



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
August 10, 2016, Afternoon

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on August 10, 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: And come to order. It's
2 pretty close to 1:30 start time. It's 1:29; It's close
3 enough for government work. We're on item 14.01, Rules for
4 Healthy Beverages. And -- what's in here, so -- okay.
5 Colorado State Board of Education will now conduct a public
6 rule making hearing for the rules -- for the administration
7 of the Rules for Healthy Beverage Policy 1 CCR 301-79. The
8 State Board voted to approve the notice of rule making at
9 its April 11th, 2016 Board meeting. A hearing to
10 promulgate these rules was made known through publication
11 of a public notice on June 10th, 2016 through the Colorado
12 Register and by State Board noticed on August 3rd, 2016.
13 The Board has authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant
14 to 22-2-107(1)(c) Colorado Revised Statutes. Commissioner,
15 does the staff prepared to provide an overview.

16 MS. ANTHES: Yes, they are, Mr. Chair.
17 I'll turn it over to Jennifer Okes and Bree Riley. I'm
18 getting to know the last name.

19 MS. OKES: So -- I'll let Bree Riley --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

21 MS. OKES: -- do the presentations. She's
22 been expert in this area.

23 MS. RILEY: Thank you, Jennifer Okes. Good
24 afternoon. In 2009, rules were promulgated for healthy
25 beverages sold in schools based on State statute. USDA



1 released similar rules in 2013 and finalized those rules in
2 July 2016, so just last month. These regulations are
3 science based and informed by the Institute Medicines
4 Report and the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. We would
5 like to take this opportunity to revise our rules and align
6 them with Federal Regulations to reduce the regulatory
7 burden on school districts.

8 We reached out to partner organizations and
9 school districts across the State. You can -- sorry. At
10 this time we received 16 comments, which are summarized in
11 the comment response document. Twelve comments from
12 partner organizations and health advocates wanted more
13 restrictive guidelines in place. Mostly, just keeping the
14 diet soda restriction for high school in place. Four
15 comments were supportive of aligning. These were from
16 school districts case CASB and BOCES.

17 We still propose that the rules align with
18 Federal Regulations. School districts have the opportunity
19 to be more restrictive in both Federal and State rules in
20 their local school wellness policies, which are now
21 required to be more robust in nature based on recently
22 released Federal Rules. USDA's regulations require that
23 districts allow parents, students, teachers, health
24 professionals, school boards, school administrators and
25 members of the general public to participate in the



1 developments, the implementation, and periodic review and
2 update of the local school wellness policies.

3 This is a perfect opportunity for a school
4 district to include more restrictive beverage standards
5 based on the needs of their community and stakeholder
6 feedback. We respectfully request that the State Board
7 approve the proposed changes to the rules and align State
8 and Federal Regulations. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Questions
10 from members of the Board. Yes, I will now to (inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) do that?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure. Yeah we --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- I think the
16 test that they testify first and then --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, well tell us your
18 testimony first and then we'll -- yes so if there's anyone
19 like to testify we have one person signed up I believe,
20 Christine Dolan-Stone. Please join us and state your name
21 for the record and who you represent.

22 MS. DOLAN: Okay. My name is Christine
23 Dolan and I'm a Registered Dietitian. I work for Garfield
24 County Public Health. I've been a dietitian for 27 years.
25 I've worked for Garfield County for the last 17. I serve



1 as a member of the National Advisory Council for Infant
2 Maternal and Fetal Nutrition. This advisory group works
3 with the Supplemental Nutrition Program Women, Infant and
4 Children, and we act as an advisory capacity to improve the
5 health of women, infant, and children across the nation.
6 The points I would like to address -- some of them are
7 based on my career as a dietitian. I have learned so much
8 about improving health and I think we all struggle with the
9 same things -- that to improve behavior, we need to change
10 the cues in our daily lives. If you want to reduce your
11 intake of sweets, you keep them out of your house. If you
12 want to walk more, you keep your sneakers by the door.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're not laughing at
14 you. It's the --

15 MS. DOLAN: They are laughing with me?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're laughing
17 (inaudible). We're laughing at ourselves --

18 MS. DOLAN: And I was thinking can we have
19 another --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- we all finished the
21 birthday cake and you may have a -- please feel free to
22 have a piece on your way out.

23 MS. ANTHES: And I'm drinking diet soda.

24 MS. DOLAN: I've been aware --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. I'm sorry to
2 interrupt.

3 MS. DOLAN: No, you're fine. So I think we
4 -- daily we all struggle with trying to improve our health
5 behaviors. I feel like we need to make it easier for kids.
6 And if you want them to drink healthier beverages at school
7 then, you make those beverages more available. In 2008,
8 the Colorado Healthy Beverage Policy was adapted. It's
9 been in place successfully since that time.

10 The Federal Regulations that we're talking
11 about are clearly intended to set minimum standards
12 essentially, the lowest common denominator. But the intent
13 of those rules is not to roll back the progress that's been
14 made in Colorado.

15 Research on the safety of diet sodas
16 suggests there maybe some negative consequences to health.
17 Although the research is varied, we can unequivocally say
18 that the diet soda is not a healthy beverage. If teens are
19 able to purchase diet soda at school, that may replace some
20 of the healthier beverages that they have access to. And I
21 guess lastly, as parents, as educators, as community
22 members, our actions have consequences. And our actions
23 should send a message to kids that we value their total
24 healthcare, academic, emotional, and physical health. And



1 we should make decisions that support those ideals. Thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Any further
4 discussion --

5 MS. OKES: Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

7 MS. OKES: There was a Food Service
8 Director that was trying to make it here to testify. And I
9 just recently learned that he was unable to make it.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

11 MS. OKES: And so I just wanted to let you
12 know that he wanted to testify on aligning the Federal and
13 State rules because of the regulatory burden that he's
14 personally experienced. And he's going to try to get some
15 comments in writing to me. So I'll forward those to Bizy.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Members, any
17 discussion? Any further discussion in these rules?

18 MS. DOLAN: What about the -- you know,
19 people worry about the sugar. Of course, sugar is an issue
20 especially, you know, these different kinds of sugars like
21 (inaudible) with your health. That's a question that's
22 asked. I asked the question, what about the caffeine? You
23 know, I'm not talking about orange soda or lime soda,
24 Sprite in such. But these -- Pepsi, Coca-Cola, all of
25 these have a lot of caffeine, they have caffeine. I don't



1 know. I -- you know, I drink tea and then it's decaf and
2 then I can only have one. Because I'm so -- you know, just
3 naturally wired and I'm wondering whether kids are like
4 that as well. You know, I -- I worry more about the drug.
5 I'm sure some people would consider sugar a drug as well.
6 You know, there two different bad things I think in soda
7 that I would say is not healthy for kids. It's false
8 nutrition and if it's nutrition at all.

9 MS. OKES: Mr. Chair, may I respond?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

11 MS. OKES: In regards to caffeine,
12 currently, with the Healthy Beverage Policy in place in the
13 State of Colorado, high schools can still sell other diet
14 beverages that have caffeine. So that's something to
15 consider, for instance diet tea. Things along those lines
16 are still okay to be sold at high schools in cafeterias
17 based on the current Healthy Beverage Policy in Colorado.

18 And another aspect to keep in mind is that,
19 most high schools in Colorado are open campus. And so what
20 we've seen across the state as a lot of the high schoolers
21 are able to leave campus and go down to the local
22 convenience stores and still purchase those types of items,
23 including diet sodas. So again just something for the
24 Board to keep in mind is that even if we have it in policy,



1 it doesn't mean that the kids and students will still go
2 off campus and purchase those items.

3 MS. DOLAN: But still the school would be
4 aiding and abetting. And I did read the -- I did read one
5 of the letters where the parent or I guess it was a parent
6 who was stating that --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Fire Emergency Drill
8 Announcement) May I have your attention please.

9 MS. DOLAN: -- I'm sorry, it was a school
10 Board person. And he was saying, well, if we make money
11 from this. How we're -- we're in great need of money for
12 our schools --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's only a drill.

14 MS. DOLAN: -- and this is -- may
15 considerable amount of money. So that's the other -- yes,
16 I did read that.

17 MS. OKES: Mr. Chair. Oh, wait.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's only a drill. So
19 hold on. Please, we hope it's only a drill.

20 MS. OKES: That's what they told us.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, please.

22 MS. OKES: So the new regulations around
23 local school wellness policies is really the opportunities
24 for local districts to create more robust policies in place
25 regarding caffeine, for instance, as well as other types of



1 drinks like diet sodas and the non-nutritive sweeteners
2 that you mention. And this is a requirement, all -- all
3 school districts in the State of Colorado currently have
4 school wellness policies. However, the new rules require
5 that they're more robust in nature. And so I believe that
6 this is the opportunity where the local agencies can make
7 more restrictive policies in place.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you. Chairman Durham.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes ma'am. Yes, Ms.
10 Mazanec.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Well I -- personally, I'm
12 really pleased to see that the USDA has lightened the
13 regulation. And I think that I would like to see less
14 regulation and more local control. And therefore, I'm in
15 support of this change. If local school districts want to
16 make changes, that's where those changes should be
17 reflected by the community there, and I don't want to put
18 more regulation on them than they need. So I'll be in
19 support of this.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Schroeder.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So I will not be in support
22 of this. I think -- perhaps our 2009 regulations aren't
23 tight enough. I believe parents expect us to do what we
24 can to protect kids. Yes, they go elsewhere but this is
25 sort of a contest between the beverage industry, which in



1 fact did contact us. The school principals and boosters,
2 who want to make more money, versus the health
3 professionals, who have also been contacting us, and the
4 parents who count on us to protect our kids.

5 And so I really -- I don't even know why
6 you're bringing this to us. Just to align it, goes totally
7 in the face of the conversations we keep having about that
8 we don't want the feds telling us what to do. We want to
9 do what's best for Colorado kids, and what's best for
10 Colorado kids is what we already have. It's not the best
11 but it's better than. And so I really hate to see us going
12 backwards. I think that's a very poor message. And I've
13 certainly, certainly heard from enough folks telling us
14 it's a very poor message to our children.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Chairman, I would just --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

17 MS. MAZANEC: -- like to say in response
18 that --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: -- what's best for children
21 is -- is a decision of parents. I haven't heard a lot of
22 parents asking me to regulate what their -- their kids are
23 getting in school. So you may have parents that want their
24 schools to be their children's nanny. I know a lot of



1 parents that are tired of schools dictating what their
2 children eat, see, learn.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion.
4 Well, do you have an amendment to -- we need to make a
5 motion first but --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just going to have
7 part of the discussion --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and then we'll go
10 on. Is that okay?

11 MS. OKES: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Originally, this law
13 was passed in 2009, and I think it had very good
14 intentions. It was to cut back on sugar and what we feed
15 to kids and the prime reason for this is to eliminate some
16 of the obesity or the obesity. We thought that was going
17 to do it. And we've cut back on a lot of the sugars, we
18 serve nutritional food in schools. But the obesity of our
19 children has gone through the roof. Now, we -- we should
20 go back and learn something from this lesson. And we spent
21 a lot of money. A lot of people spent a lot of money on
22 this. I think of a lot of the nutritious things that we
23 served to kids in the school that are objected to by the
24 students. So I think there's a bigger picture than us
25 controlling the kids. And I think, granted, maybe some of



1 the parents don't do what we want them to do but I don't
2 think legislating what the parents can do is going to make
3 any difference to the real problem.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other comments, I
5 would -- I would simply observe -- and I've always believed
6 that it's a mistake for a parent to believe that the state
7 can protect their children from these kinds of temptations.
8 The only thing that will protect their children is the
9 appropriate home life and incorporate home education. And
10 to -- to rely on a third party to do the job that parents
11 could and should do, I think it's a mistake for a number of
12 reasons. And I will be in support of the change in these
13 regulations. Do we have a motion on this topic?

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I -- do you make a motion
15 and then -- or do you, do an amendment first?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

17 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

19 MS. RANKIN: If it's not a unanimous vote,
20 it will have to be an action item in our next Board
21 meeting.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. I understand, and
23 --

24 MS. RANKIN: Okay.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The motion, if you'd like
2 to make it, would be to prove the rules for the
3 administration of the Healthy Beverage Policy 1 CCR 30179.
4 Is that your motion Ms. Rankin?

5 MS. RANKIN: Yes, it is. Yes it is, Mr.
6 Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Perfect. Is
8 there a second to that motion? Second? Ms. Mazanec
9 seconds the motion. Are there amendments to that motion?
10 We have the regulations in front of us?

11 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. I have the regulation,
12 I just don't have the proper words that I should use and
13 I'm sorry, it's in here.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think -- let me ask you
15 a question.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, I'm sorry.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Our definition of
18 extended day is still in excess of the Federal Regulation.
19 Is that correct?

20 MS. OKES: That's correct, Mr. Chair, and
21 it's because it's in state statute. So it's required by
22 state statute to be in the Healthy Beverage Policy.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So that is the definition
24 of extended day is the definition of extended day in state



1 statute or is there something that requires us to define
2 extended day?

3 MS. OKES: I believe both.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Both. So it's your
5 opinion that we cannot modify this extended day provision?

6 MS. OKES: Yes, Mr. Chair. We checked in
7 with Tony Dill and he agreed.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. In
9 that case if it's violation of state statute, then the
10 motion before us will be as stated without amendment to
11 approve the rule. Would -- any further comments? Ms.
12 Cordial, would you please call the roll.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

14 MS. FLORES: No.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

16 MS. GOFF: No.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

20 MS. RANKIN: I have -- I can ask another
21 question, right? At this point, Mr. Chair, does Federal
22 Government supersedes state government in this case?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

5 MS. CORDIAL: And Chairman Durham.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. That motion's
7 adapted by a vote of four to three.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Oh, Uh-uh. It all have to be
9 on September first?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. No, but it --

11 MS. CORDIAL: Oh, for --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- it is adapted but the
13 final vote will take place.

14 MS. CORDIAL: -- In September.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- in September Board
16 meeting.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct. Okay. All
19 right. Very good. Thank you very much.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you. Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We'll now proceed
22 to -- the next item is 17 -- no, I'm sorry. Item 15.01
23 request for waiver from Peetz Plateau RE-5 School District
24 and -- all right. I think we'll skip making a motion till
25 after we've heard some testimony and we'll then come back



1 to that. So Commissioner, would you please introduce your
2 witness.

3 MS. ANTHERS: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
4 And we have Lori Heller here, to speak on behalf of the
5 school district. She's the K through six principal at
6 Peetz Plateau and thank you for driving all this way. This
7 is a very long drive for you. So I really appreciate
8 hearing from you.

9 MS. HELLER: Thank you. I appreciate your
10 time. As a small role of the school district in Northeast
11 Colorado, our resources are extremely limited and we have
12 to use them very wisely. Our student counts currently for
13 the next school year is around 150. That is K-12. So we
14 are a very small. Sorry Okay. So we are seeking a waiver
15 of a time intensive and duplicative requirement, that we
16 don't feel affects the achievement of our students. Not as
17 the school readiness assessment required by CRS 22-7-1-014.
18 We understand the important purposes underlying the
19 requirements and we will implement alternative strategies
20 to meet the intended laws in a matter far better suited to
21 our small community.

22 The flexibility obtained through the waiver
23 is necessary to free our educators, to focus on our
24 standards, curriculum, other assessment work, to enhance
25 their ability to meet the educational needs of our



1 students. It will also allow our classroom teachers to
2 focus on their classroom time and instruction, monitor
3 student growth through positive interactions on a daily
4 basis, and continue with the assessment process that has
5 proven itself time and again for our students.

6 It will also provide more time for teachers
7 as they work to individualize instruction, so that every
8 student develops the skills that they need. We currently
9 last year hired a substitute teacher for approximately
10 three days -- four days for the teacher to be able to enter
11 anecdotes, that go along with TS GOLD, so that was three
12 days out of the classroom that she spent away from her
13 students.

14 In Peetz, even before the first day of
15 kindergarten we know our students. Most of them come from
16 our preschool, which is right down the hallway. Our
17 teachers are very close. We have three preschool teachers
18 that are in constant communication with our kindergarten
19 teacher. Any concerns, they also continue to use TS GOLD
20 in our preschool, so that information is transferred to our
21 kindergarten teacher.

22 We have several conversations before the
23 year about concerns, progress of students, needs that they
24 might have, plans for their next year in kindergarten. At
25 Peetz, our class sizes are small. Currently, they range



1 from 7 to 18. This year's kindergarten class has 12, our
2 preschool class has 16. We have license for 16 and they
3 have eight on our waiting list. So our reputation for
4 quality of education really does precede us. We have been
5 accredited or credited with distinction for the past seven
6 years. Our community has high expectations for us and we
7 will continue to maintain those expectations for our
8 community.

9 That is why part of our waiver request for -
10 - is a request for a three-year term and then we would
11 review at the end of that if there is possibility of
12 something, you know, for progress declines or for just not
13 doing what we say that we're going to do. We think three
14 years would give us the chance to be able to show that. We
15 are feeling right now in our small community, we don't need
16 another time intensive, comprehensive, often redundant
17 school readiness assessment to determine whether students
18 are ready for kindergarten. We have much knowledge and
19 much data regarding their physical, social, emotional and
20 other skills necessary for them to succeed in school.

21 Also in Peetz, as with any small community,
22 relationships are a huge key to our success. Often times,
23 the duties of teachers, parents and students cross paths in
24 many ways. It's not just the teachers seeing the student
25 in the classroom, they also see them in the hallway, at



1 ballgames, at the concession stand, around the town, at the
2 Community Co-op, it is like a big huge family.

3 Our school is the center of our community
4 and the interactions seen in and around Peetz contribute
5 greatly to our plan when it comes to designing what the
6 kids need for the classroom. Often times, it's -- it's
7 difficult for kids to, just kind of a joke that the
8 grownups know what the kids are doing for the kids do it,
9 so everybody is very connected and that's really a positive
10 thing. It's also great to see the big kids and little kids
11 in the hallway at the same time, they kind of take care of
12 each other and I would invite any of you to come out and
13 spend some time and observe that. It's really a great
14 place to be.

15 As far as the replacement policy, we current
16 -- currently have a roundup -- roundup summary document
17 which I think has been submitted to -- to your Board, that
18 details each student's strengths, the needs in each of the
19 domains that are in TS GOLD. It includes educational
20 records and readiness as well as social and emotional
21 development. There is a kindergarten evaluation and
22 readiness report that is similar to a standards based
23 report card, that our kindergarten teachers keep, from the
24 beginning of the year through the end.



1 The parents see that four times a year. At
2 the quarter, we do have parent teacher conferences where
3 they specifically set time so they can come in three times
4 a year. Any of those readiness plans will be modified as
5 necessary. If we feel the need that a student is behind or
6 ahead in a certain particular area, then we would adjust
7 those readiness plans for them. If we do have special
8 needs, we do have our policies that provide seminars
9 intervention services. We have some RCI folks in our
10 building also that help with that, paraprofessionals
11 support and things like that.

12 During the first weeks of school, in fact
13 this following week, we started school on Monday. Our
14 elementary kiddos don't come in for another five days after
15 that and the teacher spends time one on one with each
16 student for about an hour, talking with them, doing some
17 testing, finding out what they know, seeing kind of where
18 they are, discussing the year with parents. So they do set
19 that some time aside which happens before school starts, so
20 our teacher doesn't have to take away any class time to be
21 able to do that.

22 And then we also provide sort of the
23 standard testing for our classroom's main web, start early
24 literacy NWEA and we keep all that data in our Alpine data
25 system. Per classroom, teacher also keeps social and



1 emotional development information, through targeted
2 discussions and questions with the student, with the
3 parents. My kindergarten teacher is very close in contact
4 with all her parents. I know she has them a group text
5 list, if there's anything that's going on out of the class,
6 she gets a hold of them right away and she's in contact
7 with them very frequently. So I think that's all that I
8 have in addition to what has been submitted to you. So I
9 would, on behalf of Peetz Plateau School District,
10 respectfully request that you approve our request for
11 waiver.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions for Ms. Heller
13 from members of the Board.

14 Yes. Dr. Flores.

15 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Has there been a -
16 - any drop since you've been using this?

17 MS. HELLER: Drop in?

18 MS. FLORES: Drop in, let's say third
19 graders sir. Third graders are doing well.

20 MS. HELLER: Right. Our third graders this
21 past year, in our, we are basing this on the BAA, our third
22 graders did not do particularly well. Our other classes K-
23 12, did extremely well. Those three grades, each student,
24 there was 80 percent of the students that met their growth
25 goals in K-12. I would like to -- but our third grade



1 teacher was in the transition year, it was her retirement
2 year. They did a lot of artwork this year. She was on her
3 way, sorry. Which is unfortunate, but our third grade did
4 not, did not do the greatest, but our K-12, like I said,
5 they were at 80 percent of their growth goals within the
6 BA.

7 MS. FLORES: What about your fourth and
8 fifth?

9 MS. HELLER: Fourth and fifth graders do
10 well. I do have some information in here. Let me pull
11 that out.

12 MS. FLORES: So that's your explanation for
13 third grade.

14 MS. HELLER: For third grade? Right.
15 Right.

16 MS. FLORES: Okay. No, that's okay. I
17 believe you.

18 MS. HELLER: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

20 MS. FLORES: Yes. So I mean, I've looked
21 at your -- your readiness test and questions you asked and
22 you know, I would say, I would say, yes.

23 MS. HELLER: Thank you.

24 MS. FLORES: I was told by my colleagues to
25 that the TS GOLD is -- has far less, you know, questions



1 than they did before. In other words, it is not much work
2 for preschool as it is. So have you seen the new -- the
3 new test?

4 MS. HELLER: Our preschool teacher used the
5 old format last year because they weren't compatible, so we
6 chose to use the previous year's format. So I haven't seen
7 the new, the new particular, the new test that they have.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Some of that topic I think
10 (inaudible) I'm so sorry. Not you.

11 MS. HELLER: It's okay.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: We've just had, I don't
13 know, I'd say it's summer vacation except some of us didn't
14 have summer vacation, so there's no excuse for this.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Is it on?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: It's now on. Yup. Thank
17 you, Bizy. So I would really want you to try that new one.
18 In fact, I'd like all the districts to come back and give
19 us feedback whether we have finally been able to help
20 teachers. Much more so than to -- than what you are
21 requesting. This is exactly the reason that we requested
22 this.

23 It was an opportunity to reduce redundancy,
24 but to still maintain that level, that level of reliability
25 that we really want in assessment. I have a couple of



1 questions. In terms of the communication between your
2 preschool and kindergarten folks, does -- do the actual
3 forms from TS GOLD go on to the kindergarten teachers and
4 they continue to use them, what's the transition in to?
5 What extent do you -- are you using TS GOLD in kindergarten
6 even though it's not the official usage?

7 MS. HELLER: Right. Yes they do. So all
8 of the computer records that are generated by TS GOLD are
9 transferred to our kindergarten teacher, so she has access
10 to those.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: But does she use the same
12 criteria then for the analysis?

13 MS. HELLER: Yes, she did this year. Yes.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, that's cause they did
15 TS GOLD this year.

16 MS. HELLER: Cause we've done TS GOLD, yes.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Which is great. Go
18 ahead.

19 MS. HELLER: So I guess my only part with
20 the redundancy, cause we're not against testing students or
21 finding out where they are at the assessment or that kind
22 of thing, I think the part is that we're already collecting
23 a lot of the same anecdotal kind of information and putting
24 it into different places, so now we have two different
25 places.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Why do you prefer to use
2 that which is not -- which are not assessments that have
3 been approved?

4 MS. HELLER: Right. I think some of the --
5 some of the pieces of those assessments are very similar to
6 the anecdotal information that's required by TS GOLD. So
7 it's something we've used, it's something we've shown
8 success with and it's not something new that my teacher has
9 to add onto her plate.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: I think my point is this,
11 does it have to be an add on or can some of this be a
12 replacement? In other words, the legislature was pretty
13 specific in the kinds of assessments they wanted us to
14 approve. And it might be frustrating to make that change
15 in your district, but it doesn't have to be an add on, it
16 can be a replacement. Unless there's some compelling
17 reason to use these other assessments that are not seen as
18 being as relevant and reliable as either TS GOLD or any of
19 the other -- we actually approved some other assessments as
20 well. I'm assuming you're aware of that, right?

21 MS. HELLER: Yes. Yes. And I think the --
22 the system that we have was devised by our kindergarten
23 teacher, obviously it's only appropriate, I wouldn't take
24 it out and suggest it for another school, you know. So it



1 -- it's worked for us, and I've seen the success in our
2 students.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So that sounds like a
4 frustration with change. Is that fair?

5 MS. HELLER: Possibly. It could be. Sure.
6 It could be.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: How many of your
8 preschoolers are -- stay in kindergarten? Sounds to me
9 like -- do you have preschoolers that go elsewhere and not
10 two years ago?

11 MS. HELLER: We do. We do. We have some
12 students that don't participate in preschool, but I think
13 this year there were 10 of the 12 that moved from --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Your preschool.

15 MS. HELLER: -- our preschool.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Interesting. I'm not going
17 -- I'm going to vote no on this. Come back and I mean, I'd
18 rather do that, and I ask you to try this other assessment
19 first, then come back to me and say, you can't handle it,
20 as opposed to the opposite which has come back in three
21 years and have us start all over again with this. With all
22 due respect.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions from
24 members, members of the Board. Yes, Ms. Mazanec.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Did you -- did you mention
2 cost? Does -- how much this TS GOLD cost?

3 MS. HELLER: It doesn't add an additional
4 cost to our district besides the sub that I provide for the
5 teacher when she has to step out of the classroom to -- to
6 process the information.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: What about the --

8 MS. MAZANEC: To process the information in
9 TS GOLD.

10 MS. HELLER: Right. To add -- into the
11 anecdotes, you know, in those places where she already has
12 them elsewhere.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thanks for your
15 answer.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further questions?
18 Thank you, Ms. Heller.

19 MS. HELLER: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Appreciate it.
21 Appreciate your coming all this distance.

22 MS. HELLER: It's a beautiful drive.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We have a motion
24 for this -- for this item.

25 MS. MAZANEC: I so move, chair?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec
2 MS. MAZANEC: I can so move to grant the
3 waiver.
4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Motion is to approve the
5 waiver request from Peetz Plateau RE-5 School District for
6 CRS 22-7-1041(2)(a) school readiness assessment. That's
7 it. Okay. Perfect. All right. Any further discussion on
8 the motion? Is there a second?
9 MS. FLORES: I second.
10 MS. OKES: As it's moved and seconded,
11 would you please call the roll?
12 MS. HELLER: Board Member Flores.
13 MS. FLORES: Yes.
14 MS. HELLER: Board Member Goff.
15 MS. GOFF: No.
16 MS. HELLER: Board Member Mazanec.
17 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.
18 MS. HELLER: Board Member Rankin.
19 MS. RANKIN: No.
20 MS. HELLER: Board Member Scheffel.
21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.
22 MS. HELLER: Board Member Schroeder.
23 MS. SCHROEDER: No.
24 MS. HELLER: Chairman Durham.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. The motion fails on
2 a vote of three to four. Okay. Do we now have a follow-
3 up? We don't need? We don't need to follow-up. Okay.
4 All right. Thank you very much, Ms. Heller.

5 Okay. Now, on item 17.02, which is the
6 budget request. Show me the money.

7 MR. BLANFORD: We can arrange that next
8 time.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. All right.
10 Commissioner, would you like to introduce this issue
11 please.

12 MS. ANTHES: Sure, Mr. Chairman. We have
13 Jeff Blanford, our CFO and Jennifer Okes with us today.
14 This is a follow up to -- we gave you an information item
15 when we were in Pueblo at the Board meeting and I believe -
16 - is this a vote? Yes. So we gave you the information
17 item two months ago and now we're asking for a vote on the
18 budget. So am I turning it over to Mr. Blanford?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm trying to find it.

20 MS. ANTHES: I didn't start long enough?
21 Mr. Blanford has a nice tie on today.

22 MR. BLANFORD: Well, thank you,
23 Commissioner.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please (inaudible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, I move to
2 approve the budget change request for Fiscal Year '17 -
3 '18.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second on that
5 motion? Ms. Goff? Seconds that motion. Okay. Proceed
6 please.

7 MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well,
8 by way of review, the Commissioner just reminded you we met
9 in June to introduce these items to you. Where we are in
10 the process then is, is you all will take a vote today.
11 Whatever you approve in the vote or not, we'll go forward
12 in our budget request for November 1. It makes a stop at
13 the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. They review
14 it. They may elect to deny a request we make as well.

15 However, if it makes it through their
16 process, it will be included in our November 1 submission
17 to the General Assembly for their consideration. I will
18 walk everyone through the items in brief -- in a moment.
19 But since you had the opportunity to review the materials
20 over the last couple of months, I thought I'd entertain any
21 questions at this point that might have occurred to you.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You want just list the
23 three changes? I believe they're three.

24 MR. BLANFORD: Yes, sir. The first two are
25 the statutorily required items that will come later. Total



1 program and categoricals. The three to which you refer Mr.
2 Chair are first concurrent enrollment for \$74,000. That's
3 for an FTE to really bring uniformity to concurrent
4 enrollment programs across the state institutions of higher
5 education, work with school districts in this program and
6 there is something of a lack of consistency across the
7 state. The primary goal of this FTE would be to bring some
8 uniformity and unity to those practices.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you look at that as
10 a regulatory action or an assistance action. I'm not -- is
11 diversity necessarily of these programs necessarily
12 damaging in some fashion. Or is it --

13 MR. BLANFORD: Well, in my conversations --
14 well, if Misty wants to handle that. I think it's both Mr.
15 Chair but consistency and assistance is the primary goal.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chair if I may.
17 So this will be a service and support position. So even in
18 just the past three days, we've received seven different
19 requests from seven different districts to help them
20 navigate concurrent enrollment across the state. So this
21 is ensuring that students are served by finding courses
22 that are available to their students and find -- helping
23 them find partnerships with institutions of higher
24 education, providing clarity to the policies and the
25 guidance is already in place.



1 So truly service and support and this is not
2 support that we've been able to consistently provide to
3 districts. And we know that there are 85 percent of all
4 high schools that are currently participating in concurrent
5 enrollment. And that opportunities for students are
6 inconsistent at best due to the lack of support from them
7 has been a primary reason they've cited.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In addition, I think
10 the districts -- because they haven't had as much guidance
11 then they are maybe spinning their wheels and they're less
12 efficient and so it's taking them more time to administer
13 these programs and less time with the students. And so
14 hopefully with this resource centrally, we can streamline
15 some processes, aid them and so they can do more important
16 work facing the students rather than this process type
17 stuff. So we think it should be a benefit to the district.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And you may remember
19 (inaudible) that was here in June and they'd actually
20 abandoned the program due to the administrative burden.

21 MS. OKES: Yes. Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are they back with it
23 or are they back on (inaudible)?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're not

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The bill, I believe it
2 passed last session that required concurrent enrollment
3 qualifying classes, made sure that people are aware of
4 which courses are concurrent enrollment worthy and credit
5 very -- and -- which one -- has there been any feedback on
6 that yet? Have anybody -- is -- I'm not sure if that
7 timeline would mean that it's in effect now or not yet.
8 But it seems like it would be. So have you heard anything
9 about that yet?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. I believe you're
11 referring to the Transparency Bill around concurrent
12 enrollment.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't remember the
14 title.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And essentially what
16 that bill does is -- districts are asked to help parents
17 and students which credits are transferable. And again
18 it's an additional layer of difficulty because they're
19 unsure. Right? That's really up to the institutions of
20 higher education to navigate, so that's a good thing, a
21 great example of information that districts are seeking
22 that we're not able to be as helpful as maybe we could be.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, but this person
24 would at least supplement nicely with the services at the



1 department. And the fiscal loan on it was -- what did you
2 say Jeff, I'm sorry. 90 --

3 MR. BLANFORD: It's coming in at about
4 \$74,000.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: \$70,000 - \$74,000.
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Rankin.

8 MS. RANKIN: Under the concurrent
9 enrollment, is there something on our website that shows
10 which students are using concurrent enrollment for
11 remediation for college and the different programs that
12 they are on. I mean 30,000 students is -- is quite a hefty
13 number and I just don't have a handle on what they're
14 getting these -- these credits for or how much of this goes
15 toward college remediation.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. So if I may --
17 the last concur enrollment report showed that a very small
18 percentage, so -- so around four percent of all courses
19 that are taken by those 30,000 students are remedial. So
20 basically less than credit bearing courses. The community
21 colleges and the institutions of higher education here in
22 our state are really phasing out remediation as we've known
23 it. And they're asking students to take a credit bearing
24 course in addition to strong tutoring supplementation so
25 that they can get credit for those -- college credit.



1 MS. RANKIN: Do we have a set of numbers of
2 how many -- the percentage that are taking, let's say,
3 Science or Math courses or Art or whatever. I mean out of
4 that 30,000 if -- if it's pretty evenly distributed that's
5 not a problem but I'm just wondering if it's heavily
6 weighted in any specific academic area.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the only areas that
8 are remediation are either Math and English.

9 MS. RANKIN: I'm talking about the other 96
10 percent.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm
12 sorry. I don't know we can get that information for you
13 from the Department of Higher Education.

14 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Is it posted somewhere?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that would not be
16 something that's currently available.

17 MS. RANKIN: Okay. I would like to see it.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great.

19 MS. RANKIN: Thanks.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions on this
21 on this particular request? Okay. Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't remember that we
23 talked about any other way of -- like how are we spending
24 these funds for the viewing of the standards, outside
25 consultants, facilitators and all? I mean, did we -- I



1 don't remember ever talking about the approach to that.

2 This is the only approach, this is the best approach. Mr.

3 Chairman, I think we didn't, did we?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And we -- I think we had
5 some of that discussion.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: It was like an in --
7 information item or something.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Dr. Scheffel I
9 believe you're referring to the request for the standards
10 revision process. And we have some different categories
11 for costs on engagement of educators and key stakeholders.
12 So those will be cost associated with bringing together
13 content area committees to bring forward recommendations
14 for revisions to the State Board.

15 We have costs associated with working with
16 some stakeholder engagement across the state to conduct
17 some regional meetings in order to get face-to-face public
18 feedback. We're also planning opportunities for online
19 feedback as well. The cost associated with that are
20 minimal and we're incurring them during this -- this fiscal
21 year so they're not included in this decision item. We
22 also have benchmarking reports for our standards but the
23 authorizing statute for the standard revision process
24 indicates that those standards would be benchmarked against



1 the highest performing states and nation. So there's costs
2 associated with getting those reports completed.

3 So these are just kind of general categories
4 of the types of costs that we believe would be associated
5 with the standards revision process. We anticipate
6 bringing forward a full plan for the standard revision
7 process in November. I believe it's at the same time that
8 we'll be kind of talking about the Standards Spoke
9 Committee work as well. And at that time we'll be -- we'll
10 have a full plan that will allow for State Board feedback
11 on the approach to that standards revision process so that
12 the State Board has its full voice on how that will be
13 conducted. We're trying to anticipate those costs of the
14 projects.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Good. Thank you. I was
16 just part of it last time and I felt there were issues with
17 how it went. But even those, you know its a hard process,
18 it's a good process, it's a complex process but I guess I'd
19 like to see us think about other ways of doing it and that
20 -- until we figure out what those ways are. I guess I
21 don't know how the money can be estimated. Are we are
22 under a pressure to approve this budget today, Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think given the
24 submission timetables to OSPB and to -- probably not to the



1 General Assembly but OSPB. I think the answer is yes.

2 It's due when at OSPB?

3 MR. BLANFORD: Well, we've currently
4 submitted preliminary items with the understanding the
5 Board is deciding and you do always have the option to
6 remove items from the budget if you decide later. So we
7 would appreciate your vote today obviously but it's not a
8 drop dead date if you were to reconsider this in September
9 and strike it from the budget request that -- that would be
10 possible.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I guess I feel again, I
13 think every year I say I feel like the way we do the budget
14 in terms of the Board input strikes me as very much of a
15 rubber stamp. Having worked for for-profit entities and
16 not for-profit. It never goes this way, it's like somebody
17 says we need this and everyone says great and we move
18 forward. There's never -- I don't remember having really
19 an analytic discussion about how these funds are spent,
20 this is the best way to spend them, most efficient way to
21 spend them and I guess it's pretty high stakes work that
22 we're doing tied to these funds. So I wish that we could
23 have a deeper analysis of different approaches based on
24 funds. I mean I -- the total budget for CDE is, what?
25 Over five -- do you know what it is Jeff?



1 MR. BLANFORD: It's almost -- it's a little
2 over \$5 billion this year.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Billion dollars and the FTE
4 over the last 10 years? I think it doubled over 500 FTE.

5 MR. BLANFORD: It has increased
6 significantly, I don't have that off the top in my head but
7 it has increased significantly.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: And every year we add FTE
9 and I guess I, you know, return on investment for the
10 public, how funds are really spent and I guess I never feel
11 like we're doing our due diligence on the budget, so I
12 appreciate the information.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. And was that the
14 last of the -- those three items?

15 MR. BLANFORD: The -- well, there is the
16 legal fee increase, Mr. Chair and that's really -- that's
17 driven by the Attorney General's work that they do for us.
18 The estimates that we have in our request are based on Mr.
19 Dill and the other attorneys who work for CDE.

20 So unless you had any questions that's
21 possibly going to change up or down depending on what we
22 see in the first couple of months. We'll work with the
23 Department of Law to try and refine this estimate but the
24 1,900 hours and 187,000 is pretty close to what we're
25 expecting. And if I could Dr. Scheffel, we are -- you --



1 you had asked in June about when you would be able to see a
2 budget for the 17/18 fiscal year. I had mentioned mid-to-
3 late August and we are on track for that. The vote today
4 sort of determines what goes into our request for OSPB.
5 Once we finalized that, there's still a back and forth, so
6 it may change but we can get you a draft to which you can
7 react and ask questions if you would like within the next
8 month. We can provide it electronically and then the Board
9 can decide if they want to discuss it.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: But we wouldn't be doing
11 that together then because we'll be doing that offline as
12 individuals.

13 MR. BLANFORD: No ma'am, if -- if you'd
14 like to do it in this format, it would be sent to you
15 initially so you can review it but if the Board wanted to
16 discuss it that's definitely an option.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean just knowing a lot
18 about large budgets. There are just so much critical
19 thinking that should go into a budget and we assume that
20 you've done a lot of the critical thinking in CDE. That's
21 great but I think the Board has oversight over the budget
22 and I feel like I need more detail. So thank you.

23 MR. BLANFORD: Understood.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions?

25 MS. GOFF: Well, yes.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

2 MS. GOFF: I want to know. I think you
3 answered it. Thank you. That we could all have access to
4 it. Is there anything -- there's nothing which should
5 prevent full public access and transparency to any of these
6 documents, right?

7 MR. BLANFORD: Correct. Once it's
8 approved, we're in a somewhat, well you can't be in a
9 somewhat unique position, can you? We're in a unique
10 position with an elected Board, where you make the
11 determination while we move forward with. Generally, OSPB
12 policy is the requests are confidential just to avoid being
13 lobbied as the budget request is going forward. So once
14 that's complete the entire document is public. Absolutely.
15 So there is nothing in there that people can't see, discuss
16 or whatever.

17 MS. GOFF: So I'm hearing maybe -- maybe
18 two things. Complete -- completed publishable -- published
19 documents is one thing -- thing, while it's in the works in
20 -- in the development stages. Is that same thing? Where
21 is -- where are all public so it would be public to us if
22 we are actually working on a different level frankly, it
23 would be in the development of it but -- is that were the
24 axis legally ends at that stage?



1 MR. BLANFORD: Well, that's a very good
2 question. Don't poke my eye out. That is a good question.
3 As I say, we're -- we're in a somewhat different position.
4 We've spoken to OSPB about it so we have an understanding.
5 So for all intents and purposes, our budget request is
6 fully public once we put it in front of you. It's not
7 complete however because those -- that submission is still
8 subject to approval by OSPB.

9 So while that this discussion is public,
10 they could review our items and decide that they don't want
11 to approve one or more that don't think they're appropriate
12 to include in the budget. So that was really the only
13 distinction I was making is, once the budget's final as of
14 November 1st, all of that is completely public. We're in a
15 little bit of a squarely situation because you all need to
16 approve these items. Most agencies, these items are not
17 made public only their final budget request is. So that's
18 -- I know it's a little convoluted but --

19 MS. GOFF: Mr. Chair. Obviously it needs
20 to come up.

21 MR. BLANFORD: Absolutely.

22 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

24 DR. SCHEFFEL: But the fact -- if we vote
25 on this budget and it passes then those that receive it,



1 the implication is -- is that we've reviewed it, we've
2 thought critically about it, we agree that these are the
3 best solutions, this is the best use of the money, best way
4 to solve the issues, that these funds will be allocated to
5 them and that is the implication of voting for the budget.

6 MR. BLANFORD: That is a fair statement.
7 Yes.

8 DR. SCHEFFEL: People are counting on us
9 to have looked at it in detail, not just to scan over it.
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct. Further
12 discussion. I think if -- if I might -- I think -- I think
13 Dr. Scheffel's question is also -- it's not as much -- a
14 question if we continue to do standard setting the way it's
15 been done in the past which is drawn out collaborative
16 process which may or may no -- certainly has some merit to
17 it and probably have some -- some distractions.

18 But -- and if we do it that way we know what
19 it's gonna cost because we've done it before. I think the
20 -- the deeper question we haven't examined is, is there a
21 better way to do this?

22 Do you have to have, you know, a solid year
23 of meetings or is it time to perhaps recognize that there
24 are certain accepted standards? And we really don't need
25 to have the -- the kind of process that's going on in the



1 past on a number of occasions to say these are the
2 standards and we've now -- we've now invited every school
3 district and superintendent to provide significant --
4 significant input when everybody really, you know, how many
5 years we've been at this standard setting? Fifteen?
6 Sixteen? Is there anything new really?

7 And are we going to be faced. Is this just
8 opening an open invitation to people who want lower
9 standards to push that in on our nickel or the taxpayers
10 nickel. Or does, do we have enough, do we have enough
11 consensus that we ought to have high standards, we want
12 reason we know what they are. And that probably is the
13 question that I think needs the Dr. Scheffel wants answer.
14 No to large measure, I'd like to have answered.

15 And I think, I think I wouldn't mind having
16 a 15 or 20 minutes discussion next meeting on that subject.
17 That will be examined the possible ways of methodologies
18 for standard setting and yes, we're stuck with what is
19 going to cost 300 and something thousand dollars, if
20 there's no statutory change. And -- but if we decide we
21 were going to differ way, it only cost X, I think we to
22 have a discussion next week.

23 And In the meantime, I think we're looking
24 for some sort of budget. And so we submit this one as long
25 as we can change that if we think there's a better way to



1 set the standards. Then you know reserve that option. I
2 don't know I didn't mean to put words in your mouth Dr.
3 Scheffel. But I think that's what government never does is
4 look as a whole different approach just because we've
5 always done it this way is not the best answer to why you
6 keep doing it this way.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: On the way it's set up my
8 sense is that it's almost designed by design to have a
9 certain type of outcome. And I guess I didn't hear any
10 discussion about, is that the outcome we wanted? Did it --
11 did we get the kind of input we wanted? Did it -- I mean,
12 I guess I haven't heard any critical discussion about that
13 instead of we're kind of replicating it.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I could. I think
16 that you will still have if you vote to approve this, I
17 think that becomes a placeholder to meet the OSPB's
18 timelines and get it in, so they can do their budget
19 balancing for the November 1 request. But it does
20 certainly does not preclude the discussion that you're
21 having.

22 And as Melissa mentioned that -- that that's
23 in the works to bring a detailed plan forward and to have
24 those further discussions and then to the extent that that
25 has implications on the budget. We can always work with



1 OSPB to revise those and we have a very good JBC analyst,
2 who even if you all weren't having those discussions the
3 JBC analyst comes to us with questions. And he's very
4 good, he's critical, he asked tough questions, but he's
5 also very thoughtful and so and is willing to work. So if
6 we have revisions you know, there's time to change and --
7 and massage the numbers that meet the plans as you all
8 discuss those.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think relatively the
10 overall budget request, a lot of it is driven by the School
11 Finance Act. The numbers are plugged in there and the
12 school and student count. And that's probably what 80 --
13 90 percent of our budget.

14 MR. BLANFORD: Ninety-eight percent of our
15 budget.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ninety-eight. Okay, I
17 was close --

18 MR. BLANFORD: Is where we send out to
19 school districts --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is 98 percent of our
21 budget --

22 MR. BLANFORD: -- Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- is driven. So we're
24 talking about the administrative piece which is not



1 insignificant but -- so we need to focus on the
2 administrative piece, Dr. Scheffel.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I just -- since were
4 having a few minutes to talk about it. In terms of the
5 concurrent enrollment FTE, if that person doesn't get hired
6 and we don't add another FTE to CDE's rules, then doesn't
7 that push the work more to the districts?

8 In other words, the question is do you -- do
9 we want to centralize it at CDE. I mean, I have talked to
10 a lot of folks doing concurrent enrollment is very popular.
11 And I just, again like to think critically about do we want
12 an FTE or CDE doing concurrent enrollment. What if we
13 didn't do that. Are the districts calling for it. Some
14 are and some are definitely not. So again I'd like to hear
15 from other Board Members. I have certainly heard from
16 folks and I don't know that having a bigger role for CDE is
17 what at least some districts want.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do get questions
19 and -- and then we can speak much better to this. But
20 there's a lot of questions coming from districts and so
21 that's what this role would help us to be there to provide
22 guidance to districts consistency help them. But the --
23 the work of concurrent enrollment will really still be at
24 the district.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: You mean, have there been a
2 good justification for hiring another FTE. As I said, the
3 FTE is like doubled in 10 years. It's huge you know entity
4 at this point, you know.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. (inaudible).

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the requests for
7 this type of support has definitely come from the school
8 districts. And we do get -- and we haven't done the exact
9 mapping, but conservatively, about a thousand questions
10 annually about concurrent enrollment from school districts.
11 Many of which come in the form of feedback about the
12 current processes as in place, about the administrative
13 burden, it's on school districts and schools and
14 specifically school counselors.

15 One of the things that we are continually
16 asked about, is the reduction of paperwork associated with
17 concurrent enrollment. This is an area that we do see that
18 we could be helpful, if we had someone to help districts
19 navigate specifically, and to streamline the process. And
20 so what I mean by that is there are pockets of best
21 practices where paperwork and streamlining of processes is
22 reduced, and this person could be helpful to those
23 districts that would like the support to help streamline
24 their processes in that way. This is also a reduction of
25 burden for students and parents as well. We hear lots of



1 stories about dozens and dozens of forms, some of which are
2 duplicative, being completed for concurrent enrollment
3 processes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I guess I -- my question
6 is have we analyzed that sufficiently to suggest that we
7 need a person to do it? I mean, would a website be
8 sufficient with links. This really is the work of the
9 districts and the universities as they articulate together.
10 And I guess I -- I am reluctant to add another FTE another
11 \$74,000 plus benefits. And it seems like a very small
12 amount given the \$5.5 billion budget at CDE but still these
13 are public funds.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion from
15 members? Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Well in sort of a global
17 perspective, It can't possibly be surprising that our
18 number of FTE that apartment has increased dramatically
19 because the philosophical change that occurred back in
20 2008, I think, it become a service and support organization
21 as well as a regulatory organization. Simply has to have
22 meant that we would have folks who would help and serve the
23 school district.

24 So the philosophical shift certainly would -
25 - would expect to see that. The other challenge that I



1 think we are seeing is that as our school districts are
2 making significant cuts that they would look to the
3 department to try to help them, whether it's right thing
4 for us to do or not is important conversation. But it
5 certainly is of no surprise. And to the extent that the
6 department can do a task for 178 school districts more
7 efficiently and cheaper than 178 districts can do them
8 individually, we might in fact be doing the right thing.
9 So I think you just have to, I just want us to keep that
10 kind of point of view it's a significant change from
11 previous times.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: - I think that's you know a
15 good concept. I'm not sure that the schools would
16 consistently see it that way. I was talking to
17 superintendent recently who said they said that they have
18 to write like 87 reports a year or something due to CDE,
19 and some of that is by statute.

20 But I'm just saying to the extent that we've
21 grown an FTE, the regulatory burden, I would say has
22 outpaced the customer service portion by multiples. So I
23 just think we should be cognizant of that. And this just
24 really so budget we had two years ago, I think it was one,
25 I think four or five FTE were approved for ELL support.



1 What we never hear back is, I raise the issue with that
2 point. Is this the right way to support districts by
3 hiring four or five regional folks that have expertise in
4 ELL and they serve the state? What do they do? What's the
5 return on investment? Four or five FTE is a lot, and one
6 is a lot.

7 But you know we never really hear back or
8 get data suggesting that this is a good approach to serving
9 the public. Which is why I just object to this approach on
10 the budget. I know it's a small portion of what we spend
11 that a lot of the funds are already allocated before we
12 look at the budget. But to the extent that we're looking
13 at a portion is discretionary. I just think we should be
14 looking very deeply at how these funds are spent. And if
15 what we're doing serves us well, serves our state well.
16 And if our premises and our assumptions are correct. And I
17 guess the question.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. (inaudible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
20 So just to give a little bit of background, we did have a
21 formal process back in December to identify current
22 barriers that are associated concurrent enrollment for
23 school districts. And what came out of that process is
24 that school districts would like additional support from
25 CDE regarding concurrent enrollment. It's -- the



1 conservative estimate is that this would save school
2 districts about \$3.5 million in estimated time that they're
3 currently spending. And so that's and that's not parent
4 time, that's not student time, this is just conservative
5 estimate of staff time from schools and districts and knows
6 that we would like to look deeper into streamlining
7 processes.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So that's helpful data.

11 But to me again it's another example of where CDE is
12 getting the data, holding the focus groups, giving the
13 surveys whatever. And then we're given the data and asked
14 to respond to it. I don't know that that's the case. I
15 haven't heard anyone calling me saying, if only we had more
16 help a CDE with concurrent enrollment. You've heard that,
17 I haven't heard that. So again given that we have
18 responsibility for the budget in approving it, I would like
19 to be more on the inside track, but what feedback are we
20 getting on how this discretionary funds are spent or
21 proposed to be spend.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

24 MS. MAZANEC: (Inaudible).

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Microphone.



1 MS. MAZANEC: And I hate to bring this up.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no.

3 MS. MAZANEC: But the website (inaudible).
4 I know it's there (inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I, I think that's
6 a great point. The other part of this from the concurrent
7 role of the advisory Board, is that some -- someone, we
8 need somebody to create the streamlined webpage, a website,
9 period.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hello. Hi, Lisa. I'm
11 talking in the mic now.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And we heard you. And I
13 just -- yes, I think it is -- I think -- I think these are
14 important discussions, we'll get to have some of the basic
15 questions of, is there a way to do it better? And how we
16 really looked at it? And the one, the only fear I have is
17 that I don't wanna get a call from Colorado Early Colleges,
18 telling me there's a new form to be filled out.

19 And that for the convenience of the new
20 hire, that is supposed to assist in, in (inaudible) in, in
21 current enrollment. They know how to do it. They don't
22 need any help, they need to be left alone. They do have
23 had, if they do need help, they'll ask, I'm sure. So I
24 think we're once again a little bit in the vice of the, you
25 know, big district's pretty skilled at doing these small



1 district's probably not so much, and don't have the people
2 do it. And that kind of caught in that vice. So further
3 questions on the budget? Going once, going twice, is our
4 motion. Did we make the motion? We did?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And was moved in second?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And all right, would you
9 call the roll, please?

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

11 MS. FLORES: Yes.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

13 MS. GOFF: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

15 MS. MAZANEC: No.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

17 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Chairman Durham?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. That motion is
24 adapted and voted five to two. Thank you very much.

25 MR. BLANFORD: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I would like to, I don't
2 want to have a hour long, and a lot of staff time taken up
3 on the question of, but you know, are there any -- other
4 than the process we have, realistically, is there any
5 better way to do it?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I've got that
7 down.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

9 All right. Now we are, where are we? We
10 are now at 18.01. Dr. Flores, you requested the removal
11 from the consent agenda of the request of Denver Public
12 Schools on behalf of McGlone?

13 MS. FLORES: McGlone and Wyatt.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: McGlone --

15 MS. FLORES: And Wyatt --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: and Wyatt?

17 MS. FLORES: -- and my concerns are the
18 same concerns for Denver Public Schools and what it --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Why don't we wait just a
20 second, we're gonna dial them up.

21 VOICE MESSAGE: Welcome. Meeting. You are
22 joining your conference room. You are the host. Access is
23 immediate. For a menu of available prompts, press the star
24 key, six, and the pound key.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Hey, who do we have on
2 the phone?

3 MR. HATCHER: Hello.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Who do we have on the
5 phone? If you might identify yourself, please.

6 MR. HATCHER: Hi, Chairman Durham, this is
7 Gregory Hatcher, with Denver Public Schools and Lead
8 Government Affairs for the district. And I have three
9 colleagues here with me to answer questions that you guys
10 have. And I'll have each of them introduce themselves, and
11 then we can go to the questions. Hope you guys are well.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

13 MR. DEWITT: Hi, I'm Chris DeWitt. I'm the
14 Manager of New Schools and I help us run the evaluation
15 process for McGlone Academy.

16 MS. MADONNA: Hi, my name Ashleigh Madonna.
17 And I supported the review of the McGlone application.

18 MR. ANDERSON: Hey, this is Joe Anderson
19 and I'm a School Design Manager. I supported the
20 application development. Hope you're all doing well today.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Thank
22 you very much. We will start. Flores?

23 MS. FLORES: I just had some concerns. I
24 have some questions first. McGlone and Wyatt Academy, are
25 these new chartered schools?



1 MR. ANDERSON: No. Chris?

2 MR. DEWITT: No, no. McGlone Academy is a
3 grade level expansion from their K5 program, their EC5
4 program to an EC8 configuration. And Wyatt Academy was a
5 renewal of their, their existing charter.

6 MS. FLORES: Okay. So their charter and
7 one (inaudible) , is that it?

8 MR. DEWITT: That is correct.

9 MS. FLORES: Okay.

10 MR. DEWITT: McGlone Academy (inaudible)
11 school, yes.

12 MS. FLORES: Okay.

13 MR. HATCHER: And I have to clarify sorry,
14 Dr. Flores, this is Gregory Hatcher.

15 MS. FLORES: Yes, Gregory.

16 MR. HATCHER: Let me clarify that McGlone,
17 you guys had already approved their Innovation application
18 for the K5. The (inaudible) this point, this is an
19 expansion that they are able to offer middle school program
20 for students that they serve.

21 MS. FLORES: Okay. So -- and -- and that's
22 fine. I'm not questioning that -- that portion of it.
23 What I am questioning is that, DPS has, has just made out
24 a, a point. And I think, consistently, not only with
25 public schools, but with charters and innovation schools,



1 for this case, of lowering the standards for teachers who
2 teach hard to serve kids. And I know that McGlone and
3 Wyatt are these types of school.

4 One of them I know, it may have been Wyatt,
5 has, that you're hiring, you wanna hire only foreign
6 teachers, and out-of-state teachers. Now, the foreign
7 teachers, I can understand somewhat. But we do have a lot
8 of people in -- students in high schools who do speak a
9 second language. And so you know, this business of hiring
10 out-of-state schools, and out-of- out-of-state schools and
11 I hope, you don't place that you want certified teachers.

12 And I know that when you hire teachers with
13 just a degree, they're paid \$10,000 less than regular
14 teachers. That doesn't seem to be fair to me, especially
15 when you are placing these people in situations that are,
16 well for students, we really do need to have teachers that
17 are well qualified and certified. Also, I know that you
18 advertise for teachers in Craigslist. You hired 900 new
19 teachers this past year. You have an average of 4,800
20 teachers in the district. And you're hiring 900 new
21 teachers. You just got rid of 75 tenured teachers;
22 teachers with 12 years or more experience. You're also --
23 you know, to me, these, these are appalling kinds of
24 statistics that I've been reading on DPS.



1 When I read this proposal and especially
2 when you were asking for out-of-state teachers. And I
3 know, you only wanted out-of-state teachers, now that they
4 were here, you specifically asked for that and non-
5 certified teachers. And I know that the non-certified
6 teachers are probably because you wanna pay them less. And
7 this, this doesn't seem fair, especially when you pay these
8 administrators at these schools just to have an abominable
9 amount of money in comparison to, you know, just regular
10 administrators. So I just wanted to make that -- that
11 point. Would you like to respond?

12 MR. HATCHER: Chairman Durham, Dr. Flores
13 --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

15 MR. HATCHER: Would you like first to
16 respond or did you just want to?

17 MS. FLORES: No, I just, I, I would like to
18 respond on this.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Mr. Hatcher, if you
20 want to, if you want to respond, please.

21 MR. HATCHER: Okay, so Joe Anderson on my
22 team will respond to a few of the, to the few of the
23 questions that were raised.

24 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. And I, this is Joe.
25 Dr. Flores, I might be happy to talk to you more about the



1 innovation plan and more future innovation plans if that'll
2 be helpful, but a couple of things just to clarify. All of
3 our teachers in Denver followed the salary schedule that's
4 negotiated between the union and the district regardless of
5 any waivers. So I think the, the idea of \$10,000 less, I'm
6 not sure where that's coming from, it might just be a myth
7 about newer teachers get paid less because they are less on
8 the salary schedule. But (inaudible).

9 MS. FLORES: That's what you've been doing
10 before. I'm sorry.

11 MR. ANDERSON: There's nothing in these
12 plans in particular that, that talks about waiving from the
13 salary schedule. I think your other co -- the other two
14 things you mentioned we're recruiting outside the state and
15 outside the country.

16 MS. FLORES: That was mentioned.

17 MR. ANDERSON: There's nothing -- there's
18 nothing in the plan that talks about recruiting teachers
19 outside the state or outside the country. I think in the
20 district, we are working really hard to be able to attract
21 our English -- our Spanish-speaking teachers, so what we
22 call our ELL teachers. So I think we've done a lot of
23 intentional recruiting to be able to house them (inaudible)
24 --

25 MS. FLORES: I'm sure you have.



1 MR. ANDERSON: Responses. So I think
2 that's really what we're talking about. Really needing to
3 get better at attracting more teachers that can speak both
4 English and Spanish, but again not in these innovation
5 plans.

6 MS. FLORES: Well, I did read it.

7 MR. ANDERSON: What I didn't mention was
8 the non-certified teachers. So what specifically waive in
9 these plans its been in the McGlone plan, is that they can
10 hire a teacher that's non certified for none-core class, so
11 specifically to McGlone. They're looking to be able to
12 hire a robotic teacher that can come in once a week to
13 provide a robotics class to them. And because it's not
14 typically certified position, they want to be able to hire
15 that position. But any core teachers: English, math,
16 all that core content, those are all typical positions that
17 have to be licensed, and certified, and be highly qualified
18 within the district.

19 MS. FLORES: But you did state that you
20 wanted out of state teachers and you wanted non-certified
21 teachers, that you would hire those people. And I know
22 that it's hard to -- to hire teachers, especially in
23 Denver, because of how you treat your personnel. It's --
24 it's -- it's just a known fact that people don't want to go
25 to Denver public schools. And I would like to speak with



1 you. I will take your offer on sitting down and looking at
2 these numbers more closely.

3 MR. ANDERSON: Great.

4 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Thank you,
5 Gregory. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Dr. Flores, did
7 that answer your questions or-

8 MS. FLORES: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you.

10 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Any other
12 questions from members of the Board?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A motion?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, if we could have a
15 motion, please.

16 MS. FLORES: I move -- we approve of the
17 request for McGlone Academy Innovations School additional
18 waivers from state statutes.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that
20 motion? Is there a second to that motion? Going once --
21 second? Yes, Ms. Goff, thank you. All right. Further
22 discussion.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, may I just
24 read the motion to be sure that it is accurate.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you like to read --
2 read the motion?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you please?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Approved Denver Public
6 Schools' request for designation of the District of
7 Innovation pursuant to 2232.5-1073A sera and approved the
8 request for waivers from state statutes on behalf of
9 McGlone Academy.

10 MS. FLORES: That was what I meant to say,
11 thank you very much.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're very welcome.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That would your motion.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was my motion.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think the debt the
16 waivers granted to the district for the Innovation School,
17 I believe, is that -- is that -- for a group of schools.

18 MR. HATCHER: Mr. Chair, this -- shouldn't
19 the -- the one that you guys are voting on is for McGlone
20 Academy which is a single standalone Innovation School.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And the waiver is granted
22 --

23 MR. HATCHER: To -- for the expansion of
24 their --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It is granted actually to
2 -- all these waivers for districts schools are granted to
3 the district on behalf of the -- the entity, correct?

4 MR. HATCHER: Correct. Yes, sir. Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think that's right.
6 Okay. All right. Yes. All right. Yes.

7 MS. FLORES: What are the difference
8 between an Innovation renewal school and an Innovation
9 school? Does someone know? Innovation school versus
10 Innovation renewal school?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Mr. Hatcher, do you
12 know the answer to that?

13 MR. HATCHER: Yes. The -- so Innovation
14 school is -- is what you had voted on in the past
15 (inaudible) , so of that's just a school coming for
16 innovation status under the Innovation law. The -- McGlone
17 is coming forward as a current innovation school, but
18 wanting to expand their programming through six A. They
19 are in -- their current innovation school is a K5. They're
20 adding grade six through eight, and so in order to have
21 grade six through eight under innovation -- under the
22 Innovation law, they needed to add these waivers in order
23 to do that, to their current plan. So I think the renewal
24 is -- maybe we won't use renewals, not necessarily a
25 renewal, just an addition to their current Innovation plan.



1 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion?

3 MS. FLORES: So why bring it up if we're
4 not going to vote on it?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, we are.

6 MS. CORDIAL: We need a second.

7 MS. OKES: Yes, we have a second. We have
8 Ms. Goff seconded. So moved and seconded and I think we
9 have the motion stated correctly. So -- all right. Would
10 you call a roll please, Ms. Cordial?

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

12 MS. FLORES: No.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Chairman Durham.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. That motion is
2 adapted by a vote of six to one. Thank you. If we turn
3 that off --

4 MR. HATCHER: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Mr. Hatcher.

6 MR. HATCHER: Thank you, Chairman Durham.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, I think we are now
8 at -- we are now at public participation. Oh, yes she -- I
9 think -- Yes, Ms. Gibson I think spoke from Delta school
10 district this morning. It would appear that there's no one
11 signed up then for this afternoon. I believe that -- that
12 concludes -- Is there anything we have not accomplished,
13 Ms. (inaudible)? There's a lot we haven't accomplished but
14 relative to the agenda.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Relative to the
16 agenda, no, we have covered everything.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We're done till
18 tomorrow. All right. Thank you very much. So adjourned
19 until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning.

20 (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