



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO

June 8, 2016, Denver Schools, Rulemaking

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 8, 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 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible) of order for
2 consideration of item 16.01, request from Denver Public
3 Schools on behalf of Creative Community Challenge, Denver
4 Green School, Ashley Elementary and the Cole Arts and
5 Sciences Academy. Dr. Flores you had a question about this
6 if you'd like to proceed.

7 MS. FLORES: Well, I think I'm going to do a
8 brief presentation of -- of the --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Microphone.

10 MS. FLORES: Oh, sorry. I think Denver
11 Public Schools is going to do a -- a brief presentation on
12 their preliminary learning network, which is a new
13 governance system that they are thinking about.

14 MS. MAZANEC: So thank you, Dr. Flores. Mr.
15 Chair, may I?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Pam, please proceed.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Misti Ruthven, the executive
18 director of innovation. Today we have a few guests from
19 Denver Public Schools with us. We have Greg Hatcher, we're
20 he is with legislative of Government affairs, and we have
21 (Inaudible), who is executive director of Portfolio
22 Management. And I'm (inaudible) to answer any questions
23 that you may have regarding the item for Denver Public
24 Schools and the innovation zone.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Who would like to
2 proceed?

3 MR. HATCHER: So I think Mr. Chair, what we
4 will do is just give an highlighted overview of the
5 innovation zone and then we'll stop there and then pause
6 for any questions and (inaudible), if that's okay?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

8 MS. RUTHVEN: So Denver Public Schools is
9 seeking the states approval of our first Innovation zone
10 application. This is an application that's been brought
11 forward for four of our elementary schools that will be
12 entering this zone. With really the goal being to provide
13 them an opportunity to continue to grow and expand and
14 improve outcomes for students and specifically move from
15 good to great.

16 So these are all schools that have been
17 showing incredible improvement or have been doing really
18 well on our school performance framework and are seeking to
19 continue to expand the ways in which they're able to serve
20 students even better. As part of this innovation zone the
21 schools are seeking some additional waivers from the state
22 which is why we're bringing it forward today. They will
23 still be under the authority of our school Board but we
24 will be entering into a agreement through an MOU with a
25 third party that will be providing some additional supports



1 to the schools that are in the zone. But our Board of
2 Education will remain responsible for these schools, will
3 have oversight of these schools and will have the non-
4 delegable duties of ensuring that schools are performing at
5 incredible levels as we enter into this relationship of our
6 first Innovation zone.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Dr. Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Okay. My concern and having
9 read this and then having attended several meetings, excuse
10 me, in Denver and hearing from parents, especially parents
11 from that particular zone, and also teachers. So this is
12 parent and teacher meetings that I have been attending.
13 And you know, your -- one of the questions that I asked
14 your superintendent was, "So why are you coming to the
15 Board, you've had zones before?" And they said, well they
16 have -- you have had zones before but now this is a zone.
17 And they said that for this zone, you had to come to us and
18 possibly it's because of an MOU that this nonprofit that
19 just came about which is the Luminary Learning Network it's
20 501(c)(3), it's a nonprofit.

21 And what they're doing that's really very
22 different is that they have -- they're going to experiment
23 with a different governance model. So, yes there are
24 charter schools that have their own governance structure
25 but this is getting together of several schools that are,



1 some of them are, innovation schools but it's going to take
2 it to a different level. So you have this nonprofit which
3 is the Gates Foundation -- the Gates Family Foundation.

4 Mary Seawell, asked -- goes to Massachusetts
5 and asks for this outfit. It's called Empower Schools to
6 Help. So it brings together three -- four entities, excuse
7 me. It's the Luminary Foundation, it's the Massachusetts
8 outfit, it's -- well those are together, it's DPS and then
9 there's the committee of sort of another Board that's going
10 to be created. So I'm thinking, you know, and this is what
11 parents and teachers are saying you're just creating
12 another overseer. We already have in Denver four separate
13 districts. We have four separate districts and you have
14 the Northwest -- it may be five, but there are -- and
15 there's a superintendent, Associate Superintendent that
16 looks over that and then there's other entities.

17 So I mean, to me it seems that you're
18 working more with the administration than with the kids. I
19 mean, what Denver needs seriously, looking at it, having
20 attended on these schools, is you need a lower teacher
21 people ratio. I mean you cannot do 32, 37, 38 kids in
22 hard-to-serve schools and I'm talking about poor kids, kids
23 that are homeless, The Dora Moore School. I mean, that is
24 a school that serves children that are homeless. Diana
25 DeGette's a -- a person who is responsible for policy.



1 Just -- she hired somebody who came in, they apparently had
2 a home here, they moved immediately to the Cherry Creek. I
3 mean their kids were in schools with 38. This is what she
4 presented at a parent meeting. So -- and this is -- this
5 is not just an isolated case this is happening all over
6 Denver.

7 And here we have one company after another
8 company coming in to do -- to oversee and trains
9 supervisors, to train administrators, now a relay is coming
10 in to train teachers. Seriously we need to think about
11 kids and stopping this what I think is churn, churn, churn.
12 You know you can't have just go on and on and -- and create
13 and try to create being the first school in the nation --
14 this is how it was described to me by the superintendent,
15 would be the first school district in the country who would
16 have such a governance model. And you know, we need to --
17 DPS is going to reallocate funds to this learning zone, to
18 this Luminary Learning Network.

19 So we're talking about moneys as well. And
20 you know, and this means a lot of shuffling around, a lot
21 of -- it's not going to do good things for kids. When
22 research is clear on this, that to serve kids who are poor,
23 to serve kids who are limited English proficient, to serve
24 kids who are minority and who are specially ed, you are
25 going to need to cut the size down of teacher-pupil ratio



1 in elementary school, and maybe high school is another
2 thing. But this is something that needs to be done and I -
3 - I'm not just talking to you from, you know, the reaches
4 of -- the brain matter here, it's -- it's brain matter
5 that's been in various meetings. So after, you know,
6 looking and rereading and reading I just -- I just can't go
7 along with this. I'm sorry.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Just to clarify briefly Dr.
9 Flores, is your question how will this help students?

10 MS. FLORES: No, it's a statement. I'm not
11 -- I'm not asking.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Great.

13 MS. FLORES: It doesn't even tell us how
14 it's going to help students. It just says -- it makes
15 these broad statements, by 2020 the innovation -- Denver's
16 Innovation Schools will be up to, whatever. Principals
17 sign off, teachers sign off on all this stuff but yet there
18 is no strategies. I don't see any strategies that are
19 going to get kids to -- to -- to learn. There's nothing
20 about reading, nothing about hiring these people that are
21 going to be super teachers, nothing about teachers it's all
22 about administration and governance. Putting another
23 governance system on another governance system, on another
24 governance system.



1 And I just don't think that's the way you
2 get kids that are not performing and I know that they've --
3 I know these schools have done a great job of improving
4 academic learning but it's -- I just don't -- I just don't
5 see it really working. And I know that we're going to get
6 more. I know that Pueblo -- I mean it -- it comes down to
7 where principals are allowing people that are not
8 certified, they're not supervisors, they don't have a
9 supervisory certificate, they're not -- they don't have a -
10 - a --- a principal certificate and then they're -- they're
11 allowed to go in and supervise and also evaluate teachers.
12 And I don't think that's right, I'm sorry.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you, Dr. Flores. Do you
14 have a question before our --

15 MS. FLORES: No. I just wanted to make that
16 statement. Many others have questions.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Any other questions?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't have a question. I
19 have a comment and then a motion. My comment is that we
20 hear a lot -- we hear a lot that the innovation schools
21 aren't innovative. And I appreciate the effort to actually
22 be innovative and try something different. So the motion
23 that I'd like to make is that we --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry. Repeat
2 everything.

3 MS. FLORES: Do you need to make an -- do
4 you need to make that before --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, I --

6 MS. FLORES: -- we have a -- No. I'm gonna
7 make a motion.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: First I want to say that I
9 appreciate that this is actually something innovative. Not
10 everything is gonna be -- everything that's tried is going
11 to have those results you expect but I encourage Denver to
12 keep being innovative. I really appreciate that this is a
13 new try and I've visited at least one of those schools so
14 I'm excited for you. So I'd like to move that we honor the
15 request of Denver Public Schools on behalf of Creative
16 Community Challenge, Denver Green School, Ashley Elementary
17 and Cole Arts Elementary waivers.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And seconded by Ms.
19 Rankin. Further discussion? Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: This is kind of a legal
21 question, is -- can someone review our responsibilities as
22 far as innovation status. In other words, this kind of
23 relates to waivers some applications are essentially, we're
24 required to approve them because of the nature of the
25 waiver process. But could you -- this is a request for



1 innovation status, right? Innovation zone. Could you just
2 review the legalities around our approval of this and what
3 the basis of that authority is.

4 MR. DILL: Since this is -- this is a
5 request for additional waivers. My understanding is that
6 the intention -- the intention is to align the waivers that
7 are previously received from each of these innovations
8 schools so that every school in this zone has the same
9 waivers. However the -- the only legal standard in statute
10 for approving the waivers on a plan like this is the
11 following; that -- that the State Board shall approve them
12 unless the State Board concludes that the submitted plan is
13 likely to result in a decrease in academic achievement in
14 the innovation schools for innovation school zones or is
15 not physically fit. So it's -- it -- it tends to be a -- a
16 fairly low bar in terms of the statutory scheme.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

18 MS. FLORES: I know this Board. So it'll
19 probably be approved but is it -- it -- can we put a limit
20 as to when they can return? Let's say two years, they will
21 return to us in two years to see how -- what progress they
22 have made academically in -- in these schools. And
23 hopefully we'll raise the academics to 50 percent as
24 supposed to 20 percent or whatever it is right now.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Hatcher, (inaudible)
2 ahead.

3 MR. HATCHER: Mr. Chair, I just (inaudible),
4 and for Dr. Flores as well, I just wanted as Mr. Dill said,
5 I just want to clarified that the four schools that are
6 coming forward are currently innovation schools, say to
7 prove innovation schools that you guys renew and have
8 already improved and so this is them coming together as a
9 zone to work together as innovation schools. And currently
10 in Denver Public Schools, Dr. Flores I know you're familiar
11 with, we have a process of every three to five years of
12 schools and networks coming back to us for re-approval
13 which then come back to you guys as well. And so in terms
14 of our ability to hold the schools accountable, we -- we --
15 we -- we have that those processes in place.

16 MS. RUTHVEN: They don't comeback to us.

17 MS. FLORES: Okay. So you have that but
18 we're approving it and don't we have the right to say that
19 they're coming to us for approval. We have the right to
20 say, "Okay, so in two years we would like you to come back
21 to us and see how well you're doing -- how well this zone
22 is doing academically." And I'd like to kind of also look
23 into reporting of the moneys and how the -- this learning -
24 - this 501(c)(3) is doing -- how it's doing fiscally during
25 that time as well.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Kaushik did you
2 wanna respond or Mr. Dill doing right to condition it's
3 approval?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not approving the
5 Session's Bill.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are not approving.

7 MR. DILL: I -- I -- I suspect that I might
8 be able to boom this out without the use of this but the --
9 the statute says that in -- in terms of what you're -- what
10 condition you're putting on the waiver, the statute says
11 that the waiver will continue to apply so long as the
12 public school continues to be designated as an innovation
13 school or included in an innovation school zone. I believe
14 that the statute does provide for a three-year review of
15 innovation schools and innovation school zones but that is
16 reviewed as conducted by the district and not by the State
17 Board.

18 MS. FLORES: Well but if we're approving it,
19 we can't -- don't we have -- can't we just place conditions
20 on this approval? I mean, why approve it with no
21 conditions. If -- I mean, that's up to the -- I mean,
22 first of all they're going to be approved by that
23 Lamasonry, no it's not, it's Luminary Learning Zone.
24 They're going to be approved by that every year, they're
25 going to be approved by Denver Public Schools every three



1 years, and I'm saying let's do it every two years for us
2 that we're asking for two years.

3 I'm just thinking that every -- every
4 district is going to be coming to us and asking for these
5 zones. I mean -- and they're going to be asking for all
6 kinds of dispensations such as asking for a -- a super, not
7 a superintendent, forgive me, a principal to give the job
8 of supervising and evaluating to a person who doesn't have
9 any credentials, and I'm concerned about that. So, I know
10 you're not, I think I got you mixed up with Pueblo. But in
11 any case, I think we need to -- we need to have some rules
12 here. If people want to come to us, first of all, I didn't
13 think you needed to come to the Board for this, but then
14 was told well no, this is different. We're going to be
15 experimenting with a new governance model, and so if you
16 want to experiment then you've got to play by the music. I
17 mean --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. -- Dr. Schroeder.
19 Oh, I'm sorry. Dr. Scheffel.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you just talk a little
21 bit about the model. I've been trying to read through the
22 documents that I -- it's a little hard to follow. You just
23 speak to why it's innovative and what you're seeking to do.

24 MS. RUTHVEN: Sure. So we are specifically
25 coming to the state to approve this plan because there are



1 three new waivers that three of the four schools are
2 seeking as part of the Innovation Zone process. And then
3 we have one school that is seeking a new state waiver, 229-
4 106 that will impact its ability to execute the human
5 resource strategy. So that's the reason why we're bringing
6 it before the state today, is to get approval for those
7 three waivers. The model in of it -- in and on itself will
8 be innovative in that we will be partnering with a third
9 party entity LLN to provide support to this zone. It's
10 very similar to how we would partner with another third
11 party entity that might provide support. Thinking about
12 our experience for Blueprint for instance.

13 Why we need approval from the state is
14 because of the waivers that will be part of the zone that
15 the schools will then be able to execute. We will have a
16 three year renewal process, so the zone will need to come
17 before us in three years and as part of the plan we have
18 set very clear performance standards that the zone and each
19 of the schools needs to meet or exceed in order for renewal
20 to take place. So very concretely what we are asking is
21 that every school move up one performance at least one
22 performance span in three years in order to be renewed and
23 be able to remain a part of the zone. So I just want to
24 clarify that we have put in place incredibly rigorous and



1 strong accountability mechanisms along with the autonomies
2 that we will be providing.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: So --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel. Go
5 ahead and finish it.

6 MS. FLORES: But one thing about your zones
7 are that they're very heavy. Much more so on --
8 improvement as opposed to academics. So I mean, at the mo
9 -- at the rate that Denver Public Schools is moving, it
10 might take them 20 years to get, you know, academically to
11 go from one point to two point in -- in -- in scoring. So
12 I think improving is good but non making academic really
13 making any improvement academically is not good. So it's
14 moving at a snail's pace. So I know about your bands, but
15 I -- I also think that this -- the Board needs to say to
16 Denver Public Schools, we need to have them on the same SPF
17 as everybody else in the state, and we don't. They have
18 their own system because supposedly it's better, but we
19 need to have everybody, every district on the same SPF.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So may I ask a follow up?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel, yes.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is it -- just tell me if
23 I'm correct. I think what you're seeking from us are
24 waivers that are essentially required that we grant unless
25 we feel that granting the waivers actually would decrease



1 student achievement. And that part of the waiver really
2 doesn't have anything to do with Luminary Learning Network,
3 that's just the provider that you chose to oversee these
4 schools across in this zone. Am I right about that?

5 MS. RUTHVEN: That's accurate and then we --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So --

7 MS. RUTHVEN: -- will have a separate MOU --
8 we have a separate MOU that we would be signing with LLN --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I think --

10 MS. RUTHVEN: -- to provide the support.

11 MS. FLORES: Well, I asked the question --

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So let me -- so let me ask
13 this, so what is the role of luminary because I think
14 that's what your question --

15 MS. FLORES: Well, they're -- they're taking
16 all over the money --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- in way that has nothing to
18 do with the waiver, but maybe you could address their role?

19 MS. FLORES: Well, one of the things that
20 when I asked Mark Ferrandino, who is the CFO for Denver
21 Public Schools, is I asked why are you coming to the Board
22 for -- for this approval when you have had other zones
23 before and you have. And he says, well in this case, it's
24 different because we're having -- we have this MOU with
25 this other non-profit and it's several schools who --



1 already our innovation. And so, we are experimenting and
2 that is in this document too, and this document as well.
3 He calls it experimenting with a new governance model. So
4 the reason you're coming here according to Ferrandino is
5 because of this new governance model.

6 MS. RUTHVEN: So Dr. Flores, if I may. I
7 believe it's still line the waivers within the zone for the
8 schools within the zone, would be what they're asking for.

9 MS. FLORES: So -- well, this is a different
10 governance model though that you -- you're going to have a
11 -- well, I know that it -- within a charter you have that
12 too, and that district is still oversees that, but this is
13 going to be a super -- a -- a -- a super sort of group of
14 people within -- within these families and such in -- in
15 these schools. And then they're going to be a Board, and
16 they're going to have supervisory over. They're gonna
17 collect money for one. I mean, they're not going to do it
18 for free, and I just don't see that. I mean, you all --
19 there's already systems upon systems of administrators --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So --

21 MS. FLORES: -- who are training.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: So can I follow up them. So
23 I think, maybe what you're asking is a broad question which
24 is does innovation status make sense? Does the statute,
25 which allows schools to apply for innovation status and



1 innovation zones, does that work? Does it serve kids well?
2 Our broad authority is actually kind of a low bar as the AG
3 suggested. We're just looking at the waivers, but the
4 bigger question probably could provoke a -- a study session
5 where we can look at it. But just from my own information,
6 could you just talk about the role of Luminary network? I
7 know we're not voted. That's not really in our purview
8 either, but it just be interesting to know what they do.

9 MS. FLORES: I think that was it.

10 MS. RUTHVEN: Sure. So just to clarify,
11 this will be the first Innovation Zone that we will have in
12 Denver Public Schools. So we have had innovation schools
13 before, we have charter schools that we authorize as well.
14 This will be the first time that our Board will have
15 authorized an Innovation Zone. The role that the Luminary
16 Learning Network will play is that they will be acting as a
17 support organization. So they will be accountable to our
18 Board and they will be providing support to the four
19 schools that are part of this zone, and so through the MOU,
20 which the Board -- which the state Board is not voting on,
21 we have agreed to a certain number of services that they
22 will be providing. And that they will be accountable to
23 our Board for ensuring that those services are provided
24 with exceptional quality and are resulting in improved
25 outcomes for students that we will be able to check through



1 how we hold the four schools and the zone as a whole
2 accountable for results.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And is that support more
4 logistics or is it more academic like is it coaching or is
5 it more logistical?

6 MS. RUTHVEN: It's going to be both. So
7 they will be providing both logistical support and helping
8 with issues that might arise. All of the schools have the
9 ability at the school level to choose to opt in to
10 districts, a set of District Services or to choose to opt
11 out and use the LLN services that are provided. They will
12 also be providing oversight for our principal coaching but
13 we'll be using the systems that we use in DPS to evaluate
14 our teachers and our leaders. So our leap system and our
15 lead system all of which are aligned to state statute will
16 remain in place. Those will continue to be the tools that
17 are used by LLN, but they will be providing support with
18 regards to that coaching. We are also ensuring that the
19 support and those that are offering that support are of
20 incredible high quality, and so what the principals will be
21 re --- be receiving in terms of that support will meet the
22 standard that we have as a district.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Further
25 discussions? Seeing none, there's a motion on the table to



1 approve the Innovation Zone. Ms. Burdsall, would you call
2 a roll, please.

3 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: No.

5 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: Yes.

7 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

9 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: Yes

11 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

13 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

15 MS. BURDSALL: And Chairman Durham.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. The motions adopted

17 by a vote of six to one. Thank you very much for your

18 attendance today. We'll now proceed to item 12.01. Let's

19 see. It seems I can't find it here. Let's see, okay.

20 We're gonna conduct a public rulemaking hearing for the

21 rules and the annual inspection in for many of maintenance

22 school transportation vehicles. The Board voted -- the

23 State Board voted to approve the (inaudible) rulemaking in

24 it's April 13, 2016 Board meeting agreeing to promulgate --

25 promulgate these rules was made known through publication



1 of a public notice on April 25, 2016 through the Colorado
2 register and by the State Board notice on June 1, 2016.
3 State Board is authorized to promulgate these rules
4 pursuant to 22-2-107(1)(c) CRS. Commissioner, is the staff
5 prepared to proceed with an overview?

6 MS. MAZANEC: Yes we are, Mr. Chair. I'll
7 turn it over to Leanne Emm and Jennifer Okes.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go ahead.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Okes.

11 MS. OKES: Yes, thank you. So this was a
12 notice of rulemaking that you all approved back in April.
13 And so just going to recap quickly for you what's included
14 in your packet, what the rules do, and some of the changes
15 that resulted as part of that rulemaking -- the formal
16 rulemaking process. And today we have two rules before
17 you. So the first, we'll address one of those and then
18 this -- subsequently the second. But I'll discuss them
19 together, if that's okay, because what we're trying to do
20 is really streamline and consolidate these rules.

21 The first set of rules is the operation of
22 school transportation vehicles. The second set is about
23 the maintenance and annual inspection of the vehicles. And
24 the thought was is that, it would be much more simplified
25 if they could be combined because they're really all



1 related to that. So what we're asking you to do the first
2 set of rulemaking is to repeal the rulemaking related --
3 the current rulemaking related to preventative maintenance
4 and annual inspection. Those rules have been in place
5 since 1983. The operation rules have been in place since
6 1973.

7 What we'd like to do is in the second
8 rulemaking is combine all of those and then streamline it.
9 So we're taking about a third of the rules away and really
10 consolidate it. A lot of those streamlining is eliminating
11 rules that are just duplicative and repetitive of statute
12 because there's always the chance to get it a little bit
13 off sync with statute which is not good. And so we'd like
14 to just have the rules be what they need to do in order to
15 clarify or expand upon the statutes but not reiterate the
16 statutes. We do think that there is a value of having sort
17 of a one stop shop when it comes to the rules.

18 And so we've done those in drafts which we
19 have -- lots of drafts which are manuals or guides I'm --
20 excuse me, guides for each type of school bus driver
21 whether it's on the route of the bigger buses or routes of
22 the smaller type A buses or small vehicles or an activity
23 driver. So what we're doing is putting everything rules
24 and statutes and federal regulations all in one place.
25 Also, the Department of Rev -- the Department of Revenue



1 with their commercial driver's license, CDL has
2 regulations. So this will be the one stop shop for each of
3 the drivers, but these rules will just be the rules that
4 are needed. So that's sort of the goal.

5 There's several documents that you all are
6 provided. So I thought it might be good to just take a
7 second to outline which of those are B is just or A is the
8 memo that you all got that summarizes a lot of what I'll
9 talk about. B is really the -- this is actually got them
10 out of order, B is the proposed rulemaking for the second
11 set, this is the combination and you all can see at the
12 end, we're striking the original and the front is sort of
13 all of that new stuff. C is the first order of business,
14 is to just repeal that maintenance and inspection rules.
15 D, this is a comparison of the existing rules and the
16 proposed new rules and that was requested at the last
17 meeting and again, it was a great suggestion because I
18 think it was very helpful for me and hopefully for you all
19 to see the side by side, and you can see what we've done.
20 In a lot of cases, what we found is the rules are really
21 good. They are good and solid but they could maybe be
22 clarified a little bit. We reorganized them a lot, so you
23 could have school district responsibilities or
24 responsibilities associated with route drivers of the --.

25 (Meeting adjourned)



1 C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
11 and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25