



Colorado State Board of Education

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

February 8, 2017 Meeting Transcript - Prt. 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 8, 2017,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

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



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- criteria that we're
2 talking about with regard to an individual who doesn't have
3 a teaching license is not pursuing a teaching license, but
4 has the content and subject matter expertise that the school
5 district needs in order to apply. And there's just a
6 demonstration of how that content expertise and the need
7 arose, and it -- it is a pretty easy application to
8 complete, I would say it's -- it's within the 30 minute
9 timeframe to complete that application, so that adjunct
10 pathway is available outside of the educational pathway.

11 MR. DURHAM: So then then regard -- returning
12 to the specific waiver, if they submit a request, how many
13 pages does it typically run?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's actually an online
15 application for the emergency authorization. And again,
16 it's about a 30 minutes timeframe, the individual districts
17 in this case are asked to submit just a short writeup as to
18 why the individual may need.

19 For two of these applicants they actually,
20 this is the paper for all four that was pulled out of the
21 application themselves. So as you can see, these are all
22 four, I'm sorry, five applications, and these were just
23 literally the bullet points that we asked the districts to
24 submit, to say, did you try a talented, an already licensed
25 school? Yep, I sure did. It wasn't there. Did you try to



1 find somebody who already have this license or was on that
2 pathway? Yep, I sure did.

3 MR. DURHAM: So, all that's been submitted to
4 CDE for Ms. Aguilar here is on that piece of paper in front
5 you?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I would not say all.
7 So these were the things that we asked the districts to
8 submit. The applicants still goes through an online
9 application where we collect, of course the pertinent
10 information, their name, their Social Security number, their
11 information, so that we can ensure that we have a background
12 check on them, pursuant to statute, and then the district is
13 asked to just provide supplemental bullet points that they
14 can upload into that application, so that we can make a
15 determination. All told when we work through that process,
16 it's about a 30-minute process to actually apply.

17 MR. DURHAM: How long does it take you to
18 reach a decision generally?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: After the review of the
20 application in general, it is anywhere between five and 10
21 minutes, and some back and forth depending on the questions
22 we may have.

23 MADAM CHAIR: You know what might be helpful
24 for, I mean we keep hearing about all the different ways.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that districts can --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Found out about a new
3 one today.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, get a, get a warm
5 body in the classroom and maybe it would be helpful if we
6 knew those.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I got, I got mine this
8 way. So I think I'm. All right, all I would ask is that
9 anything can be done, maybe this process is as streamlined
10 as it can be, but I think it's going to get to be a more
11 common request. I think we need to make sure it's as
12 streamlined as possible, as cost effective as possible, so I
13 move the adoption of 1503 to grant --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 1403.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's that form? It's
16 now, it's now 14? 1403 to grant the initial request, or the
17 request for initial emergency authorizations for the five
18 named people.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do I have a second?
20 Thank you. And, board member McClellan also did you have a
21 question.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I wanted to know if
23 you wanted a motion, but it's covered.

24 MADAM CHAIR: We're in good shape. Any
25 objections?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we want to go now to
2 14.04 or do you want to go to, I can't the 17 one is
3 (Indiscernible), right?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, if we could
5 do just go into that yellow item --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then just a break.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and then after the
8 notes of rule makings, do the break that you had suggested,
9 and then that'll give staff time to get down for the sack
10 pie and the accountability clock.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're at 14.04.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, we're just moving in
13 any order.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Everybody can find that?
15 This is in consideration of the current English Language
16 Learner Education Professional Development. Commissioner,
17 do you have a staff person?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we do, these four
19 staff persons. Thank you. I will turn this over to Dr.
20 O'Neill, and I think we can move quickly through the first
21 couple of slides as we talk about that?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

23 DR. O'NEILL: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and
24 members of the board. Again, I'm Dr. Colleen O'Neill, I'm
25 here to present to you the Colorado English Language Learner



1 Educator Development Pathway option.

2 So today we are going to preview why we are
3 having this conversation, which is really about a US
4 Department of Justice inquiry, regarding the actual
5 development of our teachers, who support our English
6 language learners. We will take the time to review some
7 stakeholder many months ago back in September, actually a
8 year ago last September, we were asked to go forward with
9 some stakeholder conversation and recommendations, so we're
10 going to bring those back forward those to you again today,
11 and then we are going to actually request Board of Education
12 action today, so I will move quickly, probably through our
13 presentation, and, and we'll take any questions as we go
14 through. So a brief context for our students of English
15 Language Learners, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act
16 of Course says that "No state shall deny equal educational
17 opportunities to an individual on account of his or her
18 race, color, sex, or national origin by the failure, by, the
19 failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action
20 to overcome language barriers."

21 That is what we are talking about today. We
22 are talking about whether the Colorado Department of
23 Education has an opportunity to go forward, and ensure that
24 we are meeting all English language learner needs. The
25 actual inquiry that came to the Colorado Department of



1 Education from our Department of Justice, is do English
2 language learners, or students have an opportunity to
3 receive equitable education, based on teacher
4 qualifications?

5 So that's the context under which we're
6 having a conversation today. An overview of the current
7 context around that specific inquiry, with regard to our
8 teacher qualifications. There is an increase in English
9 learner population in Colorado which is making it the sixth
10 largest in the nation. We're at approximately 14 percent.
11 There is a leveling off of individuals who received an added
12 endorsement, or are culturally and linguistically diverse
13 education that serves our English language learners.

14 The US Department of Justice and US Office
15 for Civil Rights are in agreements with 15 districts already
16 in the state of Colorado, regarding the appropriate adequate
17 services for English language learners, so that's all 15
18 districts that are already ensuring that our educators are
19 prepared to teach our English Language Learners students.

20 The Department of Justice inquiry to the
21 Colorado Department of Education, really asked us some
22 questions how are is the Colorado Department of Education
23 actually ensuring that our educators meet the needs of our
24 English language learners from a licensing perspective, and
25 I think that's an important, an important criteria.



1 A little bit more of a snapshot, over the
2 last 10 years, the number of our English language learners
3 in Colorado's public schools has grown by more than double,
4 the rate of growth in total student populations. There now
5 are approximately 126,000 English language learners in our
6 state, and it comprises approximately 14 percent of our
7 total K12 population. Just under five percent or more of
8 our 100,000 teachers actually hold a Colorado license for an
9 endorsement, in a culturally, linguistically, or English
10 Language Learner Pathway.

11 So there are, there is only about five
12 percent. To remind us of a timeline of events, what you'll
13 see up on your screen now is --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Doctor, just interrupt a
15 question. How many teachers are actually employed full time
16 in Colorado?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry Mr. Durham, I
18 do not have that off the top of my head. I usually carry the
19 numbers of how many teachers we have. I apologize.

20 MR. DURHAM: I thought it was in the
21 neighborhood of 45,000. Does that sound right?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a little more than
23 that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to say 52 is
25 where I --is the number sticking in my head, I'm hesitant to



1 say that out loud, but that --

2 MR. DURHAM: So, when you- when you use -when
3 you use the hundred thousand number. That means those
4 teachers having licensed but probably aren't active or could
5 be substitutes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could be any number.
7 Yes.

8 MR. DURHAM: So, could you run a statistic on
9 how many are actually employed in the field and what
10 percentage of those have some sort of ELL endorsement versus
11 the overall pool of a 100,000 because if somebody's not
12 active then you could be kind of overstating the problem a
13 little bit.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think some of the
15 administrators keep their teachers licenses, so also don't
16 teach.

17 MR. DURHAM: Could- could be.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah that's a fair
19 number.

20 MR. DURHAM: But they're not in the --
21 they're not in the classroom.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are not in the
23 classroom, you're right

24 MR. DURHAM: I just think that's a- add more
25 apples to apples comparison than to start using a hundred



1 thousand.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much. We
3 -- I will give a little clarity around the reason we've used
4 the hundred thousand is because it's the pool of available
5 educators which has, is -- is a con -- contextual piece and
6 that we've had a conversation with the Department of Justice
7 as well. How many could we have? We could have this many,
8 so I think that's a great question and we'll.

9 MR. DURHAM: That's not a good number to give
10 to the Department of Justice. We shouldn't be using that
11 number because I think it's misleading in a way that's
12 hurtful to us and- and just because we're in the pool
13 doesn't mean they can swim.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Okay. The-
15 the timeline, I'll get back to our timeline conversation
16 just a little bit just to remind us. This inquiry actually
17 came in 2009, with a-a contact from the Department of
18 Justice.

19 Since that time, we have been working with
20 them with regard to data, questions and/or responses to any
21 questions that they have. It was pretty clear that around
22 the 2015 timeframe they came back in contact with us and
23 asked us what that movement was and what we were doing
24 really about looking at our educators; specifically around
25 licensing and endorsement for English Language Learners and



1 or those pathways.

2 That's when we brought it back to the board.
3 Since that timeframe, we have amassed our- our stakeholder
4 conversations, so since then we have held stakeholder
5 conversations through the course of '15 and '16 beginning in
6 the spring and summer of '16 and then in the late summer of
7 '16. We then came to the Board of Education for a very
8 draft work product.

9 At that point in time, to have conversation,
10 we took feedback back from that Board of Education meeting.
11 We incorporate it- incorporated it- incorporated -
12 incorporated it into our conversations, because what we
13 heard very clearly was, we wanted more pathways; we wanted
14 extreme flexibility, for our educators to ensure that they
15 can meet these requirements but have as many pathways and
16 flexibility as they can.

17 With that we are coming back now in February
18 of 2017 with a presentation for you as to what that
19 recommendation yielded. So onto the recommendation, based
20 off on the feedback that we've had from you all as the
21 board, right now the recommendation is to create an
22 integration of English Language Learners standards into
23 Educator Preparation Programs, be more specific about what
24 those requirements are, as we prepare our new teachers to
25 come into the classroom and then to develop six semester



1 hours of professional development, that would be required
2 for our current educators as well as our new teachers.

3 A little bit more insight into that. ELL Or
4 English Language Learner Educator Development Pathway, what
5 we would be looking at are the recommendation coming forward
6 at this point is a revised educator preparation rules, that
7 really focus on the English Language Learner Development for
8 our new teachers, developing a flexible approach for all
9 educators to receive English Language Learner professional
10 development and the pathways around that, and then require
11 six semester hours of professional development for current
12 educators.

13 That six professional development hours is in
14 complete alignment with the renewals statute or the statutes
15 around the renewal of educator licenses for every five
16 years. With that, professional development pathway we would
17 be ensuring flexible pathways to get professional
18 development for all of our educators. That could mean a
19 district level support, it could mean online learning, it
20 could mean institutes of higher education coming together,
21 our BOCES providing that support; very flexible.

22 At that time, we would also be determining
23 whether there were any other mechanisms by which we could
24 ensure that educators were getting that professional
25 learning including their past experiences, or whether they



1 need to engage in some district level professional learning.
2 So today we are coming before you with a request that the
3 Board of Education take action on this. There is a
4 recommended action to instruct the Colorado Department of
5 Education staff to work with stakeholders to go forward with
6 some rule development along this continuum.

7 With that, I'm going to stop and entertain
8 any questions or thoughts you might have.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan.

10 MS. MCCLELLAN: I anticipate there probably
11 will be more questions or discussions, but I'd like to put a
12 motion out on the floor. I moved to instruct CDE staff to
13 develop rules for a professional development pathway for
14 current educators and update the Educator Effectiveness
15 rules, with the focus on integration of English Language
16 Learners strategies.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second that.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Questions? From
19 colleagues. Shall we call the vote?

20 MS. CORDIAL: Sure. Board member Durham.

21 MR. DURHAM: No.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: Yes.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

25 MS. GOFF: Yes.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec.
2 MS. MAZANEC: No.
3 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan.
4 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.
5 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin.
6 MS. RANKIN: Yes.
7 MS. CORDIAL: And board member Schroeder.
8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I hope you heard the
10 word flexible. We- I heard it from you but it came back
11 from us as well. So actually, I would even add incentives,
12 if there are some ways to incentivize an interest in this.
13 Thank you.
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do I do a rule making or
16 take a break?
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's take a break
18 first.
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's take a break.
20 Okay. 10-minute break?
21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think that
22 should be -- we're caught up right now.
23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then will come back
24 to the notice of rulemaking for rules that we don't want.
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're cutting red tape
4 when you come back.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're cutting red tape.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm cutting red tape.

8 Yeah, so that-that rule that we have, for every rule we pass
9 we get two other ones? Steve?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're on the right path.

11 (Break)

12 MADAM CHAIR: Could we please come back to
13 order? The next item is notice of rulemaking for the
14 administration of the Read to Achieve Grant Program, which
15 no longer exists. Before we begin, I wonder if I might have
16 a motion for this one. Anyone ready to make a motion for
17 me? 1501.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move that notice of
19 rulemaking pursuant to one CCR 30147, rules the
20 administration the Read to Achieve Grant Program.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. That's a proper
22 motion, is there a second?

23 MS. GOFF: I second.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Should we do all
25 three motions at once? No?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think that's
2 proper.

3 MADAM CHAIR: It's not proper? All right,
4 commissioner, turn it over to you.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I, I guess
6 I'll turn this over to Leanne M, just to give you a quick
7 overview of this.

8 MS. EMM: Thank you. Leanne Emm. and this
9 is a continuation of what we heard from Melissa Bloom last
10 month, that we've gone through some rule reviews that are
11 required by statute and have identified three more rules to
12 come forward to be noticed for repeal. These three and I'm
13 going to just speak to all three at once.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

15 MS. EMM: These three, they either no longer
16 exist in statute or they have been never funded and
17 therefore, if it were ever to be funded, then we could rely
18 on the statutes and potentially come back to you and adopt
19 more rules. So, that's what these three are and then we
20 would come back to you in two months seeking to totally
21 repeal.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Great. Any objection to that
23 motion? So that motion passes. I need another motion for
24 301-48.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, I move to



1 approve the notice of rulemaking for 1 CCR 301-48, rules for
2 the administration of the teacher development program.

3 Thank you.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. That's a proper
5 motion. Do I have a second?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any objections to
8 this motion? Bingo. One more please.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, I move to
10 approve the notice of rulemaking for 1 CCR 301-49 for the
11 administration of a Science and Technology Education Center
12 Grant Program.

13 MADAM CHAIR: That's a proper motion. Is
14 there a second?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any
17 objections to this motion? Thank you, folks. So, we'll be
18 back in two months to get rid of these permanently. Thank
19 you, Ms. Emm.

20 MS. EMM: Thank you.

21 MADAM CHAIR: All right. The next item is
22 1801, accountability clock.

23 MS. GOFF: Madam Chair, before we do that --

24 MADAM CHAIR: 1701. All right, Board member
25 Durham, talk to us about this one, please.



1 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. As I
2 reviewed these contact background information forms, it
3 struck me that for some reason we're collecting gender and
4 ethnicity information, which if you'll notice on the
5 background information, we do that on all the applicants.
6 Is that required by law?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me call up our staff
8 members that worked on this.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Please.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. So, I have
11 Darcy Hutchins here who's our director of family engagement
12 partnership.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Partnership?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, too many words
15 and --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know, right?

17 COMMISSIONER: -- - Jason Adler, our deputy
18 director for (indiscernible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, the question was
20 whether or not it's- thank you, required in law. So, not
21 specifically that we collect gender and ethnicity, but the
22 law does state that we should -- that SACPIE should to the
23 best of its ability, make sure that the parents who are on
24 the committee represent geographically, socio-economically,
25 ethnically, the populations of Colorado.



1 MR. DURHAM: So, that is in the statute.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

3 MR. DURHAM: So then, you think it's almost
4 required to essentially profile these applicants?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it was, SACPIE, the
6 State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education,
7 who came up with the application and they're just trying to
8 collect the data that is most useful to make sure that we
9 have a diverse population as much as possible.

10 MR. DURHAM: So, we do report that to anyone?

11 COMMISSIONER: No, it's just for internal
12 use.

13 MR. DURHAM: So non-reporting has
14 consequences, I guess. Well I just- I just don't think it's
15 appropriate that, that those become qualifications for just
16 patient and I think they are obviously a limiting factor.
17 So, I don't think we ought to be collecting that kind of
18 information. Just my opinion, so.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Well, if the legislation
20 requires.

21 MR. DURHAM: It doesn't require.

22 MADAM CHAIR: I'm sorry, I thought you said
23 that legislation does require represen --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it requires that to
25 the best of SACPIE's ability that they have select parents



1 to be on the committee that represents the population in
2 Colorado. So, that is information that they chose to
3 include, just to try to be as diverse as possible.

4 MADAM CHAIR: And board --

5 MS. FLORES: So my question --

6 MADAM CHAIR: -- board member Flores.

7 MS. FLORES: Thank you. So, my question was
8 why didn't we try and get, I guess other cultures to try and
9 represented just three, I would have thought that maybe we
10 could have tried to do that, or did they not apply?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. So, for the
12 parents, the two parent vacancies that we have, they were
13 only white women who ended up applying. We shared it out
14 through the scoop, through district contacts, through
15 various contacts, you know, the different offices in CDE
16 have, so we had to use what we had.

17 MS. FLORES: Well, there's one person that I
18 miss- that I noticed who doesn't seem to know how to write.

19 COMMISSIONER: Well.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry.

21 MS. FLORES: So, I'm thinking, if these
22 people have to write reports and stuff. Well, that was
23 another issue and then I noticed that one of the other
24 people is a lobbyist who we see here a lot. And so, I just
25 kind of wondered and the other question, the other concern I



1 had is- well, we see here of a lot-not here today, but most
2 of the time they're here, so I assume that- and the other
3 question I have was that it seems as if we have the, the
4 charter school over-represented and so, there is another
5 charter, a league of school employee that's here and they
6 seem to be kind of all over the place and I was wondering if
7 someone- we could just maybe start asking for a public
8 school teacher and I know that we have a couple, couple
9 here.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So, thank you. I
11 appreciate the question. So, in the SACPIE legislation, it
12 says that we need a representative who- to serve on SACPIE
13 who represents statewide organization for charter schools
14 and so, we actually only have one person. So Lisa, who is
15 on your- one of the names we're seeking approval for today.
16 So, she's the only person on SACPIE set to actually
17 represent charter schools.

18 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're welcome.

20 MR. DURHAM: So, you happen to know the
21 percentage of men that are --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --

24 MR. DURHAM: Since we're supposed to have a
25 diverse group, do you happen to know the answer to that?



1 COMMISSIONER: Two out of the five parent
2 reps are men.

3 MR. DURHAM: It's pretty close.

4 COMMISSIONER: Not bad.

5 MR. DURHAM: That's good. Okay.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Is anybody ready to make a
7 motion?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was just going to say
9 that's a lot better than the mix at most PTCO meetings where
10 you -- you hardly see --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What does PTCO mean?
12 Parent Teacher Community?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Community organization,
14 there's more to it than that. But I'm- I was going to make
15 a mo- a really quick motion if I can find it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, you're not going
17 to find it because it was back in --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Got it. I hear you.
19 Or- I move to approve item 1701, appointments to the State
20 Advisory Council for parent involvement in education.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Do I have a second?

22 MS. GOFF: Second.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Goff. Do you
24 want to call the roll, please?

25 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham.



1 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: Aye.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: Aye.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan.

10 MS. MCCLELLAN: Aye.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: I

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Aye.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you very much.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you.

17 MS. GOFF: Quick question?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff.

19 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I wonder- well it's

20 really a general question.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Before you leave, hang on.

22 MS. GOFF: Just to wonder if from now on

23 whenever we do approve new committee members or such, that

24 the existing committee could be inserted at the end with

25 roll function. So that just- so that we could see who's-



1 where we are with that satisfying the statute and whatever
2 we wish to see in diversity.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Absolutely.

4 COMMISSIONER: Sure.

5 MS. GOFF: Thanks.

6 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Our next item is an update on
8 the accountability clock hearings. Commissioner I'll turn
9 this over to you.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Madam Chair.
11 This is the last meeting we have with you all before you
12 actually dive into your decision making around the
13 accountability clock and around the districts and schools
14 that will be coming before you. So, this is sort of your
15 last opportunity to- we're going to give you an overview of
16 what you're going to be doing again. So, some of this will
17 be repetitive, but we thought you should have a refresher
18 right before you dive into some of those big decisions
19 you're going to be making. So, I will turn it over to
20 Alyssa Pearson and Brenda Bautsch to walk us through this.

21 MS. GOFF: Before, before you jump off the
22 diving board, could you tell us what you'll be giving to us
23 and when? Or is that part of your presentation? Okay, jump.
24 Go ahead and jump or dive.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As the commissioner
2 said, what we want to do today is revisiting the
3 accountability process, the clock, and the pathway
4 options, just a refresher for you all, so you have that
5 fresh in your head before the March hearings start. We'll
6 review the accountability hearings, the structures and
7 procedures and then through that, we can talk about when you
8 all will get the materials and what materials you'll see
9 ahead of time and what you'll need to do at which meeting.

10 And then, we just want to make sure we answer
11 any questions that you have today, about what's coming up
12 and again, and also, say to you, if things come up over the
13 next month as you get materials, as you wonder about
14 something, please feel free to reach out to us. We're here
15 for you. This month, we want you to be able to go into
16 those March hearings as prepared as we can help you be. So,
17 just please feel free to reach out to us and we'll do
18 everything we can to get your questions answered. I'm going
19 to turn it over to Brenda now. Really, talk through where
20 we're at with schools and districts, and the process, and
21 the timeline.

22 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you. We have five
23 districts and 12 schools that are entering the sixth year of
24 accountability clock on July 1st. And those are the
25 districts and schools that will come forward before the



1 board. It looks, as of now, that we will have two heari-
2 one- there's one definite confirmed hearing for eight- for
3 March and most likely will two hearings in March. So, we
4 would have four hearings in April and three to four in May.

5 That is the number of lineups, you know that
6 Bizy has worked to set some dates on your calendars for a
7 special meeting in those months, so we can get through all
8 of these hearings because the statutory deadline is June
9 30th, 2017. So, before that is when these- just there's 10
10 unique districts. There's a total of 10 hearings, well, up
11 to- up to 10, contingent upon outcome of one of the
12 accreditation rating hearings in March. The kind of the
13 clock process, this slide that we continue to show which
14 just- it highlights those components and it gets at the what
15 we will be sending you. Is part of that, you'll receive the
16 state review panel recommendation, the commissioner
17 recommendation, and the district's proposal because those
18 are the key components of the state board, is to take into
19 consideration when directive action to a school or district,
20 at the end of the accountability clock. The state review
21 panel reports were conducted last summer. We will resend
22 that when we send all of the materials for one school
23 district. We'll make sure to put them all together, so that
24 you have them in one place. So, we will have that state
25 review panel reports that have already been issued and then



1 those commissioner recommendations will be issu- will be
2 issued in the coming weeks. And prior to the hearings, and
3 I'll get into more specifics as well in terms of timing.
4 So, this is just another overview slide.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have you done them?

6 MS. BAUTSCH: We also wanted to just do a
7 quick run through of the pathways and get any of your
8 remaining questions that you had around the options that are
9 before you. The district reorganization pathway, this is
10 just for the districts on the clocks, there are five
11 districts on the clock. And this would involve changing the
12 organization or altering the boundaries of the established
13 districts. It does involve a quite a comprehensive
14 negotiation and a vote from the- from the- from- it requires
15 board approval. But it would be an option for those
16 districts that do want to merge with another district or
17 deconsolidate. The management pathway is an option for
18 districts on the clock or schools on the clock. And under
19 this pathway, the management partners come in and work with
20 the district and the community to help support their
21 turnaround efforts. They are expected to have some
22 experience in turnaround and their primary responsibility is
23 to implement instructional, programmatic or structural
24 supports that result in improved student performance. And
25 so, all of their supports must, to that end, have some



1 effect on student achievement, although that can look
2 differently. So, for example, management partners could
3 come in, a district could bring in a management partner to
4 fully and comprehensively manage a school, or they may bring
5 in a management partner just to fill a targeted need. For
6 example, academic systems or talent management, which could
7 be teacher recruitment. It could be called- the management
8 partner could have a contract that is to, for example,
9 manage a school for in perpetuity or it could be contracted
10 in a short term, a two to three year contract. So, the
11 management partnership pathway does have- it could look
12 differently, in different schools and districts that come
13 forward you this, this spring.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I'd like to ask a
15 question.

16 MS. BAUTSCH: Yes.

17 MADAM CHAIR: I looked at your Rubric for
18 management, which was an- another attachment. Are you
19 filling that out for us or do we fill that out as we're
20 going through?

21 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you, Madam Chair, that's
22 a great question. We are filling that out and we're
23 reviewing the plans when they're sent to us in advance.

24 MADAM CHAIR: And you're going to tell us, in
25 that process, depending on the kind of management, which



1 questions need to be answered that are in that rubric?

2 MS. BAUTSCH: That's correct, yes.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

4 MS. BAUTSCH: And yes. Thank you. That is
5 contingent upon, of course, the district sending us their
6 plan. Before we were to issue the commissioner's
7 recommendation, but for example, for the district that's
8 coming before you in March, we have filled out the rubric
9 for their management plan, which you were able to see a
10 draft of. And we did mark which sections of the rubric we
11 thought were not applicable, based on the nature and the
12 structure of their management partnership. But then, we
13 didn't highlight where we felt that those key components of
14 those rubrics that were applicable whether or not they met
15 them or not. Is that will come to you?

16 MADAM CHAIR: So, will we be able to
17 encourage/require districts to be working on this prior to
18 coming to us? Or do we run the risk of, simultaneously
19 trying to figure out with you where they are on these
20 various questions? Whether it's the innovation or the
21 management Rubric. I was trying to figure out how that's-
22 what I should do with that.

23 MS. BAUTSCH: I- that's a good question. We
24 are encouraging- we've been strongly encouraging districts
25 to share drafts of their proposals with us in advance. We



1 haven't made it a requirement. We've had our language
2 around, it has been it's not- it's been that it's optional
3 for them to come to their hearing with, with the plan or to
4 give us a plan ahead of time. I think if- in the case that
5 they don't give us one and ahead, ahead of time, then that
6 makes that, that hearing process more important for that
7 body and to understand where, where they are in the
8 partnership. And, and at some point, you know, being able
9 to, to review an MOU or a draft scrope- scope of work, at
10 the very least too would be impor- an important piece of
11 evidence to see.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If that makes it, kind
13 of, seat of the pants, as opposed to having some time to
14 reflect on- for, for you all to reflect on what they've
15 submitted and for us. So, I guess my question is, can we
16 require it? Would you require it?

17 MS. BAUTSCH: I, I agree with you, but I
18 don't know if we can require districts to, to --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To come ahead of time?

20 MS. BAUTSCH: To have a certain deadline by
21 which they share with you and us, what is- what they are
22 proposing.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that we could
24 sit with Julie and ask her if there's- if there's any
25 language that we could think about as a requirement there.



1 So far, people have really wanted to work together and come
2 to the table and work with us ahead of time. So, I'm
3 hopeful that if that won't be too much of an issue, that
4 we'll get anybody coming in last minute or are not coming in
5 with anything and then scrambling.

6 MS. BAUTSCH: Okay, and in the alternative,
7 and, and I like your comment too. In the alternative, could
8 we say if you don't, then we're probably not going to
9 respond to you in the same timeframe. Simply because, we
10 need more time and we need another opportunity to ask you
11 questions. I mean, in some way, to make this not just be by
12 the sea. But sometimes on these quasi hearings, we're just,
13 kind of, get the stuff at the last minute, we're reading a
14 couple of briefs and we're making an important decision on
15 the basis of stuff that we haven't spent a whole lot of time
16 digesting and this is so important, I believe.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the way that
18 administrative procedures are written to have the vote, the
19 actual action taken at a subsequent meeting --

20 MS. BAUTSCH: Subsequent meeting, I saw that.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it's a subsequent,
22 not the subsequent. So, depending on how much preparation
23 and how ready we are, some districts may be very ready and
24 you're ready to sign off on that very quickly at the very
25 next meeting and other districts, they might needing- need



1 more time to develop that kind of written agreement.

2 MS. BAUTSCH: Commissioner, do you have some
3 other thoughts on that?

4 COMMISSIONER: No, I think she covered it.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Board member
6 Durham.

7 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I think it has been
8 very helpful and really very well put together. So, you
9 are- you're currently engaged to this person in negotiations
10 or what you would characterize as negotiations with some of
11 these districts under schools. Presuming you reach
12 agreement, does (indiscernible) become an advocate for that
13 position? Is that- and so, we would essentially have the
14 staff and the district on the same page.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is our goal. If we
16 can get to a place where we feel that the plan that coming
17 is coming forward is rigorous enough to dramatically change
18 student achievement. And if the district isn't coming
19 there, then we can't sit at this table with them. But the
20 goal is, is that we can get them there and work on that to
21 get to that place together.

22 MR. DURHAM: And I guess, I would like to ask
23 Dr. Anthes, do you feel that- and it's, it's an interesting
24 perso- we, we have a quasi judicial procedure that in theory
25 is not adversarial and would, on a negotiated basis,



1 essentially, I think is a practical matter for close the
2 board from looking at other options or from successfully
3 looking at other options. And do you feel this, this
4 collaborative method is the best way to expose this board to
5 all of the options and to- and, and does it prevent us from
6 exercising some judgment in what we think might be better
7 alternatives?

8 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you, board member Durham.
9 I, I do not think it precludes or closes any doors to the
10 board for directing an action. I believe the statute,
11 specifically, asks for a commissioner recommendation that is
12 a part of your deliberation, but it is one part of your
13 deliberation. So, there are other parts. I, I believe and
14 I think I've told this court before that, you know, and I
15 know other perspectives are different, but I believe that
16 working collaboratively with a district and being with them
17 and going back and forth and being invited into their
18 district and understanding the context more deeply and
19 pushing them in that way is a better approach. So, that is
20 the approach I've been taking with the staff. Doesn't mean
21 we haven't pushed them. Doesn't mean we haven't had tough
22 questions and also doesn't mean that we will agree with your
23 district on all cases. So, that's, that's where it is.
24 That's where the commissioner recommendation will be, but we
25 have fully alerted our districts that the board makes this



1 decision and, and all options will be before the board.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you still thinking,
3 talking, sir?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me think a little
5 while.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How much you can have?
7 Board member, Goff.

8 MS. GOFF: I'm going to go back to whatever
9 Dr. Schroeder's comment was two or three back. How does
10 this line up? We have two of these scheduled coming up and
11 while we have had a chance to read some of the pre-planning
12 as part of the whole process, we've already completed on
13 this. But on the other hand, thinking in terms of having
14 more time or possibly putting an action meeting, an action
15 opportunity at a later date or I- I'm just saying, how does
16 that line up with our time schedules and what we're able to
17 do in the way of communication? You know, a- a- as far as
18 getting more information or getting some clarification or
19 having with- within ourselves is one thing. But I'm just
20 wondering how we have what, four weeks and we have not seen
21 other than what we have a chance to see ahead of time, a
22 plan or there's really nothing concrete to consider right
23 now from their perspective. So, I- I- if you can help me
24 understand how that would work, so we keep us all within our
25 legal boundaries.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep, so, absolutely. I
2 think those are great questions. We have those slides in
3 here to, kind of, talking through the timeline and the
4 process for the procedures and all those pieces. All right,
5 shall we move ahead and get to that?

6 MS. GOFF: Thank you, Ma'am, and I apologize
7 for,

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, you are fine. But
9 clearly, that's on all your mind is ho- how does this
10 actually work and how does this play out in terms of timing
11 so,

12 MS. GOFF: I just want to be legal and clear.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

14 MS. GOFF: You know, definitely.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. Board
17 member, Flores.

18 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Have the districts,
19 do the districts have the rubric? It looks like a great
20 rubric. Do they had a document? I mean, they do know what
21 to write, check off and,

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

23 MS. FLORES: So, I, you know, I think this
24 this could be, and we have the rubric certainly and the
25 department is going to look at it first, so I- I'm all for



1 the document.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Let me check.

3 It's very helpful.

4 MS. FLORES: Thank you. This this rubric
5 looks great.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. You may move
7 forward. I think we're,

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're with you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for your
11 comment. One of the last, so there's three other pathways
12 we have that are op- options. One is, of course, the
13 charter. To charter one of the district run schools and the
14 charter schools are semi-autonomous public schools that are
15 currently authorized by local districts or by the charter
16 school institutes and they could be proposed by either
17 individuals or by charter management organization. And each
18 district does have their own way of calling for new schools,
19 have their individual processes. So, if this were to be a
20 pathway, it would be that the State Board is directing a
21 district to open up a call for new schools, for new charter
22 school and then the district would go through its process to
23 seek out that charter provider.

24 MR. DURHAM: Question.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member, Durham.

2 MR. DURHAM: Presuming, thank you, Madam
3 Chair, presuming that that's an option. Theoretically, we
4 want these changes implemented in the coming school year.
5 Is that even within remotely possible to have a school,
6 charter school up and running in a timely fashion? I- is
7 that, I mean based on what we've seen on charter appeals, it
8 would appear that that's that's an option that's not
9 practical and le- and unfortunately not practical unless
10 pushed in some fashion. I don't quite like to have your
11 comments on that timing.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Our, you- you're
13 correct to say that. Our ideal preference would be for
14 these pathways to be in effect immediately at the start of
15 the next school year, but we understand that certain
16 pathways that might not be feasible and that that year could
17 be a planning year or the year when the district issues that
18 call for new schools to identify that charter operator.
19 Similarly, if at the very end of the hearings, there were a
20 school, e- e- end of the hearings, end of the hearing cycle.
21 So, if you're closer to May or June and you're issuing the
22 closure of a school for example, that might be a little
23 close cutting and close to and get families time to notify.
24 It does depend on the pathway and the situation, so we've
25 tried to communicate to districts that will take into



1 consideration the pathway and the local context and we want
2 it to be as soon as possible, but we want it to be realistic
3 as well.

4 MR. DURHAM: And then I guess if, let's
5 presume and then in that, in that this was presumably to get
6 off the clock somehow, then the action we have been taken or
7 instructed them will take wouldn't be implemented. Is that
8 the case?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's interesting.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it, I,

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's like the clock.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is totally dependent on
13 what the action is and the timing and where they are in the
14 process. And I think I would just add some districts with
15 the charter specifically, if a district was already down
16 that pathway or it ha- has already taken that action because
17 their own district policies, things could be in place
18 already. It's kind of how far along and how far ahead
19 they're thinking. But yes, if you all said to a district
20 that wasn't planning on issuing a charter to do that in May,
21 they'll, it would be extremely challenging to open a school
22 next school year.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Unless there's somebody
24 standing by.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Unless someone, yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which,

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, with location and
3 contract and all that, but yes.

4 MS. FLORES: But wouldn't we also, wouldn't a
5 magnet school be in the running for this and not just a
6 charter? Aren't there other avenues other than privatization
7 of a public school?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Charters are public
9 schools, though.

10 MS. FLORES: Oh! Please. There are five O's,
11 three, four, whatever. They are under,

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Guys,

13 MS. FLORES: They're,

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Out in the hall. Have
15 you find out in the hall?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it's just,

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon me, three, four's

18 MS. FLORES: It's not a fight, it's just,

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I love to see.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They have their own
21 leader, their own board and such and,

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they're public
23 schools and they, it's one of the con- it's one of the
24 potential,

25 MS. FLORES: It is one of the potentials, but



1 then a magnet school is another.

2 MS. MAZANEC: I think they've been probably
3 following into the, a long line,

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member, Mazanec.

5 MS. MAZANEC: And I apo- I apologize if I
6 miss this, so we make this decision of what, but that we
7 don't have a deadline or does the law include, is there
8 anything in statute about when this change has to be made?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a good question.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Because like you said, I mean
11 if it were a charter or even re-organizations,

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is what trip us up
13 last summer, in July.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Leadership. All o- all of
15 these could take an awful long time to put into place.
16 Correct?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some longer than others.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Any deadline?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think, what?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Commissioner?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member, Mazanec
23 and my staff can correct me if I'm wrong, but I mean, you
24 have to keep in mind that we've been working with these
25 districts for some time now. We, th- this isn't called for



1 them. So, as we've seen folks coming to the end of the
2 clock, we've been preparing them to say, "Here are the four
3 pathways, here are now," some of these are more drastic and
4 would take a year planning. But in terms of, you know,
5 we're like I, like we said earlier, they're going to come
6 with a plan hopefully. And so they've been thinking about
7 this, so we are hopeful that, that many of them can start
8 implementing right away.

9 MS. MAZANEC: But does the law have a
10 deadline? This is what I'm really getting at, I mean th-

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just spatial.

12 MS. MAZANEC: It just, it just, it just says
13 that we can direct change, but it doesn't have a deadline
14 for when it has to be accomplished.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, yes.

16 MS. FLORES: And magnet is not a,

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not one of the four
18 pathways.

19 MS. FLORES: It's not one of the four
20 pathways. I can't believe that.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Is it, is it included in the
22 other or other options? Could that be included?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I mean I think it
24 would depend on how a district would craft their innovation
25 plan. They could craft, they could have that strategy



1 within their innovation plan and articulate that, so there's
2 a lot, there's a lot you can do in an innovation pathway.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please continue.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. The next,
5 the next slides are about the innovation pathway and the
6 innovation pathway under the Innovation Schools Act does
7 permit schools to seek certain waivers to achieve
8 flexibility in hiring, scheduling, budgeting, programming
9 for example. And it is allowed, it is a pathway, so the
10 pathway statute references Innovation Schools Act. So, the
11 direction from the State Board for a District to pursue
12 innovation would be that that district then pursues
13 innovation pursuant to the Innovation Schools Act. So,
14 there are, so it is just one pathway, but there are two
15 different approval processes. So, there's the approval
16 process to get the innovation waiver according to the
17 Innovation Schools Act, and then there's the pathway
18 approval process whereby we determine, the State Board
19 determines whether or not it is a rigorous enough solution
20 to achieve success in that school. So, whether that school
21 come off accountability clock in the next two years. There
22 are different criteria for approval and both would occur
23 under the, if the, that works to be the pathway, so there
24 would be an approval of the waivers and there would be an
25 approval of it as a pathway through the turnaround hearing.



1 There are however, I did want you to know that there are
2 couple of schools and districts that may come before you
3 that don't meet require state waivers, so they are pursuing
4 innovation status and they are seeking local waivers from
5 their local school board. They're not, they're not pursuing
6 state waivers, so that would not require, the left-hand side
7 of the slide the Innovation Schools Act criteria be met, but
8 it would still, of course, have to meet the approval of the
9 State Board in the accountability hearing. And we do have a
10 similar rubric in place of the management rubric with the
11 innovation one as well, where we've seen drafts of
12 innovation plans and run our ru-, run them through our
13 rubric which is geared towards assessing whether or not
14 there will be dramatic enough change as a result of that
15 innovation plan.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct me if I'm wrong,
18 and I'm sure I am. But in the last couple years, it seems
19 like we've had a lot of schools come before us and want to
20 be innovation school. So, if they are still on the
21 turnaround, and they come to us and say, they just want to
22 continue being innovation, that- that's kind of confusing to
23 me even if they've only been on it a year. How does that
24 work?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In terms of your



1 decision, if you would want to let 'em in the pathway.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean we really have,
3 given 'em enough time to review.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think- I think
5 that essence is time and that's where you are willing to
6 make that judgment of, yes, they might have been approved
7 for an innovation plan last school year. This was their
8 first school year of implementing. That- you know, they may
9 not have come off the clock in that first year of starting
10 implementing their innovation plan. We will fill out that
11 rubric for the accountability pathway for them. And then,
12 it will be up to you to decide. Do you want to give them
13 that time? Do you think it's enough?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then, we move over to
15 the right hand side.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, absolutely.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's already on the
18 right side.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It will be on the right
20 hand side. All of our conversations about innovation as the
21 pathway will all be under that right hand side rubric. They
22 may also need the left hand side for the- the waivers
23 themselves. But in terms of the decision, if you- they
24 could get the left hand side, and you go out and say, "It's
25 not enough under the pathway" or you could say, "It is



1 enough" then we want to give them that time and see what
2 happens.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Like when this is all
4 said and done, when you talk about innovation schools act an
5 see whether it shouldn't kind of reach over to the right
6 hand side anyway. Yes. Please continue.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If a district can- can
8 grade their own waivers, do they look like our waivers?
9 What- what type of a waiver would a district give?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, they can do
12 anything.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They can do on most
14 institution.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's in their
16 policies.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, your question about
18 the waivers. Most of the waivers mirror the state waivers
19 that are granted truthfully and maybe Julie's better suited
20 to answer why they would both necessarily be needed. But in
21 many cases, when a local policy exists. For example, one of
22 the common ones innovation schools' seek is for things
23 around timing calendar. They'll extend their school day.
24 They'll extend their school year. So, the way of the local
25 policy, which is to allow them to set their own calendar.



1 And then the way of the state one that indicates they set
2 their own calendar that meets or exceeds the state statute.
3 I don't know if we wanted, why that -- Yeah. Okay.
4 There's also at the state level, the licensing waiver, is a
5 big one for both charter and innovation. Are seeking that
6 right now. And that one allows them to hire staff that meet
7 the bar for hire, previously highly qualified- Yeah.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Local district level
9 through?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, they would, that
11 one would require the state waiver over the local waiver for
12 that. The other piece is the evaluation waiver that ties
13 the Senate bill 191. That would be a state statute. They'd
14 waive rather than a local policy. They could waive the
15 local tool that those district, that district's using. But
16 to really implement their own evaluation, they would also
17 need the state one but that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Board member
19 Goff?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, one time I- I
21 asked a little bit more about bring in. What about the back
22 in?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's say, I think with
24 charters, it seems a little more clear cut, that if- if a
25 school is, goes into a charter situation, I would assume



1 timeframes are attached to the contract. This develops, so
2 there would be a minimum at least, minimum amount of time
3 for the charter to be in existence and try it. But if it's
4 not a charter, or a magnet, or some other structure. Let's
5 say, there was a district or a school who didn't magically
6 pull a miracle off here. I mean, you know, realistically
7 I'd say, two years. If they are, if they are off the clock
8 by then, is there an opening for them to say, you know,
9 we're going to go back on our own. We're going to pick up
10 the traditional path that we, that we're on or not. There
11 is there is, do we have prerogative? Does the department
12 have a prerogative to say this needs to be in place and
13 tried a fair trial of a minimum of so much time? Would it be
14 tied possibly to our accountability timelines? You know I
15 just, I'm thinking now, I'm thinking at the other end of
16 this. I think, I mean what specific in statute right now is
17 just the timeline at the end of the clock at- at the end of
18 those five years. And that's what statute really lays out.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For charter and
20 innovation statute, already dictates a timeline.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or a charter school
23 would have a- a term with their --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- authorizer, and that



1 would dictate performance in your review and then a renewal.
2 For an innovation school, there's also a term associated
3 with that. It's three years. But it is only at the local
4 level.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. That's one on
6 that. That's right.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Because
8 that's kind of what, I guess, one question really is.
9 We're- we're in this, in this part. But do we have any
10 whether you call it responsibility or prerogative to
11 determine the time, time, the timelines because, I don't
12 know the districts. I'm sure they can work that out, but
13 I'm not sure they should have to do everything. I'm just
14 wondering where is the, where are the consequences sitting?
15 At what level? Who's got the job?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In terms of the
17 accountability clock, it really, it, what we have specific
18 language about is just right now at the end of the five
19 years, and that's- that's what the language in the law
20 covers.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Am I missing anything?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No- I don't think you
24 are.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Okay.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec?

2 MS. MAZANEC: So, can you explain for- for
3 schools and districts that got innovation status, did that
4 stop the clock for them if they were on the clock? Still the
5 same?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, still the same.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Clarity. Thanks.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Any other questions? Okay.
9 Proceed. I'm not sure anymore who's presenting.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just one last slide on
11 school closure as a pathway, and just to remind you of the-
12 our different options under this pathway that a school could
13 choose to close part of its schools or certain grades. So,
14 for example, if a school serves grades six through 12, it
15 could choose to close grades six through eight. And that
16 would be considered school closure by the department's
17 school closure guidelines and the definition of school
18 closure. So, that could be a situation that comes before
19 you, as well. And the other, full closure, of course, is an
20 option. And then, in terms of how the school is closed, it
21 could be an immediate closure or could be a phase out, where
22 the school doesn't accept students of a certain grade. So,
23 for example, they don't enroll those sixth graders, and then
24 the next year, they don't enroll seven, and actually don't
25 enroll eight. So, then there are nine to 12 school. So,



1 there are- there's a little bit of nuance in the school
2 closure pathway that we just wanted to point out.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Floret.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like you, you put on
5 the table that they went. Districts could actually come
6 together and merge over the commercial district. And so,
7 this would be something that they've already talked out. I
8 mean, meaning, districts merging together. This is
9 something that they would come, or would this be something
10 that is very complicated?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, no. I'm sure.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because you have to have
13 a vote of the --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of the community but
15 then --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The community or the
17 whole state?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Community.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we went from 176 to
20 178 --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was just asking.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We all voted on it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that was for, that
24 was for, the district that was the,.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was for spin, a



1 couple of spin-offs.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, but., I mean, wasn't
3 that --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is- this is the
5 opposite. This is consolidating district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wasn't that district
7 made up of charters? Wasn't that the charter district?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, no, no. This is
9 before charters. This happened for charters. I thought
10 this was just had to be a state wide vote. Am I wrong? Is
11 my memory just totally shot?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just the local
13 vote.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think she's talking
17 about --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- - consolidation in
20 the school district.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we changed
22 district, when we changed, I think we added two districts.
23 They were two districts that- that split. From 170 went to
24 176, to 178. And I thought we all had to vote on that.
25 This is sort of a silly thing.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. You know what, I
2 don't know the answer.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You weren't here either.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was not here.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was only half here.

6 Technically. I mean, I went and I voted, but I wasn't as
7 involved in the school issues. Anyway, it's complicated to
8 either merge or --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- - split up. It's not
11 just we -- we all agreeing we want to do this.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

13 MR. DURHAM: Especially if they're bonds, you
14 have to allocate bond payments, and --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

16 MR. DURHAM: -- - it really gets complicated.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 MS. FLORES: So, but, so are we sure that
19 there are no district that will come- districts that will
20 come to us and say, "We want to merge."?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not aware of any at
22 this time.

23 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. What about a --

25 MR. DURHAM: I can guarantee it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about a district
2 that wants to break up, like Denver into four areas?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They want to break up
4 with you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that a rumor?

6 MR. DURHAM: That takes constitutional
7 amendment. I think we voted on by all states.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jeff go ahead then. I
9 mean, there's been that discussion with Jeff for many years.

10 MR. DURHAM: Denver is under Article 20 in
11 the state constitution. They're created as a city county,
12 and school districts. So, I think that would require a
13 statewide vote if they want to break up.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anyway, any who, yep.

15 MR. DURHAM: I think. I mean,

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MR. DURHAM: Always ask our legal counsel
18 about Article 20.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Pearson, are you
20 next on?

21 MS. PEARSON: Oh. I think Board member
22 Mazanec had a que --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ups?

24 MS. PEARSON: Did you want us to explain
25 that?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you have a question?

2 MS. PEARSON: The phase out a little bit
3 better or again?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The phase out?

5 MS. PEARSON: The phase out where the school
6 --

7 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

8 MS. PEARSON: They --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I was interested
10 when- when you said it could be partial closure. And
11 partial closure looks like, it could be --

12 MR. DURHAM: It must be incredibly difficult.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- - quite open ended.
14 Quite --

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So, partial and phase
16 out would be two different things. So partial is if you
17 might have two grades fans in a school, like class six,
18 through 12, and middle school, and high school, and you look
19 at the data, and one of the grades fans is not performing
20 well, and they really want to focus on the other, so you
21 could partially close one of them. Phase out would be where
22 the school slowly closes over time, 'cause it- you know,
23 part of what we've been thinking about with this, is how do
24 you ensure kids- we make sure kids have a good place to go
25 to, and so for some communities, it may make sense to phase



1 the school out, instead of just closed right off. So then,
2 you just don't take new kids in. Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just had a few slides
4 on that procedures around what the hearings will be coming
5 up, and what you will receive in advance. So you will all
6 receive three items at least in advance, and they will- that
7 will include the state review panel recommendation, the
8 commission recommendation, and the district's report, or
9 proposal, if they're submitting that. That- so, those three
10 items at a minimum will be submitted.

11 You may also receive additional documentation
12 as well. We're trying to make sure that what we send you is
13 relevant and helpful to the hearings, but those are require-
14 are def- definitely going to be part of that packet, and we
15 are aiming to get those to you all at least 30 days prior to
16 the hearing in most instances.

17 The March meeting, there is- as I said, there
18 is one confirmed hearing, there's another that will likely
19 happen as well, but for the confirmed hearing, you will
20 receive those materials. I believe on Friday, Bizy and I
21 will work to get to those, either Friday or Monday. So they
22 will be coming imminently, and that will include those three
23 elements. The district has supported- or has submitted a
24 management proposal, so we will send that over along with
25 the state review panel report and the commission's



1 recommendation, and that will give you a little under the
2 four weeks to review prior to the March hearing,

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the filled out
4 rubric?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the filled out
6 rubric.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. And the full- the
9 filled out rubric is embedded in the commission's
10 recommendations. So it's include attached to that. Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then at the hearing,
13 there's an opportunity for the department to present on
14 behalf of the commissioner for the commission's
15 recommendation, and the district will have an opportunity to
16 present its plan and proposal, and then the state board has
17 the opportunity to present, or to engage in questions and
18 discussions. So that 30 minutes where the district is
19 presenting in particular, is meant to be an uninterrupted
20 time for the district to give a presentation, and then there
21 is the time afterwards.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we may interact with
23 those folks in our two hour time period?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly. Yes

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think- I think



1 we're going to like that a lot better. Don't you think,
2 guys?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That's true.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. The only thing I
5 don't like is the district report optional. I want to see
6 that optional go away.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

8 MS. PEARSON: But we can share that sentiment
9 with the districts as we talk with them. That they- that
10 the board would like- board chair would be very amenable to
11 seeing your plan at a time.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And she might be
13 grumping otherwise.

14 MS. PEARSON: Okay. We- we will happily
15 share that.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we have- we are very
17 close to finalizing the full schedule for all of the
18 hearings, and busy as working to get out formal scheduling
19 notifications to all 10 districts within the next week, so
20 that we will have. So we are very close to getting
21 everybody scheduled in, and then that way, we can send out
22 their materials in advance. And so, it'll be this rolling,
23 sending of materials. You'll- you'll be constantly
24 receiving materials from us over the next three months, but
25 hopefully in enough advanced time, so that you can review



1 those prior to the hearing.

2 MS. PEARSON: And then at that first hearing
3 and you all, there's no vote required of you then. At the
4 administrative procedures, it's really out of that- that
5 subsequent meeting, so,- so you'll have the time to review
6 the materials ahead of time, then to hear from the districts
7 and ask them questions, and then there's some time to
8 process before you make a final decision.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's time?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham?

12 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I believe my
13 question has been answered. If a board member misses a
14 hearing, are they entitled to vote on the --

15 MADAM CHAIR: Death by hanging.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Get a rope.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I won't.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She said death by
19 hanging.

20 MR. DURHAM: When it does come before the
21 board, since you listed additional proceedings?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, that's an
23 interesting question. Since we're treating it, we're
24 requiring written submissions in advance. And obviously,
25 they can familiarize themselves with the materials that are



1 going to support the positions of both parties. You know,
2 I- I'd like to take a look.

3 My instinct knows that- that they could vote
4 as long as they could provide some assurance that they've
5 become familiar with the materials submitted to guide the
6 deliberations. The other option is two, I don't know like
7 our- our live streaming is also recorded. Is that? It is.
8 Well, so, that would present an opportunity. But the main
9 thing is that all the board members are supposed to be
10 drawing from the same knowledge base in connection with
11 voting. But since they're --

12 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

13 MS. PEARSON: Right.

14 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. I think probably it 'd be
15 a good idea to (indiscernible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That will never happen
17 in this crowd, but I'll take a look.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's what I'm going to
19 worry about frankly.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin -- I
21 mean, Mazanec. Sorry.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so- so, we have the
23 hearing, and then we can consider proposed written
24 determinations?

25 MS. PEARSON: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, at the conclusion of
2 this hearing,

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Explain what
4 those are, and then when- when we vote, what I'm wondering
5 is, will there be questions, will- will there be opportunity
6 for question and answer then, or is- is that the end of the
7 hearing, and then like- like a judge or a jury, then we
8 deliberate until- or do we get to ask more questions?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You get to ask questions
10 that day.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then I'll --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think your
13 question is --

14 MS. MAZANEC: After that.

15 MADAM CHAIR: -- - do we get to come up with
16 some more questions in the interval? In- interval between
17 that hearing, and the next meeting when we vote.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Then who could those
19 questions be directed to? Will it be just our own staff,
20 or,- what would the- the school or district?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The- Madam Chair, and
22 Ms. Mazanec. But the model is- it's sort of been developed,
23 and obviously we're kind of creating the wheel as we are
24 driving. Right?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so we don't have a
2 good road map for this, but in visions that you have a
3 hearing, and then at the end of it it's closed, the time's
4 up,

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that deliberation is
7 truly just deliberation among the board. If there were a
8 reason that you wanted to re-initiate a conversation, I
9 think we would require re-opening the hearing, and you need
10 to ensure that both sides were present.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So obviously best and
13 cleanest practice will be not to go there if you can help
14 it.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Just want to make
17 sure I understand.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How it works? Board
19 member Rankin?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I got it right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On- on page 16, the-
22 prior to the hearing, the state order to see the review
23 panel recommendation, and commissioner recommendation, and
24 the district report if they have one. Except for number
25 three, is there someone at CDE that we will have a name



1 after each one of those, that if we have a question about
2 that process, or about what came in, that we can ask? Call
3 and ask?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. Yeah.
5 We'll make sure you know who -- send your questions Bizy,
6 she'll --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A quick questionnaire.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. And we know
11 that you probably will, when you see the materials, or want
12 to know the terminology or anything like that.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Ask him not to
14 use acronyms please.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're working very hard
16 to make sure we don't.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll go back and comb
20 through it. I usually read for that. But I will go back.
21 We'll do our last ones over.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But even then, there may
24 be things you have questions about so,

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As always I'll listen.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can play that bingo
5 game.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions?

8 MS. GOFF: I- I do have one, just comment.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Goff.

10 MS. GOFF: It may not be directly germane to
11 this. Our board operating procedures do have language in
12 there about voting electronically or when you're not present
13 and so forth. And what it says, I'll paraphrase, it has
14 language in it that says a board member need not be present
15 in the room, but in order to vote which would be, you know,
16 on the phone or by some kind of hook up, you need to have
17 heard the issue at hand.

18 So, whether that means live or by tape,
19 unclear but we might want to kind of look at that and see
20 what- if that's something that could transfer and apply. I-
21 I don't think it's going to happen, I'm going to predict. I
22 wouldn't --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wouldn't be real happy
24 if we had a number, if we had plural board members absent on
25 the day that we were due to vote on this.



1 MS. GOFF: I doubt any of us would feel
2 comfortable, right?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the room or not.

4 MS. GOFF: I probably wouldn't feel
5 comfortable voting.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I know, that's why
7 I don't think it's --

8 MS. GOFF: I hope it's not going to happen.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham.

10 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, I'm not as concerned about
11 being absent on the day of the vote as I am on absent the
12 day of the hearing, which is the --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, right.

14 MR. DURHAM: -- I think throws the other
15 question I would presume if we were present. If we were
16 completely absent obviously you can't vote. If you're
17 present by electronics, probably you can, at least we've
18 allowed that in the past.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Finish up.

20 MS. GOFF: I believe that's all that --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I want you to get to the
22 picture and how do you guys decide on this pictures?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is so --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh yeah.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You guys start putting



1 Jason out there.

2 MS. GOFF: I know.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wondered when --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that's what we
5 should do.

6 MR. DURHAM: I have, I have cuter pictures.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is kind of turn
8 around.

9 MR. DURHAM: New answers, much.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Upside down.

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 MS. GOFF: Thank you very much.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you all and just
15 please let us know what during the next month and beyond and
16 especially during the next month as we get ready for the
17 first one or two, let us know what we can do to help you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19 MS. GOFF: Okay. So, we didn't talk about
20 the rubrics but they're, I mean they're so detailed, I just
21 --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Next item on the agenda
23 is the legislative update. I believe we saw Mrs. Mello
24 sneak in here. Do we want to- yeah let's have a discussion
25 first, please. Oh and where is that thing? Hey this is the



1 (indiscernible). Did Steve get to look at it? Steve, did
2 you --

3 MR. DURHAM: Yes, I did.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, please.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, State
6 Board, good morning or good afternoon I suppose. It's been
7 the kind of day at the Capitol where I'm not quite sure what
8 time it is to be quite honest with you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is quarter to 4:00,
10 my dear. We're early.

11 MR. DURHAM: It's early.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just got a text from
13 Bizy saying, great we're almost there. So, technology is a
14 little behind.

15 So, as we head into February, obviously the
16 pace picks up quite a bit with the legislature bills are
17 moving through I guess depends on your definition of quickly
18 but, committees are very busy, you know, giving bills their
19 first hearings. A lot of bills go down in those first
20 hearings. So, in some ways, the bills we're looking at
21 start to winnow. However, new bills are still being
22 introduced every day.

23 So, in other ways, the bills we have to look
24 at are widening. The main item of business today is that
25 the alleged contacts are recommending an opposed position,



1 that the board take an opposed position, on Senate Bill 114.
2 This is a bill by Senator Dominic Moreno, and it has to do
3 with the accountability system and because those details are
4 complex and they matter, Alyssa is going to explain them to
5 you, just so we make sure we get this right.

6 MS. PEARSON: As well as I can today. So,
7 there's three main components of this bill. One is adding
8 another performance indicator, which looks at improvement in
9 achievement and growth and for disaggregated groups over a
10 period of four years. So, kind of saying where you are four
11 years ago, where you are today. What was that improvement
12 in adding that as a performance indicator.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In addition to the
14 growth --

15 MS. PEARSON: In addition to already having
16 growth and already having achievement and already having
17 post secondary workforce readiness. The way it's written
18 we've been trying to work on interpreting it. The way it's
19 written it's pretty specific and we are concerned that until
20 we have four years of consistent data, meaning same
21 assessment, same results, we're not sure we could implement
22 something like that.

23 So, there's just some technical pieces to it
24 that may be some challenges. The second part of the bill,
25 says that growth needs to be weighed the most in the



1 performance frameworks, when you do all the sum in it. You
2 all have board rules, the laws never said anything about the
3 weighting. In your board rules you all have said growth and
4 post secondary workforce readiness need to be weighed the
5 most.

6 So, I don't know, I think they probably could
7 work together. We wouldn't need to dig in if the bill
8 passed but I just wanted to highlight that that was in
9 there. Then the last part, is around the accountability
10 clock, but we were just talking about it and what it does it
11 removes the board's authority to remove accreditation based
12 on performance.

13 There's still the ability for the board to
14 remove accreditation, if it's about financial concerns and
15 that language is still in there, but if it's about
16 performance in terms of the clock, the board's authority to
17 do that, either that they must or may is gone from the law.

18 Instead, it says the board needs to draft a
19 corrective action and that corrective action in the list of
20 corrective actions is exactly what's in law right now, but
21 it's just called the corrective action. So, that's really
22 kind of the switch there.

23 And it talks about an appeal hearing for
24 schools and districts, we think that kind of works already
25 with the administrative procedures that are in there. We're



1 assuming that it's just that chance for the district to talk
2 to the board about that action, what the corrective action
3 would be.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, board member Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: Thank you. So, what- what are
6 they thinking? What is Senator Moreno thinking of that other
7 option? I mean, I can think of lots of options but
8 specifically, what are some of the options that he and
9 others are thinking about? In the- for the first one.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam chair, Dr. Flores
11 and obviously all, I think I want to let Alyssa speak to
12 that. I mean I have- I have not spoken with reps- with
13 Senator Moreno in detail about this bill and I just- nothing
14 we say I don't think could be representative of his
15 thinking. So, but you go ahead and if you have an answer.

16 MS. PEARSON: Were you- were you specifically
17 about that end of clock options or --

18 MS. FLORES: Well, I'm speak- I'm speaking
19 specifically about other options other than the growth and -
20 -

21 MS. PEARSON: Oh that other indicator?

22 MS. FLORES: Okay. And then I have a second
23 question.

24 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So, that indicator, it's
25 very specific in the language in this draft bill around,



1 it's adding this indicator of improvement. So, looking at
2 the change over four years, what your achievement rating or
3 your achievement data, your actual score changes over four
4 years and having that be a measure of what your growth
5 change over four years, what your disaggregated groups have
6 done in achievement and growth over four years.

7 MS. FLORES: Well, I know we have that. I
8 have some issues with growth, especially when growth is so
9 small. But I'm concerned also about accreditation, because
10 I think that is kind of something he- he did last year and I
11 was at the hearing on accreditation where I was really
12 concerned about whether a university would take children. I
13 know that he was trying to get accreditation from the State
14 but what about if it went out of State? And out of State, if
15 we took accreditation away, then sometimes those
16 universities will not take kids who do not come from an
17 accredited school.

18 So that's, you know, I mean we're talking
19 about a serious issue for kids who might have a scholarship
20 outside or outside the State. And I don't know if UC or
21 University of Colorado, any of them would take a student
22 without- and that comes from a school that's not accredited.
23 So I mean, that's a serious issue for students.

24 MS. PEARSON: Madam Chair and Dr. Flores.
25 So, I mean there certainly has been discussion about this



1 topic before in the legislature. What Alison just informed
2 me is that your ability under current laws to remove
3 accreditation from a district, not from a school, and as
4 long as the school remains accredited.

5 The issues that you're flagging Dr. Flores
6 and I think there have been lots of questions about this, so
7 I certainly understand where you're coming from. But it's
8 only if a school were to lose its accreditation, that the
9 students might suffer those consequences that you were
10 describing. So, the district losing it's accreditation.

11 MS. FLORES: Districts accredit the schools.

12 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

13 MS. FLORES: We don't.

14 MS. PEARSON: Correct.

15 MS. FLORES: So --

16 MS. PEARSON: That's my understanding.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, isn't there an
18 outside accreditation agency that accredits or do we?

19 MS. FLORES: Yeah. Districts accredit their
20 schools. We accredit their dist- the districts only. This
21 is a change over time.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Universities were an
23 accrediting agency outside.

24 MS. FLORES: Right. We used to have all
25 sorts of accrediting of schools that no longer, especially



1 high schools, that no longer occurs.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Accreditation is- is a
3 serious issue.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member, Nicole.

5 MS. NICOLE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Do I
6 understand correctly that in a district that has lost its
7 accreditation is still empowered to accredit, give its
8 accreditation to its individual schools?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think this is an area,
10 is uncharted territory, right? We have never, at least in my
11 knowledge of history of where the state led reform, history
12 is gone, we haven't removed a district's accreditation
13 before. So, I think there's things to figure out. I know
14 Julie has anything that she wants to add. We've been
15 digging through what- what- what really happens if
16 accreditation is removed.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I cannot speak for
18 Senator Moreno, but I wonder if we may have uncovered
19 perhaps an element of his thinking maybe. He may be worried
20 about what could happen if a district loses its
21 accreditation, and then wondering what the waterfall effect
22 is for the students within that district in terms of their
23 ability to feel safe and knowing that they will go forward
24 with accreditation.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I will just point



1 out that Senator Moreno I believe has two districts that are
2 at the end of the clock in his district Westminster and
3 Adams 14. So, it is a- it's not a theoretical issue for
4 him. I mean, it's something that's happening in his
5 legislative district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the concern has
7 been, and I believe that understanding has been the concern
8 about students and students having the ability to get
9 scholarships and go to college and that was part of the
10 concern the passed. I believe where it landed was that the
11 district's removal of accreditation shouldn't threaten any
12 of that.

13 But we can go back and track down. I know
14 Tony had that somebody had done some research to- because
15 there was that concern that every- I think most people share
16 about students being in this position where maybe they would
17 be eligible for scholarships or are able to get into college
18 if they had, you know, if they met the entrance
19 requirements.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a practical
21 matter. Unless I'm mistaken as we have had these
22 discussions over the last probably three years about the
23 consequences of the clock. Our concerns about removing
24 accreditation were for districts that just went and we're
25 going to ignore the fact that they were on the five-year



1 clock and given- didn't give a darn. And I don't see that
2 kind of behavior on the part of anyone.

3 You know, maybe I'll be surprised that
4 there's going to be a district that just simply doesn't care
5 and says, do to us what you want to, as opposed to we're
6 going to try this this and this to improve outcomes for
7 kids. So, this was sort of a threat that we just don't
8 really expect to come forward.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're hoping not. We're
10 hoping to have everybody engaged and caring about the
11 outcomes for kids and ready to take a pathway forward so
12 that we don't need to. But currently, you all do have that
13 ability if it gets to a point where somebody isn't moving
14 fast enough that you could remove accreditation.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member McClellan.

17 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you. This is just a
18 quick follow on to my line of questions. I think before
19 proceeding with a vote, I would want to feel sure rather
20 than leaving those students in limbo to hope that we would
21 not take the action. I would want to know if the district,
22 if it would lose its accreditation, would those students
23 find themselves in a compromised position? Because you could
24 have an A student who's worked hard for their entire
25 academic career and have their future compromised.



1 If I don't know for sure, the answer to that
2 question and if indeed the bill fails and they go
3 unprotected, so. Although, we may think it might be
4 unlikely that we would go down that road, I would want to
5 responsibly know before I vote on whether or not to support
6 this.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, sir.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
9 That's not what bill does. And, you know, I think it's
10 designed, if it passes, to try and get two districts off the
11 clock.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because it not only
14 doesn't deal with the accreditation question, it also deals
15 with adding an additional factor. So, it shouldn't be any
16 mistake about what the motive is, and I would suspect that
17 the school districts involved had something to do with
18 suggesting this bill might be a good idea. If this bill
19 passes, I think we probably just ought not to have any of
20 these hearings on the schools on the clock because it's a
21 clear demonstration the legislature is not serious about
22 accountability.

23 And if we don't keep all of the options
24 available to us, I think it's a clear demonstration that
25 this board is not serious about accountability. So, may be



1 appropriate to use the accreditation option, it may not.
2 But it may have dire consequences to people. That's kind of
3 the idea. The- the students in these schools have already
4 faced a dire consequences of a failing school for six years.
5 And that's the backdrop against which you have to judge how
6 draconian any action this board may take is.

7 Would you have to start with the premise that
8 you've had a bad result for a significant period of time and
9 our decision is we're going to let it to go on or not. Now,
10 I'm not overly optimistic that this is going to be as
11 successful a process as it ought to be, but if we want to
12 just to, if we want to let the legislature pass this bill,
13 fine. But I think we should in no uncertain terms make it
14 clear to them that we're wasting our time with
15 accountability and they're wasting their time pretending
16 that we have accountability.

17 MS. FLORES: I just want to ask a question on
18 this.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Flores.

20 MS. FLORES: And it has to do with
21 accountability. Don't school districts have various
22 measures that they can use? Local measures that they can use
23 for accountability other than a score on park and a teacher?
24 Aren't there others? Is there multiple ways of being able
25 to?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, through the request
2 to reconsider process that we just wrapped up, districts can
3 submit additional information for performance data for
4 schools or districts. The guidance we have is pretty
5 specific that that information can supplement the state
6 assessment data and not supplant it. So, we really pay
7 attention to that achievement data and K-2, where we don't
8 have statewide data, growth data, and K-3 the areas where we
9 don't have state assessment, so but it's true it's not
10 automatic it's through a review process and it's really
11 looked as supplemental to the state assessment data.

12 MS. FLORES: Okay. Then what if some of us
13 feel that or think that the tests that we're currently using
14 is not --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, it's really late in
16 the day. So, could I have a motion please. Could we have a
17 motion, please.

18 MS. FLORES: Excuse me, I want to finish my
19 sentence. It's not sufficient to.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a different
21 conversation. We need to- we need to look at this bill.

22 MS. FLORES: To really test. But that's
23 going to be in play, I think when we make decisions such as
24 this.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we have a motion,



1 please.

2 MS. FLORES: Whether that test is really
3 credible.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin.

5 MS. RANKIN: I move to oppose Senate Bill 17-
6 114.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

8 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please go right ahead,
10 Board Member McClellan.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
12 Is it possible that in the event that a district lost its
13 accreditation would the schools in question in the event
14 that they are not granted accreditation by their district if
15 they don't have that authority, would they then come before
16 us? Is there still a mechanism by which those schools would
17 be gauged individually?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, those schools
19 receive a plan type from the state that's based on, you
20 know, a school performance framework. So there is a way of,
21 the way- there's a way for the department to describe the
22 performance of students in those schools.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I guess, if you
24 don't mind, I want to make sure that we're really clear in
25 terms of what, what you are voting on right now, what the



1 bill does. So, the bill would remove that as an option for
2 the board. It certainly does not require you to use that as
3 an option. And- and I'm hearing that some of you have
4 questions about that. Right now it is an option you can
5 use. If this bill were to pass in its current form, it
6 would not be an option you could use to remove district
7 accreditation. So, just wanted to make sure that we all --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted to make
9 sure that there was still a pathway by which the individual
10 schools in a district that has lost accreditation still have
11 a pathway themselves to achieve accreditation. Are we
12 fairly certain the answer to that is yes?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That the- that the
14 school side that the school would have a pathway toward
15 accreditation.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A pathway toward
17 accreditation, district lost its accreditation.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think we know
19 this.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I know that we'll-
21 I know that we will describe their performance. That I know
22 that the, the department's responsible for assigning a
23 school plan type for that school.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, the loss of a
25 district accreditation does not automatically take away



1 accreditation for the individual schools?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's nothing in state
3 law that says that that is actually mean we have a --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. And that's where I
5 think the statute is difficult because accreditation, you
6 know, we think of it in this high rate context almost a good
7 degrees from an unaccredited institution. So, you can't get
8 certain kinds of jobs. This is really a different animal.
9 I mean, it's, it's not about an impact for students so much
10 as the biggest thing that makes it a real nuclear option is
11 that if you remove accreditation it triggers the school
12 district reorganization. I mean, it really it makes that
13 entire district its process, its staffing, its, its
14 boundaries, its everything is all of a sudden up for grabs
15 in a --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And its students too.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For me it's maybe having
18 an election. All of those things the school district
19 organization involves. And that makes conceptual sense,
20 right? If the district's chronically underperforming,
21 eventually you have to say the entire system has been blown
22 up for what it sort of. And that's what the state
23 envisioned.

24 In terms of consequences for students, we
25 have not identified a way in which it does. What we all



1 kind of keep thinking it sounds like it should do.

2 So, but one of the reasons I think probably
3 it's so important to maintain at least the option is because
4 if a district were so underperforming and perhaps
5 intransigent as Mr. Durham described. To have the option to
6 say somebody else needs to be responsible for these kids
7 because the system in some places on me.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But, removal of a
9 district's accreditation does not necessarily remove
10 accreditation from the schools within the district?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Schools don't even
12 really have accreditation, that's why it's so hot. The,
13 the, the accreditation is a district concept.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But. If it's not
15 statewide.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If a student comes from
17 that district, I mean, i- in- and if the district is not
18 accredited, so it places a big onus on the student who is
19 graduating from that district going onto university? And --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's been the
21 piece that's been so hard for us to prepper. Han's right
22 because there's not a statute that ties district
23 accreditation to outcomes for students.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Status is the breach.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But, a, a school, the
3 University of, of Alabama or the University of Illinois. I
4 mean, will they just take that and say, "Oh, Colorado hasn't
5 figured that out. So, we're just going to pass on, on that
6 student that came from a district that's not accredited? I
7 think that's what they're looking. They looking at the test
8 scores, they're looking at the transcript, and they're
9 looking at the essay. If I'm not mistaken that's what
10 higher ed --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wow. They took
12 limitations --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Like, I don't know they
14 actually even checked to see what their high school is
15 accredited.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Quick hollow vote?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think they're doing --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we reedy? Oops.

19 It's one sentence.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where did member go?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Goff? Split down on my -

23 -

24 MS. GOFF: What have I known? So, sorry.

25 Now you made me forget. What was I -- there's nothing- one



1 of the points I think is there's nothing in this bill and
2 there's not in every other bill is sort of silent on that
3 whole issue. So, until there's something in the bill that
4 we can talk about, it's not there.

5 So, we have questions, it's not there. The
6 other thing too I don't normally look at this right now.
7 There is no end date, there is no effective date, there is
8 no- that I can see, Jennifer, maybe you've noticed it
9 somewhere. There's no year where this would take effect.
10 So, we're- the way it looks we're talking about --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The bill has a safety
13 clause --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's taking up
15 immediately upon signature.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, as, as soon as the
17 bill passes and the governor signs it, it goes into effect.
18 That's what a safety class does.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To kept for practical
20 purposes that means starting next school year?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, the day it's signed.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If this bill were to
24 pass and signed on April 1st, then the schools could all
25 demand another accountability measure and as to whether or



1 not they're failing schools and they could all- and, and we
2 would not be able to remove accreditation.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can save ourselves a
4 lot of time.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, nets --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're ready to call the
7 vote, guys?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a joke. It's a
9 joke.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. Okay with me.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Cordial, board member
12 Durham.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's it.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Clarify the motion is to
15 oppose the bill.

16 MADAM CHAIR: To oppose.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores?

19 MS. FLORES: Yes.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff?

21 MS. GOFF: Yes

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

25 MS. MCCLELLAN: No.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

2 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

3 MS. CORDIAL: And board member Schroeder?

4 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Oh, sorry, back to me. So,
6 that was the most pressing piece of business from a
7 legislative perspective. We will continue this process and,
8 and continue to bring bills to you as the legislative
9 context review them and recommend a position.

10 I just would remind you that, and we try to
11 send this link out in every weekly report we do, and every
12 agenda we do, and every- everywhere we can. And you only
13 need the link once, but if you ever want to check on what
14 education bills are out there and what their status is, that
15 link will help you do it.

16 I'm, of course, always happy to answer your
17 questions, but you ever o- or read the bill or read the
18 fiscal note, all of that information is contained within
19 that link that we send you. And then I just thought I would
20 answer it if anyone had any questions about his specific
21 proposals moving through, I'm happy to answer them.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've been here all day.
23 Has anything happened over there today?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair for member
25 Goff, not on education. I- if nothing happened and she wish



1 I will say in terms of legislation, Joyce Sirkowski gave a
2 presentation to the joint House and Senate Education
3 Committees this morning in assessment.

4 This is kind of part of a series of
5 presentations that the committees have requested from the
6 Department. This person did want an accountability about
7 three weeks ago. Ms. Colman did one on standards a couple
8 of weeks ago and then Mrs. Sirkowski finished up that
9 process today. It was very well received. The committees
10 have found them to be just very informative and helpful as
11 they think about policy.

12 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Thank you. Okay.
13 So, I- I'm 20.01, legislative priorities. Board members
14 Rankin and Goff, do you like to share with us your drafts
15 and somebody make a motion to start?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At the last meeting I
17 asked if I could be a part of the revision of legislative
18 priorities. Board member Flores and board member Goff also
19 wanted to be a part of it.

20 Started out I- I rewrote them and then we
21 discussed a- at the first meeting. After that board member
22 Flores sent a- a revision of her own or things she wanted to
23 have continued and Board member Goff also had some input
24 that she sent electronically.

25 And Ms. Cordial put those together in a new



1 iteration and board member Goff and I sat down and looked at
2 our three plus the revision and made some additional
3 changes. We believe we came up with a document that
4 includes everything or in some form every idea that came
5 across and together we just produced a document that you see
6 today and we would like to have it approved. There may be
7 some questions from board members but that was the process
8 we used.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Goff, any more- any
10 comments?

11 MS. GOFF: No, not really i- it's parts of
12 this, the language maintains what was- has been in previous
13 years priority's documents slight modifications in some
14 places. One thing that is different, we added a- a I guess
15 what you would call a little preamble or an intro paragraph
16 that kind of introduces the notions that build upon and the
17 last one that one an- and understate board authority.

18 That has also been a- and a part of the
19 priorities from the past several years. Slightly reworded
20 but not really that much to change any substance from what
21 it has been. There are parts of that that I've been looking
22 at and I- I just want to- I won't say anything in case
23 anybody else wants to talk about that last paragraph.

24 It's- it's really a- a way to maintain in our
25 priorities. Basically it's the notion of separation of



1 powers. There are some things that our State Board
2 authorized, that are- that I- that we would want to preserve
3 and- and protect so to speak.

4 But that- that our authority statement is one
5 way to- to just put that out again but that's- there are
6 some things that are definitely within our realm our preview
7 and we are- we do them- we work with them all the time.
8 We're on one or more of them at any given moment so that's
9 what the purpose of that last part is.

10 And the first one, the first paragraph,
11 categories are again like Joyce said, there are some general
12 areas that are not only timely interest in and work related
13 but they are- they also really do sum up pretty much all of
14 the highlights of what we- we are about.

15 I will tell you there is no- there is really
16 no presence of the word legislation in any of this and
17 policy is used more in the general sense of policy makers
18 which we are and policy makers who are across the street and
19 this is policy. This is the- a way of carrying out goals of
20 carrying out the- the important values that- that we think
21 are part of our work and are part of our state and they are
22 important to us. So you'll see policy that supports, or
23 policy that ensures that was the rationale.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Flores.

25 MS. FLORES: Thank you. I- I like it, also-



1 but I also thinking that state board authority we should
2 have parents somewhere. I mean parents are not mentioned
3 and --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are.

5 MS. FLORES: They're mentioned up here --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are in --

7 MS. FLORES: -- further in the document. But
8 State Board Authority, I mean we mentioned nonprofits. We
9 should have parents in there as well because they're- they
10 are the public and the parents they represent children.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Under State Board
12 authority you want them mentioned is that what you are
13 saying? That's correct, okay.

14 MS. FLORES: That's right. I think somewhere
15 there- I mean we- we mentioned nonprofit organizations and
16 we don't --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I- actually maybe it
18 would help if you give me one second to talk about that
19 paragraph and where- where we may want to look at the words
20 of the state board authority is that this is really those
21 duties and powers and responsibility that are outlined and -
22 -

23 MS. FLORES: Well and I- I'm just saying
24 through collaboration.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's what I



1 would like to propose. I'd like to- I give you something to
2 think about and then we can come back here. Rather than
3 keeping that whole first sentence there. The essence of the
4 state board authority is that the board is responsible for
5 the general supervision of public schools. That's- that's
6 in the statute. That's what the books says.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that sentence could
9 end there. That would that- that would take out any
10 reference to the legislative or the other parts of what goes
11 on and then continue down with- in furtherance of our
12 constitutional responsibility, we support policy that
13 recognizes our role making authority. So the whole point of
14 that part is to reinforce or remind that our authority is
15 pa- is this part of it and that we operate through rule
16 making authority not through legislation.

17 MS. FLORES: So you --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, we work through
19 legislation. We are not the producers of this.

20 MS. FLORES: Okay. So you would be- you
21 would not be opposed to keeping the first sentence and the
22 se- and the last sentence in there?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I'm thinking- I
24 mean, that right now my- my thoughts are that it is, it
25 limits it to authority.



1 MS. FLORES: Okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It doesn't add anything
3 else, you know people could think.

4 MS. FLORES: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we do all those
6 things in collaboration. There are some others that could
7 be added there. But is it or is it not important to the
8 point being that the state board has outworked has- it's
9 specific duties and obligations and- and po- powers.

10 MS. FLORES: Well, that sounds fine to me. I
11 don't know about other members but I would like to suggest
12 that for choice and engagement that we have insurers,
13 students have high quality instead of every student and I
14 know for every student. But there may be a student out
15 there, when we put every insurer's students have high
16 quality educational choices to best meet their individual
17 learning needs and aspirations instead of ensures every
18 student and we mean it because we're saying that students,
19 students now have high quality educational choices to meet
20 their individual learning needs and aspirations. When we
21 have when we- I mean, we did the same for parents. We
22 didn't say ensures every parent has access to. So I think
23 it's --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)
25 semantics grammatical?



1 MS. FLORES: I think so, yes, and then the
2 next one would be an under choice and engagement the last
3 point. Ensures local options to further support their
4 public schools are preserved and if charters- I mean the
5 argument is, Charters are public using your argument.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those are schools.

7 MS. FLORES: Then- then.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's just one
9 argument.

10 MS. FLORES: And then so you wouldn't- I
11 don't see any- how anybody could say we shouldn't put public
12 in there because that keeps it away from you know others who
13 may not be under the rubric of the public which is charter
14 and public. So we need to add public --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Mazanec.

16 MR. MAZANEC: I move we approve these
17 legislative priorities.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could I have a second
19 please, I said a second please.

20 MR. MAZANEC: We could get this off of our
21 list.

22 MS. FLORES: Well, but I mean --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other comment?

24 MR. MAZANEC: There's nothing really- there
25 is nothing really offensive.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham.

2 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Madam chair I have
3 an amendment to the motion for approval which is in the last
4 paragraph on page two second sentence insert a period after
5 the word branches strike the balance of that sentence. That
6 removes nonprofits and private sector from the specific
7 list. I could bore you all with my pejorative --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no no, it's too
9 late.

10 MR. DURHAM: -- views of nonprofits but --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know.

12 MR. DURHAM: You'll just put it up for a vote
13 and go from there and --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't disagree. You
16 get half of your- you get half of your pejorative.

17 MR. DURHAM: Your what?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll give you a half of
19 your pejorative

20 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, what about the
22 others? Do we call the vote?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Call the amendment?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. The amendment.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Approve with the



1 amendment?

2 MADAM CHAIR: Can we talk about- Just one
3 moment, please

4 MR. DURHAM: More- more than one amendment
5 can be offered if you have your own.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I- I do. I had those
7 ones.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, let's just vote on this
9 one, please.

10 MR. DURHAM: But you have to dispose of this
11 one first.

12 MS. BOYLE: Are we in- and just for
13 clarification for myself. Are we including the changes that
14 board member four has also --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

16 MR. DURHAM: No.

17 MS. BOYLE: -- had suggested?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right now we're just
19 working on the amendment that was presented by board member
20 Durham.

21 MS. BOYLE: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which means it stops at
23 execu- at the word branches.

24 MS. BOYLE: Yes.

25 MR. DURHAM: Strike the balance of the



1 sentence.

2 MS. BOYLE: Yes. Strike the balance of the
3 sentence, but not following sentences.

4 MR. DURHAM: Not the following sentence, that
5 is correct

6 MS. BOYLE: All right.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then here we go back
9 please.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Could you just- may we just
11 finish this?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, please. I'm not- I
13 don't need to say when I'm going to --

14 MADAM CHAIR: We take a vote.

15 MS. BOYLE: I'm sorry.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff.

17 MS. BOYLE: I just want to say are we going
18 to hurt someone's feelings if we leave out judicial?

19 MR. DURHAM: Hadn't really thought about it,
20 but as a practical matter, I don't think we collaborate with
21 them.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't like to.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't.

24 MR. DURHAM: In fact, we want to minimize our
25 interaction.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Boy, we are really have
2 been acting you today, haven't we?

3 MS. BOYLE: Thank you.

4 MR. DURHAM: She's- she's part of the
5 executive branch.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that's true

7 MR. DURHAM: So she's- she's covered.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bizy, call the roll.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we call the vote
10 please?

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham.

12 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores.

14 MS. FLORES: Okay. Yes.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.

16 MS. GOFF: Yes.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan.

20 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin.

22 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Board member Flores, go
25 for it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move to make those
2 changes that I mentioned before which is on the choice
3 engagement section, to have- ensures --

4 MR. DURHAM: Every student --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- ensures student --No.
6 Not every but ensures students, just to go along with words
7 that --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this an additional
9 (Indiscernible)

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon me.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's striking through --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The first one.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have to ensures every
15 student has and makes it --ensures students have, so that it
16 aligns with the second bullet, ensures students have.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It needs to a align, if
18 I may say so, with the --the intro phrase above it. If
19 we're going to keep that policies in the plural, we support
20 policies that, so then you say ensure students --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well no, no, no I
22 haven't finished yet. There's a second ensurers local
23 options to further support --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Public.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- their public schools



1 are preserved.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. We'll just --
3 we'll just grammatically align the whole thing.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think I understand
6 what you're point --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I'm adding public.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Where's the
11 public?

12 MS. CORDIAL: The last bullet.

13 MS. FLORES: Ensures a --i --in choice and
14 engagement the last point, to further support their public
15 schools, or to further support public schools are preserved.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To look --to further
17 support public pr --

18 MS. FLORES: That public schools are sup --
19 are preserved. And then Jane you continue.

20 MADAM CHAIR: That's all. Is there a second
21 to her motion?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second it.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Any comments?

24 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Ma --

25 MADAM CHAIR: Steve?



1 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Getting tired.

5 MR. DURHAM: I think it --knows how that
6 feels. I --I think as a practical matter, I don't --well
7 I'm not Catholic, I'm not sure I want to upset the
8 archbishop, and I think the schools, public and private,
9 well, we have limited --very limited authority over non-
10 public schools. We do actually have some occasionally, and
11 I don't think they should be excluded. So, they also don't
12 need to be specifically referenced. So I think it's a very
13 neutral way that the thing that has been drafted in the
14 first place.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean schools?

16 MR. DURHAM: To schools. Yes. To schools.

17 MADAM CHAIR: So now what is the motion?

18 MR. DURHAM: Well, I'll sever her motion to
19 separate out. I'll move to sever or request to sever, and
20 to vote on each half the motion separately.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Given that --given that
22 you put it that way, we do have some public schools, I mean,
23 some private schools. But, that's --that's kind of a hard
24 one, because we don't oversee --we don't oversee private
25 schools.



1 MR. DURHAM: Correct.

2 MS. FLORES: So, I think adding the public
3 there just makes it --

4 MS. GOFF: This is --

5 MS. FLORES: -- we support public schools.

6 MS. GOFF: This is not --it's hard to --this
7 is really --this is sort of a --it's a --it's almost like
8 resolution in that state believes values. And so our --
9 we're talking --the general topic here is choice and
10 engagement. We are choice promoter --supporters. We want
11 engagement. We want both of them that is great.

12 So, I'm thinking that the general is fine.
13 You don't --It's not a matter of strictly overseeing. We do
14 interact with, and we know we don't --we just support
15 schools. We support schools, and we want --and we support
16 choice, and we want people to be engaged. And I --I think
17 anyone --

18 MS. FLORES: So we go for the --with the
19 semantic?

20 MS. GOFF: -- anyone who's reading this will
21 take it as --

22 MS. FLORES: The semantic and not of the
23 public.

24 MR. DURHAM: I think it's a generic rather
25 than a specific.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

2 MS. MAZANEC: I --I don't think that public
3 schools will be in danger of not being supported --

4 MADAM CHAIR: They're not in our minds.

5 MS. MAZANEC: By their support if we don't
6 say public.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Ms. Cordial, could you
10 read back what it is that we --

11 MS. MAZANEC: So now it's just the students,
12 right?

13 MS. CORDIAL: Yes.

14 MS. MAZANEC: So now it's just students.

15 MS. CORDIAL: And we're not going to make any
16 changes to the last bullet.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

18 MS. CORDIAL: We're not going to include
19 public.

20 MADAM CHAIR: This is under choice and
21 engagement?

22 MS. CORDIAL: Yup.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Ensures students have.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yup

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then their --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A high quality to be
2 their.
3 MADAM CHAIR: You'd prefer their instead of
4 his/her.
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
6 MADAM CHAIR: Okay
7 MS. GOFF: Did you have a second?
8 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, I did have a second.
9 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.
10 MS. GOFF: I have no problem.
11 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.
12 MADAM CHAIR: Does anybody have a problem
13 with this one, or should we just call the vote?
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Call the vote.
15 MADAM CHAIR: Call the vote.
16 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham.
17 MR. DURHAM: Presuming we're voting on the
18 first half of the severed motion, you have not withdrawn the
19 second half; is that correct?
20 MS. CORDIAL: No she has. She has.
21 MR. DURHAM: Oh, you have. Then I'm a yes.
22 MS. CORDIAL: Okay, perfect. Board member
23 Flores?
24 MS. FLORES: Yes.
25 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff?



1 MS. GOFF: Yes.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

3 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

7 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Great.

11 MR. DURHAM: Yes

12 MS. MAZANEC: I'd like to just thank board

13 member Goff for her work on this. I --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Well, thanks to both of you.

15 MS. RANKIN: Yeah, thanks to both of you.

16 You did a great job.

17 MR. DURHAM: Very high quality work.

18 MS. MAZANEC: And to you, Dr. Flores.

19 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Pleasure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just voted on the

21 amendment.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, for crying out loud. Go

23 for it.

24 MR. DURHAM: We're almost there.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. So our --and I believe



1 Board Member Mazanec had made the motion and Board Member
2 Flores had seconded the original motion.

3 MADAM CHAIR: So now we're voting as amended.

4 MS. CORDIAL: As amended.

5 MS. MAZANEC: If you say so.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

7 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

11 MS. GOFF: Yes.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

15 MC. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

17 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: And Board Member Schroeder.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Perfect. Great.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yippie.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yay.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Item 21, State Board of
24 Education Member Reports. Should we start with Board Member
25 Durham and just go down the line?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

2 MR. DURHAM: Sure thing, Madam Chair. The
3 couple of things. One is they did asked the commissioner to
4 do a little research into the, to the assessments that are
5 given and what I would characterize as some of the more
6 elite private schools, to see if any of them, and my purpose
7 was to see if any of them offered or use park or any
8 derivative of a park, and it doesn't appear that any of them
9 do. So, they're at least as in high quality education.
10 There is --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They can't.

12 MR. DURHAM: I don't know whether they can or
13 not, but they found other, other assessments, they find to
14 be --they find to be adequate. So, and I thought that was
15 an interesting piece of data.

16 On the positive side, I had the opportunity,
17 we kill Monday to visit to, with the superintendent Mr. Pat
18 Bershinsky of the Edison School District in El Paso County,
19 and I would simply say if any of you get depressed about
20 state of public education, I'll be happy to take you out to
21 the Edison School District. It was a very positive
22 experience. It's --it's in El Paso County and I have to,
23 I've been living there for 60 years.

24 I have to admit I thought I'd been
25 everywhere, but it's 49 miles from my home when I plugged it



1 in to the garment and didn't know you'd go 49 miles in El
2 Paso County but, from my home, but you can. And the last
3 couple of miles were on gravel roads that there was a little
4 washboard effect on my car. Having said that, somebody want
5 to build a board for the realignment, I thought but --but it
6 gets lot and lot.

7 But in anyway, the --it was the, as I recall,
8 highest performing district in the state. They're operating
9 out of a building that was built in 1922 and looks like it
10 was built in 1822. That's the bad news. The good news is
11 they have a 14 million dollar best grant and the
12 construction was going on every place and they're --they're
13 actually preserving, they're going to preserve the part of
14 the 1922 building and actually, and have a brand new, sense
15 of a brand new facility for everything else.

16 But it wasn't the facility that was impressive. It was
17 really the commitment of the superintendent and the staff to
18 the success of those students and they have a, I want to
19 say, I don't remember exactly, I know I said it was about 30
20 percent free and reduced lunch population, a couple of
21 extraordinarily creative programs accomplished on, not all
22 that much, not all that much money and, and couple of
23 personal notes that that superintended asked me not to
24 mention but, so I won't.

25 But things that were really very impressive



1 that they're getting done. And to top it off, the free
2 lunch that I got was delicious, and a school free lunch,
3 that's at least in my memory, remarkable. So they did a
4 great, they did a great job. They are going to have, I
5 don't think it's scheduled yet. They'll have a ribbon
6 cutting for the new construction when it's finished by the
7 fall and I'm going to encourage as many board members as
8 possible to attend.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Board Member
10 Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: Thank you. I --I have been
12 attending the hub meetings and thank goodness because I
13 don't think I would make heads or tails of what we were
14 talking about if --if, you know if I hadn't attended.

15 Secondly, I went to the cop shop. I know
16 this is, someone told me about a --a --it's an induction
17 sort of year into, looking into being a policeman and these
18 are high school students from Denver Public Schools who --
19 who go and they attend and provide services and help for the
20 Denver Police Department. In school, they're like cadets,
21 they're cadets, their public school year, I guess their last
22 year, possibly their 11th year in school and I --I just
23 thought these kids were great. I mean their attitude.

24 They were present at that cop shop and
25 they're going to be there. They're going to give their time



1 to --to be there and --and help the Police Department and
2 also talk with kids in schools.

3 And, so I thought this was a, a great
4 program. I like the kids. I --I'm not, I'm going to look
5 more into their, their cadet program but I --I think when
6 we're looking into professional development other than
7 coursework and this is one way that these kids can find out
8 whether, you know, obviously if they go into it, they're --
9 they're --they're thinking about being police people.

10 So, I --I liked it. Also I want a 600
11 dollar, I don't know, the drawing and I want the --I want
12 the it for real, I want a big --a big prize. Secondly,
13 speaking about private schools, I usually do this for the
14 Arrupe Jesuit Catholic School and I --I helped those kids
15 every year for, with the --for the Daniels Foundation, the
16 Daniels Foundation gives scholarships. So, I
17 helped interview those kids not for the foundation but to
18 help them prepare for that interview that they're having
19 with the Daniels Foundation. And I've enjoyed that very
20 much and so, in a sense, you know, these are private, it's a
21 private school but this is an unusual private school, in
22 that they take from poor kids especially immigrant kids who
23 live in --in Denver and they also have a very incredible
24 work-study program that these kids work on, on --on Friday
25 with usually the Department of --of Interior, US Department



1 of Interior and it's the, I'm trying to think, it's --it's
2 office under the Department of Interior and they work in
3 technology.

4 So, this is another area that I'm very
5 interested, you know, in helping kids. I know it's a
6 private school but it's a good endeavor that they do with --
7 with these kids. It's a --I --I wish we could look at their
8 model too or invite them some time to come in and talk about
9 their program.

10 MADAM CHAIR: You finish?

11 MS. FLORES: Yes.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

13 MS. RANKIN: I usually have more things to
14 report during the month, but this month I just don't have
15 that much. Scott Pankow, the superintendent of Ouray made
16 an appointment a week ago to come over and there was a
17 snowstorm and he couldn't get over, to pass, and then the
18 superintendent had a meeting this week in West Denver, and
19 he was able to get there, and the second day he was there.

20 He drove over and we met with, I met with him
21 and the Assistant Principal Kenneth Nelson, and they have a
22 very unique situation, very small number of students in
23 their school. It's --it's one of those very small rural
24 schools that use every community resource that they have.
25 One of them is, one of the parents is a pilot and taught



1 some of the high school kids how to fly, and even
2 superintendent said he went up in the plane, which is pretty
3 interesting.

4 One of the students made a five minute video
5 and I was going to bring it but I did that the last time, so
6 I thought I'd skipped that. But it's very impressive about
7 their band. They have a school band, and I think they're
8 about 10 or 12 kids in it. So, I mean it's not just two or
9 three kids and everything. But they are doing quite well
10 academically and I think it has a lot to do with the
11 involvement of the community and I think superintendent
12 Pankow was doing a great job and I want to share that with
13 you.

14 I also attended the lunch for BOCES, the
15 Board of Cooperative Educational Services, that was held
16 over at the Capitol. I think it was the day before
17 yesterday. So that's what I've done between the last
18 meeting.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Madam Chair.
21 I thought about listing all of the staff members who have
22 been kind enough to help answer all of my questions. But I
23 think they're seeing me here just about maybe every other
24 day would you say busy, is that about right?

25 Sometimes for as many as three meetings in a



1 day and they've been really patient answering all of the
2 questions that I have and, and giving me a really good feel
3 for what they do in their department. So, I'm really
4 grateful for that, and thank you very much, and we'll have
5 more to come in the month of February.

6 So, if you see me down here and it's not a
7 meeting day, that's probably why. I also had an opportunity
8 to meet with Community Members in Northwest Aurora. And
9 I'll be meeting with them again later this month. I've met
10 with a number of local school board members within
11 Congressional District Six from Littleton Public Schools,
12 Cherry Creek, and also from Adams 12 Five Star Schools.

13 Later in this month, I'll have a meeting with
14 Congressman Coffman regarding an issue that a constituent
15 has brought forward within the district that we share. And
16 I also had an opportunity recently to attend my first NASB
17 Conference out near DIA and we focused on community
18 engagement. And that was a really positive meeting.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't have much to
20 report but I would say that Val Flores mentioned of Arrupe
21 Jesuit, two things. One is that the Independence
22 Institute's Education Policy Center did a really great
23 report and write up on that school along with several other
24 private schools. And the second thing I would say is to
25 your point about it being a private school that we might



1 want to look at.

2 I think that's a really great --I would like
3 to --I don't know when we're going to find the time given
4 what we're looking at now, but I do think it would be
5 instructional for us to hear from some very successful
6 private schools and for the public to hear what what it is
7 they do differently that --that public schools might want to
8 try and emulate.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Well, I don't
10 have a lot of events to talk about, but I'll tell you what.
11 If we really look at the hours on the clock that we all
12 spent related to this in one way or another, I think it's
13 astounding. I would like to add to the thanks and
14 appreciation for the staff. I've also been able to benefit
15 this past month from deep or deepest conversations about the
16 work.

17 And every time I walk away, I've just been
18 enriched. I've learned something new every single time and
19 a lot of admiration. I want to thank the commissioner for
20 her spirit and how that works with everybody else here.
21 It's --it's great for us. We're very lucky. I also joined
22 Rebecca, and Belle, and --and Angelika at NASB workshop.

23 It was based --the whole point of the day was
24 stakeholder engagement that continues after we send in this
25 plan and after --after those days are over. So, the point



1 being that we want to really keep our communities all
2 involved and feel like they have made a contribution and
3 that their voice is important and valued and appreciated.
4 And one of the things is I think we'll have a chance to,
5 when we --when we can breathe a little bit about it, to sit
6 down and think about what other kinds of folks or
7 opportunities or learnings should we be adding into this and
8 continue it on.

9 And as always, I'm a big believer in
10 Colorado's ability to carry out Colorado's plan. And we
11 will --we will get a good job of this done and we'll keep at
12 it. So thank you all.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I'm not
14 going to add much other than as I have met either with any
15 of my school districts and also had dinner with some of the
16 superintendents at the case conference, I would say that the
17 concerns around school finance are intense.

18 The concerns are not only about what's not
19 going to come from the legislature, but it's also about what
20 are we going to do to them in terms of making decisions that
21 are going to cost them more money. So, we can talk about
22 that some other time, but that was really most of the topic.

23 The case presentation --the legislative
24 presentation on Friday morning I thought was just excellent,
25 it's probably one of the best ones I've ever been to, had



1 several different perspectives on school finance. National,
2 local, district-wide, it was really very, very good.

3 So, I don't think we have any more public
4 comment or if we do, please step up. So, I guess one other
5 thing in --I mean, now is future business. I wanted to
6 again point out the --at a glance that was presented by
7 staff to us. So for the next board meeting coming up, we
8 sort of have some idea. We will be --do you want to state
9 the districts that we know for sure that are coming?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The --from --for March,
11 we know for sure Cortez will be there.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cortez plus the
13 Westminster appeal?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the Westminster
15 appeal.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And we'll again
17 be, of course, we'll have the draft of the ESSA plan that
18 we'll be talking about. I believe, well, we'll have some
19 more rulemaking.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we have. I'm
21 pulling --I'm pulling it up right now.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hearings, four of them
23 coming up, I believe.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. We will have four
25 rule-making hearings that are staggered throughout the



1 afternoon.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They won't take long but

4 --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, we're also
6 going to have a legislative update meeting on March 31st, so
7 I hope you'll be ready for that.

8 We have, in the past, called in for those of
9 us who were --could --could not come be available and then
10 standards in review. So this helps us sort of get a sense
11 for what's coming up next time.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I want to take everybody
13 back one step to the end of February, where we've got --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, legislative update
15 thing.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, February. Sorry, I
17 picked the wrong one. You're right, it's February 24th.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: CASB Legislative
19 Conference.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The CASB Legislative
21 Conference. I'm going to be out of town, so you have to
22 help me what the dates are.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's I think February
24 23rd.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 23rd is our presentation



1 day.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the main part for
4 us I think.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 24th is --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm going to go suggest
8 that board members Rankin and Goff plan that out. Generally
9 speaking, we've been given the impression that, for the most
10 part, districts want to be able to ask --board members want
11 to be people ask questions, but I think you probably want to
12 lay some groundwork for it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll talk about it.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But discuss legislative
16 priorities perhaps.

17 MR. DURHAM: Is this what? 24th of?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: February.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 23rd and 24th.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 23rd and 24th

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 23rd is the panel.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're gone --you're
23 gone as well.

24 MR. DURHAM: I will be out of town. I'll be
25 out of town.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we're both gone.
2 Snowbirds.
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 23rd to 24th?
4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so, do we have a
6 presentation?
7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On the 23rd.
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On the 23rd.
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At one o'clock.
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At one o'clock, okay.
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So and --are you in
13 charge? You're in charge. You and --you and Ms. Goff can be
14 in charge to plan that out.
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can do that.
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How are we supposed to
17 do that though?
18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're supposed to be
19 there to answer questions because primarily it's an
20 opportunity for school board members to ask the board
21 questions.
22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other comments,
23 concerns?
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have new business.
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Folks? All right. I



1 think we are recessed until the 24th.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When is the legislative
3 update meeting?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know. I've seen
5 different boards do it differently too.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh my God.

7 (Meeting adjourned)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23



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

2 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Electronic
3 Transcriber, for the State of Colorado, do hereby certify
4 that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set
5 out.

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

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
12 and seal this 5th day of October, 2018.

13

14 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

15 Kimberly C. McCright

16 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

17

18 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

19 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

20 Houston, Texas 77058

21 281.724.8600

22

23

24

25