



Colorado State Board of Education

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

April 24, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 24, 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: All right. We're going
2 to come back to order and finish our hearing with Greeley
3 Public Schools. Do I have a motion, please?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Based on today's
5 hearing, I move that the department and district work
6 together to submit a proposed written final determination
7 regarding innovation status for Perry Heights Middle School,
8 the State board's consideration at the May State board
9 meeting.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Would you
12 call the roll, please, Ms. Cordial (ph)?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

14 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

16 MS. FLORES: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff.

18 MS. GOFF: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That motion passes
3 unanimately. I'd like another motion, please?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Based on today's
5 hearing, I move that the department and district work
6 together to submit a proposed written final determination
7 regarding innovation status for Franklin Middle School for
8 the State board's consideration at the May State board
9 meeting.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Will you
12 call the roll again, please.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

14 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

16 MS. FLORES: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff.

18 MS. GOFF: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, folks this concludes
3 today's hearing. The board will vote on the matter at the
4 next regularly scheduled board meeting. And as a reminder,
5 we are still acting in a quasi-judicial manner, and may not
6 engage in conversations with the department or district with
7 regard to the final written determination. Thank you very
8 much and best wishes. And my agenda says lunch but I have a
9 hunch that's not right.

10 Thank you for your patience. Thank you. Are
11 we ready? Colorado State Board of Education will now conduct
12 a hearing in Case Number 17 A.R. 06 the accountability
13 recommendations concerning Bessemer Elementary, Heroes
14 Middle school and Risley International Academy of Innovation
15 -- innovation, in Pueblo City 60 schools.

16 Under the Education Accountability Act of
17 2009, if a school receives a priority improvement or
18 turnaround rating for more than five consecutive years, the
19 State Board of Education must direct an action to the local
20 Board of Education. Bessemer Elementary, Heroes Middle
21 School and Risley International Academy of Innovation will
22 enter their sixth year of priority improvement or turnaround
23 on July 1, 2017.

24 During this hearing, the Board is acting in
25 its capacity to hear the recommendations of the



1 Commissioner, and the State Review Panel pursuant to 22-11-
2 210(5)(b) CRS. The Commissioner and the staff are here
3 today to present their recommendation.

4 The District is also present and will share
5 their report. The State Review Panel, an independent body
6 of educational experts, has issued a recommendation
7 regarding Bessemer Elementary, Heroes Middle School, and
8 Risley International Academy of Innovation. That is part of
9 the hearing record and is included in the Board packets.

10 In the case of Bessemer Elementary, the State
11 Review Panel conducted a site visit and documentation review
12 in 2015 and recommended innovation status for the school.
13 In the case of Heroes Middle School, the State Review Panel
14 conducted a site visit and document review in 2015 and 2016.
15 After the 2015 site visit, State Review Panel recommended
16 management by a private or public entity, other than the
17 District, or the conversion to a cha -- charter school for
18 the school.

19 After the 2016 visit, the State Review Panel
20 recommend innovation status for the school. In the case of
21 Risley International Academy of Innovation, the State Review
22 Panel conducted a site visit and document review 2015 and
23 recommended innovation status for the school.

24 The State Board's consideration of the matter
25 shall be limited to materials submitted by the parties and



1 maintained in the record of proceedings. At the hearing,
2 each party shall have a maximum of 30 minutes to present its
3 report. Board members may not interrupt the questions
4 during this time period.

5 Board members will have an opportunity to ask
6 questions after both parties complete their presentation.
7 The hearing shall proceed as follows: The Department shall
8 present its 30-minute report. Since the District is
9 presenting on behalf of three schools, Bessemer, Heroes and
10 Risley, I will allow the District to present for 45 minutes.
11 Ms. Cordial will let you know when five minutes are
12 remaining in your presentation.

13 Following the presentations of both the
14 Department and the District, the State Board shall have the
15 opportunity to ask questions of both parties for a time
16 period not to exceed two hours. The State Board may ask one
17 or both parties to submit proposed written final
18 determinations for the State Board's consideration. State
19 Board will consider and adopt a written final determination
20 at a subsequent State Board meeting. At this time, I would
21 ask the Department's representatives to introduce themselves
22 for the record and to begin their presentation.

23 MS. ANTHES: Thank you Madam Chair. Katy
24 Anthes, Commissioner of Education.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)



1 Turnaround Support Manager.

2 MR. SWANSON: Andy Swanson, Turnaround
3 Support Manager.

4 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you Madam Chair, members
5 of the Board, and thank you Superintendent Macaluso for
6 being here and Board President Sanchez for being here.
7 Thank you for the rest of the District team and school staff
8 and members of the audience for being here today.

9 We appreciate the partnership and all of the
10 work that you and your staff have done for the students in
11 your district. We are seeing some impact of that work as
12 eight schools have moved off the accountability clock as the
13 -- the district in 2016. Today's hearing is about three
14 schools in the district that are at -- that are still at the
15 end of the clock specifically Bessemer, Heroes and Risley.
16 We will discuss the Pathway recommendations for each of
17 them.

18 This recommendations -- Commissioner
19 recommendation is a little bit different than the ones you
20 have already heard. Because we wrote our recommendation
21 prior to seeing the District plan for each of these three
22 schools. We have not had a chance to fully evaluate each of
23 the plan for the management component of these -- of these
24 schools. So, the details for what the management plan would
25 look like, we think still needs a little further



1 development.

2 We have been engaged with the district for
3 several years through -- throughout different district
4 leadership, and as mentioned, the district did come off the
5 clock and several schools within the district have seen real
6 improvements. Schools and districts across Colorado are in
7 different stages of their planned development and Pueblo has
8 been working very hard on their District Innovation Zone
9 Plan.

10 And now, we'll continue to dive deeper into
11 the direct school plans for each of the three schools, as
12 well as the district supports for supporting their
13 struggling schools. Additionally, the district is working
14 hard to address community engagement and filling key
15 district staff positions. They have had some district
16 leadership turnover over the past year. And with these
17 challenges though, they are now getting permanent leadership
18 with Superintendent Macaluso under their feet, and they are
19 seeking other types of support through management partners
20 and continued work with our Turnaround Network.

21 The District is figuring out the best ways to
22 intensely support their schools who are still on the clock.
23 Through their Pathways Grant, they're determining productive
24 ways to engage with their community in planning. We have
25 confidence that -- that the innovation strategies they've



1 worked on through the Innovation Plan, if they are
2 implemented with a clear focus, they can see success.

3 In 2014, as we said, all the innovations on
4 schools were on the clock. In 2016, four of those six
5 schools moved off the clock due to excellent execution of
6 their plans. If we can see strong execution with direct
7 support for schools and districts, we can expect to see
8 improvements in these additional three schools.

9 There is a sense of urgency to further
10 develop and then implement these plans with fidelity and
11 consistent focus, and we would like to see a clear
12 management plan with additional details if that is the
13 direction that the state board directs. At this time, we
14 believe we can see improvement with these three schools
15 before you today, with those additional details, and at this
16 time, we'll turn it over to our team to provide more
17 details.

18 MS. BAUTSCH: Hey, thank you. I want to give
19 a brief overview of some of the district context as well
20 some of the dis -- schools' context and I'm going to turn it
21 over to our Turnaround Support managers to really dive into
22 the details of the schools. We are going to talk very fast
23 in high level since we have three schools to cover over the
24 30 minutes. But your packets and binders have a wealth of
25 information. And we're happy to answer any questions then.



1 The -- as Commissioner Anthes noted, the District was on the
2 clock for five consecutive years, but came off this past
3 year with the 2016 frameworks. We've also had several
4 schools come off the clock from a high of 17 schools and
5 prior improvement and turnaround in 2011 to now seven
6 schools that are in prior improvement and turnaround. Three
7 of those schools that have remained on the clock are before
8 us today. That's Bessemer Elementary, Heroes Middle and
9 Risley International Academy of Innovation. We want to give
10 a brief overview of their innovation status as there is some
11 history there and wanted to make sure we said it up front
12 that Bessemer Elementary clearly does not have an Innovation
13 Plan. They are a K-5 school, though they were previously a
14 K-8. Their rating right now is priority improvement,
15 although if you were to just look at those elementary
16 grades, which the school now serves, it's in turnaround.
17 Heroes Middle School is a 6-8 school in prior improvement
18 and it has an Innovation Plan in the works. So, we've seen
19 an early draft to that. It is also connected to a K-5
20 school. Risley International Academy of Innovation is a
21 middle school that's in turnaround. It already has an
22 Innovation Plan in place which was approved to be a part of
23 the zone this past September. CDE has worked with all three
24 schools through the turnaround network. All three schools
25 are currently finishing up their second year of two -- of



1 the three year program. CDE has additionally provided other
2 feedback and technical assistance on turnaround strategies,
3 grant opportunities and improvement planning. Commissioner
4 Anthes took a tour of all three schools and that with
5 district leadership in November of 2016. City staff have
6 reviewed early drafts of the innovation plan for
7 Heroes that is in progress and for Risley which was again
8 approved last year. And we will continue to engage with the
9 three schools for the third year of the Turnaround Network
10 this upcoming school year. In addition, some of the other
11 grants they've received, Risley and Heroes both received a
12 Tiered Intervention Grant, which is a federal grant that's
13 targeted to the state's lowest performing schools. Both
14 Bessemer and Heroes receive the pathways Early Action Grant
15 which is to support their planning for an accountability
16 pathway and for today's hearing. Bessemer received to our
17 grants targeted specifically to literacy and improvement
18 planning. We've engaged with these three schools in a
19 variety of ways over the past several years. We'll now give
20 a brief overview of the Commissioner's recommendation for
21 the three schools, which are all entering year six and as
22 such that state board has directed and has -- re -- required
23 -- is required to direct action before June 30th. We have
24 made three separate recommendations and there -- there are
25 little different in this case. So first I'll -- I'll do a



1 recap of the State Review Panel's recommendations. The
2 State Review Panel for Bessemer, they did one site visit and
3 evaluation of documents and that was in 2015 and the
4 recommended innovation. Heroes received two evaluations.
5 In 2015, it was for management or charter. In 2016, it was
6 for innovation and Risley received one evalu -- a full
7 evaluation which was in 2015 and that was for the State
8 Review Panel recommended innovation in that case. The
9 Commissioner has recommended management for all three
10 schools. In addition, we've recommended innovation to go
11 along with the external management pathway for Heroes and
12 Risley and the district has indicated that they are
13 supportive of this recommendation for all three schools.
14 While the specific needs are different, all three schools
15 need to focus on academic systems, community engagements and
16 school leadership to ensure success and out -- a successful
17 outcomes for all students. Additionally, all three schools
18 need systematic support from the district. We will review
19 all of these conditions more specifically for each of the
20 schools. However, we wanted to note upfront that Pueblo 60
21 has mentioned publicly that they're considering leadership
22 changes at all three schools. Should the district embark on
23 a search for new leadership at any of the schools? The top
24 candidates should have perseverance and a drive to overcome
25 obstacles. They should have a steadfast belief that all



1 students can and will succeed. They should have leadership
2 with proven results in a turnaround setting. The ability to
3 leave -- lead data driven assessment, instruction, coaching
4 and planning and competency with content and instruction.
5 Lastly, it will be important that any leader that is in
6 place in any of these schools has the ability to rally all
7 stakeholders within the community, so believe in the mission
8 and the vision of the schools. I will now turn it over to
9 our Turnaround Support Managers to divi -- dive into the
10 details.

11 MS. PICHE: Great. Thank you, Brenda. I'm
12 Ashley Piche, the Turnaround Support Manager for Bessemer
13 Elementary and Heroes Middle School. I've worked closely
14 with both these schools over the past two years through
15 their participation in CDE's Turnaround Network. Bessemer
16 Elementary is in -- is in -- In its first year of operating
17 as a K-5 school, in previous years the school was operated
18 as a K-8 and Bessemer serves a higher proportion of at risk
19 students than either the District or the State with 85
20 percent minority students, 11 percent students with IEPs and
21 84 percent students qualifying for free or reduced lunch.
22 For the last seven years, Bessemer K-8 has bounced between
23 turnaround imparity improvement status. But the middle
24 school typically showing higher growth scores than the
25 elementary school over the past four accountability cycles.



1 Achievement percentile ranks, the elementary school range
2 between two and 12 percent for English, Language, Arts, and
3 Math. Overall, the segregated groups in 2016. The school
4 earned a media and growth percentile score of 47 in English,
5 Language, Arts and 24 in Math for all the segregated groups
6 and as Brenda mentioned moving forward, SPS will only have
7 elementary school grades. If that were the case this year,
8 the school's elementary scores would have placed them in
9 turnaround status. CDE focuses on four different research-
10 based categories when working with schools. Leadership and
11 staff, school culture, academic systems and district support
12 and flexibility. We will review these categories for all
13 three schools today. Bessemer Elementary School has had a
14 stable leadership team since the Principal Connie Parker and
15 Assistant Principal Angela Flores were appointed during the
16 14-15 school year. Bessemer's leadership team has not yet
17 gone through to Turnaround Leadership Training with an
18 external partner but the district has applied for funds to
19 send the leadership team next year. The District granted
20 Bessemer the flexibility to hire a new staff based on the
21 needs of the school and as a result, they experienced
22 turnover of over 80 percent prior to the start of last
23 school year and majority of current teachers are novice
24 teachers. With consistent leadership, staff retention has
25 stabilized since then. There are currently 303 students



1 enrolled at Bessemer this year and student attendance has
2 stayed consistent over the past few years between 91 and 94
3 percent average daily attendance. Over the past two school
4 years, Bessemer leadership team has lead their school
5 through a substantial improvements to student and staff
6 culture. With new mostly novice teaching staff, the
7 leadership team invested time and resources to provide
8 training for teachers focused on creating strong
9 relationships with students, strategies for classroom
10 engagement, and strategies for teaching in a high poverty
11 community. This focus has led to an increase in positive
12 relationships between staff members and between staff and
13 students. The school has increasingly been able to engage
14 families and community members in extracurricular planning
15 and activities. Bessemer currently has a STEM focus and
16 participates in an academic program intended to bring real-
17 world applied learning experiences to the classroom through
18 project-based learning. The school is also working with the
19 reading consultant provided through the reading ignite grant
20 to provide school-wide coaching to teachers on a monthly
21 basis. Consistent high-quality instruction is not yet
22 evident within the school, thus moving forward, it will be
23 necessary for the entire staff to build instructional
24 capacity with a sense of urgency from teachers through the
25 administrative team. To instill confidence that the school



1 is on track to attaining an improvement rating or higher,
2 Bessemer's plan should address the need to build both school
3 and district capacity to develop and implement a coherent
4 instructional model with a line instructional support and
5 assessments, strategies for increasing community engagement,
6 and district support to the school, particularly through
7 high-quality leadership training and consistent coaching
8 from a district partner to support the leadership team's
9 continued growth. The commissioner recommends a partnership
10 with external -- with an external organization as the best
11 pathway for Bessemer Elementary School to achieve the needed
12 conditions for success. School culture at Bessemer has
13 shown improvement over the past two years, and with its
14 external management and district support, the school is
15 ready to shift to focus deeply on implementing a consistent
16 and rigorous cycle of teaching and learning. Bessemer's
17 teachers and leadership team have shown a willingness to
18 engage with outside partners with their participation and
19 CDE's Turnaround Network and the (Indiscernible) Goodnight
20 Grant and stakeholder input to the external management plan
21 will help to more deeply engage Bessemer's community. The
22 state review panel visited Bessemer within the first few
23 months of the current leadership team's time at the school
24 in the spring of 2015. The panel recommended Innovation
25 School status to boost their academic systems and noted that



1 the leadership team was developing the capacity to implement
2 change to improve results. CDE agrees with the panel's
3 assessment of the school's leadership team but believes the
4 partnership with an external organization will be necessary
5 to provide the support and accountability needed to
6 implement change. In summary, CDE believes the school's
7 leadership team and staff will benefit from the structure
8 and accountability of an external partner will provide. CDE
9 has reviewed all pathways available to the school and
10 believes that a conversion to a charter school could be an
11 alternative option if a high-quality charter management
12 organization agrees to work with Pueblo City's schools,
13 Bessemer Elementary, and the community to design a school
14 model that meets the community's specific needs. CDE does
15 not recommend innovation because it is not clear that the
16 needs of the school would be met with an Innovation Plan
17 alone. CDE does not recommend closure because there is no
18 evidence that there are higher performing elementary schools
19 accessible to students if the school were to close.
20 Finally, CDE is committed to maintaining a collaborative
21 partnership with Bessemer and Pueblo City schools through
22 the Turnaround Network and through planning and
23 implementation of the schools directed pathway. All right.
24 So, Heroes Middle School. Heroes Middle School serves
25 grades six through eight and operates as a K-8 school with



1 resources shared across Heroes elementary and middle schools
2 in the same building. Heroes serves a higher proportion of
3 at-risk students than either the district or the state with
4 73 percent minority students, 22 percent students with IEPs,
5 and 80 percent of students qualifying for free or reduced
6 lunch. Heroes Middle School move from turnaround to
7 priority improvement status in 2016. This is the first time
8 the school has seen upwards movement on the accountability
9 rating since 2010. This movement was driven by growth in
10 both Math and Reading over the last school year.
11 Achievement percentile ranks in the school range between one
12 and six percent for English language, arts, and math over
13 all the segregated groups. The school earned a median gross
14 percentile scores between 20 and 44 percent and English,
15 Language, Arts, and Math were all the segregated groups with
16 English learning - -- oh, sorry; with English learners
17 earning the lowest growth scores across both subjects and
18 overall the school scores place Heroes in parity improvement
19 status in 2016. Marne Autobee has served as the principal
20 of both Heroes Middle School and Heroes Elementary School
21 since being assigned by the district during the '14-'15
22 school year. There was high staff turnover prior to last
23 school year. Both consistent leadership and the staff
24 retention has stabilized over the past year. Ms. Autobee
25 received Turnaround Training Leadership last year --



1 Turnaround Leadership Training last year and has been
2 leading the push to implement data-driven instruction,
3 teacher coaching, and strategies to bolster student culture
4 based on best practices and school turnaround. This work
5 has led to a substantial improvement in overall school
6 culture over the last two years. There are 271 students
7 currently enrolled at Heroes and student attendance has
8 fluctuated between 88 and 93 percent daily average
9 attendance over the past few years. The leadership team
10 adopted a school-wide culture rubric and as a result,
11 classroom behavior referrals decreased between last year and
12 the previous school year and have remained relatively steady
13 since then. The school has partnered with the District to
14 offer a program designed to train educators and preparing
15 students who are traditionally underrepresented in higher
16 education for success in high school, college, and career.
17 And the school has increasingly been -- been able to engage
18 families and community members in extracurricular and
19 planning activities. Heroes Middle School began a
20 partnership with the Achievement Network at the beginning of
21 the school year. This partnership provides standards online
22 and assessments on-site data-driven instructional coaching
23 and professional development. The partnership has been
24 instrumental in bolstering the school's academic systems
25 this year. Heroes is in its second year of implementing a



1 school-wide lesson planning protocol which includes a
2 consistent cycle of lesson plan feedback and while
3 consistent high-quality instruction is not yet evident in
4 the building, instruction expectations are becoming clear,
5 as the school continues to work with the Achievement Network
6 and implement strategies selected from Turnaround Leadership
7 Trainings. To instill confidence that the school is on
8 track to attaining an improvement rating or higher, Heroes
9 plan should address the need to build both school and
10 district capacity to develop and implement a coherent
11 instructional model with a line instructional support and
12 assessments, strategies for increasing community engagement,
13 and district systems of support the school specifically
14 through consistent coaching from a district partner, and
15 granting the school leadership the flexibility needed to
16 appropriately respond to conditions at Heroes Middle School.
17 The commissioner recommends innovation with membership in
18 the districts Innovation Zone and external management for
19 Heroes Middle School. Innovations status will provide
20 necessary flexibility and the school's plan of action is in
21 alignment with the middle schools who have already shown
22 positive results within the district's Innovation Zone.
23 State Review Panel recommended management and conversion to
24 a charter school after the panel's first visit in 2015. And
25 recommend an innovation status after their most recent 2016



1 visit due to the school's progress over the course of the
2 '15-'16 school year. The state review panel mentioned that
3 inclusion -- the innovation zone would benefit the school
4 particularly because they've rated the leadership team
5 effective in their ability to implement change to improve
6 results. And noted that Heroes academic programming would
7 be in line with the existing innovations on middle schools.
8 CDE agrees with the -- the state reviews panels most recent
9 assessment. And in summary, the Commissioner recommends
10 innovation status for Heroes Middle School as part of the
11 Pueblo City schools' Innovation Zone along with support from
12 an external management entity as we believe that both
13 innovation and management together are necessary for the
14 school to make needed improvements. CDE has reviewed all
15 pathways available to the school and although not a primary
16 recommendation due to the progress the school has made this
17 far, CDE would support conversion to a charter school as an
18 alternative option if a high-quality charter management
19 organization agrees to work with public city schools, Heroes
20 Middle School, and the community to design a school model
21 that meets the community's specific needs. CDE does not
22 recommend closure because there is no evidence that there
23 are higher-performing middle schools accessible to students
24 if the school were to close. And finally, CDE has committed
25 to maintaining our collaborative partnership with Heroes and



1 Pueblo City schools to the Turnaround Network and planning
2 and implementation of the schools directed Pathways.

3 MR. SWANSON: All right. Okay. Thank you,
4 Ashley. Again, my name is Andy Swanson. I'm the Turnaround
5 Support Manager that works with Risley International Academy
6 of Innovation. I have through the last couple of years in
7 the Turnaround Network. Just to give a little context,
8 Risley serves a population with a higher percentage of
9 minority students, students in IEPs and economically
10 disadvantaged students than the state or district, with 97
11 percent of the students qualifying for free or reduced
12 lunch. Since 2010, Risley's school performance framework
13 has been mostly turnaround with one year of priority
14 improvement in 2013. Most indicators have been a "Does not
15 meet" except for growth in Reading in both 2013 and this
16 last framework in 2016. In looking at achievement and
17 growth in 2016, Risley's percent how ranks have -- in
18 achievement were in single digits in Math and ELA. Median
19 growth percentiles were in the 30s, where 35 is the -- a
20 line for approaching. To switch gears and look at the areas
21 of school turnaround that Ashley had described earlier,
22 starting with school leadership, Risley had consistent
23 leadership for many years under Mrs. Charlotte Macaluso
24 until last spring when the District tapped Charlotte to lead
25 the District Innovation Work and then become Interim



1 Superintendent and now the permanent Superintendent. The
2 District then hired a new principal, Mr. Drew Cleveland,
3 last summer of 2016. Dawn Johnson, the assistant principal,
4 has attended Turnaround Leadership Training this year with
5 the plan for the principal of Risley to attend in 2017/18.
6 School culture has remained relatively stable, Risley with
7 attendance and behavior events remaining flat over time.
8 Enrollment over the last few years, however, has decreased.
9 A large part of Risley's economic systems work has been in
10 partnering with the achievement network similar to the work
11 that was described for Heroes Middle School except that
12 Risley is in year two of their partnership with the
13 Achievement Network. This work has been foundational and
14 vital and Risley has also -- is also a middle year's program
15 as part of international baccalaureate. Risley was an
16 original innovation school in the district in 2013 and then
17 became a part of the new Innovation Zone in -- this last
18 September. The new zone allows for more collaboration and
19 further waivers for Risley from state statute district rules
20 and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. To instill
21 confidence that the school is on track to attaining an
22 improvement rating or higher, Risley's plan must address the
23 areas of academic systems, leadership, district supports,
24 and community engagement. While the foundation of da --
25 data-driven instruction has been laid, this work must go



1 deeper and impact the instruction of all teachers across the
2 school. Similarly, supports and expectations for school
3 leadership must be in place to ensure the leader of Risley
4 gets ongoing intense support necessary to move the school
5 quickly. Much of this work can be done through the zone
6 district supports in ensuring the plan can be fully
7 implemented. This should include weekly coaching for school
8 leadership as a priority. Finally, community engagement
9 must be systematized to ensure the school receives feedback
10 from all groups in decision making and direction.
11 Therefore, the commissioner recommends, Risley continue
12 innovation status. The Innovation Zone is in the initial
13 stages of implementation and CDE believes Risley can achieve
14 the same success as the other zone middle schools with
15 focused and deep implementation of the plan. In order to
16 ensure this high level of implementation and impact, the
17 Commissioner recommends an external management entity to
18 support the school and District with setting implementation
19 and achievement goals, supporting the work of
20 implementation, focus and prioritize the essential
21 components of the plan in providing a system to allow for
22 quick adjustments to the plan as necessary. CDE believes in
23 the Innovation Plan at Risley due to an evaluation of the
24 plan when it was first submitted in the form as well as
25 ongoing discussions that occurred during planned



1 development. The plan builds on lessons learned from the
2 original Innovation Plan, creates further flexibility, as
3 well as collaborative opportunities within the zone.
4 Similar to the Commissioner's recommendation, after a visit
5 in 2015, the State Review Panel also recommended innovation
6 status as part of the zone, having noted highly effective
7 leadership under then Principal Macaluso. In summary, CDE
8 believes the innovation status at Risley combined with
9 support in implementation and accountability from an
10 external management partner to maximize the impact of the
11 plan will lead to greater achievement at Risley, similar to
12 the other zone schools. Also, CDE has reviewed all pathways
13 available to the school and does not recommend conversion to
14 charter school at this time due to the new Innovation Plan
15 being in the first year of the implementation with community
16 support and should be given time for full buildout. Also,
17 CDE does not recommend closure because there is no evidence
18 student needs to be better served at another accessible
19 middle school, if Risley were to close. Finally, similar to
20 the work with Heroes and Bessemer, CDE is committed to
21 maintaining our collaborative relationship with Risley and
22 the District through the Turnaround Network and through
23 planning and implementation of the schools directed pathway.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I'll turn it over to
25 Commissioner Anthes to summarize our recommendations.



1 MS. ANTHES: So, you'll see in this chart the
2 Commissioner recommendations for Bessemer are management.
3 The Commissioner recommendation for Heroes is management and
4 innovation, and the Commissioner recommendation for Risley
5 is management and innovation. If directed by the State
6 Board of Education, we would complete the Innovation
7 Planning process for Heroes and work with the district to
8 develop management plans and secure a management partner for
9 all three schools. CDE would remain involved in the
10 monitoring and progress of the schools through our
11 turnaround grants and supports that we offer them and CDE
12 would receive annual reports from the district regarding the
13 implementation of the agreed upon scope of work, an interim
14 student data. CDE will continue to support all three
15 schools in the district through the Turnaround Network,
16 Turnaround Support Managers, and implementation of various
17 grants. Annual updates to the state board, the district has
18 agreed the annual updates to the state board until the
19 schools come off the clock and the board may request
20 additional progress monitoring through the written
21 determination. With that, I believe we're done. Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. At this
23 time, I would ask Pueblo City 60 School District
24 representatives to introduce themselves for the record and
25 begin their presentation on behalf of Bessemer Elementary,



1 Heroes Middle School, and Risley International Academy of
2 Innovation.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair
4 Schroeder, Commissioner Anthes, and members of the Board of
5 Education. It is our pleasure to be able to present to you
6 on behalf of Pueblo City Schools regarding the
7 Accountability Pathway Proposals for three of our schools
8 namely Bessemer, Pre-K Academy, and Heroes 6-8 and Risley
9 International Academy of Innovation. I'd like to take a
10 moment just to introduce members of -- of our team that's
11 here to my left, I have Karen Ortiz, who's the Executive
12 Director of Continuous Improvement and Innovation. I have
13 Marne Autobee, the principal of Heroes K-8 Academy. I have
14 (Indiscernible) who is the Specialist of Assessment for
15 Pueblo City Schools. Behind us, in chairs we ran out of --
16 we've run out of room, I have Ms. Amber Trout, who is an
17 Instructional Interventionist at Bessemer Academy. I have
18 Kathryn Dieck who is the Executive Director of Colorado
19 Achievement Network, and I also have Ms. Dawn Johnson,
20 assistant principal at Risley International Academy of
21 Innovation. And to my right, I have Miss Phyllis Sanchez,
22 who is the president of the Pueblo City Schools Board of
23 Education. Miss Sanche -- Miss Sanchez.

24 MS. SANCHEZ: Good afternoon, commi --
25 Commissioner Anthes, Madam Chair Schroeder, and members of



1 the Board. I'd first like to introduce the members of the
2 Pueblo City Schools Board of Education who are here in
3 attendance. Ms. Barb -- Barbara Clementi, Mr. Robert
4 Gonzales, Mr. Frank Latino and we currently have a vacancy
5 on our board which we expect to be filled in early May.
6 We're currently going through our process of filling that as
7 our vice chair, Dr. Millner, moved to Arkansas to accept a
8 position at the University of Arkansas. Thank you for
9 allowing us this time to come before you to present
10 pertinent information about our school district and the plan
11 we have prepared that we believe will allow our District to
12 improve the ratings at Bessemer Academy, He -- Heroes Middle
13 School, and Risley International Academy of Innovation. It
14 is with a great sense of urgency that our school district
15 has acted over the last six years to take our district off
16 the accountability clock and we were proud to see that the
17 vast majority of our schools are now performing at ratings
18 of either performance or improvement. According to the most
19 recent school performance framework results, approximately
20 half of our schools moved up at least one level in
21 accountability plan types. We strongly believe that our
22 entire district is only beginning to realize the fruits of
23 our labor and we anticipate that these results will only
24 continue to become more and more positive moving forward.
25 We are very fortunate to have such a great relationship with



1 our partners at the Colorado Department of Education and
2 value the support we have received from the Turnaround
3 Network. This support has been extremely instrumental in
4 helping us focus our efforts to make substantial gains in
5 many of our schools including the development of our
6 innovation zone, which was approved in September 2016. Out
7 of the six schools included in our Innovation Zone, four
8 schools have reached a rating of improvement or performance.
9 Over the last several years, our school board has recognized
10 the challenges and severe ramifications our schools are
11 facing. While many of our schools have successfully
12 produced results sufficient enough to remove the
13 accountability clock, we realize that the work still needs
14 to be done at Bessemer, Heroes, and Risley. We are hopeful
15 that the plan you are about to hear aligns closely with the
16 Commissioner's recommendations and is acceptable to the
17 State Board of Education. Under the leadership of
18 Superintendent Macaluso, our School Board believes that we
19 have the right leader in place to propel the remaining
20 schools in a positive trajectory toward rapid improvement.
21 A career-long employee of Pueblo City Schools,
22 Superintendent Macaluso, is no stranger to school
23 performance -- to the school performance framework. She was
24 often placed in our highest need schools with significant
25 challenges and demonstrated highly effective leadership.



1 She earned their support and trusted each of those schools
2 and has already established a cohesive team around her in
3 her new position as superintendent. We have been impressed
4 with her leadership and know that she will provide the clear
5 direction our schools need to ensure that all schools
6 continue to make improvements in student performance,
7 growth, and culture. This transition in district leadership
8 is providing a renewed focus in teaching, learning, and
9 overall improvement in the district. On behalf of the Board
10 of Education, we want you to know that we are committed to
11 seeing our students, schools, district, and community
12 succeed and we will do everything we can to support the
13 robust vision of our superintendent. Thank you for allowing
14 us to be here today.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Madam Chair
16 Schroeder, Commissioner Anthes, members of the Board. About
17 a month ago, we submitted materials for your review, which
18 contained information regarding a proposed grade
19 configuration for two of the schools that we will be
20 discussing today. At the time that board materials
21 reviewed, we were still very much in the middle of this
22 process. We were conducting listening tours, with school
23 and community stakeholders and still considering and
24 evaluating various components and elements in order to
25 decide whether a grade reconfiguration at one or both of



1 these schools would provide additional leverage and support
2 to the pathway plan. Since that time we have definitively
3 decided that a grade reconfiguration will not be part of the
4 pathway plan going forth, so I just wanted to -- to make
5 that clarification in your materials. It is my hope that
6 today through this presentation my team can effectively
7 convey the current efforts under way at each of these three
8 schools that have resulted in much success and improvement
9 over time. We will also present a road map and a coherent
10 plan for addressing the challenges and unique needs of each
11 of the schools on their path to continuous improvement. In
12 terms of our district context and our demographics, Pueblo
13 City schools serves approximately 17,000 students. We are
14 unlike other school districts that are struggling
15 financially to -- to balance the budget and we are
16 experiencing a period of declining enrollment over -- for
17 the last few years. And as you know we have six of our
18 schools that are in year six of the accountability clock.
19 It -- it also is no secret that we have been plagued with
20 some transition in top leadership positions such as
21 superintendent and associate superintendent and other key --
22 key central administration positions. That's just part of
23 the story of the district demographics and the district
24 context. So allow me to share with you the rest of the
25 story. The truth is none of the challenges that I just



1 mentioned will prevent us from engaging in the work that
2 needs to be done to improve outcomes for our students. The
3 truth is our district has taken the directive from this
4 board for needed improvement very seriously and has engaged
5 in school reform diligently for the past six years. In
6 2012, the state board approved Innovation Plans for three of
7 our turnaround middle schools and in 2016 we developed
8 Innovation Plans for three elementary schools and formed the
9 innovation zone for the six. Our district is committed to
10 the partnership and support offered through the Colorado
11 Department of Ed -- of Education and we are very thankful
12 for that ongoing partnership. It has helped us to -- it has
13 helped to support many initiatives and most importantly the
14 work of the turnaround network has been invaluable to many
15 of our schools and districts. According to the 2016 school
16 performance framework, Pueblo City schools had 10 schools
17 move off the accountability clock, 15 schools improved their
18 plan type by at least one level. Four of the skill --
19 schools that comprise the innovation -- that comprise the
20 innovation zone effectively stopped the accountability clock
21 -- clock and reached a plan type of improvement or
22 performance. And because of the improvement, I just
23 mentioned Pueblo City schools was able to improve their
24 accreditation rating to improvement. I'm always reminded of
25 this quote that says "the whole world is watching as we --



1 as we provide more complex instruction covering a wider
2 range of skills to an increasingly diverse group of
3 students. It is not these challenges that will define our
4 generation of educators, however our response." I have
5 served as superintendent in its full capacity for only a
6 short time. Actually it's only been about eight weeks or
7 two months. Time flies when you're having fun and prior to
8 that I was interim and prior to that I was acting
9 superintendent. But probably most importantly I want this
10 board to know that I have nearly 25 years dedicated to
11 Pueblo City schools serving in our most challenging schools
12 and in a dist -- and in district capacities that have
13 allowed me to improve the support structures for those
14 students who are most vul -- vulnerable in our system and
15 most at risk. I want this board to know that I have
16 firsthand knowledge of the challenges that lie ahead for our
17 schools and for our community and I will work with a sense
18 of urgency to respond to those challenges to ensure we
19 improve outcomes for our students. In just a short amount
20 of time my leadership team and I have been -- been able to
21 communicate and support a clear and focused direction to all
22 school leaders around creating the conditions for school
23 improvement. Specifically we have implemented a laser like
24 focus on da -- data driven instruction, observation,
25 feedback, and promoting a positive and responsive school



1 culture. This year Bessemer Academy served pre-K through --
2 through fifth grade, a grade reconfiguration eliminating the
3 sixth through eighth grade occurred at the end of last
4 school year thus allowing Bessemer to tailor instruction and
5 focus on the elementary grades. According to the 2014
6 school performance framework Bessemer did improve their plan
7 type from turnaround to priority improvement and recently
8 just barely missed a rating of improvement by 0.6 percent.
9 Bessemer has been involved in a magnet grant that allowed
10 the school to engage in comprehensive professional
11 development in STEM and has provided resources and materials
12 to advance that program initiative. In addition, Bessemer
13 received a read ignite grant, which allowed the school to
14 refine instruction and place an emphasis on strengthening
15 Tier one instruction. During the past school year, Bessemer
16 received pathways planning grant from Colorado Department of
17 Education and has engaged in working with stakeholders in a
18 meaningful way to explore inappropriate pathway for
19 Bessemer. The work of the stakeholder groups centered
20 around the pathway of innovation. Although innovation
21 status may be an option in the future, it was necessary for
22 our district to take a step back and identify those
23 structures that must be in place in order to be poised to
24 enter into an innovation zone. The pathway plan for
25 Bessemer includes a partnership with an external management



1 partner that will support specific identified needs at
2 Bessemer.

3 For the 2017/18 school year, Bessemer will
4 part -- partner with achievement network and the leader of
5 the school, the leadership team will participate in the
6 Relay National Principals Academy Fe -- Fellowship. All
7 other schools currently in the zone are proposing to enter
8 the zone having engaged with these partners during the
9 planning year for innovation.

10 There is a need for Bessemer to continue to
11 strengthen and build the academic systems and therefore we
12 believe that achievement network through the use of an
13 online platform and onsite coaching are able to assist
14 Bessemer in building a deep understanding of standards and
15 standards aligned instructional practices in both ELA and in
16 Math.

17 They will be able to assist the school in
18 establishing and pursuing instructional priorities through
19 high quality use of time and structures including da --
20 including data use routines or data analysis pro --
21 protocols and they will also be able to delp -- develop
22 teachers in their leadership team to strengthen and foster a
23 data informed adult culture and deepen impact across the
24 school.

25 The partnership with Achievement Network has



1 proved -- has provided high quality interim assessments and
2 reports, which provide educators with timely data to inform
3 their instruction every six to eight weeks.

4 This is a partnership that we have engaged
5 that we have a very strong partnership with and they have
6 engaged with several of our other schools and with many of
7 the schools in the Innovation Zone. Risley International is
8 an -- Risley International Academy of innovation is a very
9 unique school where nearly 97 percent of students qualify
10 for free lunch.

11 Risley is one of three original middle
12 schools in Pueblo City schools who received innovation
13 status and is currently engaged with the Innovation Zone.
14 Through the original Innovation Plan, Risley took on the
15 bold initiative of implementing both Interna -- of
16 implementing both international Baccalaureate Middle Years
17 program and Advancement via Individual Determination or AVIT
18 and have placed an emphasis on increasing the quality of
19 tier one instruction and fostering a positive culture.

20 Last spring, Risley became a fully authorized
21 IB World School. I don't know how much you know about the
22 international baccalaureate program but -- but it is very
23 rigorous and has very specific criteria and expectations
24 regarding program implementation and practices. A
25 verification team must conduct an onsite review to evaluate



1 the quality of implementation.

2 The feedback from Risley's onsite review
3 resulted in 13 areas of commendations and 34 areas for
4 recognitions where practices were in place. One area that
5 resulted in a formal commendation was the fact that Risley
6 is the only Pueblo City schools who has fully implemented a
7 true standards based grading system and has a line of
8 philosophy with all practices, assessments and grade
9 reporting. Risley is currently engaged with the external
10 management partner of achievement network and currently one
11 assistant principal is finishing the Relay Graduate school
12 of education program.

13 Next year with the help of Colorado
14 Department of Education Leadership Grants, we will have
15 additional slots for the leadership team of Risley to attend
16 relay. The pathway plan for Risley would include continuing
17 in the Innovation Zone and continuing with these external
18 management partners. Heroes K-8 Academy was formed when
19 students from Summerland Elementary relocated to Freedom
20 Middle school when the Summerland Elementary School building
21 was closed.

22 The effort to operate as two schools under
23 one roof was not effective and therefore the school engaged
24 in a very concerted effort to join the schools as one
25 functional K-8 program, thus K-8 Academy was formed. During



1 the last two years, Heroes is on a positive trajectory of
2 continuous improvement.

3 And recently, according to the 2016 school
4 performance framework, Heroes has improved their planned
5 height from turnaround to priority improvements. There was
6 a tremendous improvement in the school culture enabling the
7 school to begin to build an academic culture. This school
8 year, Heroes has partnered with ark -- with Achievement
9 Network in order to strengthen the practices of data driven
10 instruction and standards based instruction.

11 The current principal has completed Relay
12 Graduate School of Education and has been able to apply
13 learning from Relay to create the systems and school wide
14 structures to support student learning. Heroes also
15 received a pathway planning grant from CDE, which enabled
16 them to fully engage stakeholders in the ex -- exploration
17 of a pathway.

18 We believe innovation is an appropriate
19 pathway and feel they are poised to enter and would benefit
20 greatly from the collaborative effort and support provided
21 from the Innovation Zone. Entering into the Innovation Zone
22 wo -- would provide heroes with all the existing waivers of
23 the zone and flexibilities in autonomies from various state
24 local and negotiated agreements.

25 During the past month, the Innovation Plan



1 for Heroes has been further developed with many specific
2 components regarding the program features. And at this
3 time, I'd like to introduce you to Ms. Marne Autobee who
4 will give you an overview of that Innovation Plan.

5 MS. AUTOBEE: Thank you Madam Chairwoman,
6 Commissioner Anthes, and members of the Board of Education.
7 My name is Marne Autobee. I am the proud principal of
8 Heroes K-8 Academy. Since 2014, Heroes Academy has gained
9 momentum in improvement efforts through the hard work of
10 staff and our partnerships with CDE and Achievement Network.
11 We have experienced slight success in improving student
12 growth and culture.

13 We continue those efforts by planning for
14 innovation, have developed a comprehensive and viable plan
15 that is in the editing phase right now. I had it right in
16 front of me, it's done. The graphic on the screen helps
17 explain the plan's key elements. Purposeful teaching and
18 learning stresses a commitment to instruction using
19 research-based practices. In 2015, we implemented the AVID
20 program into our middle school grades which will be
21 integrated school-wide.

22 We identified key AVID instructional
23 strategies that every teacher must master within the first
24 year with support from instructional coaching, lesson plan
25 review, and an observation feedback model. Lesson design



1 uses backwards planning that begins with the demonstration
2 of learning with objectives aligned to the Colorado Academic
3 and Common Core State Standards. AVID strategies are
4 incorporated into every lesson to increase student
5 engagement and achievement.

6 A three-year comprehensive professional
7 development continuum involves all elements of our
8 Innovation Plan. With an extended day for teachers, we
9 facilitate weekly professional learning communities that
10 include grade level and content area discussions, in
11 addition to data meetings.

12 Five additional professional development days
13 at the beginning of the school year, build the foundation
14 for and set expectations to achieve our schools major
15 improvement strategies. Leadership development for both
16 students and staff is paramount to our success. All
17 students purchase fate in school-wide character development
18 through a strengths-based approach. Using the thriving
19 learning communities curriculum obtained from a grant
20 release -- we received this year, students not only learn
21 how to capitalize on their major strengths but also how to
22 bolster their lesser ones.

23 Restorative practices help reshape the school
24 culture. Through partnerships with RJ Colorado, the Youth
25 Transformation Center, and Pueblo's Municipal Court,



1 students and teachers are trained in restorative practices,
2 including conflict resolution and response regulation as
3 alternatives to suspension. Other leadership academy topics
4 include life-skills, workforce readiness, and job shadowing.
5 Teacher leadership development is influenced through peer
6 coaching opportunities and teacher-led professional
7 development.

8 Instructional coaches work with teachers to
9 master and refine identified instructional strategies.
10 Enrichment academies allow student choice in unique
11 electives typically not found in school. Offerings are
12 designed to pick student interest, facilitate inquiry,
13 promote thinking, and provide challenging experiences for
14 all learners.

15 At a community summit held in February where
16 more than 20 different agencies were represented, community
17 partners committed to providing instruction. Enrichment
18 academies focus on topics such as academic intervention,
19 unit recovery, the arts, athletics, and health and wellness.
20 Our schools' vision is that every student leaves Heroes K-8
21 Academy prepared for high school and beyond without
22 remediation. Therefore, unit recovery is of particular
23 interest.

24 Using a blended learning models, students
25 have the opportunity to recover failed middle school



1 credits. Innovation at Heroes K-8 Academy symbolizes
2 transformation for improvement. We reconfigured curriculum
3 by incorporating average strategy development at all grade
4 levels, refined our school's schedule by adding additional
5 collaboration and learning time for both students and staff,
6 significantly strengthened teachers competence using an
7 intentional, professional development plan and utilized
8 community and school resources to offer every student
9 enrichment and leadership opportunities.

10 To enact innovation, Heroes K-8 Academy
11 requests waivers for teacher and administrator work
12 schedules, extended school year and school day, employee
13 recruitment, hiring compensation stipends and evaluation,
14 professional learning communities and professional
15 development scheduling, nontraditional staffing for non-core
16 subject areas including the hiring of community experts, and
17 assessment scheduling tools and methods beyond those
18 required by the state and our district. Thank you for
19 allowing me the opportunity to share our Innovation Plan
20 components.

21 MS. ORTIZ: Good afternoon. I'm Karen Ortiz,
22 Executive Director of Continuous Improvement and Innovation.
23 And we feel that the pathway for Heroes in particular and
24 also Risley continuing -- Risley continuing in the zone and
25 Heroes entering the zone will provide a collective response



1 to the needs of the individual schools within the zone. We
2 have proven over the last several years as we've had
3 innovation schools and this is our fourth year experimenting
4 with innovation, our first year in the zone. We were here
5 just in September passing our Innovation Zone Plan and that
6 has provided us great leverage and great freedoms within the
7 district.

8 We know that having Heroes enter the zone
9 will present the opportunity to continue the collaborative
10 work with the network of schools who have already adopted
11 and embraced like philosophy and also a system of beliefs
12 regarding our individual instructional programs. The zone
13 also provides the autonomy through the waivers and
14 flexibilities given to the schools and the freedom to
15 basically focus on three areas and that's engage in
16 effective practices, leverage our efficiencies, and also
17 disseminate our successes.

18 So, being within the Innovation Zone just a
19 few months, we have already been able to extend those
20 practices that we've found to be successful at a district,
21 excuse me, at a district level. So, it's really helping us
22 as a district to build that capacity and also the clickers.
23 So --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's probably a good
25 thing.



1 MS. ORTIZ: So, if we take a look at this
2 particular slide, as a district, the zone has allowed us to
3 move some very effective practices at a district level. We
4 have really focused on our data-driven instructional model,
5 our observation and feedback coaching model, and also
6 looking at the climate and culture within our district to
7 help us move forward. Those now exist in every one of our
8 buildings.

9 So, not just as a zone or as an innovation
10 school, but we have taken these practices out to the
11 district level. So, every one of our school leaders has
12 been trained in these initial models. And so, that is
13 really helping us move our district forward and build that
14 capacity.

15 We also embrace the work that we have done
16 with our leadership training -- our turnaround leadership
17 training through relay and also our partnership with the
18 achievement network. Those -- partnerships began with just
19 a few schools and we have now moved them out across the
20 district using our innovative model. Four of our six
21 schools in the zone have moved out of turnaround. We are
22 now either at an improvement level and some of our schools
23 have moved out to performance by using this engaged model of
24 turnaround network training.

25 We have new leadership, we have a new focus



1 and we are building capacity at a district level. What we
2 are here today to tell you is that we are a group of people
3 who have extensive experience within school and school
4 reform, especially turnaround reform and we are dedicated to
5 making a difference in our community. We accept the
6 recommendation of the commissioner and the Colorado
7 Department of Education.

8 As we look at next steps for our district and
9 for our schools who are at the end of the clock, we are a
10 district focused on continuous improvement and a continuous
11 improvement model. We have established an office -- for
12 continuous improvement and for innovation as well. We have
13 experience at the leadership level in school reform.

14 We will continue to maintain a strong
15 partnership with our Colorado Department of Education
16 turnaround support managers and we were recently notified,
17 thank you, of our turnaround leaders grant that we received
18 which will allow us to have additional people in turnaround
19 leadership training. We are expanding our partnership with
20 the achievement network to include Bessemer Academy and a
21 more extensive coaching model at the schools that need that
22 coaching model, and relay being the driver that will help us
23 move our district forward.

24 We will also be exploring not only the
25 external partnership for our schools, but we will also be



1 exploring that at a district level. So, in addition to our
2 work with Achievement Network and Relay, we will also be
3 exploring an external management partner for the district.
4 At this point we are exploring -- we are in the process of
5 writing our plan so that our district can really focus in on
6 a specific partner that will meet the needs that we have
7 identified in our district level.

8 We want to be very intentional and very
9 strategic so that the partner is really specific in -- in
10 targeting the operations at a district level that will help
11 include talent management and the systems of support that we
12 have identified in our academic structures, our
13 accountability and management for our leaders, and also our
14 community engagement. We appreciate the work and
15 collaboration of our program managers from Colorado
16 Department of Education.

17 They are very knowledgeable. They have a
18 good handle on our schools and the pulse at each school. We
19 are committed to Pueblo, the community and most of all, the
20 success of our students. What we would like to end with is
21 just a glimpse into our buildings and the people that we
22 serve. Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're on the right track
24 because we really are trying to tailor the program here at
25 Risley for the benefit of our students. And I really think



1 that going through the process of being authorized as an Ivy
2 School has really shifted our teachers thinking about how
3 they present curriculum and how they assess students. In my
4 mind, secondary schools kind of lean towards more of content
5 focused instead of holistically and IB really promotes that
6 holistic nature of teaching. I really think that just the
7 training itself for the staff and the way that we're --
8 we're presenting curriculum to our students and allowing
9 them to demonstrate their understanding, has really been the
10 big -- a big shift.

11 I think it began with just understanding that
12 we're here to work with students in a holistic way and
13 trying to not just look at the academics piece but also in
14 how do they interact socially, what's appropriate for their
15 -- for their work beyond middle school cause they're going
16 to high school, they're going to college, and so with
17 Capturing Kids' Hearts and PBIS kind of working hand in
18 hand. You know, we're promoting those positive behaviors.

19 When you really tap into the motivation side
20 of a student, because you are doing a holistic kind of
21 approach to teaching, that's going to inspire them to really
22 work their hardest. We really work really hard about
23 developing our relationships with our students so that they
24 know that we're trying to help them be successful and
25 especially with a community project even it's all the things



1 they've learned in all of their classes and then they're
2 taking that knowledge and they're doing some kind of action.
3 It really is about taking what they're learning and
4 promoting it for their futures.

5 Maybe they want to be a nurse, maybe they
6 want to be a writer. Who knows. And so, it's really about
7 them starting to explore that and really helping them to
8 take the first steps here at the middle school level so.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What excites me coming
10 to school is when they want you to succeed and if you ever
11 have any problems with anything, their doors always open and
12 just the schools, a big family who wants to share the love.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Love that
14 (indiscernible) - -- it's the most -- it's an amazing
15 program. I'm so happy that I got chosen to be in there.
16 We're having a dentist come in and that's what I want to be.
17 So, I'm going to have so many questions for him.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. We work on public
19 speaking and collaborating together.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We go on a lot of
21 college tours and we get to see what -- what life is out
22 (indiscernible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have been here for 26
24 years at this time and I got to see through the history of
25 our school the ups and downs that we have seen. Right now,



1 Bessemer Academy is on the right track in a lot of different
2 areas.

3 We can go ahead and we can look at turnaround
4 priority improvement and improvement which we are -- we are
5 close to attaining this past year. However, during this
6 time, what have I seen in the past couple years, I've seen
7 kids that have been more involved with their school, parents
8 that have become more involved with their school, and then
9 caring and continuing to strongly care about academically
10 what they're able to do.

11 My kids are looking at now college and what
12 that needs to look like. And as part of community at
13 Bessemer Academy, they are able to be speaking into their
14 lives and into their hearts. We do work hard academically,
15 but what we've created here and cultivated here is an
16 environment that allows the kids to know that they can count
17 on each other.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've implemented a STEM
19 curriculum using Project Lead the Way and project-based
20 learning and the teachers are highly trained in that and it
21 really has aided in the change in the climate and culture of
22 the building. I mean, bef -- when I first stepped into the
23 building, the students were, you know, low self-esteem.
24 They weren't risk takers. And now, I see them taking risks
25 all the time. They're not afraid to fail. They know that



1 they can do it.

2 MS. ORTIZ: On behalf of the district, what
3 we are respectfully requesting is that we be given the time
4 and opportunity to build upon the districts positive
5 trajectory that we have seen in -- in the schools so far in
6 our work with CDE and also taking the schools that we have
7 been able to take off the accountability clock and we really
8 look forward to the challenge of being able to do this with
9 these next three schools. Thank you very much.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. So, at this
11 -- this time, the State Board can engage in discussion and
12 ask questions of both parties. As a reminder, based on the
13 board's 2016 procedures for state board accountability
14 actions, this is our only time for discussion and our
15 opportunity to ask clarifying questions of both the
16 department and district in the next two hours.

17 We need to be sure we are clear with the
18 direction and the conditions we request to include in the
19 proposed written final determination as public testimony
20 will not be heard at subsequent meetings. Colleagues. Mr.
21 Durham.

22 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll
23 start with Dr. Anthes. The recommendation that the
24 external management plan that you've -- does it mean in
25 your opinion the definition and call revise statutes 22-11-



1 210. And the question is whether that statute requires a
2 complete takeover and management by a public or private
3 management entity as opposed to just a consulting
4 relationship and is this recommendation consistent with
5 statutory requirements?

6 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Board Member Durham.
7 That is something that we wanted to talk about because we
8 don't have complete management plans for all three of these
9 schools. That is something CDE staff would like to have the
10 chance to review the details of as you heard in my summary,
11 we would suggest that we complete the innovation planning
12 process or that the district completes innovation planning
13 process for Heroes and submits a plan to us on that and
14 develop management plans and secure a management partner for
15 all three of the schools and we would like to have the
16 chance to review those, to see if it meets their needs and
17 end the statutory requirements.

18 So far, as you know, we have in terms of the
19 statute and I'll refer the legal piece over to Ms. Tulson
20 (ph) or I'm not sure which attorney should respond to that
21 or Mr. Doll (ph), but we have been having our -- sort of
22 a range of what the management partnership looks like. And
23 I think on this management partnership, we would like to
24 have a strong management partnership but we would need to
25 review, you heard from the district they wanted to do an RFI



1 to figure out the best fit for their needs.

2 And we would want to be a part of that
3 process and review it. So, one suggestion we had, is that
4 we could ask the district to come back in August, you could
5 direct an action to us now and to them to continue to build
6 out those plans. And then they could come back in August
7 and share those plans with us and we would have had a chance
8 to review them and be able to directly provide our feedback
9 on those plans to you.

10 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible) this and the
11 other districts and the other individual schools that we've
12 had in front of us that have had some proposals for
13 management, when those were brought to us, those were pretty
14 well-fleshed. I believe those were had -- those were
15 essentially completed plans and we don't really have a
16 completed management plan here, is that for us to consider,
17 is that correct?

18 MS. ANTHERS: That is correct.

19 MR. DURHAM: And then to -- to Pueblo and I
20 don't know, Ms. Macaluso, you have suggested that the
21 membership in the Innovation Zone for Heroes that does not
22 appear to be an option open to the board. If you look at
23 Colorado statute 22-11-210 that you could be an innovation
24 school but inclusion in the zone does not appear to meet the
25 statutory requirements that this board may consider. Do you



1 have any comments on that?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Board Member
3 Durham, Commissioner Anthes. It is my understanding that we
4 would bring forth an Innovation Plan to be approved and then
5 we would have a separate process to enroll them into the
6 zone so that they can be part of the zone. So, it is my
7 understanding that it would constitute a vote on behalf of
8 all six schools that are in existence in the zone.

9 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Once again, it's the
10 flipside of that same question as Dr. Anthes in other
11 schools and districts that we have seen come before us with
12 plans. We were generally developed and we almost
13 characterized as final plans but yours are clearly in a
14 state not quite that far along. What would you attribute
15 the difference in the progress made by others coming before
16 this board that are similarly situated in your circumstance?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Thank you for the
18 question. Two of our schools, namely Bessemer and Heroes
19 did receive Pathways Implementation Grants and so and also
20 our district has been in transition but those two schools we
21 have allowed them to really engage in the broader
22 stakeholder groups of their communities and that process
23 took a little bit of time.

24 In the -- in terms of Bessemer, they were
25 really centering around innovation as their pathway. And we



1 really felt like, when we came to this board in September of
2 2016, essentially, we said we will ensure that we will
3 uphold the fidelity of the Innovation Zone.

4 And so, as a district, we feel like there are
5 some certain things that need to be in place prior to just a
6 school saying, "Okay. We're going to move into the zone."
7 And so, we just feel like there are some additional
8 components that need to be developed. And so, that's why we
9 are seeking an external management partner to target the
10 needs specific to that school as opposed to innovation.

11 So, the pathway proposal that the school had
12 worked on with the stakeholders has taken a little bit of
13 different direction and the whole while, we have been
14 working with Commissioner Anthers and her staff from CDE in
15 terms of, the development of those plans.

16 MR. DURHAM: So, let me just kind of, run
17 through these one school at a time with Bessemer Elementary,
18 the Department's recommendation is management, not
19 innovation.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

21 MR. DURHAM: And do you agree with that? This
22 is a management plan with a selection of management needs to
23 be implemented.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We agree with that
25 recommendation and think that maybe the school could move



1 into the zone in a later date but that we would have to
2 engage in further planning and there would need to be some
3 additional structures in place at the school in order to be
4 successful on that pathway.

5 MR. DURHAM: And for Heroes, CDE
6 recommendation's management and innovation.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

8 MR. DURHAM: And you concur with that
9 recommendation, is that correct?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We agree that Heroes is
11 poised and ready to move into a comprehensive Innovation
12 Plan and we feel like their Innovation Plan is a viable one.
13 And we also feel like they have already engaged with what we
14 feel is an appropriate external management to target
15 identified needs in that school. So, yes we agree.

16 MR. DURHAM: And have you proceeded through
17 the statutory requirements of Innovation Zone to the point
18 that you have had a vote of staff in that school to approve
19 an Innovation Plan?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have not had a vote
21 with the staff. That would be scheduled in the next coming
22 months.

23 MR. DURHAM: And then for Risley Academy,
24 it's the same that you concur with the management and
25 innovation that's recommended by staff. Is that correct?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

2 MR. DURHAM: But what -- have you in this
3 instance had a vote of the staff in going through the other
4 statutory requirements including getting district approval
5 for waivers, from district policy to allow an effective
6 innovation zone to be created?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes we have at Risley,
8 we have.

9 MR. DURHAM: So you have a vote there of the
10 staff and you have school board approval of -- of the
11 district policies from which you would be exempt?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct. And we
13 have worked in collaboration with our teachers union on
14 those waivers.

15 MR. DURHAM: And then, I presume and I'll --
16 I'll go through my notes here but I -- next time I guess
17 will be my turn to ask questions but -- so, I presume you
18 can describe then the waivers from the union contract and
19 from the board policies that are included in this Innovation
20 Zone; is that --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 MR. DURHAM: - -- you're prepared to do that.
23 And then, you're -- you're asking - -- you're asking for
24 approval, essentially of plans that, I presume if we act at
25 the May meeting of the Board, we'll be asked to -- you can't



1 get to -- you can't get all of the things done.

2 At least I don't presume you can't get to a
3 vote of staff in the next -- what we're looking at, 15 days
4 maybe? Less than 15 days to our May meeting when we would
5 consider these. Can you get -- can you actually have a -- a
6 completed Innovation Plan?

7 So this board could actually know what it was
8 voting on, in that period of time? Can you get through the
9 hoops of staff approval, board approval, union approval, if
10 necessary? Can you get there?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The union has been our
12 partner in this process. We will have a complete
13 comprehensive Innovation Plan. I -- I believe that we're
14 very close to that, if not, my staff is saying yes, that
15 they are -- it is complete and the votes. Ms. Ortiz, can
16 you talk about that 'cause I know you're working on the
17 timeline pass-

18 MR. DURHAM: We are talking about May - --
19 May 11th, is that the next board meeting? 10th? May 10th.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -this one will actually
23 be at the June board meeting. The written final
24 determination. Not in May.

25 MR. DURHAM: The June board meeting, okay?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For a particular reason?

3 MR. DURHAM: I'm sorry, what's the reason?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For a particular reason?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was just that -- no-

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It -- it -- it was in
7 anticipation of there being additional detail-

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because they're behind.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -to be moved and
12 redeterminations.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good. That helps.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would anticipate that
15 we would be able to have the school vote and that we would
16 be able to bring it forth to our Board of Education and we
17 would be ready with that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

19 MR. DURHAM: At the -- at the June -- I think
20 we're meeting about the 14th to 15th of June.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 MR. DURHAM: All right. Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can -- if I may go
24 back to board member Durham's question, could the attorneys
25 please weigh in on what is management? What is it that,



1 Pueblo and staff should be expecting in a management plan?

2 Based on what the legislation-

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll just read from the
4 statute I got right in front of me here. It says that,
5 "With regard to a district public school, that is not a
6 charter school, that the district public school should be
7 managed by a private or public entity other than the school
8 district." And at least just my -- in my first read advises
9 that the school itself is managed by someone other than the
10 school district. That was just my -- my basic reading of
11 it.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Superintendent Macaluso,
13 does that -- ho -- ho -- how does that affect your school
14 leadership?

15 MS. MACALUSO: Sure. It is my understanding
16 that -- as you -- as you read further, it was my
17 understanding that -- this -- the district could choose and
18 identify a management partner that could meet specific
19 identified needs that were present in the school and not
20 engage necessarily in a total management to be managed by
21 that outside entity. That's -- that's my understanding.

22 MS. ANTHES: Madam Chair, let me -- can I ask
23 Brenda Bautsch to talk about this a little bit from our
24 perspective?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you. Thank you for the
2 opportunity. Yes, I appreciate that -- that reading of the
3 statute. We have been in confidence with our legal counsel
4 for the last year in developing what we were providing
5 guidance to the districts for what this pathway was. An
6 artificial management pathway has been and it can provide a
7 targeted needs so we could be focused on academic systems
8 for example, or it could be a whole scale of systematic
9 control or it operates out of the school. And so we have
10 seen plans come before the state board that are on that
11 spectrum. From filling a targeted need of providing
12 coaching or professional development to being more of a
13 strong vote of -- would be a stronger management
14 partnership. So, again not having seen a plan we haven't
15 reacted to one yet.

16 However we have -- we are open to, we had
17 written our recommendation and we were open to a management
18 partner that could fill specific needs around the academic
19 systems similar to how AVIT currently supports those
20 schools.

21 So we called attention to that in the
22 recommendation and that could definitely be a need that this
23 could -- a major partner could fill. We also called
24 attention to the need for a management organization to
25 support the district in -- in providing support to its low



1 performing schools. Which from my understanding is what the
2 district was proposing to do through its RFI process. And
3 please, correct me if I'm wrong.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Doll, do you read
6 it that way? That we have the spectrum?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just from reading the
8 statute itself I don't particularly see it that way, but, I
9 think here in terms of trying to interpret this, I think the
10 board has some latitude, because I certainly don't have
11 possess the absolute reading of it. But just the language
12 to me really says it should be managed by -- managed beyond
13 commonly needs to be controlled or to have, and over
14 something. And, just the idea of just having a consultant-
15 like relationship, I don't know if it would meet that
16 definition.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Tolleson.

18 MS. TOLLESON: And just with the caveat being
19 obviously that I'm wearing my hat here as a counsel for the
20 staff and Mr. Doll's advising you all. But I -- I do
21 generally agree with this reading of the statute. I think
22 where we're getting some confusion, is we've got different
23 language in the provision of the statute that relates to
24 districts and their accreditation, and the statute that
25 relates to individual schools when -- and which is why for



1 example, with Montezuma, Cortes, they had the partnership
2 with the University of Virginia program and that was what
3 they brought forward, and this board blessed.

4 But that's because the statute that relates
5 to school districts talks about a management change with the
6 agreement of the district. There's not that kind of
7 language in the statute regarding individual schools but
8 instead it really talks about that it be managed by someone
9 other than the school district. Now-

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is worrying us too.

11 MS. TOLLESON: Right. I -- but I think that
12 there're -- there are some other ways, around you could say,
13 that in part of -- that part of appro -- approving excuse
14 me, an Innovation Plan for example, you want the involvement
15 of a certain kind of consultants. I mean, there are sort of
16 other ways to skin the cat. Right? But if you're going to
17 call it management the statute defines it differently.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. It's exactly the
19 dilemma. Because innovation is not what is recommended
20 here. It's management only. And management only at the
21 school level may in fact be what Mr. Doll is suggesting
22 which is pure management. Therein lies our challenge in an
23 attempt to follow the law.

24 MS. ANTHERS: I would have to refer to our
25 staff in terms of how we interpreted the school



1 recommendation on management. If we were referring to it in
2 the same way that we thought district, or if we -- you know,
3 so, I don't know if.

4 MS. BAUTSCH: Yes we were interpreting it the
5 same for both the districts and schools. Yes.

6 MS. ANTHERS: Okay. So we were thinking
7 right. So I think to Ms. Tolleson's point, you could
8 recommend the -- the directed pathway as innovation and that
9 would be the -- with a management, you know, support partner
10 and we could write up the written determination in that way.
11 And then you could have the district come back so you could
12 -- we would do that written determination, you could have
13 the district come back and if they can't get it done by June
14 and August and review those plans more detailed, you know,
15 the more detailed plans and then determine if you think that
16 that's sufficient.

17 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

19 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Well, but Dr.
20 Anthes, I mean, relative to Bessemer, the recommendation is
21 management.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And not an innovation.

23 MR. DURHAM: It's not innovation.

24 MS. ANTHERS: Right. Yes. And what I was
25 just getting clarification from our staff. I think we were



1 interpreting management, in the same way we've been
2 interpreting management from the district level. Which Ms.
3 Tolleson just clarified for us.

4 So -- so we -- when we put management down
5 there we may have been thinking about it in that more broad
6 interpretation, which you're now hearing from your attorneys
7 that maybe that's not correct.

8 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Bautsch.

10 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you Madam Chair. We had
11 yes, agreed that Bessemer was just a recommendation for
12 management not with management and innovation. We had also
13 alternatively said that there could -- charter could be an
14 option too if there was an appropriate operator and that
15 same logic would apply for management.

16 So if there was a -- an EMO, Education
17 Management Organization that was available, then that could
18 be a potential option. However again, that would -- that
19 would require allowing the district have some time to issue
20 a call for new schools to receive applications from
21 providers whether that be at your -- at your decision in a
22 management organization or charter management organization.
23 There have to be time to lock with that process.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Colleagues, questions?

25 Board Member Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: Thank you. But Dr. Anthes --
2 Commissioner Anthes, was -- was that end step, was -- was
3 that part of the plan with the -- with management?

4 MS. ANTHES: I'm not sure I understand your
5 question.

6 MS. FLORES: Well, my -- my question is, I
7 guess, was to go with management in -- and later on to go
8 with innovation, or did you -- were you really thinking
9 because you said not -- not a -- a magnet school, no, I
10 don't mean magnet-

11 MS. ANTHES: Charter?

12 MS. FLORES: -a charter school. You -- you
13 didn't say not charter. So-

14 MS. ANTHES: I think in general, what we were
15 thinking is that the -- the district has developed an
16 Innovation Zone and we have seen great progress in their
17 Innovation Zone for four of their six turn-around districts
18 or schools, I'm sorry. And that with -- with a more
19 detailed Innovation Plan for these three specific-

20 MS. FLORES: Okay.

21 MS. ANTHES: -schools, in partnership with
22 some external management support so that we can ensure high
23 quality execution, like the other four schools that came off
24 the clock, that that would be -- that would be our
25 recommendation. So, it -- it was sort of a partnership



1 between those two. We have -- you know just thinking about
2 consistency, you know, we have talked about this with some
3 of the other schools that have come before us too. So, just
4 need to, you know, think about that as well.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fine. So, I think some
6 of our frustration, in all honesty, has been that your
7 discussions haven't gone on far enough, right? You're still
8 sort of in some fairly early stages for you to be coming
9 before us. On the other hand, we're supposed to make a
10 decision by June 30th. So, you're in a pickle, and we're in
11 a pickle on this one. You've got kids for whom education
12 needs to improve. And so, we feel that urgency in the same
13 way that you do. So, this is going to be kind of a
14 struggle, I think for us, to figure out what's the best
15 route, what's the fastest route that everybody gets on the
16 dime.

17 I think it's pretty clear that the belief of
18 the department, and I would guess that we share that, is
19 that you do get some outside expertise to help support your
20 administration and your teachers for this thing -- for
21 things to happen faster than they historically have. Your
22 Innovation Plan for Heroes, which now may in fact be more
23 important than before, I'm not sure that staff had a chance
24 to look at the rubric.

25 In fact, I don't think they did. So, where



1 was (indiscernible) because we've never even seen it? So,
2 please move that one in quickly.

3 MS. ANTHES: Yup.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, June is -- is better
5 than May, but I'm a little worried about June on what we can
6 come up with. Maybe, you all decide that you should have an
7 external management or operator for one or more of these
8 three schools. That might be the fastest way to move things
9 for your students.

10 Hope you'll be just kind of thinking about
11 that. I'm not really sure what the right thing is. I -- I
12 can tell you I'm frustrated, but that's about all I can tell
13 you right now. Board Member Mazanec.

14 MS. MAZANEC: So, four of the six schools
15 that were in the Innovation Zone came off the clock. I
16 assume that's due to the flexibility and autonomy that the
17 Innovation Zone provided for those schools. Am I correct?

18 MS. ANTHES: Yes. And -- and those schools
19 also engaged with -- with an external partner, namely Relay
20 and Achievement Network.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Again, specifically, what kind
22 of autonomy and flexibility provided, what was needed?

23 MS. ANTHES: Sure. Ms. Ortiz, do you want
24 to talk about some of the waivers?

25 MS. ORTIZ: Absolutely. And so, the zone



1 would provide those same waivers to any school that came in
2 to the zone, the waivers that we've already established.
3 Waivers that we have that are very important, are our time.
4 And so, we have a different calendar and we have an extended
5 day.

6 So, our students also have an extended
7 learning opportunity, which goes beyond the regular school
8 day and the regular school year. We have flexibilities with
9 our hiring process and -- and we do not accept
10 administrative transfers into our buildings. Absolutely.
11 Director-

12 MS. MAZANEC: Did you say you do not accept-

13 MS. ORTIZ: Correct.

14 MS. MAZANEC: -transfers?

15 MS. ORTIZ: In the zone, in those schools
16 that have innovation status. We also have a different
17 staffing pattern. So, we have some additional staff that
18 has been able to provide that and better professional
19 development to our teachers on a regular basis. We also
20 have time built in the day across the zone with all of our
21 schools. And so, there is a professional learning community
22 that is established before students even walk into the door
23 each day, where our teachers collaborate and they plan on a
24 daily basis.

25 MS. MAZANEC: And I -- I read something about



1 incentives for teachers. What in -- what incentives are
2 necessary?

3 MS. ORTIZ: Well, we have -- we have an
4 extended day. So, our teachers do work an extended
5 calendar. They work more hours and -- and more days. And
6 so, they are compensated for that -- that additional time
7 that they work.

8 We also have a sign-on stay-on bonus. So,
9 our teachers who sign on to work in our most difficult and
10 most challenging schools get an additional incentive there
11 as well. And then, we also have Pay for Performance. So,
12 as our teachers are demonstrating additional work that
13 they're making strides, they do receive a compensation -- a
14 bonus for -- for achieving those goals.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll have maybe --
16 maybe two. Go ahead.

17 MS. MAZANEC: One other question I have is
18 about professional development and data-driven instruction.
19 I've seen that a lot in this presentation, that teachers
20 need professional development and data-driven instruction.
21 And I have to say I'm surprised by that. I -- I would
22 assume that teachers come out of college, their teacher
23 preparation program, understanding data-driven instruction.
24 Can you just address that a little bit.

25 I -- we're seeing it everywhere that teachers



1 need more professional development to understand how data
2 needs to drive instruction. And I just don't -- I'm having
3 trouble understanding that.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. And at this time,
5 I'd like to -- I'd like Ms. Kathryn Dieck to come up and --
6 maybe you want to talk about-

7 MS. DIECK: Thank you. Thank you for your
8 question. And I'm going to speak as an extra on all. Like
9 we are a national but locally based nonprofit, and what
10 we're seeing is we partner with schools and -- and really
11 making sure that every -- every child in every classroom has
12 a great teacher.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry. Who are you with?

14 MS. DIECK: Sorry. I'm Kathryn Dieck, with
15 the Achievement Network.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, you're with the
17 Achievement?

18 MS. DIECK: Yes. Sorry, but so -- I think
19 that that question is because as we've made a shift in the
20 Colorado State Standards and the Common Core Standards,
21 they've require teachers to have a greater understanding of
22 what it is that kids need to be able to know and do, and
23 then be able to use data -- data effectively to make sure
24 that every student is meeting those standards.

25 And so, I think there is a shift especially



1 not perhaps the -- the teacher candidates that are coming
2 out now but teachers who have been in the profession for a
3 number of years, as we made that transition in the State
4 standards.

5 MS. MAZANEC: So you think this is new based
6 on Colorado State Standards, Common Core Standards?

7 MS. DIECK: In the -- in -- I think it is --
8 it has magnified in the last I'd say seven years.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Interesting. Okay. Oh, one
10 question for staff. I believe one of these schools, I'm not
11 sure which one now. The recommendation of the Commissioner
12 was membership in the Innovation Zone. That's sort of a plo
13 -- implied to me something different than you know. I -- I
14 got the im -- impression that they could just join, is that
15 incorrect?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm actually going to
17 turn that over to Ashley or Brenda. Yeah.

18 MS. PICHE: So, membership in the Innovation
19 School would require a vote of all the schools that are
20 currently in the Innovation Zone in Pueblo. There are six
21 schools. So, it's not just something that the school and
22 the school with Heroes, that the school would kind of just
23 join as a member. It would have to be approved by all of
24 the zo -- the schools are currently in the zone and they
25 would have to have an Innovation Plan that's in alignment



1 with the central theory of th -- the zone as well.

2 MS. MAZANEC: So -- so what factors would
3 determine whether they would vote yes or no on that?

4 MS. PICHE: That's a good question. I don't
5 know if the district wants to take that one.

6 MS. BAUTSCH: Sure. I'll address that and --
7 and Ms. Ortiz you can -- you can also weigh in. I think
8 what -- what the Innovation Zone, they have -- they -- all
9 of the -- the schools in the zone have the same waivers and
10 have the same -- same commitments to how they're going to
11 move forth and so, any schools that enter the zone, they
12 would be aligning their plan to the same waivers that --
13 that is afforded under the zone.

14 So, that kind of expedites the process and
15 so, they want to make sure that they are committed to the
16 common -- the common practices that have been established by
17 the zone and so, the zone actually is their own professional
18 learning community to advance the collective efforts of the
19 group.

20 MS. MAZANEC: And so, they might not want to
21 add more to their pre -- professional learning community?

22 MS. BAUTSCH: I don't think it's about not
23 wanting to add more. I think it's about ensuring that those
24 foundational pieces and those structures are in place and
25 making sure that it's an appropriate time and that schools



1 aren't just saying, "Okay. We -- we want to be part of the
2 zone or we -- we want to go there or-" So, we -- we want to
3 make sure that those practices are in place. Those
4 foundational pieces.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I wanted to ask.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just -- just hover.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh. I'm sorry.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know.

9 MS. MAZANEC: One more and this is probably
10 for staff too. Are there any charter management
11 organizations in Colorado equipped and able to take over
12 Bessemer Elementary or Heroes?

13 MS. PICHE: So, we haven't named any in
14 particular and with support the district and again a call
15 for -- for new schools to see if there was any interest for
16 one high performing CMO's or-

17 MS. MAZANEC: They would just need to do a
18 RFP.

19 MS. PICHE: Exactly, to see what is
20 available. Yes.

21 MS. MAZANEC: But you're not aware of it?

22 MS. PICHE: No. Not any in particular.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan.

25 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you Madam Chair. So,



1 this maybe-

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh. I'm sorry. Did I
3 cut you off? I'm sorry Ms. Bautsch. Did I ca -- cut you
4 off?

5 MS. BAUTSCH: So -- just-

6 MS. PICHE: Sorry.

7 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you. No. No. No. I
8 sorry. I would just like to jump in and say that reg --
9 regarding that we as Commissioner Anthes mentioned, one
10 option would be for us to comprehe -- ask to request of the
11 district come back in August with a more fleshed out plan
12 where we could perhaps identify and answer some of these --
13 these questions that are out there around. If there is a
14 provider available or what their plan would be to issue a
15 call for new schools as well as a fleshed out Innovation
16 Plan for Heroes schools.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why August instead of
18 June?

19 MS. BAUTSCH: It just realistically what
20 could be done between now and June.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Sorry. Board
22 Member McClellan. I'm sorry.

23 MS. MCCLELLAN: Sure. Thank you Madam Chair.
24 This may be a little bit premature in that case. I was
25 going to ask some questions about an any identified



1 management partners and it sounds like you're engaged with
2 Relay and Achievement Network but it may be a little bit
3 premature for me to dive into those questions.

4 If that's not necessarily going to be our
5 management partner going forward. I was going to ask about
6 their track record in the event that we think they maybe the
7 management partner who's engaged here. Do we know much
8 about their track record of success for turning around
9 schools with similar demographics?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

11 MS. PICHE: So, Relay is focused on
12 turnaround leadership training and typically, it's a trend
13 that happens outside of the school sites. So, they -- I --
14 I'm not -- I'm pretty sure that I haven't -- I me -- track
15 record of management and the way that we're talking about
16 it. Achievement Network and other areas of the country.

17 So, on East Coast has served as an external
18 management partner with some accountability built into
19 relationships they have with schools and have a lot of
20 success there and I know Kathy will speak more but I know
21 that good practices here for our Colorado and that folks
22 are-mare based on you know the same research that has been
23 used across the country to turnaround similar schools.

24 MS. MCCLELLAN: So, we don't know yet if that
25 necessarily would be a management partner, if we're engaging



1 a management partner moving forward?

2 MS. PICHE: That would be up to the District.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: Okay. Sounds like that might
4 be a little bit premature. And then I -- I wanted to ask,
5 the district has been successful in getting 10 schools off
6 the accountability clock. What is it that worked best for
7 your district in those cases, and can those lessons be
8 applied to these three schools. Are these just the three
9 greatest challenges remaining as we're trying to get these
10 last three schools kinda over the hump? Or there are four
11 more. And there are four more after this. I beg your
12 pardon?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. I think -- I
14 think it goes back to ensuring that we have appropriate
15 leadership i -- in our buildings, that our staff is well-
16 trained. It goes back to those elements. Teachers using
17 data to drive instruction and fully understanding that.
18 Ensuring that we are teaching -- teaching standards. We
19 have worked hard over the last few years to implement a very
20 cohesive assessment system and -- and a curriculum and Ms.
21 Coletti can speak a little mi -- a little bit more about
22 that, but I think those are all contributing factors to the
23 success of those schools.

24 MS. MCCLELLAN: And then I -- I -- After
25 that, I also wanted to touch on. I -- I noticed that



1 Principal Autobee I think attended the Relay Graduate
2 Program and I wanted to ask about if that was noted in the
3 SRP report for 2015-2016, and it was a noted change, and I
4 kinda wanted to see if you could touch on what kind of
5 changes you've implemented at Heroes following that
6 training?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh. Just swap out the
8 name tags.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for that
10 question. Relay Principal Fellowship is a very intense,
11 rigorous program for school leaders. I would say the things
12 that have changed the way we do things at Heroes because of
13 that is, we have established an observation feedback cycle
14 with teachers who are struggling and so that requires a
15 weekly observation, kind of a short cycle period where we go
16 into an observation, we give them a bite sized piece of
17 feedback with a high leverage action step, and then we
18 monitor that action step to make sure that it's -- it's
19 taking place in the classroom.

20 That's an ongoing cycle and, so it's
21 continued. I mean, it can also -- it can take place with
22 the principals, assistant principals, instructional coaches,
23 peer coaches, any type of person who is trained in the
24 observation feedback model.

25 In addition, we have weekly data meetings



1 with our teachers, who have been identified as needing
2 those, and so they collect their demonstrations of learning
3 each week. They provide an exemplar and -- they are
4 expecting from the students, and then we kind of hash that
5 out with them and -- and figure out where the students are
6 still missing the boat, what -- what it is in the
7 instruction that is still lacking.

8 So it always goes back to what the teacher
9 needs to kind of brush up on, or strengthen in their
10 instructional approach. We also focus on leading adult
11 professional development. So we lay you -- you design your
12 entire professional development plan at the very beginning
13 of the year, and so that kind of led us into the
14 professional development plan that we've identified in our
15 Innovation Plan as well.

16 We create a culture that is sustainable both
17 for students and for staff, that's -- that improves the
18 climbing culture of the building. So it's lots of different
19 pieces that really help you identify the gaps where you're
20 missing the boat in the reform of your school, and helps you
21 strengthen those pieces. So-.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, please.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As a follow up to that



1 question, I think it's important to also note that for the
2 first time, our district is also involved in Principal
3 Supervisor Fellowship of Relay, and so that includes myself
4 and Miss Ortiz, and so that really is, is the same program,
5 but it allows, it allows principal supervisors to go and --
6 and offer coaching to the principals. So when they're
7 coaching their teachers, we're watching and providing a
8 coaching session and we're also providing those actionable
9 high leverage action steps to improve their coaching method
10 with teachers.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Board Member
12 Goff, did we make you wait so long that you no longer have a
13 question?

14 MS. GOFF: I never did.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we can't tell it
16 when you do this whether you're (indiscernible).

17 MS. GOFF: I have a short one though.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, see?

19 MS. GOFF: Even though it focuses on
20 elementary and middle -- the middle level, how are you
21 currently, and what are you -- what is your thinking ahead
22 about communicating, continuing exchange, sharing with the
23 high school levels? I think about that, just about in every
24 context, how is the P20, how is the K12 actually becoming
25 visible and incorporated into everything that we're thinking



1 about? So that would be one part of it.

2 The other part would be the actual teach --
3 instructional strategies and teaching strategies and how --
4 how that's coming along in the sense of how teachers and
5 other, other educators who actually work with kids. So I'm
6 talking Parap -- paraprofessionals and administrators do,
7 but as far as the standards go in how -- how comfortable is
8 the -- the teaching body, the whole -- the group of people
9 who do the closest work every day with teaching the content.

10 And that because it is something that has to
11 be there in order to realize, we're talking -- we talk a lot
12 about project based learning or the actual hands-on first
13 view evidential visible stuff that kids do. But how are --
14 how're standards coming across? We've all had seven, eight
15 years now getting used to what that means, what that looks
16 like, and how do you know if you are lining up if -- not
17 that everyone is the same, but how the, how the view of what
18 that means and what that aspires to fit within your context
19 and your comfort level about how people understand it.
20 That's high school at the end of that road, but the means to
21 get there is the standards.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Thank you for
23 that question. I'd like to invite Ms. Dawn Johnson up to,
24 to address part of that question. We have really worked
25 hard at trying to get a continuum of our elementary schools



1 into the middle school so for example Bessemer STEM program
2 would fit into Roncalli Middle School and then would fit
3 into Central High School.

4 And so, we're working hard at, at trying to
5 ensure that we have a corridor of continuum for our students
6 in terms of that transition. That transition is always --
7 always very important and always something that we need to
8 address. As far as the instructional strategies, I'd like
9 Ms. Johnson to kind of talk about the International
10 Baccalaureate and what that means in terms of the standards
11 and how the different instructional strategies kinda play
12 into that.

13 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you for the question.
14 For, for our school as far as the International
15 Baccalaureate, we really engage in that transition with our
16 elementary schools who fit into our middle school, and then
17 we also work with our high schools. We do a vertical
18 articulation meeting where all schools who engage in the IB
19 program, and we are -- we have an overall meeting where we
20 review how that -- how the program is advancing from one
21 program to the next, the primary years into the middle
22 years, and then to the high school program which is the
23 diploma program.

24 And so, that whole meeting, that whole day
25 that we set aside for that discussion, is really to look at



1 how we're advancing each of those programs into the next
2 level. And so, instructionally, it really is about making
3 those connections between what you're doing in the primary
4 years into the middle school, and how are you building on
5 that, and then you moving that into the diploma years, yet
6 to the high school level.

7 So it really is about that big art --
8 articulation and then smaller groups and kind of digging
9 down into those -- those standards and connecting them to --
10 for IB for their criteria that they have identified for each
11 of those programs.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

13 MS. FLORES: I guess we, we started from the
14 end. I mean, from the other end. And I wanted to ask you,
15 I know this is something the state doesn't get involved in
16 that is curriculum, but how can we talk about all the other
17 pieces when we -- when, you know, we haven't really talked
18 about the curriculum, you said it's coherent, it's holistic.
19 But what is it?

20 What -- what is the curriculum that, and I --
21 and I presume that to get into the zone, you would have to --
22 - a school would have to be kind of in that curriculum zone
23 as well. So would you explain that?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. So our district
25 provides a viable and guaranteed curriculum.



1 MS. FLORES: A viable what?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A viable and guaranteed
3 curriculum through our Scope and Sequence of maps and our
4 assessment system. And then -- then our schools have
5 curriculum materials. Is that what you're-

6 MS. FLORES: Right. I mean in, in -- way
7 back, a curriculum was about either you were -- the society
8 was very important, the self was very important, or
9 knowledge was very important. Curricula are usually about
10 knowledge, self, or society to improve, you know, either.
11 So where would you put yours? I -- I saw the humanistic one
12 which I would say self, which was, you have the part about
13 restorative justice, life skills, and work shadowing, and
14 stuff, but -- so, does Relay -- is Relay a curriculum?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, Relay is not a-

16 MS. FLORES: I mean, I'm not asking about
17 Relay because I want to -- I want you to a -- answer my
18 question about the curriculum. So you have developed a
19 curriculum, maybe, for your school?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have developed a
21 scope and sequence aligned to the standards by -- by grade
22 level and by content.

23 MS. FLORES: And how would you describe,
24 describe it? I mean, it's -- it's given, what I-

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Sure, I'd like to



1 invite (Indiscernible) Coletti.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, our content
3 specialist identified standards at each grade level that
4 need to be taught in accordance with the State guidelines.

5 MS. FLORES: Right. But usually, I mean when
6 you're -- I think I heard you say too that it was a personal
7 kind of interpersonal, or what's the term for?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Social emotional.

9 MS. FLORES: Well that it -- well it has --
10 I'm sorry?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Personalized learning.

12 MS. FLORES: Yes, that it was personalized
13 learning. So, and is - -- is it you have objects, or you
14 have subjects that you -- not subjects, that's not the term.
15 I'm sorry, I'm just kind of tired and this light is awful.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you think maybe we
17 just need to take a break, and we'll let you speak first,
18 when we come back?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That might help you
21 gather your question.

22 MS. FLORES: Well.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know everybody's got
24 questions but what do you think about a five minute break.
25 Everybody back by three, would that be okay with you all?



1 MS. SANCHEZ: And think about curricula,
2 that's coherent.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would that be okay?
4 Sorry folks we can only sit so long.

5 MS. FLORES: My question has to do with the
6 curricula. And you probably heard me say that I think
7 individual standards are meaningless isolates by themselves.
8 So, do you have a curriculum? I know you use AVIT, which is
9 a social studies curriculum, but what about Math and
10 language arts? What is the curriculum that you follow? That
11 the zone follows.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

13 MS. FLORES: That you want the others to
14 know. I mean, it may have been created by you, but you have
15 like a special name? Can you describe it?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Ms. Ortiz?

17 MS. ORTIZ: Yes I'm going to take a shot at
18 this.

19 MS. FLORES: Okay.

20 MS. ORTIZ: So, we follow the state standards
21 obviously. So, that is what we uses as, and we have
22 established our Scope and Sequence for our curriculum. And
23 what I think I'm hearing is that, within the zone we have
24 several different programs. They're not necessarily our
25 curriculum or our curricula, but they are programs that we



1 utilize.

2 For example, at Risley we have IB. And so,
3 they have this IB program, they follow the State standards,
4 but they implement that program. At Pueblo Academy of
5 Arts, we have an integrated art school. And so, they
6 utilize the arts in order to make sure that they're reaching
7 our children, and we have those options.

8 We have a STEM academy. So, that we have the
9 science, technology, engineering, mathematics piece as a
10 program. But we still have our district curriculum that we
11 utilize. And our district has ensured that we've adopted
12 materials that meet those State standards. So, we have
13 various materials to meet those standards.

14 For example, we have our journeys and our --
15 in our -- thank you, our collections for elementary and our
16 middle school. That's our English language arts, that's our
17 reading program. We also have HMM for our math program.
18 The entire district has the same resources.

19 MS. FLORES: Okay. There's resources. Now,
20 you've mentioned backwards design that all teachers at the
21 very beginning, you know, get to this backwards design. So,
22 does every teacher together, I mean by themselves?

23 MS. ORTIZ: Oh. Good question. And so, what
24 we have established within our Innovation Zone, is we have
25 developed the venue for our teachers to be able to



1 accomplish this, and that is through our professional
2 learning communities. So, our teachers come to school, for
3 example, at 7:30, but the students don't come until age 8:30
4 a.m. So, they have that time from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m.
5 that they plan together. Yes.

6 So, it would be at certain times grade levels
7 plan together, at other times content areas. So, our Math
8 teachers would all be planning, our language arts teachers
9 would all be planning, and they're doing this in a central
10 location, so that the administrators are also present in
11 this planning.

12 MS. FLORES: Right. And you're planning
13 something that was designed a year ago, or is it just a
14 continual planning and designing of new-

15 MS. ORTIZ: You've asked the question about
16 how do our teachers come out of school not knowing this. We
17 have lots of teachers who have not been through formal
18 teacher education, because we're in an area where there's a
19 shortage of teachers. We hire a lot of teachers that have
20 an alternative licensure program, or they might be a teacher
21 in residence.

22 So, they have a degree but we're bringing
23 them in. We're teaching them to be teachers basically. So,
24 a lot of them do not have this pedagogy that our teachers
25 back in the day when I was in teacher school, I learned how



1 to do this.

2 MS. FLORES: So, do first grade teachers have
3 a scope and sequence.

4 MS. ORTIZ: Yes, they do.

5 MS. FLORES: That's like this.

6 MS. ORTIZ: Absolutely.

7 MS. FLORES: That they can follow.

8 MS. ORTIZ: Absolutely.

9 MS. FLORES: And so that they can plan, then
10 make lesson plans put in their lesson planning book.

11 MS. ORTIZ: Yes, absolutely.

12 MS. FLORES: And so, they start maybe in the
13 summer and then have it done so that they have -- they cover
14 everything through the year.

15 MS. ORTIZ: They do have an entire scope and
16 sequence, which has been developed by the district following
17 standards. But what they do is they look at effective
18 practices when they're planning. So, that if you walk into
19 one room, you can walk into the next room, we have that
20 guarantee that a student, no matter which teacher they have,
21 they'll be still getting that same curriculum.

22 And so, it's guaranteed and viable and so,
23 they plan together, what they might use, what it might look
24 like, the questions that they might ask, and making sure
25 that they're very detailed in their planning.



1 MS. FLORES: And so, how much time do you
2 take, for instance, during the year, to work on the test, to
3 work on the part test.

4 MS. ORTIZ: We don't work on the part test.

5 MS. FLORES: You don't do-.

6 MS. ORTIZ: We do preparation all year long
7 in instruction, and the teaching and learning cycles. So,
8 our work really is focused on making sure our students know
9 and can do whatever it is the standards are telling them.

10 MS. FLORES: It's okay, it was a trick
11 question.

12 MS. ORTIZ: Oh -- oh sorry. i was like no.
13 So, we don't practice the test. We really are. It's really
14 about the whole child and making sure that we're educating
15 them, following our scope and sequence, and also paying
16 great attention to their social and emotional needs as well.

17 MS. FLORES: Very good thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: This is for President Sanchez,
20 what's prohibiting heroes in Risley from becoming a part of
21 your successful innovation program. Can your local board
22 support that?

23 MS. SANCHEZ: Well I think, Risley has
24 started that process especially becoming the world IB
25 receiving that certification. I think that in my own



1 observation, changing the culture in some of our schools
2 takes a little while longer than some of our other schools.
3 I can tell you personally, I remember visiting Risley maybe
4 10 years ago, and almost being run over by kids who are
5 usually much taller than I am. But I can tell you that in
6 visiting that school now, there's a sense of pride, there's
7 a sense of order. Kids speak to adults when they're in the
8 building, ask them how they're doing. So, that culture is
9 changing and I think that, that takes a longer time in our
10 high poverty schools.

11 I think one thing about Pueblo is we are
12 generational poverty city. We have high generational
13 poverty in our city. But I think in those pockets, where we
14 have that high poverty, we tend to see that more.

15 I think the Risley community is adopting that
16 school, a library was just built, a satellite library was
17 just built across the street from the middle school, which
18 is making a difference. All of those things are having an
19 impact. But we have supported innovation at Risley, since
20 they were a middle school in turnaround.

21 I think with Heroes, I think that, that
22 community has stepped up completely, we have heard that
23 throughout our listening tour that the board recently held.
24 We heard partners in that community saying that they wanted
25 to step up and help those schools, that they were already



1 involved in those schools, and some of the planning through
2 the Pathways Grant. We heard longtime residents come up and
3 say that they would do whatever they needed to do, even
4 though they didn't have kids in those schools anymore, to
5 support that school and what they were trying to accomplish,
6 and understanding the importance of their children in their
7 neighborhood having academic success.

8 So, I think we're just on the cusp of that,
9 for heroes. So, that would be my comment on those two
10 schools. The Board highly is supporting what's happening in
11 those schools, and as we come together with the plan,
12 however, we really want to make sure that we get it right.
13 We think getting it right rather than making it expedient,
14 is very important and that's I think what we've done. And
15 what we're currently doing by involving those whole school
16 communities in the planning of what's happening in those
17 neighborhoods.

18 MS. RANKIN: I guess my question, maybe,
19 didn't do it quite right. If there's things going on in
20 your district that are innovation, why are we improving the
21 innovation for heroes in Risley. If you are already
22 embarking on it, and I would think you would have the
23 wherewithal to continue it on. Hopefully it's a good
24 program regardless of whether we agree to it or not.

25 MS. SANCHEZ: Well I think that Risley has



1 been in innovation, the board did approve that. They're
2 currently working -- now they're in the bigger zone.

3 So, I think that has -- and, you know, we
4 also were looking at, I know that Superintendent Macaluso
5 was looking at evaluating every level of those schools from
6 the leadership on down. So, the board is supporting.

7 We do believe that the IB is definitely the
8 right track for Risley. We've also, as Superintendent
9 Macaluso has said, we're building those corridors of
10 excellence. So, that Risley school, which the feeder high
11 school is East High School is also an IB school.

12 So, we're trying to and Fountain, which is
13 also in the same neighborhood, is an IB school. So, we're
14 really trying to connect those corridors. A lot of times
15 children of poverty, children who come from poverty, they
16 need that corridor. They're going to stay in their
17 neighborhood schools. So, we're trying to build those
18 strong corridors in those areas.

19 Hero is just finishing up their plan, I
20 believe that Mrs. Autobee said that, their plan is pretty
21 much ready to look at. So, the board will get its first
22 glimpse at that in its final -- in its final work.

23 MS. RANKIN: Okay, thank you. Also Pueblo
24 has been plagued with a history of failure. We know this.
25 This is not any secret and it's been a struggle and a



1 challenge. Has there been any bright spots of success in
2 the past that we can learn from?

3 MS. SANCHEZ: Is that a question for me or
4 for Superintendent Macaluso? Okay. Well, I think we have, I
5 think when we've had so many of our schools come off -- come
6 out of turn around, we've had some of our elementary schools
7 who jumped -- you know, we had the bi year last year, who
8 jumped actually two program levels, two tier levels. So we
9 know that what's happening is working.

10 I believe some of these leadership
11 opportunities for our principals through Relay and through -
12 - through the turnaround network, I think that they've had a
13 huge impact. We've seen -- I've seen leaders more excited
14 after taking some of those trainings, and coming back and
15 being able to teach their staff what to do has made a big
16 difference. But I think we have had many pockets of
17 success, and, you know, we have -- we truly believe that we
18 can move the needle for our kids.

19 We're not going to give up on our kids.
20 There is nothing -- so, when we talk about failure, we look
21 at moving forward and getting to that success level. We
22 don't want for our kids to think that they're failures, we
23 are doing everything we can in our community to move them
24 forward.

25 MS. RANKIN: I guess I was looking more for



1 historical over the years. I was thinking specifically the
2 one from Linda Moodbell that seemed to cause some success in
3 that district, and also six years on this clock that we
4 haven't been able to move it has, has really been quite a
5 concern. But one of the challenges that I was wondering
6 about is the turnover of staff and, Mrs. Macaluso, could
7 you talk to that?

8 MS. MACALUSO: Sure. The turnover of staff
9 at schools?

10 MS. RANKIN: Staff and administration and
11 just a lot of change going on.

12 MS. MACALUSO: Sure. I think anytime that
13 you have a school that's, that's very high poverty, and I
14 think we have a teacher shortage that we're currently
15 dealing with which is always an issue. But I think the
16 number one thing that, that retained staff of buildings is
17 having a positive culture, having a supportive environment
18 for both students and staff.

19 When we provide time for professional
20 learning communities and staff to come together, staff will
21 give it their all. They will, they will put their blood,
22 sweat, and tears into the work if they feel like this is an
23 environment that's supportive, and so that's really what we
24 have tried to focus on is to improve that, that morale among
25 staff, to have high quality leaders that support that



1 culture in the schools, and so that's really, that's helping
2 us.

3 Our district has -- is engaged in a
4 partnership with Teach for America to recruit and retain
5 some teachers in some high, high need areas, and so that's
6 also something that's working. If I could even just touch
7 base on, on the question that you asked earlier in terms of
8 some bright spots, I think bright spots are occurring
9 through our Innovation Plans, because what we are seeing is
10 that schools are really engaging a broad stakeholder group
11 to really take the ownership of these schools and really
12 examining, what are the root causes of underachievement if
13 we could eliminate barriers and have it wide opened? What
14 would that plan look like? What kind of education would we
15 afford our students?

16 I remember being a principal at Risley
17 International, it was Risley Middle School at that time. I
18 received calls from across the state when we were exploring
19 international baccalaureate. Those calls were from people
20 that said, "Do you know that you're serving because of
21 poverty?" And I said, "Absolutely, I do." And they, they
22 should be afforded the same opportunity that all schools are
23 afforded.

24 And so it's really about having a grassroots
25 effort and really identifying if we could change things to



1 make it better or we could eliminate barriers, what would
2 that look like? And having that staff and community coming
3 together, like what Ms. Autobee did in her plan, and having
4 that buy in makes a huge difference in terms of the program
5 and the plan that we're executing. So I think that's really
6 a bright spot for our districts.

7 MS. RANKIN: And I just want to touch on --
8 you've talked about culture. I want to touch on cultural
9 literacy, and that's the ability to understand and
10 participate fluidly in a given culture. But it's basically
11 core knowledge principles, and I hear a lot of process going
12 on here.

13 I don't hear a lot of Math and English
14 language, and I just read in a book by her showing a well-
15 rounded knowledge specific curriculum can impact needed
16 knowledge to all children and overcome inequality. And I
17 just want to read a sentence in this book that professes
18 that, and it is, I think particularly, Dr. Constance Jones,
19 the principal of a large mixed population public elementary
20 school which in 1990 became the first school in the nation
21 to follow the principles of cultural literacy. I believe in
22 that, I believe in that.

23 How long are you going to be at this school,
24 Mrs. Macaluso? How are you going to be the -- How long are
25 you going to be the leader, the superintendent of this



1 district and see this through? Do you have any idea on that?

2 MS. MACALUSO: I hope for a very long time,
3 because I'm really -- I'm committed to our community and I'm
4 committed to the district.

5 MS. RANKIN: And you will own this pro --
6 program when it comes into being?

7 MS. MACALUSO: Absolutely.

8 MS. RANKIN: Thank you very much. I have a
9 couple of questions for CDE. Mr. Swanson, ho -- how much
10 support have you given Pueblo when you -- from when you
11 started, and when did you start?

12 MR. SWANSON: So my support, specifically
13 with Pueblo -- so I would be in my third year with
14 supporting Pueblo. And so, Ashley and I tagged team,
15 because, actually because Pueblo takes advantage of so many
16 supports that CDE offers, they have 10 schools that are in
17 our turnaround network, and so in order for us not to have
18 too much of a load that we can't actually support the
19 schools in the way that we need to, we have divided that up.

20 So I support the six current zone schools,
21 and so each of them are in varying degrees of how long
22 they've been in the network in that so support typically
23 looks like being on site either monthly or quarterly,
24 depending on the needs of the schools as well as touching
25 base with district leadership, having this district at the



1 table, working with them through innovation planning,
2 helping give them feedback on those kinds of things as well
3 as district supports that schools need, the different trends
4 that we're seeing across the schools, whatever is kind of
5 needed in that scenario.

6 So the four schools, four of the 10 schools
7 are in their third year of network engagement, three of
8 those came off the clock this last year, and then the
9 current schools were talking about and a couple of more are
10 in their second year of network engagement in that. I hope
11 that helps answer your question.

12 MS. RANKIN: Yes. Monthly and quarterly.

13 MR. SWANSON: Yup, yup. And then with a lot
14 of planning support like, right now in the spring, we've
15 done a lot of annual reviews right now at schools, we're
16 looking and talking with teachers, talking to students,
17 talking with leadership and then giving them kind of a
18 report for their planning purposes on what to do next, and
19 then in the fall it will also be ramped up again wit -- with
20 even more support, with how do they begin that -- beginning
21 it -- those beginning stages of the implementation.

22 MS. RANKIN: Okay, thank you. Ms. Bautsch,
23 same question.

24 MS. BAUTSCH: Same question for me? I'm
25 actually going to defer to Ashley, if that's okay. I have



1 been involved with the pathway planning process, so involved
2 with managing this process and shepherding the plan through.
3 So in terms of the actual support on the ground, that is
4 Andy and Ashley.

5 MS. PICHE: So I've been working with Pueblo
6 over the past two years in the same capacity as Andy, and
7 took on four individual schools of which Hero and Bessemer
8 are two of them. So in the past two years I've been on site
9 at least quarterly and then helping to kind of, connect the
10 schools and districts resources, and also, you know, sitting
11 through in PD's kind of, learning with the schools as well,
12 to see how we can help implement the plans.

13 MS. RANKIN: So quarterly, meaning four times
14 a year?

15 MS. PICHE: At minimum. Yes.

16 MS. RANKIN: And Mr. Sherman, are you part
17 of this? And would you give me your report on, on how much
18 time you've spent with Pueblo?

19 MR. SHERMAN: Thanks for your question. Andy
20 and Ashley, as they've stated had both been supporting
21 Pueblo for as long as they have been here at CD for the last
22 couple of years. But I know from my office there have been
23 support managers supporting the district longer than I've
24 been here. It's been five years now. So I know that Pueblo
25 has three, three or four superintendents at least that I can



1 recall have been involved with the support structures here
2 at CD.

3 MS. RANKIN: Has -- have there been -- In
4 your opinion, have there been a lot of turnover in staff in
5 Pueblo since you have been a part of overseeing it?

6 MR. SHERMAN: I can mainly speak at the
7 district level, and certainly there has been. Ms. Macaluso
8 was the third superintendent that I've worked with at the
9 district, and I know there are other folks in the district
10 office that have, that have come and go, I believe.

11 MS. RANKIN: Okay, thank you. I'm done.

12 MS. MAZANEC: I believe we read in our
13 material in here that the district hasn't attended all the
14 Turnaround Network activities, but has had limited
15 engagement in principal coaching and support. Is that
16 right?

17 MR. SHERMAN: I'm sure if that -- if you read
18 that, that would -- th -- that's the language that's in
19 there. Our turnaround network, we ex -- have expectations
20 that the principal supervisors participate in the
21 performance management sessions and our events. Certainly
22 over the years, that problem has been engaged in the
23 network. They have, you know, th -- they've participated in
24 those and I think they've actively been willing participants
25 in the network.



1 I don't know exactly their -- the attendance
2 of Charlotte or Karen or some of the others at different
3 events over the time, but certainly there's times where
4 folks come and attend and don't attend. But I do know that
5 during this last year the transition with the
6 superintendents it's been -- I'm sure it's been challenging.
7 There are other -- other causes that draw her attention.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I'm assuming that it was
9 meaningful if it was included, but-

10 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. Yeah. I -- I would just
11 add, it seems like -- I mean i -- it is important that we --
12 we accept that expectation for a reason. With the network,
13 we believe strongly that principals don't operation -- don't
14 operate in isolation that the context of the district in
15 support of their supervisor and other folks in the district
16 is really critical.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. MACALUSO: So, I would like to just
19 comment and say that as a principal, I fully appreciated
20 that the work from the turnaround network and I appreciated
21 that professional developments. Every opportunity that I
22 have had this year as a superintendent, I have attended
23 every -- every network as opposed to the conflict that
24 occurred with the relay training. So -- so I value the
25 professional development of the turnaround network.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I have some
2 questions about the feeder system to the schools that are --
3 that we're looking at today. I understand that heroes, K-5
4 is also in the red. Is that correct? And so when you did
5 the Innovation Plan, was that for K-8 or was that for just
6 the middle school?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Autobee?

8 MS. AUTOBEE: Our Innovation Plan actually
9 has K-5 in mind. Of course our -- our primary focus was on
10 the middle school, but we can't treat our middle school any
11 differently than we do our elementary, so it is a K-8 plan
12 completely.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. How about for the
14 others? For let's see, Bessemer is elementary, but for
15 Risley.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Risley is a six-eight
17 middle school.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. The feeder
19 system, is that an accredited one or is that one that's in
20 turnaround?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It -- I believe that
22 they -- I don't believe that any of them are in priority
23 improvement or turnaround in terms of the feeder.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So you do -- but
25 you do have four other schools that are coming to us next



1 year. Is that what I read?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, that's not correct.

3 We do have some other schools that are on the -- on the-

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're on the clock,

5 but they're not-

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -so maybe year two or

7 year one.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions?

10 Board Member Durham.

11 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a

12 few questions about-

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, you got all those

14 pink sheets in there.

15 MR. DURHAM: Those are my notes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those are your notes? Oh

17 I was talking to your questions.

18 MR. DURHAM: From the weekend, it was a long

19 weekend. The Appendix I which is the waiver request from

20 the Public Education Association, Collective Bargaining

21 Agreements. Can you -- can you describe -- maybe we can,

22 kind of, get them in a package, but I presume that paper for

23 poor performance represents an exception or waiver from the

24 Collective Bargaining Agreement. Is that correct?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.



1 MR. DURHAM: Could you describe how much
2 flexibility you have under that waiver? Wh -- what's -- how
3 much can you pay? What are the circumstances under which you
4 can pay it? How much have you paid out? How many these
5 awards have you given and what would be the measure or your
6 judgment in the measure of success?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. So I'm going to
8 answer that to the best of my ability and I'll have Ms.
9 Ortiz help me out. The first year they did not qualify for
10 a pay for performance. It's my -- if I remember that
11 correctly. There are certain criteria that we develop as a
12 district that are tied to their unified school improvement
13 plan and those outcomes are -- are clearly articulated and
14 outlined, and so the amount-

15 MR. DURHAM: But are they - -- those details
16 approved by the union and waiver or the union has just
17 waived them and you've developed criteria?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We developed them in
19 conjunction with our -- with our union and they're aware of
20 it.

21 MR. DURHAM: So the amount, you know the
22 amounts offhand? Number paid?

23 MS. ORTIZ: So, the amount for the pay for
24 performance is it -- is a \$1,000 per teacher, if we meet our
25 criteria and-



1 MR. DURHAM: Is it -- is it payable to
2 everybody in the school-

3 MS. ORTIZ: Yes it is.

4 MR. DURHAM: -if the school meets the
5 criteria?

6 MS. ORTIZ: Every certified employee if the
7 school meets the criteria because we feel it is imperative
8 that everyone is working collaboratively, and so we
9 establish those guidelines and then they -- we ratchet them
10 up each year.

11 So as you meet that, it makes it a little bit
12 more difficult to meet your next goal. But we did, we have
13 paid for the last two years now. This year and the year
14 prior.

15 MR. DURHAM: So, they're not really
16 individual? They're by school?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: By school.

18 MR. DURHAM: Or is it by zone? Is it
19 everybody in the Innovation Zone?

20 MS. ORTIZ: No, it's by school.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's by school.

22 MS. ORTIZ: So each school set -- the school
23 criteria is set individually.

24 MR. DURHAM: So, there's no -- no reason to
25 repeat. There's no individual-



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 MR. DURHAM: -reward. And then secondly,
3 here you have an "at will" employment. Has this been
4 granted? An "at will" employment period of three semesters.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

6 MR. DURHAM: What is the normal policy?
7 What's normal "at will"?

8 MS. ORTIZ: We don't have an "at will" as a
9 district. So that is zone specific. So that's a zone
10 specific. So any time in three semesters, then you can
11 administratively reassign. We can terminate employment.

12 MR. DURHAM: These -- these are for
13 probationary teachers? Because probationary teachers for
14 three years you can terminate employment. So these must be
15 non-probationary.

16 MS. ORTIZ: So, it just depends. And we
17 follow -- of course we follow the state statute, but these
18 are for anyone who is in our zone prior and had established
19 a non-probationary status they were grandfathered in. And
20 so these are folks who come new to our school since the
21 inception of the zone and it could be people in the
22 district.

23 MR. DURHAM: So does your union contract
24 essentially provide more protections for a non-probationary
25 teacher than state law? State law is three years before



1 you're eligible for tenure.

2 MS. ORTIZ: Correct, non-probationary status.

3 MR. DURHAM: Well, three years. But what --
4 what's your -- what's your district policy?

5 MS. ORTIZ: I'm not sure I understand.

6 MR. DURHAM: Well, as -- has union negotiated
7 policy more stringent than state law?

8 MS. ORTIZ: No.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

10 MR. DURHAM: No. So, a non-probationary
11 teacher can be -- can be removed at will any time in first
12 three years.

13 MS. ORTIZ: Semesters. We just have a three
14 semester at will.

15 MR. DURHAM: So, that is different than state
16 law. It got to be. State law has three years. You're non-
17 proba -- you're probationary for three years under state
18 law. In Pueblo you're only probationary for three
19 semesters?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, and did you want to
21 -- I -- I think it -- I think it determines th -- the time.
22 So, non-renewal at the end of the year as opposed to -- to
23 mid-year. And if you want to-

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes I don't -- I don't
25 know exactly all the particulars of difference, but there's



1 a difference between "at will" and "probationary" even
2 within that scenario. So they still have the probationary
3 status for three years, but the "at will" being those three
4 semesters, the process in which employment can be terminated
5 is much simpler than even in a proba -- probationary status
6 situation.

7 MR. DURHAM: S -- so the union has negotiated
8 something stronger than state law. So tenure is actually
9 only a secondary protection in the -- in the Pueblo school
10 district. Is that correct?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't believe that's
12 correct because I think there is something even within state
13 law, that's different between a teacher has probationary
14 status and just somebody who is an "at will" employee.
15 Those are two different classifications. I -- I don't know
16 the exact details of what makes that specifically different,
17 but those are two different classifications within that.

18 I will add, I mean just to get to your line
19 of questioning, the one aspect they do have that is more --
20 that is a flexibility around "non probationary" teachers is
21 one year of scoring ineffective, a teacher can lose their
22 "non probationary" status as opposed to state statute just
23 two years. And so, that is a way in which the zone is more
24 aggressive than current state law and the use state statute.
25 There are waivers against state statute to do that.



1 MR. DURHAM: Okay. All right. So, you're --
2 the teachers who receive partially effective or ineffective
3 ratings in accordance with the evaluation pro -- process are
4 subject to administrative transfer and not termination.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

6 MR. DURHAM: And that's -- that's something
7 that if you are outside the Innovation Zone, you wouldn't
8 even be subject to administrative transfer.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

10 MR. DURHAM: Okay. So, let me just proceed
11 here. The schools and Innovation Zone have the authority to
12 establish zone wide compensation system in addition to
13 appendices A, B, and I don't think we have appendices A and
14 B here provide -- provided to us, so I could've -- in this
15 much paper, I could've missed it. So, what is appendices A?
16 Compensation rate system in addition, what would be the
17 requirements of appendices A to presume that serve your
18 contract?

19 MS. ORTIZ: It's right here.

20 MR. DURHAM: I mean, it doesn't appear to be
21 in our documents. I-

22 MS. ORTIZ: It's -- you actually do have a
23 copy of the Innovation Zone plan.

24 MR. DURHAM: I do. But I could not find
25 Appendix A. As I said, in this much paper I could have



1 missed it. Appendix B in the -- in this -- in this plan is
2 evidence of support from-

3 MS. ORTIZ: Right.

4 MR. DURHAM: So, that's not -- that would not
5 -- appendix B would not appear to be compensation for extra
6 performance. In addition to Appendix B, C and compensation
7 rate system, in addition to appendix A, B and C. Are we
8 referring to a different appendix to these than are provided
9 here? Because-

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So board member Durham
11 if I can clarify-

12 MR. DURHAM: This is -- this is appendix B.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

14 MR. DURHAM: And it doesn't have anything to
15 do with rate system, it's letters of recommendation.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when the original
17 innovation schools came forward they had three separate
18 innovation plans. When the zone came forward those were
19 kind of compiled into one Innovation Zone -- zone plan as
20 opposed to three separate innovation plans for those three
21 schools. I'm not sure where you're reading from in terms of
22 the-

23 MR. DURHAM: Page 151 middle of the page.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of the zone plan?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One fifty one of which



1 part?

2 MR. DURHAM: One fifty one of the -- here the
3 last two slot from-

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's which tab?

5 MR. DURHAM: It's in the -- it's in the
6 second tab-

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8 MR. DURHAM: -Pueblo pathway plan. It's page
9 151 and it's Pueblo's City School PTA waivers, appendix I,
10 it's la -- labeled here, which I think is just an appendix
11 to the -- to the -- to the waiver -- to the plan. I don't -
12 - and then it reference -- reference -- it references
13 appendixes that I don't think are included here, I don't
14 think.

15 There's no reason to waste too much time on
16 that, but I think it will be helpful to really fully
17 understand you know exactly the flexibility we receive with
18 these waivers and -- and for the board to really be able to
19 evaluate whether it's meaningful flexibility.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

21 MR. DURHAM: So, I think, and as we get
22 further along the approval process, we really need to
23 understand where the flexibility is granted is really
24 meaningful or whether it's eyewash. That's all I have now.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So did -- are you



1 saying that the six schools that are in the zone, that they
2 have an identical Innovation Plan?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. So-

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm confused.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, when we
6 brought forth the three plans-

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Initially.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -initially, they had
9 three separate plans based on their program but they had the
10 same, they had negotiated the same waivers.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we brought forth
13 the zone, it was a zone plan but included in there were the
14 three -- three specific plans and then we had the three
15 elementary schools that really operated a lot of the same
16 practices and the programs that they were using was as one.
17 So, the six became the zone and the waivers are the same for
18 all six but, there are some program elements that are
19 different.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we-

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, when-

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -spoke to CDE to kinda
24 mush it all together in a -- in a what would make sense into
25 a zone plan.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, when Heroes seeks to
2 join, is there guidance from that document to ensure that
3 their plan aligns with -- I mean, I'm trying to figure out
4 they're different but they have the same waivers.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So -- so, when
6 they -- when we develop the -- the zone plan, we addressed
7 how a school would enter -- enter the zone. And if a school
8 entered the zone, they would be afforded those waivers that
9 are afforded the zone.

10 And so while Heroes will have their specific
11 program plan that meets the needs of their unique school,
12 the program zone elements or those structured -- structures
13 and waivers would be the same. Does that make sense?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kind of.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It gets a little -- it
16 gets a little muddy. If I didn't clarify that, Andy if you
17 could clarify that but is that-

18 MR. SWANSON: Yeah. I-I think that's --
19 that's exactly right and I'll say one of the ways to kinda
20 differentiate it's kinda Karen talked about earlier. So,
21 Pueblo Academy of the Arts, Risley, and Roncalli are all
22 zone schools. They all are afforded the same flexibility,
23 the same waivers. For one of those purposes being, when
24 they were three individual schools, it was difficult for the
25 district to be able to really flex in ways that are



1 meaningful addressing needs of the school when you have
2 three very disparate plans with different waivers that may
3 have been involved in each of them.

4 By combining them into a zone, it's actually
5 much easier for them to be able to -- for district
6 leadership and folks just on the ground to be able to know
7 what are the ways you interact within that zone.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's waived and what
9 isn't.

10 MR. SWANSON: But, yeah, Roncalli is a STEM
11 school. So, STEM drives what they do there. Pueblo Academy
12 of Arts obviously is an Arts school, that drives what they
13 do. And then Risley, International Baccalaureate drives
14 what they do. Those are very unique aspects of their plan
15 that are operated under similar waivers.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But the waivers for
17 teachers, for dismissals, for district curriculum etcetera
18 are the same?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are the same. Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you. Any
21 more questions or comments?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just have a question.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores?

24 MS. FLORES: Yes. You know, I just wish we
25 had been, meaning the whole board last -- when was it? Last



1 June when we were in Pueblo. I -- when, you know, we had
2 the zone for Denver Public Schools. I wish that that whole
3 board would have been as interested in that zone as we are
4 about Pueblo.

5 I just see a disparity there and I wish we --
6 we really had looked at DPS, Denver Public Schools as we are
7 in Pueblo right now. And I think that if you look at
8 schools in Denver Public Schools, I know, I mean, I get
9 frustrated with the little amount of growth that they do.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are on Pueblo today.

11 MS. FLORES: Yes, I know.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

13 MS. FLORES: But, I just had to say that.

14 I'm sorry.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sure you did.

16 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: I just have one last question.

19 The three schools for outside management other than the
20 district, are you thinking of choosing one company that will
21 go to all three or are you thinking of three distinct unique
22 managements?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the management
24 partner that we have identified is Achievement Network and
25 Relay and so again I think it goes back to, you're talking



1 about the partnership for the schools? Is that-

2 MS. RANKIN: Well, I guess -- I guess I'm
3 talking about the part of it that we're voting on to put in
4 place.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

6 MS. RANKIN: Are you telling me it's already
7 in place?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. For -- for
9 Bessemer, Achievement Network is not -- not in Bessemer
10 right now nor is Relay.

11 MS. RANKIN: But it's in the other two?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Heroes has -- has had
13 their planning year with Achievement Network. Yes.

14 MS. RANKIN: So tell me what -- what outside
15 management company is it that you want for all three
16 schools?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Achievement Network and
18 Relay.

19 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so I think it goes
21 back to that definition that we have worked with the CDE
22 staff and I think that all along it's my understanding, it's
23 my belief that we were told that there was a continuum of --
24 of, you know, that definition for partnership.

25 MS. RANKIN: That's -- that's the one I was



1 just inquiring. Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But-

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec?

4 MS. MAZANEC: And so, the external management
5 isn't really management. It's more like a partnership. You
6 would continue to have support and consulting from
7 achievement network and relay, but they wouldn't have no --
8 they would have no control over your schools.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct. Our
10 understanding was not that they would come in and -- and
11 govern or -- or control our schools, but that would -- they
12 would serve as a partner, to address identified needs within
13 the school.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we've got a little
16 pickle. Should we maybe go into exec session or, I think
17 so.

18 MR. DURHAM: I move for an executive session.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh wait, wait. We got
20 to -- we've got to do something else first. Board member --

21 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, I'm sorry. I move to amend
22 the agenda to include a ah, executive session.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. any
25 objection into going to this exec session?



1 MS. MAZANEC: We think now we move to-

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- No. The first one
3 was-

4 MS. MAZANEC: Now we move to-

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. The first one
6 was any objection to changing the agenda, and there's none.
7 So now, thank you. Ms. Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: I move to go into executive
9 session.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Any
12 objection to go into exec session? No.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A motion has been made
14 for an executive session for today's state board meeting in
15 conformance with 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice
16 on specific legal questions, pursuant to 24-6-402-(3)(a)(II)
17 CRS, in matters required to be kept confidential by federal
18 law rules, or state statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III)
19 CRS.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ladies and gentlemen,
21 thank you for your patience. As I said earlier, we are
22 building this plane while we're flying it. We're trying to
23 interpret appropriately the law. We um, we're just doing
24 our best, and so it's taking some legal counsel for us to
25 feel comfortable with our emotions. But I think we've got



1 some.

2 MR. DURHAM: Madam chair.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

4 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair. The
5 motion I'll make -- I'll make three times just changing the
6 name of the school each time, so we'll try and get it in --
7 in enough detail the first time so we have a good record,
8 but um, I move that -- I move that the - -- let's see.

9 Where is the --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where's what?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I haven't really --

12 MR. DURHAM: I need the original thing. I'm
13 sorry. I'll give it back to you, I promise. Okay. Okay.
14 I move that the department and Pueblo District 60,
15 separately submit recommendations. That the recommendation
16 to be prepared by the Colorado Department of Education,
17 would propose a management solution for these for - -- and
18 we'll start with Bessemer Elementary School, consistent with
19 CRS-11-210(5)(9)(i) and the Pueblo School District 60,
20 prepare and submit to the board for consideration an
21 Innovation Plan for Bessemer Elementary School that would
22 include, and I do I want to use the word man - -- that would
23 include management - -- that would include a management
24 partnership, with an appropriate - -- appropriate public or
25 private entity, and that these recommendations be submitted



1 for action not later than June 14th, 2017.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a proper motion.

3 Do I have a second? Is that one or two motions?

4 MR. DURHAM: It's one motion.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One motion.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second it.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Would you be
8 kind enough to call the roll?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of course.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we -- excuse me.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Clarification?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Director Durham. Did
13 you really mean partnership?

14 MR. DURHAM: Management partnership, yes.
15 For the -- what the district will submit.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

17 MR. DURHAM: Cause it's not a management.
18 It's not the same view of a management plan, as will be
19 submitted by the Department of Education pursuant to CRS 22-
20 11.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, perhaps, do you or
22 Ms. (Indiscernible) like to repeat the motion?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I sure do.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is a test.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I sure do. So the first



1 part of the motion is to um, move that the department and
2 Pueblo School District 60 separately submit recommendations.
3 The recommendation prepared by the Department of Education
4 would propose a management solution for Bessemer, that is
5 consistent with 22-11-210(5)(a)(i), and then for Pueblo, um
6 their recommendation is to prepare and submit to the board
7 an Innovation Plan for Bessemer, that would include an
8 management partnership with the appropriate private entity,
9 and that these recommendations would be submitted for action
10 no later - -- no later than June 14th, 2017.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you. Call
12 the roll, please.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Board Member
14 Durham?

15 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores?

17 MS. FLORES: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff?

19 MS. GOFF: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec?

21 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan?

23 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin?

25 MS. RANKIN: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Schroeder?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

4 MR. DURHAM: I'm sure I'd make exactly the
5 same motion, only substitute Heroes Middle School.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. That's a
7 proper motion. Any questions? Would you call the roll,
8 please?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham?

10 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores?

12 MS. FLORES: Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff?

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec?

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan?

18 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin?

20 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Schroeder?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Once more with feeling.

24 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair. I would
25 make exactly the same motion, only this time, uh with the



1 inclusion of Risley-

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Risley.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Risley.

4 MR. DURHAM: Risley. I'm sorry, Risley
5 Middle School.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: International Academy.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a proper motion.

8 Is there a second?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

11 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

13 MS. FLORES: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan.

19 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.

21 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Schroeder.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ladies and gentlemen,

25 thank you very much. I look forward to seeing you in June.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's on. So, please be
3 patient. Our apologies, it's just been an extremely long
4 day, but we don't want to leave after all this time today
5 without being able to give some input to our staff, with
6 whom we normally can't talk, because legal counsel tells us
7 we can't talk, but we need to share with them information
8 that we need for future 56 hour days. Colleagues, Board
9 Member McClellan.

10 MS. MCCLELLAN: I want to make sure that, the
11 CDE recommendation that comes back, incorporates the spirit
12 of the -- the -- the recommendation that a management, other
13 than the district be put in place, and I think we're going
14 to see two contrasting plans. But, I think that will be
15 beneficial for the board to be able to weigh. So, thank
16 you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Solely and with my
18 concerns in preparing, and that is, I need -- I need to have
19 a bit of a bigger picture when we're just looking at schools
20 within a district, what is the scenario of the pick -- of
21 the district itself? Both in terms of the feeder system
22 that's coming into those schools. But also how many other
23 schools are on the clock, et cetera.

24 Just to sort of get up -- just to get a
25 broader picture. Apparently, it was illegal that I went on



1 school view to look some of the stuff up. But, that website
2 has so changed, that it, significantly frustrated me and I
3 really couldn't get the kind of report that Commissioner
4 you've included a couple of times in some of their
5 recommendations.

6 The five year clock for the district. The
7 five year -- the clock for the various schools within the
8 district. So, that kind of information helps to give me at
9 least a broader picture of what we're looking at for the
10 students in that -- in that school district. Colleagues,
11 what other information -- I mean we'd like to have this all
12 in 30 pages, but I -- or less. But, I know that's not
13 realistic, certainly.

14 I personally appreciate your portion of it, I
15 think it's been consistent, so that if I don't want to read
16 through all your 20 or 30 pages, I know to which section to
17 go. I wish we had a format for the districts also, so that
18 we could look up certain things in a certain place as
19 opposed to literally plowing through 300 pages and then
20 finding questions that we have.

21 I don't know whether there's anything, and
22 this is sort of a learn as we go along, but anything that
23 you guys have learned from the input, from the districts
24 that could help organize the materials in a way that we can
25 sort of look things up a little bit more, would be very,



1 very helpful. Dr. Flores?

2 MS. FLORES: Well, I think that was a great,
3 great idea. Board Member Mazanec, I really think there was
4 a great idea that you -- that you gave us some time ago,
5 because, you know, last night I go through glasses. These
6 glasses and so, I don't have my glasses today, because also
7 the greatest strength glasses, and I took them out of my bag
8 where I usually puts them, so that I could read last night,
9 finish, you know, finish reading all these, and we have done
10 -- we have done hours and hours of reading. When -- you say
11 56 hours?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I am kidding but-

13 MS. FLORES: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Preparation is more than
15 that, I'm sure.

16 MS. FLORES: And, we did it after the week --
17 last week. We had that -- well, we had a board meeting
18 where we have a lot of reading to do, and then within a
19 week, not to have any time off. So, it's been -- it -- it
20 has been difficult and that would really help.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It will continue through
22 June, so to the extent that you all can help us a little bit
23 in some consistency in the format, that would also help.

24 Anything other -- any other comments?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just want to make sure



1 that any of the proposed management groups are -- are legal
2 according to our State law, as to what we have and have been
3 vetted for the details that are involved from within,
4 because we do not have a list of those. And I would like to
5 make sure that within our State law, that they're allowable
6 before they even come to us.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Crystal clear call out
8 of anything that's required or necessary that's missing.
9 So, i -- if there was an incomplete plan, if -- if the CDE
10 calls out the following elements were simply missing, then I
11 will spend a little less time flipping back and forth
12 assuming that I'm the one that couldn't find it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For example, the
14 analysis of the -- the rubric for the Innovation Plan for
15 the group that didn't have an Innovation Plan.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are -- is staff doing
17 the rubric for management?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We would like to do that
19 for, well -- we -- we don't have the management plan to run
20 it through a rubric, but we would like to do that. So, I --
21 I will say just so we can certainly unless our attorney
22 directs us differently. I believe we can add some of these
23 things to the commissioner recommendation for districts
24 coming forward. In terms of the template for the district,
25 I don't know if we can change that midstream because almost



1 all of the districts have submitted, you know, where we are
2 in the timeline. So, I think that's an excellent lesson for
3 moving forward in the future.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we're not going to
5 have any of these next year.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's hope.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All schools in Colorado
8 will be on performance.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But, we will certainly
10 add the elements that you've talked about to our record for
11 our -- the ones coming forward.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for your
13 patience. We needed -- just needed to do that. So, the
14 current State Board of Education will now conduct a public
15 hearing pursuant to 1 CCR 31 Rule 6 Westminster Public
16 School appeal, the 2016 district accreditation rating of
17 accredited with priority improvement. At the hearing, each
18 party shall have a maximum of 30 minutes for oral
19 presentations.

20 The State board may interrupt with questions,
21 but I would ask, that unless the question is a short,
22 factual question, that board members hold the questions
23 until after each party completes their presentation. At
24 that time, you will have the opportunity to question the
25 parties more fully. In other words, this is a little bit



1 different than the charter appeals, in that, you will be
2 able to question the parties after they've made their
3 presentations. So, we can maybe hold our fire a little bit
4 unless it's a pertinent question.

5 The hearing shall proceed as follows: The
6 district shall make 30 minute presentation. The Department
7 shall make its 30 -- 30 minute presentation. The district
8 may reserve a portion of its time for rebuttal, following
9 the department's presentation. How much time would you like
10 to preserve -- preserve?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At least five minutes,
12 Madam Chair. Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Cordial, will let
14 you know when you're -- when you're five minutes remaining.
15 After the presentations are complete, the State board shall
16 discuss and may ask questions of the district and the
17 department during its discussions. The State board will
18 discuss the issues for up to 30 minutes, at which time -- at
19 which the time th -- the time may be extended, the sole
20 discretion of me as board chair.

21 And I do have a (indiscernible) to go to, so,
22 the State board shall render its decision by majority vote
23 and may do so today, but no later than 30 days from today.
24 Commissioner, do you have anything to add?

25 MS. ANTHES: No. Thank you, Madam Chair.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, this time I
2 would ask Westminster representatives to introduce
3 themselves for the record and begin their presentation.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, sorry.

5 MR. FARRO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Jonathan
6 Farro (ph), on behalf of Westminster Public Schools. With
7 me at the table is my co-counsel, Holly Ortiz, and also Dr.
8 Pamela Swanson, the superintendent of Westminster Public
9 Schools.

10 And you may have noticed, we've filled up
11 your, your entire first floor here today. We have a number
12 of other folks here not just in the board's room, but also
13 in the overflow area. We have basically the entire
14 executive leadership of the district. We have leadership
15 and members of the Westminster Education Association, the
16 teachers union here to support us, we have the Mayor of
17 Westminster, has made the trip today.

18 We estimate that, at least, 90 personnel from
19 the district are here today, in person, to, to hear and
20 watch this appeal. And we understand that leadership from
21 Casmi is here as well and leadership from Case had hoped to
22 make it, but weren't able to at the last minute. So, we
23 have quite a crowd for you. And the reason that we're all
24 here today is because Westminster Public Schools has been
25 prejudiced with a priority improvement year six rating.



1 That is the result of many illegal state actions.

2 These range from repeated changes to
3 standards and assessments to devising an accountability
4 system that is controlled by student demographics and grades
5 districts on a subjective curve. Despite these
6 illegalities, the district showed many years of sustained
7 improvement while serving an incredibly needy student
8 population with an innovative and groundbreaking competency
9 based system of education.

10 It was on track to exit the accountability
11 clock and it would have, but the illegal late adoption and
12 retroactive application of a new district Performance
13 Framework stopped Westminster Public Schools' momentum.
14 Now, facing the loss of accreditation, the district can
15 justify the mere four points needed for an improvement
16 rating and as will be shown today, that is the only
17 appropriate resolution for this appeal.

18 Our Education Accountability Act defines an
19 effective accountability system as one that reports
20 information concerning performance that's perceived by
21 educators as fair, balanced, cumulative, credible, and
22 useful. The statute also requires that school district
23 performance must be objectively evaluated on statewide
24 performance indicators that are supported by consistent,
25 objective measures.



1 This board has also passed its own rules
2 echoing those legislative requirements. One of its rules
3 says that this board shall promulgate rules establishing
4 objective, measurable criteria in determining the
5 appropriate accreditation category for districts. That is
6 the legal standard governing this appeal.

7 Now, I'd like to just start with the first
8 instance of illegality that I'd like to talk about today, is
9 the most recent and from the district's perspective, perhaps
10 the most egregious, is the 2016 Performance Framework that
11 was adopted, not in the preceding accreditation year, not in
12 2015. This performance framework was adopted in 2016.

13 In the summer of 2016, for the 2016
14 accreditation year. It was applied and used to measure
15 scores on tests that had been taken before it was even
16 adopted in the spring of 2016. This was a late adoption and
17 it was applied retroactively in clear violation of this
18 board's rules.

19 CDE concedes in its position statement that
20 this board's rules quote, "Dictate that the performance
21 targets set in the 2016 frameworks should have been set no
22 later than November 30th, 2015." But, and I quote again,
23 "This board did not vote to adopt the targets until June
24 8th, 2016 and these targets were then used to evaluate the
25 results of the state assessments that had already been



1 administered in the spring."

2 Changing expectations is not fair or credible
3 and the performance measures that change are not consistent.
4 That is reason alone to grant Westminster's appeal. The
5 rating that it appeals today is based on this 2016
6 framework.

7 Therefore, the rating is invalid. It is
8 illegal and frankly, no court would uphold it. Now, CDE
9 argues that this framework couldn't possibly have been
10 prejudicial to the district. Well, first of all, prejudice
11 is not a requirement that must be shown for purposes of this
12 appeal. There has been a failure to comply with the state
13 board's rules. Prejudice is presumed.

14 Now, even if it was required, the district
15 has shown it. Is it prejudicial to be held accountable for
16 measures that you did not know you were going to be held
17 accountable for? Using a football analogy, it's the fourth
18 quarter, the seconds are ticking down, they line up to kick
19 a field goal. This is it. You win or lose the game based
20 on this kick, but the goalposts aren't there. There are no
21 uprights.

22 No matter, you're told you have to kick the
23 ball anyway. And after the ball is kicked, then it will be
24 determined whether or not it was good enough. But, when you
25 kick the ball, you don't know how far you have to kick it



1 and you don't know how wide the uprights are going to be.
2 That's as prejudicial as it could be and this prejudice
3 isn't just intuitive. It's from the face of the framework
4 itself.

5 You can see Westminster's score at 40
6 percent. They receive 40 out of 100 points. This was lower
7 from the 2014 framework where they received 46.8 points.

8 That's a 14.5 percent drop just with this new
9 framework. Not only that, the change halted Westminster
10 Public Schools momentum. From 2010 to 2014, there was a
11 clear upward trend of sustained improvement in the district.
12 You can see here, this shows that at the school and district
13 level and you really don't even need to read. You can see
14 the colors.

15 As the years progress, less schools were in
16 the orange and red category. When this started in 2010, 13
17 of the district's 18 schools, that's over -- that's almost
18 all of the schools in the district, were either on priority,
19 improvement, or turnaround status. They were on the clock.
20 Well, through this time period, over these five years, the
21 district made such improvement that only two of those 18
22 schools remained in the priority improvement rating at the
23 end of 2014 and then after the accountability pause, those
24 two schools exited the clock.

25 So, the district is very proud that it has



1 had all those schools that entered, exit. And this is a
2 level of performance that we believe is unprecedented in the
3 state of Colorado. A district that was facing this level of
4 need and turnaround was able to make that change. You can
5 also see that the performance has increased both at the
6 student level as well.

7 We have a series of slides that show this and
8 you can see it in all the different content areas. Whether
9 you're looking at reading, writing, or math, it's an upward
10 trend. Well, in 2016 under this new framework, eight
11 schools that had entered -- eight schools re-entered the
12 clock, prejudice. Our rating decreased, prejudice. This
13 isn't surprising either.

14 When you look -- start looking into the
15 changes that are embedded in this framework, it's no
16 surprise that the district experienced what it did. One of
17 the main changes in the framework was a change in emphasis.
18 Emphasis shifted from growth to academic achievement. And
19 within achievement, now we start to count and measure not
20 just achievement as a whole but achievement by individual
21 students subgroups, demographic groups, minority students,
22 free and reduced lunch, English learners.

23 Well those two changes alone had a major
24 impact for Westminster. The student demographics, well
25 they're serious. Westminster serves a very needy student



1 population, and it has embraced that challenge. But you can
2 see that minority students free and reduced lunch students
3 are both in excess of 80 percent of the student population,
4 which is approximately 9,500 students. We're talking about
5 a large district here.

6 So multiply these percentages out. These are
7 significant numbers of students. We have 40 percent English
8 learners, and we have approximately 20 percent of students
9 who are mobile. And that is mobility during the -- when
10 school is in session, that's not during a calendar year.
11 That's just when school's in sess -- in session. 80, 80, 40
12 and 20, those are huge numbers.

13 Well, unsurprisingly, most of the students in
14 the district when they report to school they're behind
15 already. They start school behind. And that means that
16 they have to learn a lot more than a year's growth in a
17 year's time, in order to catch up.

18 If you think of it as this analogy, if we
19 have two buses of students that need to get to Vail, and
20 they both are going to leave at 9:00 a.m., one of them is
21 leaving from the Metro area, and one of them is leaving from
22 the Kansas border. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to
23 figure out which one is going to get there first, which one
24 has to go farther, and which one has to accelerate and
25 travel at a higher rate of speed.



1 That's Westminster public schools. They are
2 starting so much farther behind, it takes more time to get
3 to the same destination as other districts, and they have to
4 do it. Now CDE mentions some so-called comparative
5 districts that they claim are similar and show that well,
6 okay, some districts with demographic challenges have exited
7 the clock.

8 Well let's -- let's look at them more
9 closely, because none of these districts are comparable.
10 You can look at the percentages but the only, the only
11 district on there that is -- is really close in terms of the
12 percentages for every student group is the Sheridan School
13 District. And Sheridan, Sheridan has a much smaller
14 population. And when you calculate their percentages out
15 across our population, for example, they have 582 English
16 learners as of last year whereas Westminster has almost
17 4,000.

18 Sheridan may have a little bit under 300
19 mobile students whereas Westminster has over 1,800. The
20 truly only comparable in the state of Colorado is Adams 14
21 School District. This is the only other district in
22 Colorado that has that 80 80 40 and 20 combination that I
23 mentioned. Well, how did it do under the 2016 performance
24 ratings? Its performance dropped by more than 10 points.
25 Prejudice.



1 These changes in this framework are not
2 evidence of a balanced or credible accountability system.
3 If you go back to football, what it feels like from the
4 district's perspective, is that in the fourth quarter of the
5 game the state has lengthened the field, and it has
6 rewritten the rule book.

7 Well, the district is still just four points
8 away from improvement, and we believe that we can justify
9 those four points for the board. We're confident that you
10 can get four points just by somehow recalculating
11 performance under the old framework ratings. When growth
12 was weighted higher, and when subgroups students weren't
13 counted separately under achievement. Think about how this
14 could be a significant problem for a district like
15 Westminster.

16 Because you have overlap and demographics,
17 significant overlap. And yet the state counts free and
18 reduced lunch students, minority students, students with
19 disabilities, English learners, all separately. Students
20 are being double counted in our district. And as we've
21 shown you, it's not a surprise that achievement wise we are
22 going to score below grade level, because they've started
23 behind.

24 That's what the achievement measure is. It's
25 a snapshot of where that student happens to be. Growth is a



1 more accurate measure of performance, and growth
2 unfortunately was deemphasized with this rating. CDE even
3 admits that the district would have earned more points under
4 the previous framework. They claim to have undertaken some
5 type of simulation.

6 I really can't comment on what it is because
7 they haven't disclosed to us or to this board how they did
8 the simulation, what the underlying data was. I mean, I
9 can't say whether there is any validity to it or not. It's
10 interesting because we didn't think that such a -- such a
11 comparison could be made.

12 And as we've set out for you in our written
13 materials there are many, many quotations from CDE that
14 indicate that you cannot compare 2014 and 2016. But somehow
15 they did a simulation they say in. I noted because under
16 that simulation Westminster increased its score by 2.8
17 points.

18 That's a s -- they call it a small jump.
19 That's substantial. That's a 7 percent increase for this
20 district. And it means that they are only 1.2 points away.
21 Only just 1.2 points now to get to 44. Well, as we
22 submitted in our motion request to reconsider, we think you
23 can get almost an entire point if you remove the scores from
24 our alternative high school, which is something that is done
25 routinely for districts in the state, hidden like high



1 school that would be almost a full point. That would leave
2 us with less than a point needed.

3 We think that we can cover that as well. CDE
4 has acknowledge that it has -- has difficulty properly
5 measuring growth for English learners, and again we have
6 over four tho -- approximately 4,000 of them. This has been
7 a major improvement focus in our district. There's a
8 sizable population and the district has worked very hard to
9 serve these students. In 2016, we saw great gains in the
10 number of English learners who became fully English
11 proficient.

12 Not only that, we beat state expectations.
13 From 2010 to 2014 the percentage of English learners at the
14 elementary level, this goes back to those charts we were
15 showing you earlier, we saw inc -- substantial increases.
16 In math it was almost 13 percent, in reading 15 percent, in
17 writing almost 14 percent. Those percentage gains are
18 gigantic and they exceed more modest gains that much more
19 affluent districts in our state have had over that same time
20 period.

21 Do we need more points? There are several
22 other ways that we think that the score under measures are
23 actual performance. There really, from the district's
24 perspective is just no support for its unique competency
25 based system of education. We call it the CBS. There is no



1 support for that in the state accountability system. And
2 we're the only district in the state that is, that is doing
3 this on this scale. 2016 was the first year that we were
4 held accountable for new scores -- for scores on the new
5 park exam.

6 And frankly the district CBS is still
7 responding to the changes to the common core over the last
8 few years. I'll recount them briefly. It goes back to
9 December 2009, around the time the district was just
10 beginning to implement the system.

11 We had new model content standards in 10
12 separate areas. Less than a month later, more changes from
13 Common Core. And then in December 2010, this is the big one
14 from our perspective because we had an addition of 870
15 discrete learning targets, that had to be incorporated into
16 the educational program in the district.

17 Well, of course when you make these changes
18 you have to change your assessment. We went from TCAP to
19 park. And all these changes break the links between what is
20 taught, learned, and recorded. They do it at the individual
21 student level and then it expands into the classroom, school
22 and throughout the district. It is particularly difficult
23 in the competency based system which promotes a deep lasting
24 learning, and it depends upon accurate data to truly
25 differentiate instruction.



1 Shallow teaching to the test is not a viable
2 option for Westminster Public schools. It might be in other
3 districts but not in our district. And there's no social
4 promotion. Students only advance when they meet their perf
5 -- performance targets. For the district it's really felt
6 like it's in year one or two of its CBS over and over, while
7 it's been on the accountability clock because these changes
8 force it to -- to react.

9 Another reason is that testing students based
10 on their ages is inconsistent with the system I've just
11 described here, where students are grouped by performance
12 levels not their age. Generally group students in the pre K
13 to second grade, three to fifth grade, sixth to eighth, and
14 then in the high school level.

15 Westminster would like to test the students
16 where they're actually at, where they're instructed,
17 whatever level they happen to be. And guess what, they're
18 at a different level in math than they are in English
19 language arts, than they are in social studies, than they
20 are in science. We don't group them by grades. So we're
21 able to differentiate instruction in that way, and provide
22 truly individualized learning for each student.

23 But CDEs refused to allow the district to
24 test at each instructional level for each content area. So
25 the district has had to test everyone at the same level even



1 if they're not working at that level. And any other school
2 district with -- with traditional grades they wouldn't be
3 required to give a fourth grade student a fifth grade
4 assessment. That's just going to guarantee that they're
5 going to perform below grade level.

6 Westminster's also pi -- piloted online
7 testing. But these are more difficult. This wouldn't be a
8 problem except that there have been districts in the state
9 that have persisted in giving paper administration, and the
10 two tests are not comparable. There have been statements
11 from CDE about using technical adjustments and psychometric
12 analysis and things I can't even pronounce. We don't know
13 what those are because they've never been disclosed.

14 But we can look at the questions as you can
15 exhibit appendix g to our position statement and there's a
16 cut out from the test. If you're -- if you're asked to draw
17 a fraction on a line, it's a lot easier. If you've -- are
18 given four different pictures of the line as opposed to you
19 have to actually pick on the line on the computer where it
20 is.

21 Of course the online test is a little bit
22 harder. You don't have that guessing pass. Now, we're not
23 saying that changes can't be made to the accountability
24 system but the measures must be consistent. A one year
25 pause just wasn't enough, the accountability clock should



1 have been reset with the changes that we had. Another
2 reason is mobility. We covered it briefly when we were
3 talking about demographics.

4 CDE minimizes the impact of mobility in terms
5 of accountability because they say they only account scores
6 of students who are in school, since the October one count
7 date. If you came to school after that then your score
8 doesn't count for accountability purposes. That's great.
9 But it ignores a very big elephant in the room. A lot of
10 students are mobile in the summertime.

11 There's a difference between counting mobile
12 -- mobility during when school's in session and during the
13 calendar year and you can see on this graphic that by our
14 own internal measurements, the actual mobility rate is
15 double the official statistic. Wow. What does this mean? I
16 mean, studies show that mobile students perform well below
17 their peers and that depressed academic achievement will
18 continue with them through subsequent school years, even if
19 they become stable.

20 Even more concerning, is that they creates a
21 disruption and chaos in highly mobile schools and it can
22 adversely affect even stable or non-mobile students.
23 Particularly, research shows, when those students are
24 minority students as they are in Westminster public schools.
25 Well there's some other issues and problems with the



1 accountability system that make a priority improvement
2 rating year six illegal and invalid. CDEs ratings are based
3 on a bell curve.

4 Westminster's compared to other school
5 districts. This is embedded in that performance frameworks.
6 Not just 2016 but in the years before that as well. The
7 points that a district earns are based on a comparison with
8 the state average performance. Well, this is particularly
9 meaningful for Westminster public schools because the
10 average isn't set by districts like Westminster with 80 80
11 40 20 demographics.

12 The average is set by districts with much
13 more affluent and advantaged student populations. That's
14 who Westminster is being forced to compete against for
15 accountability purposes. In addition, the cut points have
16 been set, even since the beginning of the system in Colorado
17 to ensure that a percentage of schools will stay in priority
18 improvement or turnaround status.

19 CDE admits that in 2010, it was set at about
20 15 percent of districts to fall in those two categories.
21 And even for 2016, cut points again were set so that about
22 5.5 percent of districts would be rated in these lower two
23 categories. How is that objective to measure a district,
24 when a set predetermined number of them are guaranteed to be
25 rated as failures.



1 It also isn't fair, it isn't balanced and it
2 is incredible as required by state statutes. A comparative
3 system is now becoming even more problematic with
4 questionable data integrity. Westminster public schools is
5 proud that it had over 95 percent participation rate in
6 standardized testing yet 11 school districts in our state
7 had such low participation that they could not even be
8 rated.

9 Another 84, roughly half of all the districts
10 in our state were flagged for low participation rates in two
11 or more content areas. But yet, CDE's answer to -- to the
12 district has been, don't worry about it, we can compare, we
13 can adjust. Well, we're not inclined to take their word for
14 it anymore. This is a significant issue and a district like
15 Westminster has played by the rules. They have refused the
16 incentive in this system to opt out students that they feel
17 are not going to perform well.

18 Has that been happening elsewhere across the
19 state? That's our concern. And really, Westminster is being
20 punished -- punished because it has taken the steps to --
21 to test online and to have high participation and now -- now
22 here we are in a rating appeal facing loss of accreditation.
23 That's prejudice.

24 Well, one of the key problems with the
25 accountability system is that, the more needy your student



1 population is, the more likely you are to be rated in a
2 lower category. And why? Because student demographics
3 control the ratings. CDE acknowledges that factors such as
4 poverty, I see my time is up. I do have five minutes left
5 for rebuttal.

6 Let me just conclude very quickly. This
7 appeal is really important. There's a chance for the d --
8 for the board to follow the law. There's a chance to have a
9 system that will meet the statutory criteria. We welcome
10 that conversation and participating in it.

11 Unfortunately, our rating today and for the
12 last five years has been on a system that doesn't meet that
13 criteria. It's illegal, it's invalid and we ask that the
14 appeal be granted. Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. This time
16 I'd ask the Department's representatives to introduce
17 themselves for the record and to begin their presentation.

18 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you Madam Chair. I'm Katy
19 Anthes, Commissioner but I'm going to turn this over
20 directly to Alyssa Pearson, Associate Commissioner.

21 MR. DILL: Yes, and also presenting is myself
22 Tony Dill (ph) Counsel for the Department.

23 MS. TOLLESON: And Julie Tolleson, also here
24 for the Department.

25 MS. PEARSON: Madam Chair and members of the



1 Board, thank you for your time today. We understand that
2 you have a difficult decision in front of you at the end of
3 a very long day and I appreciate your time and
4 consideration. Today, CDE will present a more complete
5 picture of the data in context to help you understand why
6 the department believes that Westminster public schools
7 should be accredited with a priority improvement rating.
8 While Westminster has focused in certain areas and is
9 starting to see some improvements as a district, when
10 considered comprehensively, their performance does not
11 warrant a higher rating.

12 Today's presentation will provide an
13 overview, a description of CDE's determination for a
14 propriety improvement rating and responses to Westminster
15 public schools claims in this appeal. We are happy to
16 provide responses to any of your questions at the end of our
17 presentation.

18 State statute and board rules allow districts
19 to appeal decisions to the State Board of Education. The
20 rules require the district to set forth the specific grounds
21 for the ask -- for the assertion which means the burden of
22 proof for showing why a higher rating is warranted is left
23 to the district.

24 Today, your decision is focused on the
25 description of performance for students in Westminster



1 public schools. Basically, answering the question does an
2 accredited with propriety improvement plan rating
3 appropriately describe the student performance in the
4 district. The accreditation rating is just that, a
5 description of performance. Performance that directs our
6 attention, the attention we give as a Department of State
7 Board and state. It directs or supports resources and
8 concerns.

9 The question today is whether or not the
10 performance of students in Westminster public schools
11 warrants that kind of attention. We think it does.

12 Depending on your decision today, further
13 conversation about how to address that performance may occur
14 on May 4th when the district is scheduled for its
15 accountability pathway plan. You have already received the
16 details of that plan from both parties. Yeah, we've -- it's
17 been emailed and we've got binders for you today but.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 MS. PEARSON: The binders are sitting over
20 there. But we have emailed.

21 MS. PEARSON: Okay, okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They've gotten
23 everything.

24 MS. PEARSON: Before we go any further into
25 details, I want us to take a step back to frame what the



1 issue today is really about. First, I want to thank -- to
2 deeply thank the educators in Westminster public schools
3 many of whom -- of whom are here today. They truly have an
4 incredibly challenging job and that many of their students
5 have further to go to meet the student expectations, and
6 that the expectation is that they take their students that
7 further distance, that they are starting at Kansas and going
8 to Vail and not starting at the Metro area.

9 We truly appreciate that work, passion and
10 sacrifice they provide daily for their students. But today
11 the decision is not about how hard educators are working.
12 The accreditation rating is not a judgment about them. In
13 fact, it's not about the adults at all. It's about how
14 students in the system are doing and meeting our student
15 expectations.

16 Your decision about how you see best to
17 describe that performance, and the criteria considered in
18 making that decision. Mostly it comes down to your
19 expectations for our students. I want to tell you a quick
20 story before we move on. I've known most of you all for a
21 while now, but I don't think you all know about what brought
22 me to CDE.

23 Before I came to the Department, I taught in
24 Denver at a school with 98 percent fee reduced lunch, high
25 percentages of the English learners and minority students.



1 Teaching there was the hardest work I've ever done. It was
2 hard work. It was harder even than this and I hate this.
3 The challenges in front of my students tore me apart, mainly
4 because I didn't have the answers to help them with
5 everything they were facing. I approached the work with
6 high expectations for myself and the impact that I could
7 have, and for my students for when I knew they could do and
8 needed to achieve.

9 We had some successes but I didn't feel like
10 it was enough. As much as I tried, there were certain
11 content areas and skills that I just wasn't making as much
12 progress on as I'd like. I remember going down to -- down
13 the hall to get advice from one of my colleagues and master
14 t -- teacher with tears in my eyes, cause -- because I just
15 didn't know what else they could do.

16 I felt like I was caught between two choices.
17 I could adjust my expectations to where my kids were at, so
18 we could feel some success or I could dig deeper into
19 learning to figure out what we needed to do to meet those
20 expectations. You have the same choice in front of you
21 today. You can lower the expectations because of the
22 challenges kids face, adjusting the rating for Westminster
23 public schools and make the adults feel something -- success
24 or you can keep the same reasonable expectations for all
25 students and push on us, the adults, to keep trying, to keep



1 learning, to figure out how to get this right for the kids
2 who need it the most.

3 I firmly believe that when you rise to the
4 expectations that are put in front of us. I believe that
5 the students in Westminster public schools deserve the same
6 expectations. Now, let's step back into the details a
7 little bit and show you the comprehensive data set that CDE
8 ana -- analyzed to determine that a priority improvement
9 rating, is the most appropriate for Westminster.

10 Westminster public schools earned 40 percent
11 of the total possible points in the District performance
12 framework. This falls well within the priority improvement
13 rating range. The District earned does not need ratings on
14 nearly every achievement indicator, across all grade levels,
15 and these aggregated groups, except for elementary science,
16 which had an approaching rating.

17 For growth in post-secondary workforce
18 readiness, approaching ratings were earned. Westminster
19 public school students performance is not meeting State
20 expectations. The following slides will show this data in
21 more detail. This chart shows the District's ratings and
22 performance from 2010 to 2016. The District was accredited
23 with the turnaround plan in 2010 and 2011. Consistently in
24 priority improvement from 2012 through 2014, and again in
25 2016 under priority improvement plan.



1 Details of the rating points are also
2 provided. We'll discuss more later, but it was not changes
3 to the frameworks that have led to this priority improvement
4 rating for the District. If the achievement cut scores had
5 stayed the same as they were in 2014, the District would
6 still be on the accountability clock.

7 If the weighting of the indicators of this
8 stayed the same, the District would still be on the
9 accountability clock. The performance of Westminster public
10 school students is clearly at a level warranting attention.
11 A priority improvement rating. This slide provides a look
12 at the District's 2016 achievement rates. In English
13 language and Arts, four out of five students are not meeting
14 State benchmarks.

15 Even more alarming is that more than 83
16 percent of high school students are not at benchmark, when
17 they are that close to exiting the K12 system. Math
18 assessment -- assessment results are even lower than English
19 language Arts, nine out of 10 middle school students are not
20 reaching benchmarks in Math. On average, across content
21 areas and grade levels, Westminster public school students
22 are performing at level two are partially meeting State
23 expectations. Bless you.

24 For 2016 the District's growth is higher in
25 English language Arts and Math, but both are below the State



1 median. While the gap between the District and State is not
2 as large in growth as it is in achievement, the growth is
3 not sufficient for students to reach State expectations and
4 achievement. This slide shows the graduation rate trends
5 for Westminster public schools by year end cohort. The
6 color bars show the same cohort over time.

7 So, that first blue color, shows the four
8 year rate for students who should have graduated in four
9 years in 2012. And then you jump over to the five year
10 column and that's there same group of kids, how many more
11 graduated in five years and then six years and then seven
12 years. You can see that the students who are expected to
13 graduate in 2012 in four years, has increased when looking
14 over time.

15 In 2012, only six out of 10 students
16 graduated. By 2015, increases were seen in the rate was up
17 at 76 percent. But still that's one in four students not
18 graduating from the District within seven years. You can
19 also see the trend in the four year graduation rates. If
20 you go across those colors that pass right there and those
21 have been declining over time. From 60 percent in 2012, to
22 56 percent in 2016.

23 The District's appeal today is centered
24 around the problems with the achievement data, you heard a
25 lot of that already. But it is important to note that the



1 other measures, graduation rate, dropout and the ECT, also
2 show levels of performance that warrant State attention. In
3 2016, the State's dropout rate was 2.3 percent, while it was
4 almost double in Westminster public schools at 4.4 percent.
5 And looking at the composite, Colorado ECT score, the
6 District's highest score was in 2016, at 16.2 which is an
7 increase over recent years but is still far below levels of
8 college readiness.

9 We'll now spend a little time responding to
10 Westminster public school specific claims, and their
11 position statement. Westminster public schools, claims that
12 their student demographics prohibit the District from
13 earning a higher rating. Inherently, this claim is
14 tremendously concerning to CDE. It seems to say that
15 certain groups of students, based on their demographics,
16 cannot achieve reasonable levels of performance.
17 Specifically, in the District's position statement they
18 stated, "Unlike so many other Districts, Westminster public
19 schools lacks a majority cohort of economically, ethnically -
20 - ethnically and linguistically advantaged students to boost
21 its overall academic achievement and post-secondary and
22 workforce readiness."

23 While it is true that the Districts at the
24 end of the accountability clock have higher poverty rates
25 than the State average, CDE does not believe that means the



1 accountability system is unfair. The system measures
2 student performance. As a State we struggle with student
3 performance in areas with higher poverty rates. If those
4 are the places that students are struggling the most, then
5 that is where our attention should go. There are things for
6 us to learn about based on this trend, but it doesn't mean
7 that the system is unfair. In the Districts and the
8 presentations skipped over some of those 3D charts, but I
9 want to talk a little bit a -- about them because they are
10 really quite misleading.

11 The data modeling in them assumes a certain
12 level of performance for students based on their demographic
13 characteristics. Mainly assuming that students that are not
14 fee reduced lunch eligible are high performing, and students
15 that are fee and reduced lunch eligible are not. The data
16 on all those charts could be changed, based on actual
17 performance of student groups.

18 As we've seen in the District shown on this
19 slide, it can be done. Our role as educators is in -- is to
20 impact that performance, not confirm a set of expectations
21 based on where students come from. With high expectations
22 for students, we can change the outcomes. This narrative
23 being presented by Westminster public schools, blaming
24 performance on the kinds of students they have, communicates
25 a concerning level of expectations for students.



1 Remember, we rise to the expectations that
2 are set before us. Westminster public schools, claim --
3 claimed a sustained trend of school District improvement.
4 But the graphic provided by the District in their position
5 statement, does not give the complete picture of their
6 current performance.

7 In fact it is fairly misleading. When the
8 2016 data is considered, then you can see the dramatic
9 decline in performance in the Districts. But even in 2014,
10 we saw some early warning signs with fewer schools and
11 performance than in 2013.

12 All eight of the schools identified as
13 priority improvement and turnaround in 2016, had previously
14 received similar low ratings at some point during the past
15 six years. When looking at individual school performance
16 over time, you can see variable -- variable performance for
17 some schools like Fairview and Francis M. Day, but we do
18 want to acknowledge positive trends that have been seen in
19 the District at schools like Mesa Elementary, Scott
20 Carpenter Middle School and Sherrelwood Elementary.

21 We know there are things to learn from these
22 schools. These charts show the achievement percentile ranks
23 for English Language Arts for the elementary, middle and
24 high schools. While improving, the English Language Arts
25 achievement percentile ranks are still far below the state



1 expectations for the district as a whole and major student
2 groups.

3 Likewise, this slide shows the performance
4 for math, again, far below the state expectations. There's
5 actually some mixed trend at the middle school level. While
6 CDE does not believe this claim around the recognition of
7 their -- their work is really relevant to this appeal, the
8 department wanted to ensure that the board has a complete
9 understanding on the feedback that the district received.

10 As the district submitted selective
11 information, CDE believes that it is important to provide a
12 balanced perspective and note the areas in the state review
13 panel and advanced ed highlighted for concern and attention.
14 I'll give you a moment just to look over this. Although
15 you've probably read it in your hours of reading up until
16 now.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Members of the state
18 board, good evening. Westminster has argued that its
19 student scores on statewide assessments, under measure its
20 actual performance because in 2009, Westminster moved to a
21 competency based system of providing education.

22 Under the CPS system, Westminster group
23 students by their performance levels rather than by their
24 age. Thus, Wes -- Westminster claims that under this
25 system, traditional grade levels do not exist in



1 Westminster. Yet West -- Westminster also claims that
2 although state law allows it to determine a student's grade
3 level for purposes of taking a statewide assessments, it has
4 had no practical alternative other than to assess students
5 based on their age, rather than on their ability level.

6 And that's at Westminster's position
7 statement at Page 10. Westminster argues that this has
8 resulted in its students underperforming on state
9 assessments. However, it's clear that under state law,
10 assessments are administered according to grade level.
11 That's right in The Accountability Act which states that the
12 Department shall administer a state assessment to all
13 students enrolled in grades three through nine in public
14 schools throughout the state.

15 The Accountability Act also mandates that CDE
16 selects specific grades in which to administer the state
17 science assessment and to administer the state social study
18 assessments. Indeed, the statute clearly states that each
19 student enrolled in a public school is required to take the
20 state assessments at the student's grade level as determined
21 by the enrolling local educational provider, which in this
22 case would be Westminster.

23 So, please note when you're considering this
24 appeal that it is Westminster and not the department that
25 determines the grade level of students for purposes of the



1 statewide assessment and that is precisely what Westminster
2 has declined to do here rather when confronted with a choice
3 under its CPS system of testing its students by grade level
4 based upon age or by assigning its students to lower grade
5 levels based on those students actual overall abilities,
6 Westminster has chosen the test based on age.

7 Westminster should not now be allowed to
8 avoid this priority improvement rating based on the
9 consequences of its own decision. It is important to
10 understand that under our educational accountability system,
11 it is imperative that the state use comparable me --
12 measures in order to fulfill the statutory mandate to
13 measure students level of attainment on the standards and to
14 measure students' academic progress towards attaining those
15 standards.

16 The comparable measure used to fulfill this
17 test for imperative is testing students by comparable grade
18 level. This is what allows CDE to compare the percentages
19 and achievement levels across student groups to determine
20 the progress made by different public schools over time.
21 Finally, it is important to note that every student succeeds
22 act, the -- the -- the recent federal law has continued what
23 was the law prior to that under No Child Left Behind, that
24 state academic assessments in math and reading or language
25 be administered in each of grades three through eight at



1 least once in grades nine through 12 and that the science --
2 and that there'd be other -- other ones for science that are
3 -- that are done by grade level as well.

4 Indeed, if you look at ESA, the section that
5 deals with statewide plans for -- for assessments and
6 accountability uses the term grades 43 times. Rightly or
7 wrongly, the use of grades is simply presumed by both the
8 state and federal law. Thus, in addition to our state law,
9 ESA also requires Colorado to measure student performance by
10 greater proficiency. And now, I'm turning it back to
11 Alyssa.

12 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. Westminster public
13 schools claims that the changes in state standards have
14 impacted their rating. All this slide shows you a timeline
15 of the adoption of the standards. Our call at the school
16 districts had three years to review and revise their local
17 curriculum and resources to align with the new standards in
18 2013/14.

19 Districts performance in the current academic
20 standards was fully measured and used for accountability for
21 the first time during spring of 2016. More than five full
22 years after the last adjustment to the standards.

23 MR. TONY: Ladies and gentlemen, it's back to
24 me. Put the next slide. Westminster has also argued
25 correctly that they serve a highly mobile, low income, and



1 minority-majority student population.

2 Based upon the makeup of their student
3 population, Westminster goes on to assert that CDE's
4 priority improvement rating is unfair because it is based on
5 a statewide comparison that includes wealthier, less
6 diverse, more English speaking and less mobile school
7 districts.

8 Westminster argues that, in their instance,
9 they should only be compared with school district with
10 similar student demographics to their own when arriving at
11 the districts accountability rating. Essentially,
12 Westminster argues that CDE should have implemented a
13 statewide two tiered accountability system.

14 With one standard for the students of
15 wealthier and less diverse districts and another necessarily
16 lower standard for students attending low-income, high
17 minority districts. However, in addition to being
18 inherently discriminatory, any such lesser standard for low
19 income high minority districts would violate both the letter
20 and the intent of the educational accountability act of
21 2009.

22 Consistent with its constitutional duty to
23 establish and maintain a thorough and uniform system of free
24 public schools throughout the state, the General Assembly
25 has sought to create a seamless system of public education



1 in Colorado, in order to educate students to their full
2 potential. Thus, the General Assembly has sought, through
3 educational accountability, to ensure that every student,
4 regardless of background, achieve the required level of
5 proficiency and standards as he or she progresses through
6 elementary and secondary education.

7 In order to ensure that all students have the
8 same opportunity to attain ed -- educational success, The
9 General Assembly has mandated that the same statewide
10 assessments be administered to all students enrolled in
11 grades three through nine in public schools throughout the
12 state. Consistent with this mandate, The Educational
13 Accountability Act established a system of statewide
14 educational accountability that seeks to maximize every
15 student's progress towards post-secondary and workforce
16 readiness by holding the state school districts, the
17 institute and individual public schools accountable for
18 performance on the same set of indicators and related
19 measures statewide.

20 Any such system must be uniform and statewide
21 in order to objectively evaluate the performance of a
22 thorough and uniform statewide system of public education
23 for all groups of students in the state, school district or
24 institute, individual schools and is appropriate to reward
25 success and provide support for improvement at each level.



1 Indeed, Colorado's accountability system must be uniform
2 statewide precisely, so that otherwise disadvantaged
3 students such as those attending Westminster, do not fall
4 through the cracks in the system.

5 Since the ultimate purpose of any such system
6 according to the law is to assist the state in closing the
7 achievement gaps that plague public education system, by
8 spotlighting the gaps in students' academic growth rates and
9 ensuring that educators have the data necessary to assist
10 the neediest students in making more than a year's academic
11 growth in a year's time so these students can catch up to
12 the academic performance levels of their peers.

13 And although that sounds wonderful coming out
14 of my mouth, I'm sure that is actually a quotation from the
15 state statute. To this end, the system is designed to hold
16 all school districts accountable for the same statewide
17 performance indicators. CTE has been charged with the duty
18 of annually determining the level of attainment for each
19 public school, school district in the state on the same
20 performance indicators, precisely so that CTE can determine
21 the achievement levels across all student groups, and to
22 determine the progress made by each school district in
23 improving each student groups academic growth and
24 achievement.

25 Having the same high expectations for all



1 students and applying the same accountability measures to
2 all schools has been the cornerstone of modern educational
3 policy in this country since at least 1994. In that year,
4 Congress made the formal determination that all children can
5 master context and complex problem solving skills. Research
6 clearly shows that children, including low achieving
7 children, can succeed when expectations are high and all
8 children are given the opportunity to learn challenging
9 material.

10 The same policy of higher expectations for
11 all students has continued to be national policy throughout
12 the NCLB era and remain so to the present day. The current
13 federal law related to state plans for assessments and
14 accountability uses the term "all students" 34 times, and it
15 uses the phrase "all schools" five times. Westminster's
16 argument, that is priority improvement performance rating is
17 somehow unfair or subjective because Westminster was not
18 compared solely with other school districts with highly
19 disadvantaged student populations, would not only in violet
20 -- violate both the intent and specific wording of our
21 state's occa -- educational accountability act, would
22 accomplish precisely what that act was intended to prevent.

23 A two tiered system of educational
24 accountability in which disadvantaged students are held to
25 lower expectations and outcomes than their more advantaged



1 peers. When seen in this light, accepting Westminster's
2 argument would not only perpetuate a system of educational
3 failure, would also deprive its own disadvantaged students
4 of those state level supports and improvements necessary to
5 close the achievement gaps in their students' academic
6 growth rates by factuating change in those areas in need of
7 improvement.

8 For these reasons, CTE believes that
9 Westminster's argument should be rejected. And now back to
10 Alyssa.

11 MS. PEARSON: Westminster public schools
12 claims that the changes to the district performance
13 framework have led to additional bias towards districts with
14 students living in poverty, and that's resulted in the
15 identification as priority improvement.

16 First, as a reminder, CTE does not believe
17 that demographics being related to the ratings is unfair, as
18 long as performance -- student performance is being
19 described. The district did not provide any evidence that
20 the changes to the frameworks were the determining factor in
21 their ratings and that burden of evidence is on the
22 district.

23 But even so, CTE ran some additional data.
24 Specifically, we ran a simulation of Westminster public
25 schools ratings, if the 2014 ratings had been used instead



1 of the 2016 meetings. That's -- that's the chart up here,
2 these percentages. So, adjusting more weight to growth and
3 less to achievement.

4 When CTE ran those results, dis -- districts
5 still received the priority improvement rating. CTE also
6 looked at the individual achievement targets with the 2014
7 framework ac -- achievement expectations included. Using
8 those, the district would have received "does not meet"
9 ratings on all achievement indicators and would still be on
10 the accountability clock.

11 Additionally, CTE looked at the relationship
12 between the poverty rate and the percentage points earned on
13 the frameworks between 2014 to 2016. In fact, the
14 relationship was weaker in 2016 than it was in 2014. As
15 noted previously, there are other districts with similar
16 demographics that have shown that that higher ratings are
17 attainable.

18 You can see them on those -- those little
19 dots in the chart right there. Higher poverty rates, higher
20 performance. Westminster public schools also claim that the
21 testing results were unreliable due to parent opted and
22 paper online differences. Based on a review of previous
23 achievement levels, it appears that if -- if no students in
24 the state had been opted out in 2016, the student
25 expectations would have been higher.



1 For example, of the eighth grade students who
2 opted out in 2016 and tested in 2017, oh, tested in seventh
3 grade in 2015, about 40 percent -- 47 percent met benchmarks
4 in English Language Arts in 2015, compared to 42 percent of
5 the population as a whole. So basically, those opt --
6 students that opted out in 16 that had tested previously
7 were higher performing students. The same pattern holds
8 showing grades five, six and seven, but in grades three and
9 four, the prior scores were fairly comparable with the opted
10 out students and those that were not.

11 This means that the performance of
12 Westminster public schools would have been lower relatively
13 than was reported if all parent excuse students in the state
14 had tested. The district still would have been identified
15 on the accountability clock. Additionally, appropriate
16 technical measures were undertaken to ensure that the paper
17 and online results were comparable.

18 We can answer further questions about that
19 later if you have them because I need somebody more
20 technical than me to answer those. While CTE and the State
21 Board of Education were delayed and formally adopting the
22 aptitude achievement targets, based on the new assessment,
23 we do not believe that these changes prejudice the district
24 in any way.

25 Districts were kept well informed of the



1 recommended changes to the performance frameworks. The
2 discussions around the decision points were held in multiple
3 public board meetings, as I'm sure you all well remember.
4 Input and feedback were requested from districts and
5 adjustments were made as a result. The newly adopted
6 changes were applied consistently to all schools and
7 districts in the state and no way impacting Westminster
8 Public Schools Accreditation rating differently than any
9 other districts.

10 Again, if previous achievement targets or
11 indicator weighting's had been used, the district would
12 still be on the accountability clock. So in conclusion,
13 based on the data shown and shared in CTE's position
14 statement, a priority improvement reading is the best
15 description of performance in Westminster Public Schools.
16 Students in the district need our support and attention.
17 This attention has already begun to impact important next
18 steps for improvement as you have documented in the
19 Westminster public schools accountability pathway plan.

20 The choice in front of you is an important
21 one. Your expectations for students especially our neediest
22 students in the state determines how far we rise. You all
23 upheld these expectations in the past and past appeal
24 hearings, and those districts, some that are in the room
25 today, rose to that expectation, increasing student



1 performance.

2 By saying Westminster public schools level of
3 performance is good enough, we send a message that students
4 of poverty, those who are learning English can achieve at
5 high levels. We know that they can. We've seen it happen
6 across our state.

7 We know that we need to provide the
8 attention, support and resources to ensure that the students
9 in Westminster public schools can rise as well. With the
10 appropriate accreditation rating of priority improvement,
11 our attention will be directed to those students.

12 We greatly appreciate your time and
13 consideration on this today. We know it has been an
14 extremely long day for you and thank you for your careful
15 deliberation. We are happy to answer any questions you may
16 have after the district's rebuttal.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Mr. Farro?

18 MR. FARRO: Thank you. Westminster is not
19 asking for a two tiered accountability system. We're not
20 asking for lowered expectations. All we're asking for is an
21 accountability system that complies with the law. It has to
22 be fair, objective, balanced, cumulative, credible, and
23 there have to be objective and consistent measures.

24 The accountability statute directs this board
25 to adopt rules and it has done so, and yet CTE admits that



1 the board didn't follow the rules. That's never been
2 addressed today. Our students were catching up, they were
3 making progress, but the framework was changed the way
4 things were changed, the cut points were changed, all of
5 that illegally in the middle of the accountability clock.
6 It's not fair and it's not legal. All we're asking for is a
7 system that comports with the law. A system that is
8 supposed to be flexible.

9 You can see the correlation. This isn't a
10 surprise. There's a -- there's a very strong negative
11 relationship. This is CTE's own chart. You've seen it
12 years ago. This chart we believe led to a study to be
13 commissioned. It's all quoted in -- in the final submission
14 for you and it's attached in full.

15 We're not trying to mislead anyone with
16 selective quotations. The entire document is attached for
17 review and you can see that there -- that the study found a
18 stro-, a considerably stronger negative correlation and that
19 the overall performance outcomes for districts populated
20 with high concentrations of minority students are notably
21 lower.

22 It recommended that there be a discussion
23 about whether the outcomes present an accurate picture of
24 performance in the state. Well, there was a conversation
25 and unfortunately a change was made retroactively, and that



1 change actually made the issues that we're bringing to you
2 today worse.

3 By CDE's own charts, you saw they showed two
4 line charts. That line is trending down. You can --
5 whether you look at it in terms of free reduced lunch,
6 minority, mobility, there is a negative relationship here
7 and these are just hypothetical schools. This is not actual
8 data.

9 These are hypothetical schools. However,
10 they show you that the more population are free reduced
11 launch students you have in your school, then it shows you
12 how it will change your performance. If you're at 20 or 40
13 percent, every one of those students mathematically could
14 get a zero on standardized test. And if the rest of the
15 students in the school performed and stayed average, then
16 that school would -- there's no way it could possibly ever
17 get rated on the lowest two ratings on the clock.

18 That's not fair. If you're at 60 or 80
19 percent, you can see that now all of a sudden you don't have
20 that as they said, "that cohort of advantaged students" that
21 mask a low performing population. And so, you have to --
22 have to grow and accelerate to -- to avoid being on the
23 clock.

24 That's not a fair system. Granting this
25 appeal would not be discriminatory. The system is supposed



1 to be flexible. It's supposed to respect local control.
2 Westminster public schools has chosen a very novel
3 competency based system that it believes will best serve the
4 needs of its students. Let's embrace the longer graduation
5 rate. Perfectly permissible under state law. That's why
6 you see that shift to the seven years because it takes more
7 time for students that are behind to catch up and finish.
8 That's not a negative, that's a positive.

9 And how -- what is the impact of mobility on
10 graduation? You haven't heard anything about that or let
11 alone mobility period. It's an effect and I -- the research
12 shows that. It's the existing system that's discriminatory
13 and denying this appeal would result in corrective measures
14 that are unwarranted and themselves would be discriminatory
15 against Westminster public schools.

16 Thank you very much for your time. We ask
17 that the appeal be granted and that the district be given an
18 improvement rating.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. This time
20 the state board will engage in discussion and ask any
21 additional questions that you may have of the parties.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Dill, did I hear
23 this right? Did you say that Westminster and any other
24 district could choose to test their students on the state
25 assessment according to their age or their ability?



1 MR. DILL: They test according to the
2 student's grade level.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

4 MR. TONY: And of course the test is done by
5 the student's grade level. However, what grade level you
6 place each student in is determined and this is right --
7 This is -- I'm reading right out of the Accountability Act.
8 As determined by the enrolling local educational provider.

9 So, yes, Westminster could determine, and, I
10 mean, I think we can all understand perhaps why they did not
11 do this but they could determine that overall a student
12 who's much older should in fact be a much younger grade,
13 that's the purpose of the state assessment.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's as a function
15 MR> of enrollment in school. There's -- there's not some
16 ability for school districts to decide I'm going to have my
17 students tested by this metric instead of grade level, okay.

18 MR. DILL: I do believe-

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just want to make sure
20 I heard.

21 MR. DILL: I do believe that is it -- that is
22 correct. They're tested at grade level but the grade level
23 for the students is determined by the school district
24 itself.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Understood.



1 MR. DILL: It does not have to necessarily be
2 based on age.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I would have
4 one more thing.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would also -- I would
7 also say that I appreciate and agree that some students are
8 beginning at the Kansas state line. They have farther to
9 go. And I do have some concerns about what that means when
10 we compare school districts. I just would say that I share
11 those concerns. I don't know the -- what Westminster is
12 proposing is the answer.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Others?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yup.

15 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move
16 that the Board denied the Westminster appeal.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you have a second?

18 That's a proper motion.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Any the
21 other discussion?

22 MR. DURHAM: I think-

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Durham.

24 MR. DURHAM: I think I'd like speak to the
25 motion for just a little bit. I think -- first of all, I



1 think the work that Ms. Pearson and her group does is
2 really among the hardest work that gets done here at the
3 department and it certainly full of its share of
4 controversy.

5 But I think you have to keep a couple of
6 things in mind. One is that what the federal government has
7 really required us to do is identify students that don't
8 perform at grade level and -- and then based on -- on the
9 finding of the fact we've located those students to try and
10 implement plans that will remedy their failure to perform at
11 grade level.

12 The -- and I don't think we're looking -- I
13 don't think that the federal government nor the state
14 statute looks for -- looks for or signs a reason for failure
15 to perform at grade level. And the fact is that we're -- we
16 need to identify those students regardless of their status
17 and we need to try and remedy the -- remedy their
18 circumstance.

19 The -- the -- the why students are not
20 performing at grade level is -- is an excuse. But what it
21 does is it gives us or should give us a roadmap to remedy
22 that failure. And if that in -- if poverty is a significant
23 factor in that failure to perform, then hopefully the great
24 minds that work in this field of education should be trying
25 to solve those problems that affect poor performance that



1 are in fact based in poverty.

2 And the fact that poor students don't perform
3 as well as rich students, I think -- I think that happens to
4 be a fact but it should not be an excuse for continued
5 failure once we've identified -- once we've identified the
6 students and I think particularly the federal government and
7 their jurisdiction in this area really requires that we find
8 out who those students are and that we not try and minimize
9 the proportion of those students that may be poor into some
10 way hide the reality.

11 We are, I think, tasked with exposing the
12 reality and dealing with the problem. So, I think that --
13 and I do think one thing of the opt out I always find that
14 to be an interesting argument but I would say I don't think
15 there's any doubt. The evidence shows that on a statewide
16 basis, higher performing students opt out at a higher rate
17 than do low performing students. And I don't think there's
18 any question about that.

19 And if everybody had a 95 percent opt out
20 rate, I think Westminster suit circumstance would be worse
21 not better. So, I will vote for the motion to deny the
22 appeal because I think it's our job to identify poor
23 performance and then it's our job to further find remedies
24 regardless of the reason for that performance. That's a
25 duty that I think this board needs to take very serious.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Board Member
2 Rankin, he found some fault with that motion. I wonder if
3 you want to-

4 MS. RANKIN: I'd just would like to restate
5 it. Based on the material submitted by the district and the
6 department as well as the presentations we heard today, I
7 move to deny the Westminster's -- Westminster's appeal of
8 its 2016 accreditation rating have accredited with priority
9 improvement in its request to be accredited with
10 improvement.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that an okay
12 adjustment, sir?

13 MR. DURHAM: Yes. With the approval of the
14 second, I'll withdraw my motion and accept this one as a
15 significant improvement.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's been a long day.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any more comments,
21 folks?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please. Ms. Goff.

24 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.

25 Durham. I have to agree with the basic concept you were



1 just talking me about. I do think we all have a
2 responsibility and one thing about this particular decision,
3 knowing that another one potentially follows as a result of
4 today, I think was added to another kind of dimension to my
5 thinking and has for quite a while.

6 I am -- I am going to vote to uphold the
7 motion and deny this particular appeal. I agree with all of
8 the main points that were made by the department. I
9 understand and empathize, of course, identify, understand is
10 always working toward that as much as possible. About the
11 conditions that are on your minds and of great concern to
12 the community.

13 The logic to me is if this appeal is denied,
14 that does predicate the happening of the work that you have
15 been engaged in together with the department to make the
16 best effort possible an improvement for these schools.
17 Otherwise, no guarantees, no promises, whatsoever, but there
18 would have been, if this well maybe, if this appeal is
19 granted, the trust that I would put in Westminster Public
20 Schools to carry on and make every effort to complete this
21 work in an institute and establish a great plan and go for
22 it with great energy and dedication and perfection as much
23 as possible, is still there.

24 But there's not quite the same message sent
25 to your public, to your community if that doesn't ever



1 happen. I -- I'm -- I'm just thinking that this is a
2 wonderful reason for the -- for joint work, joint thinking,
3 more joint planning and efforts being made to increase the
4 accomplishments of these kids whom I don't think it's any
5 secret. I also believe that the capability of young people
6 is there.

7 We just have to make a real point in doing
8 all we can to make sure they have what they need to help
9 them get there. I do think that's a statewide effort that
10 it's got to start happening differently. But I will be a
11 yes vote today. Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted to say
17 that-

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, sorry.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Before -- I apologize
20 Board Member Flores. Before you get started, I'm going to
21 open up the line so Pam -- so Board Member Mazanec can call
22 in, please.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores, go
25 ahead.



1 MS. FLORES: Yes. I just wanted to say that
2 I, I worked at a school that was 100 percent highly mobile.
3 It was -- there were migrant students. I taught seventh and
4 eighth grade English, Language, Arts. And, I mean, they --
5 they came in October and they left around April and I just
6 want to say that if I believed that kids couldn't make it to
7 grade level, I probably would have probably stopped
8 teaching, stopped my career in education.

9 That's not to say -- and they did, there were
10 several students that were brought up to grade level and
11 high, high mobility. This was in McAllen, Texas. And so, I
12 thi -- I think you, you fail to understand the, the idea of
13 standardized testing. And I, I mean, I guess, through your
14 -- I kept saying that standardized, but this doesn't mean
15 that we have to believe that students cannot come, cannot
16 rise, you know, to that level.

17 They can because if not, I think, forget
18 about school. I do agree with you in one point that I think
19 we should have decided earlier that it was kind of late
20 before we decided, you know, what -- how we were going to
21 roll this year or last year. And so, you know, that point I
22 will -- I will give you, but I, I do think that we have to
23 believe, we have to keep on believing that kids can rise and
24 that we are able to bring them to grade level. I'm glad we
25 changed strong.



1 I'm glad we changed from, you know, gaining
2 to, to achievement. I believe in achievement. The other
3 way I, I just saw kind of a yearly attainment that Denver
4 Public Schools was, was getting 0.05, 0.07. I mean and
5 those were little, little gains, I don't know how they'll --
6 that's for 20 years on maybe one or two points. I don't
7 know when they'll ever get to the performance.

8 I haven't been watching your school district,
9 that's true. But, I think we have to believe not that I
10 believe in kind of local, that I -- I don't think that a
11 test can really show what kids know. I really do believe
12 that and that your teachers probably can, can show a better
13 idea of how much they're growing.

14 That's because I work in the area of
15 measurement for many years and I know teachers know better
16 than, than a test. But, you also have to believe that, you
17 know, a test is measuring something. I, I, I really thought
18 that science, that you scored higher in science when usually
19 that's not the case, I thought that was interesting. And
20 the research has shown that also, I'm changing now to the
21 show that the test, kids do better when they do a paper and
22 pencil. You're right on that one.

23 I mean, I think, nationally that has been
24 shown. Research has shown that kids do better if they do it
25 on paper and pencil than on a computer, but I also think



1 it's, it's great that you're teaching computer skills. If
2 you're, that you're doing it and the kids are performing on
3 a computer and, and you have, you knew you had a -- you
4 could choose but you chose to do it on a computer because
5 you want kids to, to learn and perform on a computer. And I
6 think that's great too.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Board Member
8 McClellan.

9 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
10 wanted to go back to page 16 of the CDE presentation where
11 simil -- districts with high rates of free and reduced lunch
12 or percentage of minority students for English language
13 learners are highlighted where we have seen improvement for
14 some of these districts.

15 I wonder and after Mr. Doll touched on the
16 importance of access to state level supports for students
17 who need help the most, could you please touch briefly -- I
18 know the hour is late and people have driven a long way to
19 be here because they care about the children in their
20 district, I do want to ask you to touch on the mechanism by
21 which or the method by which students are identified as
22 needing help and then how these test scores can work to
23 actually allow districts and schools to access the programs
24 that may actually help to improve performance for these
25 populations? For example, in Sheridan, Denver, Mapleton,



1 Weld, and in Westminster, should they choose to access
2 programs like the Turnaround Network.

3 Can you speak briefly to the way that these
4 tests help identify the need and then how the department
5 helps to work with districts and schools to actually help
6 children get what they need?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's a Ms.
8 Pearson question. Please.

9 MS. PEARSON: Sure. Let me try and do high
10 level and we can follow up with more details later. The,
11 the performance frameworks really provide a way for CDE.
12 It's kind of like a map on the ground for us. We talk about
13 the frameworks being that way for schools and districts
14 about where there is green and blue.

15 You want to dig and see why things are
16 working so well there, where there is red or orange, you
17 want to dig and see what's not working quite so well, and we
18 use that same kind of way at the state where we have
19 districts and schools identified, that is where we target
20 our resources and support. So, like you all I've heard from
21 some of these hearings and we talked about before, CDE
22 offers a number of different supports and federal funding
23 for school improvement that can be used for school system
24 support as well as especially Title One funding and read
25 that funding for individual students, for those students



1 that are not meeting standards, are at risk of not meeting
2 that standards.

3 Title One especially and also the Read That
4 funding can be used to direct those supports. We can get
5 you a comprehensive list of the supports provided to share
6 in Denver, Mapleton and Wild Eight on there as well as to
7 Westminster.

8 I think it's a combination. I think what
9 we've seen with districts is really strong leadership,
10 really smart leadership that's really focused. Westminster,
11 I think, is on that pathway and you'll see that in their
12 accountability plan, if we have that hearing on the fourth,
13 that they really are trying to narrow and focus and dig into
14 what's working and what's not, learning from the schools
15 where they've seen such great successes and digging into
16 what happened this year and why we saw the fall back of
17 those eight schools. Does that kind of, give you high
18 level, enough?

19 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes. Thank you very much.

20 MS. PEARSON: Thanks.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, folks, the motion on
22 the table is to deny the request for Westminster to have a
23 change - -- deny Westminster's appeal to change their
24 rating. I want to clarify, folks, this does not mean - --
25 this decision will not mean that Westminster's accreditation



1 is being changed today.

2 I just want to make sure it's clear they've
3 talked repeatedly about their accreditation. That's not
4 what this is about. This is about an appeal for their
5 accredited improvements, so they are still an accredited
6 school district.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Still accredit --
8 absolutely.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't want our
10 community to be misled. Anyone ready for us to call the
11 roll, please?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

14 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. Before
15 our vote, I want to compliment you on solving the problem
16 with the room being too cool.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I didn't.

18 MR. DURHAM: E -- excellent job. I vote yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) have a
20 blanket around me.

21 MR. DURHAM: I vote yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that a yes?

23 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

25 MS. FLORES: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff.
2 MS. GOFF: Yes.
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec.
4 Where are you?
5 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.
6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member McClellan.
7 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.
9 MS. RANKIN: Yes.
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Schroeder.
11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much for
13 coming, folks. Oh, oh sorry. Board Member Rankin.
14 MS. RANKIN: Representative Donald Valdez
15 from Alamosa had come into the room and he left. I just
16 wanted to acknowledge there was a representative here.
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you sure he joined
18 it? I believe we are recessed until May 4th. Our next
19 regular meeting is May-
20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 10th and 11th.
21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 10th and 11th. Thank
22 you so much.

23 (Meeting adjourned)

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600