does not appear to square with
9 the finding.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this team that you're
11 talking about, will it be a team from the University of
12 Virginia?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You are -- Are you
15 referring to the conversation by Cortes earlier?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I'm talking about -
17 -

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The management?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're talking about team
20 system going and the review panel, who are they?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're local. They're
22 local.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The review panel local.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you give us a
25 quick (inaudible) make up of the average review panel?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. So all the
2 panelists are Colorado-based. They're all experts from
3 within the states and it's a variety of (inaudible)
4 superintendent, teachers, administrators, what have you.
5 I'm also from a variety of locations. So we're all urban
6 expertise. So we have some that are experts in online
7 programs. Some that are experts in ELL depends on that
8 particular school or districts. So we really try
9 (inaudible) They go one team for two. We will cover, at
10 least two people, who are hearing all that we've said that
11 been listed in the documents.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Two people who are gonna
13 experts in all that you just mentioned.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who, we try to match the
15 amount given in the demographic and upon the request from
16 the district. So we do contact the districts ahead of
17 time. They -- if there's a particular expertise area that
18 you want emphasized (inaudible) Yes, we want literacy
19 experts. We want ELL experts. We want --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Let's do the call.
21 (Inaudible).

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is to go in and
23 evaluate so that they can provide any kind of grading and
24 recommendations to do that, not going in to fix it.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And this -- and this is at
2 the end?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. This is just
4 purely to provide that evaluation to give you, guys.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Like there's all that money
6 to spend before to -- to help. I mean, this, to me looks
7 like a punitive system. It is an assistance that's helping
8 all of (inaudible). And I know we've had these districts
9 for five years but I don't know, we -- we -- we helped
10 change and sometimes those districts have another
11 superintendent. They could have different superintendents.
12 So even within those five years, there may have been three
13 different superintendents. So I mean, is that taken into
14 account? And maybe, you don't even have the same
15 principles with those schools. (Inaudible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: And yet, you're trying.
18 You're trying to do that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That content is
20 absolutely some of the evidence we're gathering. But
21 again, the focus is on what is needed for the student. And
22 if there's (inaudible) on superintendent. So that's
23 something about that. That -- that they are trying to
24 (inaudible) so that, you would understand better that
25 (inaudible) or what's not working there.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: But wouldn't it be better if
2 we had maybe a three-year cycle, where in three years, you
3 would go away and look at policy such as what Boards and
4 superintendents are doing, and look at how the money you
5 spend another year, and then, the third year here, you
6 would go in, and look at the curricula, how the curricula,
7 and how it's being taught. And so in this sense, within
8 those -- I wouldn't even say three years, beginning three
9 years, and every three years, there's -- I just -- we -- we
10 have, maybe, 50 -- 50 weeks which you could do that or if
11 we have four year cycles where maybe the Board needs
12 control then (inaudible) understanding because this just
13 can't, you know, move superintendents around.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have to have some
15 stability. And speaking of our kids, kids need stability.
16 They really do need stability, and when you have so much
17 change, it -- it's not good for, for kids that are
18 economically stressed, or kids that may have violence, kids
19 who may have a number of those things. And we need to have
20 that security and a pliant that has from low 5% of schools
21 in a state. You're gonna have those districts come up over
22 and over again. And that's not going to be stable. We
23 need to help. We need stability.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I might just say I'm --
25 I mean I think what you're describing has a lot of the



1 support work that we do. The State Review Panel just to
2 reemphasize is really at the -- towards the very end of
3 this clock and it's, it's, it's designed --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, that's what I'm
5 saying. Where we should be at the very beginning.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This -- this -- this
7 piece in particular is just one component of what we're
8 talking about. This is designed to be evaluative. But
9 there is, there is multiple years of support that we, that
10 we offer in a variety of different ways but I think do a
11 lot of what you're describing.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Some of these districts have
13 had millions of dollars in federal help previously, and
14 there's been a lot of work, it hasn't changed in all cases,
15 it has changed in some cases. And it's been an on -- it's
16 not just suddenly now, it's been ongoing for some time.
17 And there are some districts that don't, don't want CDE to
18 come in. And honestly, I -- I wouldn't want it to be any
19 different, if they don't want to help them then they're
20 accountable to the legislature that said, "Hey we'll give
21 you tax dollars, you gotta, you gotta do something or these
22 are the consequences." This didn't come from us, this came
23 from the legislature.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Quick over review kind
25 like sorted high level, here and there?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, yeah. They're all
2 -- yeah, I know. Yeah. Somewhere.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we approved the
4 list I think actually.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can't remember
6 (inaudible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Further questions from
8 the Board on, on any of the elements here that -- going
9 forward?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. I just wanna
11 (inaudible) to some of, some of this like, like the
12 template I kind of like think about a little bit. And then
13 I would love to do my homework on this one. I don't think
14 I've done my homework on this one enough to where I really
15 understand.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) as well. I
17 -- I haven't had the chance to dive deep into it and you
18 know, look at the research and figure out, you know, what
19 does the research say as far as the highest leverage point
20 in this turnaround effort. And is that represented on this
21 group with that I needed a little more research.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I think -- and I
24 think if probably, if we could have what, what do we think
25 if that sample or a representative sample or reports from



1 the committees one of the -- that we could -- be provided
2 and then issue, all be encouraged to read so we kind of
3 understand how they get to where they're -- how, how they
4 got to where they, they got to. We could take all of those
5 recommendations and then adapt as a commissioner probably
6 has not produced a report yet on any of this, is that
7 correct?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because we were on the -
10 - we're still on the timeout.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: But he could tell us
13 (inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I mean, so yeah,
15 commissioner might tell us what he thinks is important at
16 some point and what else, any body?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll -- I'll try to make
18 it just basic. Overall, the Innovation Schools concept, I
19 have based but I'm not so sure whether districts have asked
20 for it or try on behalf of schools or themselves, without
21 knowing how far the work gets out, without, you know, this,
22 this whole notion of districts that are not reaching out to
23 see the more -- many ways, but I think someone around here,
24 a little bit, that they, that they are -- I'm looking on a
25 lot of innovation recommendations, and I guess at some



1 point, I would like to know what the overall rest of that
2 word is. When, when districts apply for innovation, what
3 is new? What is innovative?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because at times, I -- I
5 -- I have a question. Is this a good way? Is this a good
6 outlet for just getting waivers? And what's the
7 replacement of new on that? Trying to tighten the belt I
8 think it's, it's the whole -- our whole category of
9 improvement. We've chatted about it loosely in the order
10 you see in there, but I think it's five accreditation rate,
11 which could change, if all the other change is done. But
12 what is that improvement category? I -- I -- I don't know.
13 I don't know. Where will a school -- where does a school
14 find it's motivations incentives that's inspiration? I
15 have no answer. And I'm just curious about that.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: May I remind you of the
17 study that University of Colorado, that Denver kids for
18 Denver Public Schools. And what they found was, that there
19 were two things that were staying again. The first thing
20 was that teachers who had to stay behind the Innovation
21 Schools had a good self-concept. The second thing that
22 stood out was that, most of these Innovation Schools didn't
23 do anything innovative. They were just -- they just went
24 along what was being done before and nothing creative and
25 innovative was being done. So I don't know if, you know,



1 this, this was a study about three years ago and things may
2 have changed and things --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, there's a report
4 that we just got that I -- that I read with this last Board
5 meeting. And it has been not only what happened up to last
6 year but it also included the data from the, from the park
7 assessment. And it shows growth in some schools of
8 innovation and it shows a lot of growth than others and
9 well -- can I finish? The comment that I made at the Board
10 meeting last time was, can we peel that one a little more
11 and find out those schools, those schools of innovation
12 that showed growth -- student growth, what's unique about
13 them compared to the schools that didn't? And there are
14 schools there that are on the clock, and there are schools
15 that are doing very well. And they use time differently.
16 They have different hiring practices and then some, some
17 other things, and in some cases it's made a difference, in
18 some cases it hasn't. And that's one thing that I think we
19 wanna learn is whether we can actually identify particular
20 characteristics that even have made for improvements with
21 kids.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Well the researcher is out
23 there, I think we should look at that. For more schools
24 that do well, what they do, I think the research is out



1 there. We don't have to you know, kind of figure out what
2 we are looking.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It -- it just become
4 kind of a taken for granted in the tapestry word and I, I
5 would hope that districts and schools that are looking at
6 innovation have a real grasp of what that means to them,
7 and -- and then it's got to be new. That's the basis of
8 that word, is the word new. And I'm -- I'm having trouble
9 with it. And so to be at this particular very important
10 point in our decision making coming up, I need to have a
11 lot there, I've got to have a better handle on how I think
12 about that word. And -- and I got some things I want to
13 see within these plans. It's truly new, but it have --
14 it's got to be -- it's got to be pretty power.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Case studies says none is
16 (inaudible). Something I asked, case studies that maybe we
17 might look at. It's, it's not a new concept, it's been
18 around. And it's something that, you know, that been done
19 by States too.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At some point --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I know it's been --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably going to want
23 to look at the law again.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: That too. Well, I think
25 we've been chatting about that for a while but we'll --



1 we'll take a look at the law because that might give us
2 help. And Charter Schools shouldn't be the only -- Charter
3 Schools shouldn't be the only option and maybe Innovation
4 Schools shouldn't be the only option either. Maybe we
5 should just give them time. Give them time. And I know in
6 five years -- but five years with as many changes as some
7 of the schools have gone through, it's, it's not enough.
8 That's why I think that we need to work with words, we need
9 to work with -- we need to work with Boards administrators
10 in -- in -- those -- in those districts.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam, if you can do
12 through --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And communities.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we need some more
15 stuff done?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we need --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we need anything else
18 done?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair may I -- may
20 I --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Comments in wrap up?

23 Great. So I think, just to wrap up and summarize our
24 conversations say I wanted to compare some of the things
25 we've heard today, that the idea of the template is useful



1 and we'll continue to work on that, it's a work in
2 progress. And that the idea of the progress monitoring
3 contract is also something that we will all be amenable to
4 continue to work on that as well. The one question I did
5 want is to get clarification on was regarding with on the
6 screen around the -- the Board policy options, your
7 administrative procedures. Would that be something that
8 you would want to have a Board -- a formal Board policy on?
9 And that's something that Tony and Bizy and I can work on
10 and -- and maybe shoot you over a draft or you, you don't
11 have to have a Board policy. No we just wanted to kind of
12 get your thoughts on that.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: In other words be consistent
14 about these?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the answer to
17 that question needs to be asked just for a due process
18 perspective so they were not vulnerable on question of
19 providing a district with due process. We're trying to,
20 trying to establish procedure that'll work, and be
21 effective and then I think we need to stick with it. So
22 the answer to that question, there needs to be yes,
23 probably query it for the administrative.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: However Steve, if we, if we
2 have a district that comes forward, and based on staff
3 commissioner recommendations, and our reading, everyone has
4 dotted their eyes and cross their teams and we're feeling
5 go forth. We've supplied with something in here that --
6 that allows us to have an abbreviated. I don't wanna say
7 we don't have a hearing because I think the public ought to
8 know, but I'm not sure we've got to do it in hour and a
9 half. And I think, when I think about having that
10 particular piece that if everything has been resolved, it's
11 not a good word. Agreed to on how to move forward, that
12 maybe we don't need an hour and a half for that particular
13 or more for that particular both.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe they will find
15 some exception policies.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: That's my suggestion.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Thank you
19 very much well versed.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh shush, don't use that
21 word. The other thing we've heard was that we -- we know
22 with the Board policy will -- will work on that but there
23 needs to be time built in for deliberation and being
24 cognizant that that may rave in the discussion a little
25 bit. We will work on refining this calendar so that there



1 are necessarily for each meeting but also wanted to let you
2 know that there are still 20. We will try to get scheduled
3 before June and we'll, we'll rework this a little bit. I
4 was reserving May and June expecting that some would happen
5 then, but just trying to -- saying we conduct on the
6 schedule a couple for those months, we can also schedule
7 some for November and that would -- it would lessen the
8 number at each meeting. So we will, you know, work with
9 the idea not to kinda think about how to calendar that out.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: When do the districts get
11 their data for this year's?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They'll get their
13 preliminary input by -- in September, we're looking at.
14 Then there's the request to reconsider process where they
15 can move forward. If the solution is not to bring forward,
16 maybe we can start sooner if districts wanted to come
17 sooner. But I think districts on final -- due districts is
18 final in November eight, supposedly December. So after the
19 November meeting all of that is final, and then we can --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So that's, that's a very
21 appropriate schedule that you have.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Absolutely. We
23 wanted to make sure that there's something we know like
24 we've been talking about the truth of accountability and
25 the plan phase and setting those cut scores, how those get



1 set, how you all decide what average or number of
2 households or in the districts sort of (inaudible)
3 improvement happening.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's too many
5 districts. Do you actually mean either four districts or
6 four schools? So that's one, two, three, four, five,
7 that's 20 districts. So that's correct. So there's 19
8 unique districts but I was assuming one of that, I was just
9 using some more numbers. But I was assuming one might have
10 to come twice, they have a lot of schools on the clock.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So it may or may not be a
12 district that's on the clock. It could be a district
13 that's on the clock or it may not be a district that's on
14 the clock. But it's the schools that belong to that
15 district.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Schools within the
17 district.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Within the district.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or it could be that --
20 it could be that the district is ready to -- is prepared to
21 share with you their plans for some other schools, but
22 perhaps not for their district. That maybe need to do a
23 separate presentation, the district as a whole.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Could be a nightmare.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just a heads up. Just a
2 heads up that January, potentially, we will have brand new
3 Board Members and committee.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That's --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They need to learn
7 quickly.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: They are well --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ask Joyce.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Don't -- don't make me.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You -- you -- you may
12 get another reason that we wanna be sure that we've got
13 this procedure.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Pro bono.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Streamlined.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no orientation
17 occurred.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably a good reason
19 to ensure that there is structure in this, in this -- in
20 the entire beginning to end of this process.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you all very, very
23 much for your time for coming down here. We really
24 appreciate it. Thank you Mr. Chair.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you for all the work
2 you guys. Thanks.

3 (Meeting adjourned)



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 25th day of October, 2018.

/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