



Colorado State Board of Education

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

May 11, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 11, 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 MADAM CHAIR: Like to bring the meeting back
2 to order. Our apologies for the delay. We'd like to honor
3 the 2016 United States Senate Youth Program representatives.
4 Commissioner --

5 MS. ANTHES: Yes.

6 MADAM CHAIR: -- may I turn it over to you,
7 please?

8 MS. ANTHES: Thank you very much. We are glad
9 to have you. Today, we are pleased to be honoring the
10 recipients of the 2016 United States Senate Youth
11 Scholarship winners. And so, at this time, I'm going to call
12 Director Lynn Bamberry up to tell us a little bit about this
13 and provide the awards. Thank you.

14 MS. BAMBERRY: Today, we'd like to honor Maia
15 Brockbank and Tennyson (Tye) Brown-Wolf, the Colorado
16 delegates for the 54th annual United States Senate Youth
17 Program. Selection to the United States Senate Youth Program
18 is based on a student's outstanding abilities and
19 demonstrated qualities of leadership in an elected or
20 appointed high school student office, in addition to
21 outstanding leadership abilities and strong commitment to
22 volunteer work.

23 Two delegates are chosen from each state, the
24 District of Columbia and the Department of Defense Education
25 Activity. The two students gathered in Washington from March



1 4th to 11th, 2017, for a week of intensive study of the
2 federal government and in particular, the US Senate.

9 This scholarship, in addition to the program
10 week in Washington is made possible by a grant from the
11 Will- Willi- sorry, William Randolph Hearst Foundation. Of
12 the applications received, Maia and Tye rose to the top and
13 demonstrated higher academic achievement, leadership
14 ability, and a commitment to public service.

To give you a little background on each of the awardees, Maia is a senior at Denver High School of the Arts. She currently serves on the student council and is the Denver Public Schools Board of Education student representative. She's active in National Honor Society and International Thespian Society.

21 In addition, she served as the United States
22 Senate Page worker as an Intern for Senator Michael Bennet.
23 After graduation, she plans to major in political science
24 with an emphasis on minority rights. Her dream would be to
25 serve as an adviser to the president on historical trends,

1 revisionist history and how history can affect modern-day
2 public policy.

3 Tye Brown-Wolf is a senior at The Peak School
4 in Frisco, Colorado. He's currently the president of
5 Colorado Student Leaders Institute, the Colorado Governor's
6 School, student advisory board member, as well as the
7 captain of the debate team. Tye is taking accelerated
8 classes through both Colorado Mountain College and the
9 University of Colorado Denver.

10 He served as the director of outreach for
11 State Representative Millie Hamner's campaign and was a
12 volunteer for Hillary Clinton's presidential bid. He aspires
13 to work on legislation concerning American finances and
14 foreign policy.

15 Both Maia and Tye epitomize what our nation
16 needs for the next generation of leaders: A person who
17 challenges himself academically, cares about people, serves
18 their community and is willing to do the hard work required
19 to make our world a better place. So, please help me
20 recognize Maia and Tye as they come forward to say a few
21 words.

22 MS. BROCKBANK: Hi, Madam Chair and members
23 of the board. Thank you so much for having us here. We're
24 really honored to be here. So, we just wanted to give a
25 couple of points about our experience in Washington and,



1 sort of, as a point of thanks to you guys for help making it
2 all possible.

3 So, one of the things that was really
4 important for me and being in the trip was, sort of, the
5 emphasis that was being placed on public service, which I
6 think can be categories- categorized in a lot of different
7 ways and something that's often really overlooked as only
8 applicable to elected officials. And that that's something
9 that was really emphasized on the trip that that isn't true
10 and that there are public servants all throughout our
11 government who make a big impact on our lives today.

12 And some of my highlights from the trip
13 included being able to experience who those public servants
14 were. So, some of my favorite memories were meeting with the
15 Senate Parliamentarian and the Office of the Historian, and
16 an old friend of mine who is now working as a Capitol Police
17 officer, and, sort of, redefining what public service is.

18 And that's something that has stuck with me
19 and will continue to for the rest of my life. And it seems
20 like that's something that should feel very obvious is that
21 everyone at a level of government or outside of deserves
22 some level of recognition for the service that they do. But
23 in particular, in today's political climate, it feels like
24 there's a strong aversion to difference, and so those people
25 often go highly unrecognized.

1 And so, having the opportunity to, sort of,
2 be able to recognize the work that everyone does on each
3 scale is really important to me, which is why I wanted to
4 thank you guys too for also doing your job as public
5 servants. I know that the Department of Education is not
6 always glamorous, and you don't always get the, the star-
7 spangled treatment. But I just wanted to thank you guys so
8 much for what you do to be servants and that you are the
9 leaders that we look up to for tomorrow. So-

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN-WOLF: Good afternoon Madam Chair
12 and members of the board. My name is Tye Brown-Wolf, I'm a
13 senior at The Peak School in Frisco, Colorado. Next year,
14 I'll be getting a joint degree from William and Mary and St.
15 Andrews in Scotland. So, two years at both institutions for
16 a degree in International Economics.

17 I, until yesterday when session ended, was a
18 legislative intern for Representative Millie Hamner. Over
19 the past couple of years, I've tried to immerse myself in
20 both state and local government.

21 However, there are limited opportunities to
22 do so with the federal government. And the United States
23 Senate Youth Program does just this. It gives 140 United
24 States citizens the ability to go and experience federal
25 government firsthand. In addition, I got to experience 103

1 other remarkably talented and accomplished delegates. And I
2 have three main takeaways from that week.

3 The first is that I'd like to attend law
4 school. I wou- eventually, this might change, would like to
5 become a judge. The Wa- my time at Washington taught me that
6 judges have a remarkable ability to avoid party politics,
7 yet at the same time, make real decision to make real
8 change. This spoke to me on a personal level and I aspire to
9 do so.

10 The next is, it restored my faith in the
11 political process. Personally, I disagree with much of the
12 current administration has been doing, a lot of the
13 different budget cuts, and a lot of the leaders that are
14 leading our country. However, the week in DC taught me,
15 although I might not have faith in our political leaders, I
16 do have faith in our political process.

17 And that was very refreshing and encouraging
18 at the same time. And the last is the large spectrum that
19 the 104 delegates had political views in. Going into it, we
20 were all 17 or 18, and we were the perfect age for Bernie
21 Sanders' supporters. I thought we were all going to be very,
22 very liberal.

23 However, I would say that it was split 50/50
24 between conservatives and liberals and that was encouraging
25 as well because not only did we have a wide range of

1 political beliefs, but everyone could sit down and have a
2 conversation about those beliefs and back up why they hold
3 those at such a personal level. So, all in all, the week at
4 Washington was incredible and I learned a lot. Thank you so
5 much for all that you do and the support you have for
6 Colorado. Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. We commend
8 you for your dedication to student achievement and for as-
9 inspiring students to higher performance. If you'll please
10 join me in honoring the 2016 US Senate Youth Program
11 Scholarship winners again. And when I call you, would each
12 of you please come forward with your families for a
13 photograph in front of our seal. Maia, (indiscernible).

14 MS. BROCKBANK: Oh, no.

15 MALE SPEAKER: So, I think, yeah. We have to
16 move all the stuff up here.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've discovered this
18 now. Congratulations.

19 MS. BROCKBANK: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You too.

21 MS. BROCKBANK: Thank you so much.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're going to take a
23 few. Thank you. And Tye.

24 MR. BROWN-WOLF: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please come.



1 MR. BROWN-WOLF: Thank you so much.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, everyone take a
3 little step- there we go. Congratulations.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Pause for photographs)

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the next recognition
6 is of Colorado's 2016 Title One Distinguished Schools.

7 Commissioners, turned over to you.
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we're pleased to be
9 honoring the recipients of the 2016 Title One Distinguished
10 Schools for this year. I've met a couple of our school
11 leaders already as I went to their schools earlier this year
12 to present the award to them.

13 So we're glad to have you up here so the rest
14 of the board can congratulate you. So this time our
15 director, Lynn Bamberry, will come forward again to tell us
16 about it.

17 MS. BAMBURY: Thank you. Today we're going to
18 honor the 2016 Title One Distinguished School Award winners.
19 Since 2006, Colorado in conjunction with the National Party
20 One Association has selected examples of superior tied to
21 One School programs for recognition through the National
22 Title One Distinguished Schools program.

23 Schools are selected in one of two
24 categories. Exceptional student performance for two or more
25 consecutive years are closing the achievement gap between



1 student groups. In order to be eligible, schools must meet
2 the following criteria: have a poverty rate of at least 35
3 percent, demonstrate high academic achievement for two or
4 more consecutive years, meet or exceed state criteria for at
5 least two consecutive years.

6 From among the more than 750 Title One
7 schools in the state of Colorado, the 2016 Title One
8 Distinguished Schools Award for closing the achievement gap
9 was presented to Wildflower Elementary. Wildflower
10 Elementary School had percentile ranks above 80 percent for
11 both Reading and Language Arts and Math in 2016, indicating
12 that they perform better than over 80 percent of elementary
13 schools in the state.

14 Wildflower Elementary School closed the
15 achievement gap of all the segregated groups in English
16 Language Arts from 2015-16 while improving the achievement
17 of students overall. Wildflower Elementary School also
18 closed the achievement gaps for Math, for English language
19 learners, minority students and students with disabilities
20 from 2015 to 2016.

21 Eads Elementary was awarded the 2016 Title
22 One Distinguished Award for exceptional student performance.
23 Eads Elementary had part means scales scores above 760 for
24 both English Language Arts and Math in both 2015 and 2016,
25 indicating that the average performance of students tested



1 in the school is above, meets or exceeds expectations.

2 Based on this performance, Eads Elementary
3 School had percentile ranks above 90 for both Reading and
4 Math for both years, indicating that they perform better
5 than over 90 of elementary schools in the state. These
6 Colorado schools joined hundreds of other distinguished
7 schools nationwide in making a difference for our Title One
8 children.

9 At award ceremonies at each school in
10 December, Dr. Anthers presented each school with their award
11 including a banner commemorating their incredible
12 achievement and a cheque for 10 thousand dollars to use at
13 the school's discretion. I would now like to introduce each
14 of our Title One Distinguished Schools and ask a
15 representative to say just a few words. We'll have Wendy
16 Godwin from Wildflower and Sue Fox from Eads Elementary.

17 MS. GODWIN: Hi, I'm Wendy Godwin, the
18 principal at Wildflower Elementary. First of all, I want to
19 thank you so much for this prestigious award. Our-our little
20 school and our little neighborhood-hood we work really,
21 really hard every day to make sure that we're achieving and
22 doing the best for all of our students.

23 My staff gives 150 percent every day and
24 they're just phenomenal people to work with and they come
25 back every year no matter how tough it gets, they-they just

1 keep coming back and giving and we just love all of the kids
2 there and we just really want to thank all of you all for
3 choosing us for this prestigious award and thank you for
4 the-the-the 10,000 dollars award. Of course, it didn't take
5 as long to spend that. Once again thank you so much. I do
6 appreciate it.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wildflowers in the
8 Harrison School District.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I'm sorry.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

11 MS. FOX: Madam Chair and members of the
12 board, I'm Sue Fox. I'm the Special Education teacher at
13 Eads Schools, K through 12. And we also want to thank you so
14 much for honoring Eads with this award.

15 I speak for the school staff, the school
16 board and community when I say that we are very proud to
17 receive it and plus the 10000 dollars was also a very nice
18 boost. Our staff feels strongly that every student deserves
19 the opportunity to be successful.

20 We treasure every child and we try to keep
21 the parents informed and involved and we have high
22 expectations and standards. Eads is a small town in the
23 south eastern part of the state. Since I've been teaching
24 there the last 19 years, our demograph-demographics have
25 changed fairly, significantly.



1 We have seen an increase in the number of at-
2 risk students and have developed ways to deal with this.
3 These include a-interventions during the school day and
4 after-school homework program and summer school
5 interventions.

6 We continually monitor and assess where our
7 students are academically, and the entire staff works
8 together to allow the children to achieve to the best of
9 their abilities. We invite you each and every one of you to
10 come visit us at any time. Thank you very much.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much for
12 your hard work and dedication to our kids, by inspiring all
13 of us. So when I call you would you please come forward
14 separately. Come forward and have a photograph taken and
15 receive it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Miss Godwin?

17 MS. GODWIN: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We need someone here
20 (indiscernible).

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's almost time.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kindergarten readiness.

23 Are we all back now? Can I start? So, the next item on the
24 agenda is consideration of Kindergarten School Readiness
25 assessment menu. Commissioner?

1 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you. At this time,
2 I'll turn it over to Dr. Colsman, associate commissioner of
3 student learning. This is a topic though that we have talked
4 about a long time ago that I know you all are interested in,
5 in terms of school readiness assessments and we're trying to
6 provide more options for schools and districts. And so this
7 is the start of that conversation.

8 DR. COLSMAN: Good afternoon. And despite
9 what some people say, this is actually- it's very glamorous
10 to be with you. So, it's very glamorous. Yes. Your service
11 is actually quite glamorous.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You got to worry about
13 your life.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are you trying to
15 achieve here, Ms. Colsman?

16 DR. COLSMAN: Just- just basking- just
17 basking in the glorious. No actually it is- it is actually
18 truly a pleasure to be with you each time. My name is
19 Melissa Colsman, associate commissioner of student learning.
20 And with me, is Emily Kielmeyer, our kindergarten readiness
21 program manager for CDE.

22 And Emily- and Emily was a- is a former
23 kindergarten teacher and has worked extensively with
24 different kindergarten assessments and has been able to
25 provide great support for our kindergarten teachers in the



- 1 State during the start of Kindergarten School Readiness. So,
- 2 she'll be here to answer some questions as we go along.

3 So, as we wait for the presentation to be
4 pulled up, Bizy will also be handing out- we have a bonus
5 slide for you today which is in response to a couple of
6 questions we've received since the original materials were
7 sent to you. So you get a bonus slide which just provides a
8 little bit of additional information.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At no extra cost?

10 DR. COLSMAN: At no extra cost. No expenses
11 were spared. Our- our purpose today is to, first of all,
12 present recommendations from the Kindergarten School
13 Readiness assessment committee for changes to the school
14 readiness assessment menu, and then also ask for a vote on
15 the recommended changes to the menu.

16 As a brief overview of Kindergarten School
17 Readiness, within cap for K with respect to the requirements
18 for the State Board of Education and for local education
19 providers, the State Board is req- is required to adopt a
20 description of school readiness, adopt one or more
21 assessments for school readiness, adopt a system for
22 reporting population level results and then on a regular
23 basis, kind of revisit the description of school readiness
24 as well as the school readiness assessments.

25 And we've put in red that piece that we're

1 talking about today which is looking at the school readiness
2 assessments. School districts are required to ensure that
3 every child in a publicly funded preschool or kindergarten
4 program has an individual school readiness plan and that
5 that plan be informed by a school readiness assessment.

6 So, kind of doing a quick march through time
7 of kind of where have we been with this work. In 2010 is
8 when the State embarked on a yearlong process to look at the
9 State's assessment system and looking broadly at all of the
10 requirements within cap for K. There was a- an assessment
11 committee that had a subcommittee specific to school
12 readiness assessment which provided recommendations for this
13 work and we've been following those recommendations as we go
14 along. In 2012, is when we conducted the first review
15 process to bring forward recommendations for board
16 consideration, for school readiness assessments.

17 At that time, there was only one assessment
18 that met legislative criteria. At that point, what we talked
19 about was the legislation was head of the marketplace in
20 terms of the types of assessments that were being required
21 in cap for K and what was actually available. At that time,
22 the State Board was responding to the value of having choice
23 and having a menu and ensuring that there was more than one
24 option in the menu, because if there's only one choice, here
25 really isn't choice.

1 So, the board agreed with a proposal to phase
2 in the process of implementation of school readiness
3 assessments so that there'd be an opportunity for perhaps
4 the marketplace to catch up. In 2013, another assessment
5 review process was conducted.

6 There were no assessments found that met
7 criteria. And at that point, the phasing process was agreed
8 to be extended further. In 2014, we struck gold,
9 metaphorically, that there was an additional review process
10 conducted and there was an opportunity to recommend two
11 further assessments.

12 One is called the Desired Results
13 Developmental profile, that's an assessment developed by the
14 State of California, and as well as the Riverside Early
15 Learning assessment, I'm sorry, Riverside Early Assessment
16 of Learning, called REAL. And then also at that time,
17 Teaching Strategies had developed a kindergarten assessment
18 survey version of its larger assessment, so it's a shorter
19 assessment able to be administered or actually be able to be
20 used by teachers instead of thinking of one on one with
21 students more globally within groups of students. 2015, then
22 was the first-year full implementation of school readiness
23 assessments.

24 And last year, the State Board adopted a
25 system for reporting population level results. And today,

1 we're coming forward with our results of a fourth review of
2 school readiness assessments. And again, this was required
3 to have occurred by July 2017.

4 A few pieces of what these assessment
5 qualities are required to include, cap for K indicates that
6 these assessments be research based, be recognized
7 nationally as reliable, suitable for informing instruction
8 and support, suitable for measuring increasing knowledge and
9 skills, and that these assessment would be used to inform
10 the development and implementation of individual school
11 readiness plans, and could be used on a- on a regular basis
12 to guide teacher practice.

13 So, over these last few years, we've learned
14 quite a bit about this initiative. And you have had an
15 opportunity to hear, actually from districts, about the
16 issues that they have dealt with- with respect to this. One
17 of the things that we've heard is that, yes, there still is
18 a value of choice in the State.

19 We've also heard that there's challenges for
20 teachers over the time needed to learn to efficiently use an
21 observational assessment. There's a learning curve in using
22 the types of assessments that are suitable for five-year-
23 olds and it takes time to learn to use those well and
24 efficiently. We've also heard general concerns about State
25 assessment requirements.



1 So, the school readiness assessment
2 initiative was also part of a lot of discussions around the
3 number of assessments that the State requires so that has
4 kind of been, kind of, I say, amassed in that discussion as
5 well. We've also had requests to show a better coordination
6 between Kindergarten School Readiness assessments and the
7 required READ Act assessments which occur at different grade
8 levels.

17 And we've been able to work with districts
18 and teachers to help them understand the school readiness
19 assessments are about looking at the- the different
20 developmental and academic domains of children which are
21 much more broad than a specific assessment of the Colorado
22 academic standards.

That said, we did make sure that a requirement for the review process for our assessment recommendations would include an alignment with the Colorado



1 academic standards to ease that for teachers.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Colsman.

3 DR. COLSMAN: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I may, I'd like to
5 add on page six, assessments to be used on a continuing
6 basis to guide teacher practice. If I'm not incorrect,
7 there's also a piece here about engaging parents in a
8 conversation as a result of these assessments.

9 Is your requirement that they be informed
10 throughout the year as their children progress? Could- could
11 you flush that out because for me, at least, that's actually
12 a very important piece, is the fact that communicating with
13 kindergarten parents about these.

14 DR. COLSMAN: Right. I think- yeah. Madam
15 Chair, that's a- that's a very good point and I think with-
16 with the READ Act, there is a very specific parent
17 engagement requirement specific to the development of READ
18 plans and with implementation of the READ plans. Within the-
19 the school readiness initiative, there's not as strict a
20 requirement around parents having to be involved in the
21 development. However, it's obviously a very important
22 practice.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought when you
24 developed the plan that the pa- it had to be shared with
25 parents, am I wrong?

1 DR. COLSMAN: So I'm looking at the- I
2 believe we provided, in- in addition to your materials, a
3 summary of what's in cap for K. So, with you, I will skim
4 through that and see if I see- making sure that I'm not
5 mistaken.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I might be wrong. I
7 might have the wrong one, but I thought parents had to-

8 DR. COLSMAN: Right. But I would say though
9 that, especially at the kindergarten level, because, you
10 know, often- especially for first time parents, this is the
11 first opportunity that a parent has engaged with another
12 adult in looking at the growth and development of their
13 child and they are always hungry for information.

14 How is my child doing? Is my child
15 progressing the way that, you know, typical children are
16 progressing? Where can I help? And so, the assessment tools
17 and resources are- are meant to have very strong parent
18 engagement components, but it's- it's- from my read, I'm
19 seeing a very specific requirement there.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. Thank you.

21 DR. COLSMAN: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, you will recall that
23 back in February, we brought forward the re- request for
24 information, which provided the criteria for review for
25 these assessment tools. Our, our school readiness committee



1 met, and has these recommendations for your consideration.

2 The committee is recommending that the school
3 readiness assessment list continue to include the Desired
4 Results Developmental Profiles, so that was on the list from
5 earlier. Th- the assessment still meets the requirements of
6 state statute, that the assessment menu still continue to
7 include Teaching Strategies GOLD.

8 This is a good opportunity to talk about the
9 continuum of options that are available within that tool.
10 So, there is a full assessment tool, which is one that
11 includes a, a number of academic and developmental domains
12 and a multiple options of how teachers can document student
13 progress there.

14 There is also an abbreviated assessment tool,
15 so an abbreviated version of that tool. Those are meant to
16 still record student progress on a student by student basis.
17 There's also a Kindergarten Entry Assessment survey and so
18 that's a version of the tool that allows a teacher to
19 perhaps work with a group of students or look at their whole
20 class in a single objective as a time.

21 So instead of student by student, actually
22 look at a particular objective and assess all of their
23 students at the same time. So, it's, it's kind of, it's more
24 of a checklist and a, a less time-consuming process. Then
25 there's also an abbreviated Kindergarten Entry Assessment



1 survey.

2 So, really there's a broad continuum of
3 options within that tool. Those are all available at the
4 same subscription price. So those, you, you buy a sub-
5 subscription, you can choose any option, it's completely at
6 the district or school level. The committee's request is
7 recommending removing the Riverside Early Assessments of
8 Learning or REAL from the list.

9 The reason for that, it's no longer being
10 published. So, it's no longer able to be used or available
11 for use. The committee identified HighScope Child
12 Observation Record or HighScope COR. As an addition, this is
13 a, a tool that actually has been in existence for a number
14 of years.

15 They've actually been able to complete some
16 of the validation studies that were not complete last time
17 and actually bolster some of the areas that were found to be
18 inadequate the last time they were reviewed, and so, they
19 are now meeting requirements.

20 There was also an interesting submission, and
21 this was a, a kindergarten assessment tool developed by the
22 State of North Carolina, and one of our school districts is
23 very interested in considering this as an addition to the
24 school readiness menu. So, the committee reviewed that
25 assessment tool.

1 But there were still some issues with respect
2 to completion of some of the validation studies. The
3 validation studie- studies have not yet been completed and
4 so the committee had some reluctance around whether or not
5 to recommend that fully to be added to the menu. But
6 instead, we are recommending that Jeffco Public Schools be
7 able to pilot a, a study of that tool for the next two years
8 in order to participate in the validation study.

9 They are very interested in this process and
10 we think that it actually could give th- the state another
11 option of consideration. So, the, the last piece that I will
12 share, and this is the bonus material that our many
13 thousands in the audience will not be able to see at the
14 moment, but -- but Bizy has them just in case. Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, so what you'll see
17 there is just with respect to how many items do these
18 assessments have and how much do they cost. I think that was
19 something that was pointed out would be helpful for board
20 members. The one thing that I'll point out to you is, we
21 don't have a, we can't say how long these assessments take,
22 because these are not assessments that are administered to
23 children.

24 Five-year-olds don't really take test.
25 Instead, these are assessment tools that are based on

1 observation of children's behavior and a documentation of
2 that to report back to parents as well as to inform a school
3 readiness plan. So, what you'll see is, instead of time, is
4 how many ratings do each of them include.

5 The one thing that I, I will note for you is,
6 you'll see that the full version for Teaching Strategies
7 GOLD and the Kindergarten Entry survey versions, both have
8 the same number of ratings. But how those ratings are done
9 is what the difference is, is why the survey version is
10 faster.

11 So imagine, if you're doing 60 ratings with
12 each individual child, or if you're doing 60 ratings of your
13 whole class at a time, and so that's kind of how that, how,
14 why those are the, the difference between the two. I will
15 point out as well that the DRDP and the North Carolina
16 version, so DRDP-K if you remember that's developed by
17 California and the North Carolina tools, those are both free
18 and available for download.

19 In fact, for DRDP, we have a number of
20 charter schools that are using that as an option, but
21 because those are state produce, there's no cost for those.
22 However, there, if there would be an interest in having some
23 sort of way to have a more of a- an online record keeping
24 system, that is an option, but there's a cost associated
25 with that.

1 And that would be an economies of scale kind
2 of discussion depending on how many districts would be
3 interested in using it and in terms of sharing a cost. For
4 right now, that'll, that'll end our presentation. What I'll
5 ask for is, you know, obviously ask, answer any questions
6 that you might have, but we are asking for you to approve
7 the recommendations of the committee.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Comments, questions?

9 Board Member Durham.

10 MR. DURHAM: I move to approve the
11 recommendations of the committee.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you. So, Board
14 Member Rankin, questions?

15 MS. RANKIN: Yes. I'd like to revisit GOLD
16 strategies and the GOL- I, I guess they call it now GOLD
17 light because it's less now. Can you tell me approximately
18 how many schools are, are using that and the percentage of
19 full GOLD or light? I'm just curious.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. With -- I'll
21 defer to my colleague, Emily Kielmeyer.

22 MS. KIELMEYER: Yes, thank you. Most of our
23 districts have started off their school year with the
24 reduced versions, so the light version. It is a great way to
25 begin the school year as you get to know your kindergarten

1 class and your students. They also mostly use the survey
2 version or the checklist version as Melissa described to
3 really be able to look at their small groups, whole groups
4 but really that class view.

5 And then districts may choose to continue
6 using that. They may expand and choose some additional
7 items. There really is a great deal of flexibility within
8 these options now. And so anecdotally, I would say the
9 majority again of those using GOLD are using the reduced
10 version to start the year.

11 And then we do have about 25 districts or so
12 that have chosen to continue utilizing GOLD. They may use it
13 for their report cards, for parent-teacher conferences
14 really to continue to inform teacher instruction and
15 planning. But we don't collect actual data on that but
16 anecdotally that's what I've found as we've been out working
17 with districts across the state.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you have any
19 anecdotal information since they've been around the longest.
20 That's the only reason I'm picking them out. As to how
21 students that have been involved in this program fair
22 compared to other students that are in parallel in all other
23 way?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a wonderful-
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Assessment



1 (indiscernible).

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No in next step it would
3 be, though she knows.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to say
5 that's a wonderful question. I've heard anecdotally from
6 teachers that it has definitely supported them. Sometimes
7 when they're looking at maybe interventions or progress
8 monitoring especially if they're looking to progress monitor
9 across areas.

10 So they might want to look at both
11 developmental and academic areas to support the child and
12 it's also supported them in working with their families and
13 really communicating to the family how the child is doing,
14 maybe some things the teacher is doing in class that are
15 really working and it gives some suggestions to families.
16 Again, it's very anecdotal. So I don't have any specific --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we not have any
18 follow up like going on to first or second, third grade or
19 even through the reading scores if they've been in that
20 program? Maybe it's just anecdotal but I would think you
21 have some more concrete.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So, I'll take this
23 question. The first thing I'd like to do is also just
24 distinguish between the data and assessment provides and
25 then using that data and information.

1 And so, so one of the things that we always
2 want to make sure that we distinguish between is whether an
3 assessment will cause changes in, in student performance or
4 whether it's the changes in what happens in instruction with
5 respect to those results. So I think that's an important
6 variable to consider with these.

7 So, so with respect to, we are able to take a
8 look at student performance from K1, 2, 3 in our redact
9 information that we have. Right now, we don't have our
10 reporting system for kindergarten in place to be able to
11 make that connection between kindergarten school readiness
12 and to K1, 2, 3 and ultimately grade three achievement just
13 because the record, the reporting system will only be going
14 in place this year.

15 And it's not in an individual student level
16 if you'll recall. So there will be some questions that we
17 can't necessarily answer. But I think that would be actually
18 a very good question to ask the districts what you're
19 working with because they're the ones that have access to
20 that information and they know how their students are
21 responding to the instruction.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mentioned this before
23 but when I first came on the board, I went to one of the
24 classes on TS school, that was the, or TS school that was
25 the only one that was out there at the time and I heard a

1 lot of criticisms about how much time it takes and the
2 effort. But I have a district that the mandatorily require,
3 but the teachers are just, they will not let it go.

4 They want the full thing and as the child
5 progresses, they will go back and use some of the, a- and
6 it's, it's amazing but the whole district is doing quite
7 well and I'm hoping to see some kind of correlation with
8 prekindergarten work. I think it's vitally important
9 especially when you have the parents, they are wanting to do
10 it. So thank you so much.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Mazanec.

12 MS. MAZANEC: What is next step? Will you
13 have a program in the next step?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it was, yeah, I'm
15 sorry. What I was saying is after they get done with, with
16 pre-K and that sort of thing. Are they doing better as a
17 next step? It's not a program, it was just-

18 MS. MAZANEC: In the reporting is just how
19 many are ready for kindergarten and how many aren't, right?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the reporting system
21 that the board adopted is more of a what percent of kids are
22 showing readiness indicators by the number of domains. So
23 it's a little bit of a complex system.

24 So there are six domains in legislation. So
25 physical and motor development, cognition, general knowledge

1 and so on. And so, the reporting system the board adopted
2 asks for what is the percent of kids that shows zero out of
3 six, one out of six, two out of six, three out of six all
4 the way through six out of six domains.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: Just curious, Jeffco's -- was this
7 a recommendation? Is this contended to be a replacement for
8 a while of another one on the menu? I don't know, where did
9 it come from and why, I guess? I'm just curious.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we've had a number of
11 discussions with Jeffco leadership with respect to how they
12 were considering the kindergarten school readiness work in
13 their district and they have done a great deal of research
14 and preparation for thinking through how to best implement
15 within that district. And they have done some of their own
16 research on different tools that are available and actually
17 believe that the North Carolina tool really was one that met
18 their needs and so had asked us to consider a, inclusion on
19 the list.

20 MS. GOFF: So it wouldn't necessarily mean
21 Jeffco, they could always have the option but could change
22 up one of, whatever they're using now primarily for this one
23 --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So my-

25 MS. GOFF: -- or just add it to the-

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My understanding is that
2 they would replace what they're doing now with this North
3 Carolina tool and they would use that for a two-year time
4 period. At the end of that time, we would have been able to
5 look at some of those validation studies and determine
6 whether or not that should go permanently on the list for
7 the rest of the state.

8 MS. GOFF: Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The full version?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Both versions.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Both versions.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, for North
13 Carolina.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

15 MS. FLORES: Is this just the, you might
16 think silly but how much does the state give to a district
17 per child? How much is spent per child per te- for testing.
18 Do you have any idea?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So for the kindergarten
20 school readiness assessment, there are no state allocated
21 dollars for that. However, we, Colorado with the Department
22 of Human Services have been a part of the race to the top
23 early learning challenge fund. And during that time period
24 of this grant, we've been able to reimburse districts for
25 the cost of these assessments.

1 We'll actually be able to, this coming school
2 year will be the last year that through the grant we'll be
3 able to reimburse costs for the assessments.

4 MS. FLORES: I mean I was just remembering
5 when I worked in the evaluation department for Houston
6 school district, and we had \$2.75 to spend on testing per --
7 per student. So I mean when you read, and I know tests have
8 gone up.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to say that.

10 MS. FLORES: I mean, I'm something and then
11 we think of all the tests that we require and what that adds
12 up I'd like to know at some point. Maybe you're not the
13 person to answer this but that would be interesting. Thank
14 you.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Any other questions? Do you
16 want to call the vote, please?

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

18 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

19 MADAM CHAIR: A motion has already been made
20 and seconded. So the second one? No.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Yes. Board Member Flores
22 seconded the vote.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

24 MS. CORDIAL: So Board Member Dur- yes, okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He said yes.

1 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

2 MS. FLORES: He -- yeah.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: Yes.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: Yes.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

10 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we thank you for

16 this glamorous opportunity.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Next item is

19 an update on the department's budget.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, thank you. I will

21 ask Leanne Emm and Jeff Blandford to come forward and

22 they'll be giving us an overview. That said, we're going to

23 use this opportunity to kind of just refresh our memory

24 about the budget process. And I will say, in the past

25 several years that I've been a staff person at the

1 Department, I've seen the budget process and I know we've
2 been holding off on a lot of things, just because of the
3 climate, you know, out there.

4 But in terms of when I came in as the
5 permanent Commissioner, I did want to just have an honest
6 conversation with you all about sort of an overview of the
7 needs we see in the Department. It doesn't mean that we have
8 to put all of these things forward, but we do want to share
9 with you from a Staff perspective, the different needs and
10 things that we see.

11 So you may have looked at this material and
12 sort of gulped hard, as I know I did when- when we kind of
13 asked our staff to bring forward the needs but, we want to
14 have this transparent conversation with you because you all
15 will have to make the decision, about what goes forward and
16 what doesn't. So with that, I'll turn it over to Ms. Emm.

17 MS. EMM: Thank you. Leanne Emm, Deputy
18 Commissioner, School Finance and Operations. We've already
19 turned over to Jeff to kind of walk through the PowerPoint.
20 I just wanted to talk a little bit about what Katy was
21 saying and we really wanted to take this opportunity to kind
22 of give an overview of the Department budget and look at
23 those needs without necessarily discussing how much they
24 might cost or something like that, because we'll be back
25 with you in June, in order to put some more- put some more

1 meat on the bones in order to be talking about what those
2 items might look like from a cost standpoint.

3 But we really did want to take the
4 opportunity to let you all know, here's what we're seeing
5 across the Department. And given that we just ended the
6 session yesterday, we really just don't want to talk about,
7 you know, taking stuff forward into the 18, 19 year, until
8 we've had a little bit more time to really see what the
9 Legislation did to us this year, and see how we can
10 incorporate some of that going forward also. So with that,
11 I'll turn it over to Jeff Blandford.

12 MR. BLANDFORD: Hi. Thank you, Leanne. As
13 Leanne mentioned, we, the State Board meeting marks an
14 ending and a beginning. The Legislative session ended
15 yesterday, and we get to ki- kick off the budget cycle
16 today. I can't tell you how excited I am about it.

17 With that, we'll jump right in. It's got
18 three parts, our presentation. We're going to conclude with
19 the-.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You want me to do the
21 clicker?

22 MR. BLANDFORD: Oh sure. That would be
23 wonderful, thank you. Multitasking is not my thing.

24 We'll start with just a general overview. I
25 know we have at least one new board member and by way of

1 review for the rest of our members, then a quick look at the
2 budget process, how these changes will take place if- if
3 they in fact are approved by the State Board and then we'll
4 get into the budget priorities and talk about those a little
5 bit.

6 With that, we'll be flying at 30,000 feet
7 today but if you want to go up or down, just let me know, we
8 can go wherever you'd like. The State's budget is about 5.4
9 billion dollars. and based on this graphic, you can see 98
10 percent of that goes out to payees of some sort, school
11 districts, administrative units and other recipients.

12 The other two percent which is about 110
13 million dollars stays here at the Department to run
14 operations and programs we have here. And the breakdown
15 between state and Federal in case you're curious, is about
16 4.7 Billion dollars. And the sorry, that's state and then
17 the Federal is about 467- sorry, 647 million.

18 I'm transposing numbers already, 647 million
19 is what our Federal expenditures and budget are typically
20 year to year and that's about 12 percent of the budget
21 you're looking at there. To drill down just a bit, this is
22 an overview of how we use that 110 million dollars here at
23 the State level, pretty evenly divided between payroll and
24 contracts with operating coming in a distant third.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, can we interrupt

1 you?

2 MR. JEFF: Absolutely.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Mazanec.

4 MS. MAZANEC: What does the contract's
5 portion represent? I understand operating and salary.

6 MR. JEFF: The con- the biggest piece of the
7 contracts there are- there are small. You- you have to issue
8 a purchase orders say if you buy office furniture, so that
9 would be included in this, but the biggest chunk of the
10 contracts is the assessment by far, I- I looked at those
11 numbers today getting ready. That's about 28 to 30 million
12 dollars of the contracts, is- is the state assessments.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How much?

14 MR. BLANDFORD: It's about 28 to 30 million
15 that we have budgeted this year. How much we will spend,
16 remains to be seen, but that's- that's what's in the budget
17 for this year. A big- a big one you may recall we had a best
18 decision item last year.

19 Well, it was the year before, but the
20 contract for the database upgrade was this year and that's
21 about 2.7 million. So, we have some significant contracts,
22 but once- once you take assessment out of the equation, it
23 drops down into much smaller dollars than the 28 or 30
24 million.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

1 MR. BLANDFORD: Thank you, Madam Chair. So,
2 to just put some- some again, top Level numbers to it. Our
3 long bill is divided into three divisions, CSDB, The
4 Colorado School for the Deaf and the Blind is the fourth
5 division, but we do not include that in CDE's budget, so we
6 have- we aren't presenting that here. The first division is
7 aptly titled Management Administration and that's most of
8 what happens there.

9 We do have some programs in that division but
10 that is where most of the operations of the Department are
11 funded. Division two is where the grants, both State and
12 Federal come out of, that is by far our largest section of
13 the long bill, and library programs has its own section and
14 it's divided pretty evenly between distribution and
15 operations.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I always thought
17 that the library programs are actually a bigger dollar
18 amount than the assistance to public schools.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One is a million, one is
20 a billion.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Makes a big difference.
22 Because I looked at that last night and I didn't think- I'm
23 like, wow that looks really weird.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Build a lot of
25 libraries.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have no idea. Okay.

2 I feel better now.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's been a long wait.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It happen when you are

5 tired.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You just need to like

7 bold the b.

8 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah, that doesn't jump out

9 like it probably should.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It doesn't, yeah.

11 MALE SPEAKER: If there are no questions on

12 the budget, we'll move on to the chain --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, tell me --

14 MALE SPEAKER: -- request process.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- we have state-level

16 administration, 110 million on page three and then we have

17 65 million.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All three, Madam Chair,

19 all three of the state level administration line. So, you

20 have 63.5 in management and admin. Then you have another 42

21 in the assistance to public schools in the state level, in

22 under the library. So those together --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There it is.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- come to the 110.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- there it is. Okay.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was looking at that
2 myself.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I guess --

4 MALE SPEAKER: We overuse the word
5 administration.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I shook up with the,
7 with the (indiscernible) that I, I never even looked at the
8 next one, but you're right. thank you. Please don't test
9 us.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 MALE SPEAKER: We can repeat it as much as
12 you want.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It won't help.

14 MALE SPEAKER: Which is probably not much
15 but.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very clever of them to
17 have the budget discussion after lunch.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Eyes glazed over. Go
20 ahead, sir. Please.

21 MALE SPEAKER: Well, you might ask yourselves
22 how we would go about changing or adding to these numbers we
23 just went over and that's the next topic in our
24 presentation.

25 The budget requ- change request process as I

1 mentioned, it starts with the State Board for CDE. You all
2 approve any requests that we bring forward.

3 So, as Leanne mentioned, next month you'll
4 see details, there will be some estimates numbers, rationale
5 for why we're asking what we're asking for, a lot more
6 specifics than what you're seeing here today.

7 And provided you approve that, in July and
8 August, we will submit the same items in a somewhat
9 different format to the office of state planning and
10 budgeting, for their review and consideration. If they
11 approve those items, they will be incorporated into our
12 November 1, budget request, which will go to the Joint
13 Budget Committee and their staff for their consideration.

14 That's where we get to about three quarters
15 or two-thirds of the way down the page. The JBC analysts
16 take our budget submission and they prepare their briefings,
17 to be presented to the Joint Budget Committee.

18 That has generally happened for CDE in
19 December. I believe those hearings for agencies in general
20 start in November but ours has typically been between
21 December 7th and December 15th, and I think we can continue
22 expecting that. During the briefing, members, the JBC is the
23 primary attendance, but Joint Education Committee members
24 often attend our briefing and hearing.

25 During that presentation, members ask

1 questions about the budget presentation. Those questions
2 form the agenda for the next bullet there which is J- CDEs
3 hearing.

4 We are able to address the joint budget
5 committee with any concerns, questions or other discussion
6 we would like to have with them, but the, the bulk of the
7 agenda is driven by the questions that members ask during
8 our briefing.

9 From there, figure setting similar to the
10 process, we will go through here, they hear our items in
11 December, get our responses to any questions they may have
12 and then during figure setting, the JBC takes a vote on each
13 agency's budget including any change requests we have
14 submitted to determine whether they will be included in the
15 long bill for that year or not.

16 Now we're getting to our priorities and how
17 we identify them generally and then how we identified them
18 this time around. Budget meets with programs throughout the
19 year about their operating and internal budgets. But often
20 during those meetings and conversations, budget priorities
21 do come up, so we certainly put those aside and keep them in
22 mind for what we do in the early spring where we survey
23 program managers across the department requesting any budget
24 priorities they may have.

25 And those are then presented to the executive

1 team and the commissioner, for which ones will be presented
2 to the state board here in June now. And if there are no
3 questions, we can get to what you've all been waiting for,
4 which are our budget priorities for fiscal year 2018/19.

5 A little terminology before I go any further,
6 we call this the 17/18 budget cycle because we prepare the
7 budget during fiscal year 17/18 but it's actually for fiscal
8 year 18/19. We prepare the budget almost a full year in
9 advance. So, if I slip up on that I apologize, but that's,
10 that's a terminology that we'll be using for the next couple
11 of months now.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just stop. One moment,
13 please. Board member Flores.

14 MS. FLORES: I think we've gone a little far.
15 I wanted to just kind of go -- go back. I'm sorry --

16 MALE SPEAKER: Sure.

17 MS. FLORES: -- and ask about, I mean, the,
18 the state assessment. If the feds require a federal
19 assessment, shouldn't they pay for it? I mean, I think they
20 should.

21 MALE SPEAKER: Well, I'm not sure I should
22 opine on who should pay for it --

23 MS. FLORES: Well, I mean, it, it still can
24 change.

25 MALE SPEAKER: -- but -- but sure. It -- it

1 is and -- and the feds do provide a grant that does
2 contributed, the lion's share does come out of state
3 funding, but the feds do provide us about seven million
4 dollars a year for state assessments. So, it's not
5 exclusively state-funded even though by far the bulk of it
6 is.

7 MS. FLORES: I was just thinking about the --
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cookies keep. Get your
9 cookie stand going.

10 MS. FLORES: -- the computer network that the
11 division of school accreditation, the teacher accreditation
12 license.

13 MALE SPEAKER: License, you mean.

14 MS. FLORES: They need all that money to kind
15 of get all that computer going, I mean, that would
16 definitely pay for it.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't look at me. Are
19 you finished?

20 MS. FLORES: No. I'm just saying we should
21 really-

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

23 MS. FLORES: -- do something about it.

24 MALE SPEAKER: Well, as a -- as a technical
25 matter, board member Flores, the licensure you need is in



1 its own cash fund.

2 MS. FLORES: I know --

3 MALE SPEAKER: So, I'm not sure it would be -

4 -

5 MS. FLORES: I wanted the state, too.

6 Everybody else who pays. The doctors, the lawyers, the state
7 pays for that, but for teachers, we have to --

8 MALE SPEAKER: -- well, no. Those are fees as
9 well.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those are fees. That's
11 not a cash fund.

12 MALE SPEAKER: Yes doctors, lawyers.

13 MS. FLORES: So hunting licenses and all
14 sorts of other things. There are lots of cash funds.

15 MALE SPEAKER: We have a lot of cash funds to
16 --

17 MS. FLORES: I need money.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Blanchard.

19 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

20 MS. FLORES: All right. I'm sorry.

21 MALE SPEAKER: Not at all. It's fine.

22 MS. FLORES: I thought I found a big part of
23 the money that-

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Keep playing, you keep
25 saying serve cookies.

1 MALE SPEAKER: Smart people that are sitting
2 at this table have worked for those pots of money already;
3 none left for us.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

5 MALE SPEAKER: Not at all. The priorities we
6 have identified as the last piece of our presentation, and
7 the first one of those is accountability turnaround in
8 support.

9 The supports that CDE is currently providing
10 have shown a lot of promise on e- early indicators show an
11 increase student performance in those schools and districts
12 where the comprehensive supports have been provided.

13 Unfortunately, once ESSA in, in July kicks in, about half of
14 our schools and, and or districts that are on priority or
15 turnaround will no longer be eligible for those federal
16 funds. We, we do have- do, do you have- I'm sorry.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, no. I'm the one
18 that said, I'm the one that said why. This is why- this is
19 what I wanted to have explained. What are the changes that-

20 MALE SPEAKER: I would like to turn it over
21 to Alyssa.

22 MS. PEARSON: So, we don't have the exact
23 numbers yet. We've run some simulations just on the one year
24 of data that we have looking at, because ESSA really has
25 some different priorities for what schools get identified,



1 right?

2 They have the same, the same priorities with
3 comprehensive, those lowest five percent school. So that's
4 in alignment. All those schools for comprehensive
5 identification, our turnaround and priority improvement
6 schools, I think they're all actually turnaround schools.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they're still
8 funded?

9 MS. PEARSON: They're still funded. Study
10 finds were funded. ESSA added that component of the low
11 graduation schools, that comprehensive low graduation
12 schools, and some of those are priority improvement, and
13 some of them aren't.

14 And if you- and again, these numbers will
15 change once we ha- we have all the final data and then you,
16 but they're no- it's not a direct overlap. And then, ESSA
17 has that component around the targeted schools, right, where
18 it's individual disaggregated groups not meeting those
19 expectations.

20 Again, some of those are already priority
21 improvement turnaround, but some aren't. And I- that's
22 really purposeful in ESSA, that they want to make sure we're
23 getting attention to those schools, where maybe overall kids
24 are doing well, but there's groups of students within a
25 school that aren't.

1 And that's just something that prior to state
2 law and the way we've done things that hasn't been a strong
3 focus, we've kind of focus more at the one is struggling.
4 And beyond just that five percent at the bottom, we've been
5 kind of looking beyond that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, does that change
7 from what NCLB was like?

8 MS. PEARSON: NCLB is one thing and then we
9 had the waiver. I think it's really the change from the
10 waiver that does that, because with a waiver we said, "We
11 use our state system for our federal system for
12 identification of schools.".

13 So, I think the bonus of ESSA is that now,
14 we're going to be able to support some other schools, and
15 focus on some needs for some students that we, as a state,
16 haven't been doing, and then schools and districts of-
17 different schools and districts have been focusing there,
18 but that hasn't been the focus of what we've been doing.

19 But where it leaves us right now again,
20 preliminary numbers, it looks like about half of our
21 priority improvement or turnaround schools would not be
22 identified under ESSA. So -- so we just have that kind of
23 conundrum, where when you've seen those lists of grants and
24 support, we've been given, most of those are coming out of
25 the Federal 1003 funds, this federal school improvement



1 support funds.

2 So, we -- we are at this point of how can we
3 get creative, where can we find supports if we want to
4 support those other state-identified schools that are not
5 federally identified.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: By when can you do a
7 SWAG estimate?

8 MS. PEARSON: To really know? We'll know much
9 more concretely come August, September, when we have the new
10 assessment results if we run priority improvement, the new
11 performance frameworks and --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is before we send
13 our request over to, I'm trying to remember what schedule it
14 was.

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. We'll have some time,
16 right? And we can revise, too, right?

17 MALE SPEAKER: They are do prior to that,
18 Madam Chair, but you can pull our, our request all the way
19 up to probably the end of October. The budget's being
20 finalized, so other changes are hard.

21 But, as far as change requests if an agency
22 wish to remove something, it would not be problematic. If we
23 wanted to increase or change it some other way
24 substantially, that could be problematic, but it's never a
25 problem to pull it out. So, it would be before the due date,



1 but there would be time to revise through September at
2 least.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Ms. Emm?

4 MS. EMM: Yes, I was just going to add that-
5 so, the consideration for you all that we would like to
6 bring back in June is, would you like us to prioritize this,
7 and start crafting the, the documentation and the arguments
8 that we would need to step forward in order to support these
9 schools that would be losing out?

10 So that's kind of where we would need your
11 guidance. And then, we would, you know, picking crafting
12 that message, and, you know, figuring out what the, what the
13 parameters, and the numbers would look like, and all that.

14 Yup.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

16 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Could you give us
17 like four districts that would be out of this that we're
18 helping right now? But will -- if you will not?

19 MS. PEARSON: I don't have that note. It's
20 classified. I like that answer. Can I use that answer?
21 That I would probably say it's classified. I think we --
22 these are really stimulated numbers right now, and because
23 we haven't told schools about identification or anything
24 like that, we don't have that solid.

25 I'd rather wait till August or September, and

1 give it -- when we can -- once we've notified schools and
2 districts, we can give you that complete list of who's
3 eligible for what and where so --

4 MALE SPEAKER: Creede on this.

5 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, folks.

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

9 MR. FOX: Thank you. So, that, that is your
10 first item for consideration?

11 MALE SPEAKER: So, the ESSA- I was just going
12 to ask for some additional funding, is that correct? So,
13 justification was the first one would be to compensate for
14 loss of federal funds?

15 MR. FOX: Yes, sir.

16 MS. PEARSON: All right. And -- just that --
17 I'd say may be redirected federal funds right now. And Pat,
18 you correct me. I don't know that we're going to lose
19 actual dollars although it's something that we don't know
20 about, but bec -- it's that redirection of prioritization.
21 So, is that fair to say?

22 MALE SPEAKER: We're identifying a lot of
23 state schools and (indiscernible).

24 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

25 MALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).



1 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When you say
3 redirecting, that means you're taking money from somewhere
4 else. Where would you be taking the money from?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: From schools that needed
6 and schools that don't.

7 MS. PEARSON: So, it -- it's that, it's that
8 who are we looking at, right? Instead of us, with the
9 waiver, we've been looking at our priority improvement
10 turnaround schools. It's now saying just the lowest five
11 percent, no, it's the lowest five percent of title one
12 schools, not of all schools, so that's about 30 schools
13 compared to our almost 200 priority improvement turnaround
14 schools.

15 So, it's that -- and then, redirecting it
16 into low grad and the, the targeted schools. So, it's
17 really just this, who -- which schools are we prioritizing
18 for support. And the feds are saying, "There's some other
19 priorities on who we look at besides just the lowest
20 struggling ones in a state of saying, 'Who could be
21 closed.'"

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just trying to
23 figure out. Aren't we asking for more money?

24 MS. PEARSON: For -- for this? This is
25 looking at ways to support all the schools that are



1 identified.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

3 MS. PEARSON: Right. And I think there's
4 some ways to do it --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it's not
6 redirecting, it's getting some more?

7 MALE SPEAKER: More to say.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe some -- may --
9 maybe some redirecting, but also --

10 MS. PEARSON: I think, yeah, I think it's the
11 federal funds are getting redirected for other schools or
12 looked at broadly, and then we've got these- because of
13 that, we've got other schools that we don't have funds to
14 support. Does that make sense?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I would say, just
16 another sort of argument on this one is, you know, we have
17 our state accountability system that says, "CDE shall
18 support," you know, districts that have been identified.

19 We've been using federal funds to do that.
20 And, you know, we do, you know, state funds should also be
21 contributing if, if the state laws are requesting us to
22 support.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's a theory.
24 That's a Colorado theory. Grants give them donations,
25 folks.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MS. PEARSON: That's --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. Sarcastic.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All Right. Who's got
5 the courage to sit in next one? Okay.

6 MALE SPEAKER: Next one is Dropout Prevention
7 and Student Re-engagement. Kind of like accountability.
8 Dropout prevention seen some good results. About 80 percent
9 of the districts they've supported, have had improved
10 student outcomes. However, they've seen a significant drop
11 in funding over the last couple of years. The -- the office
12 was formed, I want to say, right around nine, 10.

13 Please don't quote me on that. It's could be
14 a year earlier or later. But it -- it was sustained for a
15 while with state funds. Those were discontinued, and then
16 federal grant, competitive federal grant, was secured for
17 four years.

18 That just expired August of 2016. So, from
19 2015 to today, we've seen the efforts in this office. And
20 the funding for this office dropped from five FTE to a
21 portion of an FTE with no dedicated funding for- for this
22 function. So, this is the next area we would request the
23 board's consideration and input to.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Mazanec.

25 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question. What does

1 the -- what does the department do concerning dropout
2 prevention and student re-engagement? What does that look
3 like?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're having Misty
5 Rothling come up. She's the executive director in that area
6 and she can speak to that more succinctly than I.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Is it mostly providing support
8 to districts and --

9 MS. ROTHLING: It is mostly supporting --
10 support -- providing supports for districts. And over this
11 period of time, for when the office was formed to now, we've
12 seen the graduation rate in the state increased by almost 7
13 percent, and the dropout rate almost half itself.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Really, we just kind of went in
15 what that looks like. I mean, and frankly I'm asking, is
16 this something that districts could do themselves?

17 MS. ROTHLING: So, over that time, we've seen
18 a variety of strategies being identified such as early
19 warning systems or utilization of how to identify students
20 that might be struggling. And, well -- well districts may
21 be able to do some of this on their own. What they don't
22 have capacity to do oftentimes is learn what works. And
23 then, our responsibility has been to help scale those
24 practices versus districts trying something and then finding
25 out later, right, that it's not a strategy that maybe was

1 proven or evidence --based.

2 MS. MAZANEC: So, are you saying it's mostly
3 that you vet these programs or these strategies,
4 interventions for districts, and then it's not like you go
5 into the district and -- and implement it, implement them
6 for them, correct?

7 MS. ROTHLING: So --

8 MS. MAZANEC: You're providing what we call
9 research-based?

10 MS. ROTHLING: Thank you for your question.
11 So, it's really a balance of we find oftentimes that
12 administrators and folks in the schools are spending their
13 time with students. And that oftentimes, they -- there's
14 not capacity for them to look at what is it that they're
15 doing for dropout prevention, and to support proactive
16 graduation efforts.

17 And so, it's really almost a consultative
18 role in many ways, helping them do a scan of their needs,
19 and then providing suggestions about how they might support
20 graduation rates. F is just for graduation rates and
21 decrease dropouts -- decrease dropout rates.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

23 MS. ROTHLING: We are happy to give you more
24 specifics.

25 MS. ROTHLING: But we're going to get into

1 more specifics about actual FTE or assigned to each of these
2 next month.

3 MS. ROTHLING: Yes.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sounds like examples
6 will be also very important.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

8 MS. ROTHLING: Yes. Thank you. And we can
9 also provide you the- didn't we just complete a legislative
10 report on the dropout prevention? Well, forward that to Bizy
11 and make sure that you all have that. It's got really good
12 information in, about the results of these programs.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I think we're trying to keep
14 that.

15 MS. ROTHLING: Oh, yeah. We do have that.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. It's probably in
17 the-

18 MS. ROTHLING: The reality -- the reality is
19 replace --

20 MS. MAZANEC: But it wasn't on the agenda.

21 MS. ROTHLING: -- a bunch of reports and
22 there's more. Yes. They're waiting our attention.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Proceed please.

24 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our
25 next item is a big one just in today's world, Information



1 Management Systems. It's really got three parts for this
2 particular priority. The first is security and the
3 infrastructure around that as attacks and threats become
4 more sophisticated, so must the responses and preventions to
5 those.

6 The second part of that is around the data
7 collections from districts, the accessibility of those, the
8 reporting and information that we provide. Part of this is
9 around finding that we had from the Office of Civil Rights,
10 which- which again is the accessibility of the data. And the
11 last piece, which is kind of the foundation on which the
12 other two said are the hardware and software upgrades. It's
13 -- it's really about maintaining and- and maybe improving
14 our obsolescence plans so that our hardware and software is
15 more up-to-date.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin.

17 MS. RANKIN: The three you just named. Does
18 it entirely over that? Are- are they just there?

19 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, board member
20 Rankin. No. In fact, everything is- is not prioritized by me
21 at this point. We're just sharing our priorities. The
22 commissioner and the executive team will make those
23 determinations at a later date.

24 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. And I -- I have one
25 more question on the security infrastructure.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you have your mic on?

2 MS. RANKIN: Oh, I'm sorry. The security

3 infrastructure, the -- the first one on security. I -- I'm

4 concerned about what kind of security infrastructure do we

5 have. Is ours separate from the SEPA and what the state

6 use, you know, across the street? Are we a silo or are we

7 under there? Because I believe they would have more

8 enhanced if we were by ourselves. Are we a part of that

9 security?

10 MALE SPEAKER: And I hope Marsha's, Marsha

11 Bowhand is here. I can say we do -- we get our Internet

12 service from OIT, so there are security measures that we

13 share with them. So, I don't think they're completely

14 separated at all. I think it's an integrated approach. And

15 we work with them to do that. But if you want more

16 specifics, I would need to --

17 MS. RANKIN: You know, and I don't need the

18 specifics right now and let's, Marsha, please feel free to

19 speak if you'd like. But when we go into this with the

20 money attached to it, I would like a little more of a

21 specific breakdown of that.

22 MALE SPEAKER: That makes sense.

23 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. And maybe OIT can

24 provide it. That -- that would be very helpful.

25 MALE SPEAKER: I will make sure Marsha gets



1 that to us.

2 MS. MARSHA: He will make sure I do.

3 MS. RANKIN: I don't need it right now, but
4 if you'd like to talk about it, I'd be more happy to listen.

5 MS. MARSHA: Just real quickly. He's right.

6 Just right in that. OIT does provide sort of the underlying
7 Internet access, but we do a lot of our own security
8 infrastructure here, not physically here, but, you know,
9 within our- our- our own sort of environment. And we have
10 some additional requirements that OIT doesn't necessarily
11 have.

12 So, we need to make sure that- that with the
13 state law that passed. And now we have some additional very
14 specific requirements. So, the security infrastructure and
15 controls that we need to maintain and improve sometimes go
16 above and beyond. But we can get you more details on that.

17 MS. RANKIN: And OIT is very clear on what we
18 have. That is, that they can't provide is all of that
19 somewhere?

20 MS. MARSHA: It's -- it's clear what -- what
21 services OIT provide to us. I would not go so far, as to
22 say, they're clear on what we are doing. That's over and
23 above because they've got the rest of the state to worry
24 about. But it is very clear what services they provide to
25 us, and what services we pay for. One, just as an example,

1 one of the items that we've listed in that particular area
2 is something that would allow us to share -- share data with
3 researchers, so it's not identifiable.

4 So, that's -- it's a little different than
5 the infrastructure that OIT would provide because they
6 wouldn't have that requirement. But it gives us a way to
7 see they could still engage in research, and research
8 partners could do that. And we wouldn't have the issues
9 that we're currently having with identifiable information
10 being shared.

11 So, that's just an example of something
12 that's a little bit different than what OIT would need to
13 provide, if that helps. We'll bring you some more of those
14 in June.

15 MS. RANKIN: I just want to make sure that
16 there's not redundancy or something they can help us with --

17 MS. MARSHA: Right.

18 MS. RANKIN: -- that we're not doing because
19 they're more vehement than we are.

20 MS. MARSHA: Yeah.

21 MS. RANKIN: Maybe. But thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are there any federal
23 grants?

24 MS. MARSHA: Not right now. We haven't been
25 able to tap into federal grants in the past. There's not

1 very much of that available right now. And we're not really
2 thinking many of those are going to come around for a while,
3 but, I mean, we- we keep looking for them, but there's no a
4 lot there now.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, in alignment with
6 Ms. Rankin's question, I guess I'd like to know what is the
7 system we have? How old is it? To some extent, the risk
8 level. That stuff proceeds with changes are not making
9 changes.

10 And then, any opportunities to increase
11 capacity. We could do more if, because it seems like if
12 we're going to be spending or asking to spend money, let's
13 be thinking, today, I think what we're thinking is let's
14 catch up because we're probably behind. But maybe it's an
15 opport -- maybe we should be thinking a little bit further
16 ahead if at all possible.

17 MS. MARSHA: We'll do that. Are you writing
18 that down?

19 MALE SPEAKER: I am.

20 MS. MARSHA: Yeah, we'll bring that.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 MALE SPEAKER: Do you have a back of the
23 envelope estimate?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a back of the
25 envelope estimate, but I'm not sure if we want to go there.



1 Do we want to go there?

2 MALE SPEAKER: That -- that could be
3 classified in talking.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We know.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let us -- let us -- let
6 us get a good envelope.

7 MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. It's a little
9 shaggy envelope.

10 MALE SPEAKER: Shaggy envelope.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It's kinda got --
12 it's -- but yeah.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Borrow napkin?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No we. We do envelopes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Big manila envelope.

16 MALE SPEAKER: I feel that's got a big
17 number.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I only deal with
19 big numbers.

20 MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it doesn't start
22 with a B.

23 MALE SPEAKER: That's good.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not that big then
25 is it? But it --

1 MALE SPEAKER: Brian will keep track of it.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, (indiscernible)
3 going to be focused.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll take it. I'd take
5 it

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. She's not on the
7 T's.

8 MALE SPEAKER: She is not on the T's.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the problem.
10 Please proceed folks.

11 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. Well, our last
12 priority item is, I think slightly less glamorous but
13 equally important, and I'll just summarize it to say our --
14 our purchasing area is experiencing a little more work than
15 they're able to keep up with, and they do the important
16 things like the assessment request for proposal, and the big
17 contracts that the department has to make sure are right
18 signed and all that.

19 So, that is the last item we thought we'd
20 conclude with the options we have for funding those items,
21 if the board is so inclined. The options are limited, but
22 we've got a few. The first is in my area, it's a budget
23 decision item, and through that process you can -- it's also
24 known as a change request coming back to terminology, but I
25 refer to it as a decision item because there are other

1 budget events that are also referred to as change requests,
2 and under that scenario or -- or process we can request new
3 funding, or we could request that we move dollars between or
4 appropriations between long bill lines, provided there is
5 nothing in statute preventing that.

6 There are many appropriations we receive that
7 actually specify the number in the statute, and that would
8 require your legislation. So --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you are threatening
10 to take this out of our salaries?

11 MALE SPEAKER: I would never do that.

12 MALE SPEAKER: It's okay.

13 MALE SPEAKER: As much as you all make, I
14 wouldn't dream of it. The next option is always an option,
15 we could identify areas within the department to reallocate
16 or reprioritize. And the last would be at the board's
17 discretion entirely, which would be to run legislation, and
18 that would also include the first option where a
19 reallocation would require legislation. It would either be
20 new funding, or if we had identified a program that is
21 meeting the needs of its constituents, but the dollars,
22 there are some grant programs that have difficulty awarding
23 100 percent of their funding, you could reallocate those
24 dollars as well.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Questions, comments,

1 thoughts? Board member Flores.

2 MS. FLORES: When I spoke with a -- an export
3 member from Michigan, who said that we should really fill
4 out some just very lazy paperwork that needs to be done, and
5 I spoke with you about that, that could bring in more
6 federal moneys that would be easier to do.

7 I know you kind of looked at it, and I don't
8 know how deep you went into it Pat. Could you tell us about
9 a little bit? I think you had a better understanding of it
10 than I did, when we came to you to -- for an explanation.

11 MR. PAT: It was a - the gentleman --

12 MS. FLORES: I can't remember --

13 MR. PAT: -- John. I reported to these guys.

14 MS. FLORES: Right.

15 MR. PAT: Because I felt it was kind of -- it
16 was too --

17 MS. FLORES: Well it was -- suddenly for me.

18 MR. PAT: -- deep, it's too complex from a
19 fiscal standpoint, but I think the general point was the
20 amount of effort, fiscal effort that -- and what we used to
21 count our state effort toward education, makes a difference
22 in how much federal money we end up receiving. So he was
23 saying, and -- and that we might be able to look at our
24 inputs, our supports for education, and count some things
25 that we haven't been counting, and he had helped other

1 states do that, and he was offering to help Colorado do that
2 as well.

3 MS. FLORES: And I think -- right, I think
4 he's -- he's moving here because of his family. He has
5 family here, and so I -- I just -- I think I --

6 MR. PAT: I talk to them as much as I could,
7 but it got beyond my capability, and so I thought that I
8 would forward to our fiscal and budget folks.

9 MALE SPEAKER: Is it program specific? So
10 like Title I --

11 MR. PAT: I think it was related to how much
12 Title I we're in. Remember when we talked to the U.S.
13 Department of Education just last year?

14 MALE SPEAKER: You state your formula and --

15 MR. PAT: That's what I kept -- yeah --

16 MALE SPEAKER: I got you, I got you.

17 MR. PAT: So it might be something we want to
18 pursue, and I think it's a good idea.

19 MALE SPEAKER: But -- if -- if it's what I'm
20 thinking of it, may require legislation as well within the
21 title one grant. There are four categories of grants. One
22 of them is a series of weighted factors, and one of those
23 factors is how equitable your school finance formula is
24 relative to other states around the country, and if it's
25 more equitable, you do -- you do enjoy an increase in -- in

1 your title one allocation.

2 That -- that allocation is proprietary, so I
3 couldn't tell you how -- how much, but we would certainly be
4 happy to talk to anybody about increasing our federal funds.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That may be -- and I
6 think that that's a really good area, that when we have to
7 do this interim committee on the school finance study, that
8 if we were to make changes to the school finance act
9 formula, what would that do, and would it have a back end
10 effect on potentially bringing more federal dollars in.

11 MS. FLORES: Sounds good. Would that- would
12 that entail maybe hiring more people with the department? I
13 mean, and don't start spending the money, we haven't gotten
14 the money yet.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, no, no, wait a
16 minute.

17 MS. FLORES: So would it -- just weighing
18 that bringing in more people to get more moneys with that
19 kind of -- be maybe not -- not a good thing. If we're
20 spending more money in trying to get a little bit more
21 money.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I'm going to
23 -- I'm going to put on my Leanne opinion hat, and just say
24 that if we were to be able to increase funding to the school
25 districts, through either the state or federal funds, that I

1 would prefer to see it go to this -- to the districts, and
2 not attempt to build staff internally just because we are
3 getting a little bit of extra money.

4 MS. FLORES: Oh no, no. I wasn't saying that.
5 But sometimes there is, you get more people in to try and
6 get more money, but at the end, you don't get any. I mean,
7 it doesn't weigh.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very true, very true.

9 MS. FLORES: Any more questions? Thank you.
10 All right. Thank you, folks. The next item on today's
11 agenda is an update from title one multi district online
12 school allocation pilot. This is some more eyes glaze over
13 kind of stuff, for which we're very ready. Mr. Chapman,
14 please. Sorry. I just want to do --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just going to kick
16 it off, and then I'll kick it over to Pat. Last year, you
17 all had approved extending the criteria for multi districts
18 online schools, and this is a kind of program which would
19 take the federal dollars, and basically count -- count those
20 kids (indiscernible).

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In place for the past
22 few years and when we expanded the criteria last year to
23 pick up the Elevate School, I think that was done in
24 October. So, it's been Hope -- Hope and Douglas County have
25 been participating. And then last year, you all approved



1 the expansion of the criteria, which picked up Elevate
2 School in Byers.

3 At that time, we had -- we had talked about
4 the possibility of through looking at the ESSA program,
5 would we want to bring forward this pilot and implement it
6 statewide? So, that's what -- that's what we wanted to tee-
7 up today to talk with you about and some of those
8 implications about rolling that out statewide and then bring
9 this back in June and then you all could -- could direct us
10 to either stick with the pilot or get rid of the pilot in
11 its entirety or maybe yes, go ahead and go statewide.

12 MALE SPEAKER: Madam Chair?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sir?

14 MALE SPEAKER: This illustration page that
15 you have. So, if I -- if I understand that the -- the --
16 the difference between what a district now receives and what
17 the -- with the -- with the pilot that we now have, and what
18 they would have if the -- if the funds just followed the
19 student. Is that in the far-right column or is it in the
20 next to the far-right column?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, sir. It's in the
22 far-right column, that if we were to look at this- if we
23 were to look at this chart.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, which --
25 which chart are you?

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's this chart here.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just want to make sure
3 it goes around.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It looks like this.

5 Yeah. And actually, if you flip to the very back.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, this one?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, no, that's okay.

8 Never mind. The very first page. So, in Adams County right
9 now, Adams, Arapahoe, so, that's Aurora, and this is using
10 16, 17 funding levels and running it through basically an
11 ESSA illustration. It is not totally all the way through
12 the formula. There will still be subject to change --

13 MALE SPEAKER: It's not precise.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- all over the place.

15 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. It's not precise.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. But without the
17 pilot they'd have 14.3 million. We are operating with the
18 pilot that some of their funds gets pulled because they have
19 students living within their district that are actually
20 attending a multi-district online school in another
21 district. So, therefore Aurora gives up a little bit of
22 their money. It goes over to- to the pilot districts. So,
23 they lose \$371,000 under the pilot. If we rolled it
24 statewide, they would -- their allocation would come down
25 \$419,000 instead of \$371,000.

1 So, if we were to roll it statewide, allocate
2 statewide, then Aurora's difference would be \$47,000, if we
3 did it statewide versus sticking with the pilot. Whereas,
4 Denver their district, their difference would be an
5 additional \$60,000 that would be pulled from their
6 allocation to go statewide. The reason why we're looking at
7 this, at this point in time is because we feel that it is
8 the best time to do this.

9 We've got new allocation processes for ESSA.
10 So, districts are going to see a change in those allocations
11 anyway, and the other thing that we are -- that we are
12 attempting to alleviate or avoid is- is the situation that
13 we were in with the Elevate. That when we have potentially
14 other schools that -- that identify that they may want to
15 participate and then we have to come to you in the middle of
16 the year and potentially look at changes in criteria, we
17 felt that if we rolled it statewide it's -- it's fair and we
18 can implement it easily.

19 So, that's why we wanted to bring it to you,
20 and- and for discussion.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

22 MALE SPEAKER: Well, so then -- then the net
23 change and for most districts with like other Pueblo is all
24 in the tens of thousands rather than the numbers I thought
25 they might be, and then the gainers are those districts that

1 have- they already -- that have the online programs, multi-
2 district onlines?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. And to be clear,
4 the funding -- so, for instance on the back page, Falcon 49
5 would be a large gainer of rolling this statewide. However,
6 that funding does not necessarily go directly to their
7 online schools because they would still be required to rank-
8 order their schools.

9 MALE SPEAKER: Right.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And depending on where
11 those multi-district online schools fell with their at-risk
12 populations and that -- that would -- that would designate
13 how they would serve their schools. So, it's not an
14 automatic, we're going to pull from Aurora and give it to an
15 online school. It's -- it's district to district.

16 MALE SPEAKER: Okay. So, what, you're not
17 looking for action today or you are looking for some
18 direction or what's -- where are you?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Madam Chair?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we can -- we can go
21 either way. If you all want to take this month and think
22 about it and we can come back to you with a proposal and an
23 action item next month. Districts would absolutely love it
24 if we could tell them, yes, this is the direction we're
25 heading because we are going to be striking those



1 allocations, so that they can be preparing their budget.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To plan.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And, yeah to plan and
4 everything. So, if they had an inkling -- if they had kind
5 of an idea of which way, we were leaning prior to the June
6 board meeting where you would adopt it, they would
7 appreciate that, but we can also be sense-makers for them
8 also. That you all haven't taken formal action.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

10 Board member Mazanec.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm wondering what kind
12 of reporting does -- do districts do normally on these Title
13 I Funds, on the use of them, and what- what kind of
14 reporting do we see?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 MALE SPEAKER: They have to submit an
17 application at the beginning of the year and this far they
18 have they're Title I reporting. There is Title II reporting,
19 there's Title III reporting; there is reporting for all the
20 programs, so they have to submit end-of-year reports. They
21 submit an end-of-year financial report, and so this doesn't
22 increase the level of reporting.

23 This -- this process doesn't increase the
24 level of reporting for the district. The school that if --
25 if one of these multi-district online schools is served,



1 then that means that they have to provide something to their
2 district.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The districts are
4 already reporting on --

5 MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- the ones that are --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If they're Title -- if
8 they're Title I districts.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That are already taking
10 advantage of this.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If they're Title I
12 Districts.

13 MALE SPEAKER: If they're Title I.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If they're districts
15 that get Title I.

16 MALE SPEAKER: Which is, oh, I think all but
17 one or two.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you sure?

19 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because not all
21 districts --

22 MALE SPEAKER: It's all, but one or two.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But if they're getting
24 them for their multi-online then they're reporting, right?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. They -- the

1 -- that is correct. The level of the effort from their
2 reporting standpoint is going to be the same. The only
3 thing that would change is let's say, I'll use Falcon again
4 because they're a big winner. So, what might happen in
5 Falcon, is that maybe they have three schools right now that
6 are receiving Title I Funds. Maybe, this would allow them
7 to serve six Title I Funds in Title schools and expand their
8 offering in that regard. So, they would -- they're going --
9 still be submitting budgets, they're still going to be
10 submitting their plans for how they're going to spend their
11 money and things like that.

12 MALE SPEAKER: So, they might be doing it on
13 behalf of six schools as opposed to three schools.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. I guess what I'm
15 really wondering is I'm sure this is old hat to you but it's
16 not to me. What does the reporting look like? Do they -- do
17 districts report what the Title I Funds are being used for
18 and --

19 MALE SPEAKER: They --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and their efficacy
21 or?

22 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. So, for example if they
23 might prepare a target at the school level, they would,
24 might be a school wide school. So that they would have a
25 school wide plan. So, there is that planning component.

1 They do submit information about the types of services that
2 they will be providing through Title I; how often, to whom,
3 what assessments they might be using, how they go about.
4 They would be submitting to us the tables of which schools
5 will be served by the rank-order. So, they have to look at
6 their average poverty for the district and then identify the
7 poverty level of each of the schools. I'm sorry I'm losing
8 my voice.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's a district.

10 MALE SPEAKER: This always happens on the
11 report day.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's a district
13 report not the multi-online.

14 MALE SPEAKER: There is some obligation on
15 the part of the school to provide information to the
16 districts so the district can provi -- fulfill its reporting
17 requirements.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the school board
20 president has to sign off on it.

21 MALE SPEAKER: Correct.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Thank you.

23 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, there is just a
25 whole process.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I'm inclined to be
2 in favor of it.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Makes sense.

4 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Makes sense, yeah.

6 MALE SPEAKER: As I understand it it's easier
7 to administer for you, if we do it this way as opposed to
8 the way we've been doing it.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We haven't been doing
10 it.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, sir.

12 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. We've been doing on a
13 pilot basis as far as-

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pilot only but we
15 haven't been doing it for all.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that's true.

17 MALE SPEAKER: That's harder to administer
18 than just doing it in block.

19 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

20 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

21 MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

22 MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have the program
24 that allows you to do this now because I think one of the
25 restrictions we felt before was that it was going to be a



1 mathematical nightmare.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. And then we got
3 our thinking hats on and we came up with a -- with a more
4 elegant solution.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a math programming
6 problem.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Math is elegant.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you love it. I love
9 it.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The 'v's and 'm's and --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: V's and M's.

12 MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you guys want to?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would move to approve
15 it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Generally speaking I'm
17 not in favor of voting on a meeting date that something is
18 introduced. However, if we are unanimous in our wish to
19 address this now, then, are we unanimous or did -- are some
20 folks want to ponder and maybe check with your districts?

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Then maybe bring it back
22 next time, please.

23 COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.

24 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.



1 MADAM CHAIR: We're going to take a quick
2 break.

3 (Break)

4 MADAM CHAIR: So, if we may, I'd like to move
5 back to item, I think 13.11 or 13.12. However, we -- whoe -
6 - whoever is doing the numbering?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 13.11.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Consent item. Commissioner,
9 could you help us with that please?

10 COMMISSIONER: Yes. Thank you. Madam Chair, I
11 believe Board Member Durham had a question about that
12 culturally and linguistically diverse standards that being
13 embedded throughout the program. And I worked with staff
14 over the last day to find out that, in fact, there are three
15 very specific, separate courses that focus on those areas in
16 addition to elements being embedded throughout the program.

17 So, there are three courses, there's plenty
18 of paperwork to back that up if you would like. Board Member
19 Durham did not want the volumes of information re- related
20 to that, so.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham you want to
22 make a motion?

23 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
24 we've killed enough trees just moving. I -- I move -- I move
25 the adoption of item 14 --

1 MADAM CHAIR: Thirteen --

2 MR. DURHAM: 13-point 0 --

3 MADAM CHAIR: -- point 11.

4 MR. DURHAM: Point 11. Thank you

5 COMMISSIONER: And that's to approve the
6 Noropa University Authorization request of its initial and
7 added endorsement programs as set forth in the proposed
8 agenda.

9 MR. DURHAM: Correct. And I'm presuming that
10 this is an otherwise qualified program as the others that
11 were approved.

12 COMMISSIONER: Correct.

13 MR. DURHAM: Okay. That's the motion.

14 MADAM CHAIR: There is a second. Any
15 objections? Great. Item 8.01, the State board will now
16 consider and adopt to final Written Determination for the
17 Accountability Recommendation concerning Westminster Public
18 School, Case Number 17-AR-08. Public testim -- public --
19 public testimony will not be heard at this time.

20 However, department, staff district staff and
21 legal counsel are available only to answer any final
22 questions which we may have. Neither the department nor
23 district may provide any additional information unless
24 requested by the State Board. Colleagues do you have any
25 questions? Board Member McClellan?

1 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you Madam Chairman. I
2 understand this doesn't foreclose any further discussion or
3 questions, but I did want to put a motion out on the floor.
4 I move to approve the final written determination as
5 proposed by the department and district to direct
6 Westminster Public Schools to implement its management
7 pathway plan as filed with the State Board on May 10th,
8 2017.

9 MS. FLORES: I second it.

10 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chairman. I'm trying --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Questions? Board Member
12 Durham.

13 MR. DURHAM: -- to make a substitute motion
14 that the board instruct the department to re -- prepare the
15 necessary documentation to remove the accreditation from the
16 district.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

18 MADAM CHAIR: So now, we have two motion?

19 MR. DURHAM: No. We have a substitute.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we have a second.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Have -- point -- have a point
23 of border and just for my own understanding. Am I not
24 correct that my motion must be voted upon first as the
25 proper motion, with a second?

1 MR. DURHAM: No.

2 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know.

3 MR. DURHAM: You can make substitute motion
4 if it fails the you're back to the main motion.

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: I see.

6 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Let's call the
7 second motion, but we still would like -- I still like to be
8 able to have a lot of documented questions. Is it okay? Can
9 we get rid of this one, and then -- can we vote on this one,
10 and then go to the questions? Ms. -- Ms. Cordial?

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham?

12 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores?

14 MS. FLORES: No.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

16 MS. GOFF: No.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

18 MS. MAZANEC: No.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan?

20 MS. MCCLELLAN: No.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

22 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: No. Am I allowed to have a
25 question? Okay. I have questions. So, my question is for -

1 - is this letter that you provided us in an attempt to
2 answer our request? Is that a part now of blue pathway
3 plan?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

5 MADAM CHAIR: So that we can officially say
6 these two are --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. We worked very,
8 very hard to try to answer the questions from the state or
9 from our last meeting.

10 MADAM CHAIR: And essentially -- the answers
11 are in here do some referencing into here?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 MADAM CHAIR: And you've made some changes in
14 here?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

16 MADAM CHAIR: I have to say it's confusing.

17 Here and there with red, and other places it wasn't. So --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I tried to provide
19 the cover letter so that it would be --

20 MADAM CHAIR: It did refer us.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, yeah it did.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. I wanted to make
23 sure that was going to be a part of the documentation.

24 Board member Rankin, your question.

25 MS. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a

1 question to Dr. Swanson. I read in your letter. Things will
2 clarify to pages 17 and 18, and pages 56 through 60. I read
3 it, and reread it, and reread it and I had a difficult time
4 in my own mind coming up with an answer to my question, when
5 we came before you.

6 My question was, who is management? And I
7 would like to reference again, dictionary definition of
8 management, 'As the ex- executive, administrative and
9 supervisory direction of', and couple that with the law that
10 says, 'The management must be performed by an entity other
11 than the school district.

12 I really wanted that to be clear on these
13 pages and I went through it many times and couldn't find it.
14 I see a couple of, maybe consultants, to the district. In
15 our last meeting, I felt it might be the president and the
16 board. I- I wasn't very clear on it and I have to say I'm
17 sorry, but I am not clear on this issue right now, as I read
18 this. So, I'm having trouble with Section 22-11-09 Colorado
19 Revised Statutes, whether it's district or school, it's the
20 outside management that is the responsible party. Can you
21 help me with this? Help me to understand it.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We believe that our
23 management partnership, they really do have a legitimate and
24 very authentic role in our school district with legitimate
25 responsibilities, where they can take actions. Our local

1 school board is ultimately the -- the school board that does
2 for example, the hiring in our school district or the
3 firing, for that matter. But both of our partners, both
4 Avanset and Dr. Marzano, they have specific roles and that
5 was what I was trying to clarify in the letter.

6 Because when we started working with Avanset
7 even before the hearing here or putting the plan together
8 here, it was very clear to us that if we want to maintain a
9 five-year accreditation with them, there are certain actions
10 that they can direct or else that won't happen in our school
11 district. We will not retain that. And so, they still are
12 able to direct very specific actions and evaluations in our
13 school district, just as Dr. Marzano will have control of
14 all the operations of the Laboratory School.

15 And our hope is that, we'll be able to learn
16 from that Laboratory School so that we can build capacity
17 across the whole district.

18 MS. RANKIN: So is your answer, the ultimate
19 responsibility for this plan is your local Board of
20 Education?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ultimately, the local
22 Board of Education is elected by our co- our community and
23 they've already voted unanimously to approve our plan. And
24 in that plan, that's where we have what we believe are
25 legitimate partners who have very, very real roles.

1 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member, Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
4 a couple of observations. One, I think it's also -- it's
5 always difficult to interpret the intent of the legislature
6 and I think you just periodically need to look at plain
7 reading the statutes.

8 The statute on this -- on this relative to
9 district says that, this board shall not allow a school
10 district or the institute, referring to the Charter School
11 Institute, to remain accredited with Priority Improvement
12 Plan or below, for longer than a total of five consecutive
13 years.

14 MALE SPEAKER: And I think, what they're --
15 what they're telling us beyond the plain reading of the
16 statute, is that, you know -- the kids who are in sixth
17 grade today, started and have been in this- they've been in
18 the school district from the beginning, have been in the
19 school district that is by any objective measure, a failing
20 school district. We don't- nobody likes the harsh use of the
21 term, that just happens to be a fact.

22 And the kids are going to graduate sometime
23 here, I would guess in this coming month, have been in this
24 situation since sixth grade. And what really shakes my
25 confidence, is that when we had the hearing, it was- and I-

1 I think, I made a reference to the 12-step program, if
2 you're going to solve a problem, you first got to admit you
3 have one.

4 And there didn't appear to be much admission
5 particularly on the part of the board, that there was a
6 problem. And there is certainly -- there is clearly a
7 problem.

8 There's no question that there's a problem.
9 But I don't think it -- I -- I don't know that this is true
10 of the management but clearly of the board, I characterize
11 their comments as almost a denial that they had a problem,
12 and I hope none of the taxpayers of that district were
13 paying any attention to that denial, because the evidence is
14 incontrovertible.

15 And so, if this problem is going to get
16 fixed, you know, it requires -- I think more important, the
17 first thing it requires is for the adults who were involved
18 in this, to give up something if necessary, for the benefit
19 of the children. Give up control, if in fact the management
20 plans and that's in place right now, and the ma- and the --
21 and the board that's in control can't seem to get the job
22 done.

23 Maybe it's time to -- for -- for them to --
24 to do a little self-reflection. So, I don't see that the
25 adults in the room are giving up very much. Now, will this

1 program work? That was put in front of us. Well it -- it
2 might. I hope so. But, I don't think it's the kind of
3 change necessary to ensure that things are going to be
4 better six years from now than they are today.

5 And so, that's why I made the first motion.
6 I'm sorry at lost because I think -- I think there are not
7 many, but I think there are several districts in the state
8 that -- that are in this spot, that it's -- it's really time
9 to try significantly different things. And whether or not
10 this is significantly different in this proposal, I guess
11 we'll find out. I'm going to vote against this -- the
12 motion, because I believe it's -- provides inadequate
13 protection for the children of the district.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Anybody else? Board member
15 Rank -- Mazanec? I'm sorry.

16 MS. MAZANEC: My concern is in -- seems to --
17 the plan seems to be that we look again through the survey.
18 We will -- we'll be deployed. We'll utilize data.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It turned you off,
20 automatically.

21 MS. MAZANEC: So, I'm a little concerned
22 about the lack of detail. And in -- in -- and in fact in
23 your plan, you -- your timeline seems to involve a lot of
24 gathering of data and analyzing data. It seems shocking to
25 me, after years of having knowing that things are wrong,



1 that now we're going to began to look at -- we're going to
2 begin collecting and begin to look at it. Do you have any
3 answer for that? I mean, do -- would you agree that you've
4 had years to do that, and it seems -- I'm not sure that it
5 serves your students, or your community to start now.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I don't think that
7 we're starting from scratch now. I think we had a four-year
8 mark of continual upward improvement. Currently, we do not
9 have any schools that are facing sanctions. It's the
10 district as a whole.

11 And so, the two partners we have, part of the
12 day that we want to take a look at now, so when we get the
13 latest results, that we just took tests, so we want to get
14 the latest results from those assessments, so that then when
15 we apply more intentional focus at particular schools that
16 had a bump last year, if those are still the same schools
17 that have the bump. That's where we want to be able to
18 apply particular -- particular intervention, if you will.

19 MS. MAZANEC: What I'm referring to is on
20 your pages 56 through 59. Year one, you're going to analyze,
21 your two and three, you're going to conduct follow up. Year
22 three, you're going to analyze and follow up. That's -- it
23 sounds like a lot of analysis, but not a lot of action.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I think we have a
25 lot of action. I -- I -- I respectfully don't agree with



1 that characterization at all.

2 MS. MAZANEC: So, tell me about the lot of
3 action you see happening.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think when Dr. Hurst
5 was here and Dr. Marzano at the last meeting, part of the --
6 the questioning that we got from the state board, that I
7 think they were attempting to ask him, we also tried to
8 answer my cover letter, is that the two partners will also
9 be working together. That part is different, because up to
10 now, it's been Dr. Marzano as an instructional partner along
11 the way.

12 But opening a lab school's are different
13 ballgame. As far as advance Ed goes, they're looking at the
14 entire system, and part of their role as partners is to be
15 able to analyze all of our data, make suggestions, make
16 recommendations, even direct, if necessary, different
17 interventions, so that as a whole system, not just school by
18 school, but certainly all of our schools, we move to a
19 better improvement category.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Board member
21 Rankin?

22 MS. RANKIN: Dr. Swanson, I just want to say
23 thank you for what you're -- you're doing. But again, our
24 focus here is on students and the parents. And I'm not
25 saying that yours isn't either. I'm just saying that our

1 job here is to follow the law, and direct what it is the
2 legislature told us to do. So, I just want to state it one
3 more time. Section 22-11-209 CRS: That a public or private
4 entity with the agreement of the school district, consent to
5 take over management of the school district, or management
6 of one or more of the district public schools.

7 So it -- I feel focus is directly on the
8 district. But with that said, I wish you the very best of
9 luck. I hope you are off this clock in one year. I would
10 love to see that happen. That's the direction. I -- I'm
11 really hoping for you. Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Any other questions? Ms.
14 Cordial, would you please call the roll.

15 MS. CORDIAL: And this is for board member,
16 McClellan. Yeah. Okay. Board member Durham?

17 MR. DURHAM: No.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores?

19 MS. FLORES: Yes.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff?

21 MS. GOFF: Yes.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

23 MS. MAZANEC: No.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

25 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

1 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

2 MS. RANKIN: No.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

5 MS. CORDIAL: The motion passes for the
6 three.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, all. Board members,
8 do you have any requests for future items to be on the
9 agenda? Any closing comments? My sincere thanks to staff
10 again for your incredible amount of work. Stay tuned till
11 June.

12 Guys, anything? All right. We'll hammer.

13 (Meeting adjourned)

14

15 C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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



1

2 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

3 Kimberly C. McCright

4 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

5

6 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

7 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

8 Houston, Texas 77058

9 281.724.8600

10

11

12

13

14