



Colorado State Board of Education

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

June 14, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 14, 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: My apologies. Thank you for
2 being patient and waiting. Behind schedule today.
3 Unintentional. The flight has been delayed. That's all I
4 can say. So the next item on our agenda is the recognition
5 of schools in Colorado's High Achieving Schools Study.
6 Commissioner, I'll turn it over to you.

7 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you. Today we are
8 pleased to be honoring schools from the High Achieving
9 Schools Study, and at this time, I will call Director Lynn
10 Bamberry forward to tell us a little bit about the awards.

11 MS. BAMBERRY: Thank you, Madam Chair, and
12 Members of the Board. Today we're going to honor schools
13 from the High Achieving Schools Study. In 2014 --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Lynn?

15 MS. BAMBERRY: Are we not on? No. People
16 have started coming on. All right. In 2014, the unit of
17 Federal Programs, in collaboration with the Exceptional
18 Student Services Unit, conducted a rigorous study of high-
19 achieving schools to identify and document the practices
20 that have contributed to the school's overall performance
21 and to the performance of the school's dis-aggregated
22 groups, particularly English language learners and students
23 with disabilities.

24 In order to be chosen for the study, these
25 schools demonstrate academic achievement results meeting the



1 following criteria: achieve a percentage of proficient
2 advanced in reading and math over the 60th percentile marker
3 for the state for at least four dis-aggregated groups. The
4 school performance framework at the performance level have
5 earned and exceeds or meets on academic achievement
6 indicator and have a poverty rate of over 10 percent.
7 Findings are disseminated to the field that highlight the
8 effective practices that have been or could be supported and
9 replicated in other schools with federal funding, ESSA or
10 IDEA. In addition, grant funds were put into a grant
11 program called Connect for Success to replicate the
12 practices documented in the high-achieving schools in
13 struggling Title I schools.

14 The schools that are here today have opened
15 their doors to 28 low-achieving, high Title I sites to come
16 view their effective practices and have participated in
17 networking days to talk about not only what works, but how
18 to make it work. And I can't tell you how much we
19 appreciate and them letting us crash the buildings and talk
20 to everyone from teachers, parents, paras, district
21 personnel over a three-year period and their willingness to
22 share their practices, commitment, and time to increase
23 achievement in all of the schools throughout the state.

24

25

So in



1 appreciation, once we're done, we have a certificate and a
2 banner for you, and I would like to introduce each of the
3 applicants to come talk to you. So we'll have Roberta
4 Ballard from Canyon Creek Elementary in Cherry Creek School
5 District. Christina Hendricks from Tavelli Elementary in
6 Poudre School District. Loren Huwa from South Lakewood
7 Elementary in Jeffco. Kelli O'Neil from Soaring Eagles in
8 Harrison 2, and Kerin McClure who's representing Janis
9 Hughes since Janis is out cruising from Burlington
10 Elementary and St. Vrain. So Roberta if you'd like to
11 start.

12 MS. BALLARD: So I'd just like to say that I
13 am so honored when they announced our school to be awarded.
14 And it was a wonderful experience to have them come in and
15 talk with our families and with our students and with our
16 teachers, just to find out what it is we were doing at
17 Canyon Creek to make a difference for students every day.
18 And I have the unfortunate but also fortunate peace to go
19 and transfer to a new school, and so I've been at Arrowhead
20 Elementary for the past two years. But what I feel
21 fortunate is to be able to take that information from the
22 study to my new school and be able to replicate some of the
23 things that I've learned from the other schools involved as
24 well, which has been wonderful for me as a principal to
25 connect with principals from across the state, and take that



1 information and be able to use it towards the students that
2 I have at Arrowhead Elementary. So I'm just honored to be
3 here, and I appreciate being part of this continued support
4 for us as principals. So thank you.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

6 (Applause)

7 MS. HENDRICKS: I'm Christine Hendricks,
8 principal at Tavelli Elementary in Fort Collins. I've had
9 the honor of hosting probably 20 schools that have been part
10 of this Connect for Success, and it is the most delightful
11 experience. And I hope it's delightful for them as it is
12 for us, because we learned so much in having that dialogue
13 and that conversation with them and talking about our
14 structures. And our teachers are so proud, because it's
15 affirming to them of the hard work that they're doing, and
16 it's really great opportunity for them to kind of celebrate
17 their successes that they've experienced. And also for us
18 to talk to them about, these are things that we still need
19 to work on. And we learn from each other, even the schools
20 that may be struggling a little bit. They have a lot of
21 great things going on. So we try to be their cheerleader
22 and give them the ideas and the ideas to help support them.
23 So it's really been quite an honor and a great experience
24 for our school and for me personally. So thank you for that



1 Lynn and everybody else. And it's just been a pleasure.

2 Thank you.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

4 (Applause)

5 MR. HUWA: Good afternoon. I'm Loren Huwa,
6 I'm the principal at South Lakewood Elementary in Jeffco.
7 And I'd like to thank the CDE and the Board for their
8 recognition of this award. It was just a few short years
9 ago that my school was a low-performing school. It was, and
10 our SPF came across, and we were a needs-improvement school.
11 And with the work and hard work of dedicated staff members,
12 we were able to turn that around and able to share this now
13 with the folks coming in for the CDE grant and working with
14 them. And also in working with them, we were able to refine
15 our practices to bring even more to our students. So it's
16 been a learning experience for them, but it's also been a
17 great experience working with these folks here and these
18 other schools. It's been a great experience in bringing
19 about opportunities for my kids, too. But thank you very
20 much.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

22 (Applause)

23 MS. O'NEIL: I'm Kelli O'Neil, and I have
24 with me today Kim Easdon and Jen Locke. They've been with
25 me a combined total of 27 years, so it's -- I feel very



1 fortunate to have such an incredibly dedicated team. I
2 actually want to stop and thank the Connect for Success
3 group and the State Department of Education. I think you
4 guys got it right. To see is to believe. And you allowed
5 schools that were struggling a chance to go out and see what
6 it could be like and to start dreaming about making changes
7 in their building. And to have schools come in, in the
8 morning, they spend all day with you, and the first thing
9 you see is closed body language, and they start blocking,
10 you know. And by the end of the day, they've began to dream
11 about how they can make changes in their school, because
12 what they see is there's no magic bullet. It's processes.
13 It's quality teaching, it's aligned curriculum, it's
14 research best practices, and everyone is doing the same
15 thing. And I think by the end of the day, they all realize
16 that could be them. And so it's very exciting. Thank you
17 very much for honoring us today.

18 (Applause)

19 MS. MCCLURE: Hi. My name is Kerin McClure,
20 and I am very fortunate to be the principal of Burlington
21 Elementary School. What more could you ask for as a
22 principal than to inherit a high-achieving school? So every
23 day, I see those practices in action. I've been part of St.
24 Vrain Valley Schools for close to 15 years, and Burlington's
25 reputation is well-known there. So I want to thank you very



1 much for allowing us to shine our light a little bit
2 brighter to a wider audience.

3 I also want to thank our school district that
4 has really supported innovation, and the work's not over.
5 We continue with that. And I would also like to share with
6 you that Janis Hughes, who has been the principal at
7 Burlington prior to me for 23 years, is on a vacation in the
8 Baltic. Well-deserved. Although I will tell you that she
9 texted me on my drive here, and we have a videotaped message
10 from her for you to see. So if you could play that first,
11 that would be great. And thank you so much.

12 (Applause)

13 MS. HUGHES: (Inaudible) and Members of the
14 Colorado State Board of Education for recognizing the
15 Burlington Elementary School community's focus on academic
16 achievement success for all of our students. We
17 accomplished these results through strong, consistent
18 collaboration, in our trust in each other, and in the fact
19 that we know that we can and will make a difference for each
20 and every one of our students. I wish I could be there with
21 you today, but on behalf of our Burlington staff, our
22 Burlington parents, and our students, Kerin and I accept
23 this honor.

24 (Applause)



1 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you so much. We commend
2 you for your dedication to sharing your practices with other
3 schools in the state to increase student achievement and
4 inspiring other schools to reach higher levels of
5 performance. Please join me again in honoring our high-
6 achieving schools.

7 (Applause)

8 MADAM CHAIR: When I call each of you up,
9 please come forward to have your photo taken with the
10 commissioner and your representative Board Member. Thank
11 you. First of all, Darryl Sigman, Canyon Creek Elementary.

12 (Pause)

13 UNKNOWN VOICE: Case Number 17-AR-09. Public
14 testimony will not be heard at this time. However,
15 department staff, district staff, and legal counsel are
16 available to only answer any final questions we may have.
17 Neither the department nor district may provide any
18 additional information unless requested by the state board.
19 Colleagues, do you have any questions?

20 (Pause)

21 You're on -- you are on the air right now.
22 Those that are on the telephone, you are on the air. Do we
23 have any, questions from the Board? Discussion? Concerns?

24 MADAM CHAIR: That's interesting.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have something?



1 MADAM CHAIR: No.

2 MADAM CHAIR: We're waiting for someone to
3 have a question or a discussion.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to start?

5 MS. GOFF: I just want to say something.

6 MADAM CHAIR: For the discussion, please do.

7 MS. GOFF: I just want to...

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff?

9 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I would like to
10 acknowledge the work of staff and the people in the Huerfano
11 District. I think this is something that we had -- I'm
12 speaking for myself, but I want to express I felt very
13 comfortable when we finished the hearing, and we had had the
14 discussion. And it was incumbent on the parties at that
15 time, the department and the district to work together to
16 come up with this plan. And I do think that for that unique
17 context that they came away with this as something that
18 looks promising. And we really do -- I feel good. I feel
19 confident that this will be on the road, down the road to a
20 good place for everybody. Thank you.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec?

22 MS. MAZANEC: It doesn't happen very often,
23 but I agree with Director Goff.

24 MS. GOFF: It does too happen.



1 MS. MAZANEC: No. I really -- I want to
2 commend the work done by staff of course but particularly,
3 Huerfano School district. I think they were very proactive,
4 have taken this seriously for a very long time. So I think
5 I'm very impressed with the work, and I am very hopeful that
6 it's going to make a big difference.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comments? Do I have
8 a motion, please?

9 MS. MAZANEC: I move to approve. You need it
10 to be --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Get your stuff --

12 MS. MAZANEC: Director McClellan has it. She
13 can move.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

15 MS. MCLELLAN: I move to approve the final
16 written determination as proposed by the department and
17 district to direct Peak View School to implement its pathway
18 proposal for its external management agreement with
19 Generation Schools Network as filed with the State Board of
20 Education on June 6, 2017.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Do I have a second?

22 MS. MAZANEC: I second it.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Vote, please.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham?

25 MR. DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

2 MS. FLORES: Yes.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

4 MS. GOFF: Yes.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

6 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan?

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

9 MS CORIDAL: Board Member Rankin?

10 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Oh, I see. We failed to

13 read another piece. It shouldn't change anything. But

14 within 30 days of receiving a copy of the written final

15 determination, the district or institute shall agree to

16 implement the directed action pursuant to terms to be

17 specified in a revised version of the accreditation

18 contract. Signed copy -- copies of the revised contract

19 will be made available to both parties. Thank you very

20 much.

21 MS. RANKIN: Do we need to get them off the

22 line, MS. Cordial?

23 MS CORDIAL: Oh, yep.



1 MS. RANKIN: And I want to thank Peak View
2 for listening in, and congratulations and best of luck.
3 This is Joyce Rankin from your district.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thanks, State Board.

5 BOARD: You're welcome.

6 (Pause)

7 MADAM CHAIR: Next item, the Board will now
8 consider and adopt final written determinations for the
9 accountability recommendations concerning Bessemer
10 Elementary, Heroes Middle School, and Risley International
11 Academy of Innovation. Case number 17-AR-06. Public
12 testimony will not be heard at this time. However, the
13 department staff, district staff, and legal counsel are
14 available only to answer any final questions we may have.
15 Neither the department nor district may provide additional
16 information unless requested by the State Board. And I
17 should ask Pueblo folks to come forward, because I believe
18 we probably will have some questions.

19 (Pause)

20 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues, questions?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have some. So in
22 reading about all three schools in the district itself, I'm
23 seeing an awful lot of turnover. So -- and there's no -- I
24 didn't find any explanations for the turnover. How are we
25 assured that this isn't a pretty constant activity in Pueblo



1 Schools, whether it's for these three schools or in central
2 administration?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you for the question.
4 Chairwoman Schroeder and Commissioner Anthes and Members of
5 the Board of Education, we -- it is true that we have had
6 some turnover, both in leadership and both with teachers
7 with -- within the three schools. We have worked very hard
8 to ensure that we have principals in place at the three
9 schools. We have one more to hire at one of our schools,
10 but we are confident that we have leaders that possess the
11 turnaround competencies to move the schools forward. Even
12 just in the last six weeks since the last time that we were
13 here, we have hired people at the central administration
14 that we feel very confident in.

15 I would like to introduce you to MS. Suzanne
16 Morie, who has significant experience in turnaround and
17 significant experience in instruction, and she will serve as
18 my Assistant Superintendent. And so we also have had some
19 hiring in terms of central administration. We have hired a
20 continuous -- Executive Director of Continuous Improvement
21 and Innovation, and that is MR. Ted Johnson. And he also
22 has extensive experience in turnaround and has worked
23 collaboratively with Colorado Department of Education.

24 And so we really feel confident that we are
25 building our team. It is true that our team has been in



1 transition over the last year. But we feel confident that
2 moving into next school year that we have built the
3 appropriate team needed to advance our organization both at
4 the school level and the district level.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Except you didn't answer my
6 question. Have you done an analysis as to why you have the
7 level of turnover that you have in your district?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think one of the
9 contributing factors is the fact that our schools are in
10 turn around. That they are high poverty. There was some
11 uncertainty in regard to what was the status of our schools,
12 quite frankly, in regard to the management partnership,
13 moving towards innovation, and so forth. So that actually
14 contributed to a little instability within the staff. As we
15 move forthwith, innovation, the -- two of the schools voted
16 predominantly in favor of the going towards innovation, and
17 those staff members within the school that didn't agree with
18 that did have -- we did execute an optout process. So some
19 staff changes results because of that method and that
20 process.

21 MADAM CHAIR: So you moved teachers in order
22 to bring in teachers who supported innovation? Did I
23 understand what you meant?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have a staff
25 commitment form, and so we're very clear going into an



1 innovation school that these -- this is how we're going to
2 operate from this point forward. And so we're very clear
3 about those high expectations and those commitments. And so
4 we do give staff an opportunity to opt out if they are not
5 committed to advancing the innovation plan, yes.

6 MADAM CHAIR: In all three schools?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The process at Bessemer
8 and Heroes happened recently. The process that --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, it was already --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was already in place
11 previously.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Pardon me. You're right.
13 You're right. So 90 percent is a lot of teachers. Did they
14 stay in the district and go elsewhere?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, 90 percent was in
16 favor.

17 MADAM CHAIR: No, no. Ninety percent of the
18 turnover in one -- in Bessemer. It really is Bessemer that
19 had 90 percent turnover?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not to my knowledge.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Oh. Then I misread that.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, 90 percent of the
23 staff was in favor of moving --

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. That's why that didn't
25 make any sense. (Inaudible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That would be very
2 concerning.

3 MADAM CHAIR: It was, but I can't read, so I
4 am -- I have a reading deficiency. I looked at your
5 schedule, your daily schedule that you have available. But
6 then, I also read that -- and it's fairly compact in that
7 you've got PLC in the morning, but then everything else, I'm
8 pretty sure, is about student contact? You know, I couldn't
9 figure out how once a week you would have all teacher
10 meetings in the school. I got a little -- I've been trying
11 to figure out your scheduling. How are you different from
12 the rest? How are your -- these schools different from the
13 rest of the calendars in the district? And then, how do you
14 actually manage all the time together among teachers given
15 that you've extended the learning for kids?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Would you like to
17 --

18 MS. MORIE: Sure.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- respond to that?

20 MS. MORIE: Sure. Madam Chair Schroeder and
21 Commissioner Anthes, Members of the Board, I'm Suzanne
22 Morie, I am the newly hired, very excited to be hired and
23 working in Pueblo, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and
24 Learning Services. And to answer your question



1 specifically, I think you're talking about Bessemer's plans
2 specifically.

3 And so at the beginning of the school day,
4 every single teacher has an opportunity for a PLC for 45
5 minutes, but there's also the opportunity, since everybody
6 has that time at the same time, to come together as a whole
7 staff as necessary, to come together vertically as well as
8 horizontally. And so that time is there for -- to serve a
9 variety of different purposes, and to be scheduled out as
10 needed. And so then --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

12 MS. MORIE: -- you are correct. The rest of
13 the time is focused on student contact time, both
14 intervention time, as well as very specific segments of time
15 for extended literacy blocks, extended math blocks, as well
16 as the enrichment and the integrated science and social
17 studies that align with their instructional programming.

18 MADAM CHAIR: And then at the elementary
19 school level, students -- I'm sorry, teachers don't actually
20 have a free period as such, or do they?

21 MS. MORIE: So they have time off during
22 specials, during their arts sections. And in fact, at
23 Bessemer, their -- one time a week, they were strategic in
24 their scheduling to also schedule an additional technology
25 time that aligned with their STEM programming. And so one



1 day a week, they'll actually have a double block of time for
2 extended planning time and collaborative planning time with
3 their pleasurable team.

4 MADAM CHAIR: And mentoring time?

5 MS. MORIE: Correct.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

7 MS. MORIE: Yes.

8 MADAM CHAIR: That's pretty tense scheduling.
9 How do you plan to expand parent engagement in your schools,
10 all three of them? There's very little in your materials to
11 process that.

12 MS. MORIE: So I appreciate that feedback.
13 From CDE, we did receive some very specific and helpful
14 comments last night in the rubric response, and I did
15 certainly notice that parent engagement piece. I think
16 there are pieces that are outlined in the innovation plan
17 specifically. So for example, I know STEM has different
18 evening activities where they bring the teachers in as more
19 of a student celebration of the work that they're doing and
20 that sort of thing. I know they have an accountability
21 board, and they were actually very excited because they have
22 now -- they've struggled to get parent engagement. And they
23 now, because of the innovation plan and working that process
24 with all the stakeholders, they have some parents who were



1 really interested in being on the accountability committee
2 going into next year.

3 So I think that you'll see improvement there.
4 But I also think it was feedback well-taken to bring back to
5 their team and their school-based accountability to add some
6 additional measures in that area. So legitimate feedback.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are Title I
8 schools, and they do have unified school improvement plans,
9 and so they are required under Title I to provide outreach
10 for parents according -- around standards or the
11 instructional practices that are at the school. The schools
12 are really focusing on an advocacy piece. How to talk to
13 parents and engage parents in terms of how do they advocate
14 for their students, the importance of attendance, monitoring
15 grades, and so forth.

16 MADAM CHAIR: So MS. Sanchez, in general,
17 what sort of outreach do you have as a Board to the overall
18 district to ensure that you have high levels of engagement
19 from your community?

20 MS. SANCHEZ: Well, one of the things that we
21 did definitely with these schools particularly, I mean, we
22 have done some town hall meetings in the past, where we're
23 doing them in quadrants, talking about specific things. But
24 with these three schools, we actually, the Board did attend
25 parent meetings. And so I think that when you start talking



1 about changes in a school or any kind of changes that might
2 happen with staff or curriculum, we actually, Bessemer had a
3 very high turnout of parents who came and were engaged and
4 actually talked to the Board about, you know, they want to
5 become more engaged, they want to keep their school, they
6 want to see their kids do well. So I think that, in
7 retrospect, that actually was a catalyst for parents to
8 become more involved and be -- truly become stakeholders in
9 what's happening rather than spectators.

10 So that was something that we initiated with
11 these plans were actual meetings in their school communities
12 in which either the entire Board or most of the Board
13 attended those evening meetings, to hear comments from
14 parents, to take questions, and to listen to their concerns.
15 And many of them did contact the Board. So I -- as I said,
16 I think that, even that is something that seemed very
17 difficult for those school communities, I think it was a
18 catalyst for that engagement and recognizing the fact that
19 we parents have to be our partners in the success in what
20 happens, and we need to be able to support that.

21 MADAM CHAIR: And what are your plans for
22 sustaining that now you got them?

23 MS. SANCHEZ: Well, they were part of the
24 plan, and our plan is to keep going back and talking about
25 the progress, you know, very regularly. And talking about



1 what's working, what's not working, get their perspective on
2 what's happening because these plans, they will continue to
3 be engaged as stakeholders and not be -- our goal is not to
4 lose them in that probability, because Bessemer was probably
5 one of the lowest parent engagement schools, and it turned
6 out to be the school that had the highest parent engagement.

7 So I think that what we learned from that is
8 that parents, we need to work with them, we need to talk to
9 them about all of the things that MS. Morie discussed, in
10 the fact that, you know, how we can become better partners
11 and what their role can be, especially in that advocacy
12 piece, because I think a lot of times, what happens in
13 poverty areas is parents distrust schools to do the right
14 thing. But they also need to advocate and ask questions of
15 us and hold us accountable.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think what was very
17 evident in listening tour is that there is a need for
18 additional education around accountability, and the
19 pathways, and so forth. And so as we continue with the
20 innovation plan, there needs to be that ongoing conversation
21 to bring our stakeholders in, to continue to educate them in
22 the process and and what, you know, what we're doing, what
23 the plans look like, how we're executing that. How we're
24 monitoring the effectiveness, our success and you know, the



1 needs and so forth. So definitely a need for ongoing
2 conversation.

3 MS. SANCHEZ: And I think another good part
4 of that was really, I think, the comprehension of the
5 partnership. That we're not working in isolation as a
6 district, or as a school building, or as parents. But this
7 really is, you know, a collaborative partnership. And we
8 are all partners in seeing their children succeed. I think
9 that was a big message I think that parents felt was
10 important to hear.

11 MADAM CHAIR: So you use the term monitoring.
12 So I -- we have received the same thing that you all
13 received and have had absolutely no time to look at it. But
14 there are some -- certainly things that jump out, and one of
15 them is the lack of a clear monitoring plan at this point.

16 MS. MORIE: So I would really like to address
17 that. In the management plans, in each of the management
18 plans, there actually is, I think, a pretty well-articulated
19 monitoring plan. So for example, monthly, there will be
20 monthly walk throughs at each of the schools that will be a
21 combination of myself, the principal manager, the executive
22 director who coaches the principal weekly in the building
23 and a commitment to that, our ANet partners, and a walk
24 through to monitor the progress month, to month, to month.
25 Each quarter, there is a written report that is



1 collaboratively written with our management partner, with
2 ANet, that will be distributed to our Board of Education, to
3 the schools, so that they can share it with their
4 communities, both their staff and school communities, as
5 well as the larger parent community. And it's also going to
6 be sent to CDE, so that's quarterly.

7 And so there's a pretty tight monitoring,
8 and the understanding is that it's not just monitoring
9 progress, but it's also course correction. And I've already
10 even had a conversation with our -- with the principal
11 supervisor around their work in supporting the principal
12 month-to-month with the implementation of the next steps.
13 The voice around it, the accountability around it,
14 especially if it's going to be a shift in practice or
15 whatever, those decisions are made. And so in that way,
16 there is a pretty tight accountability and monitoring of the
17 goals that are set along the way with an opportunity to make
18 changes as needed.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Is your ANet representative
20 here with you today?

21 MS. MORIE: Yes. We have two ANet leads who
22 will be serving our schools, and I'd love to bring them up
23 to the table at this point if you have questions for them.

24 MADAM CHAIR: We'd love to ask them some
25 questions. Thank you.



1 MS. MORIE: As they're walking up, what I
2 would like to share is that both of these leaders have
3 experience in turnaround, and they both have worked with our
4 district before. And we feel that's one of the, the
5 strengths of this particular management partnership decision
6 is that we can build off of some strengths that have already
7 been established in relationships.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Let me pass this over to
9 MS. Rankin, I don't want to --

10 MS. RANKIN: Welcome. I have a couple of
11 questions but not specifically for you at this particular
12 point. I want to ask CDE a question. What is the fourth
13 grade reading scores, proficiency in reading? I'm sorry.
14 Fourth grade proficiency of reading percentage wise in
15 Bessemer Elementary School?

16 (Pause)

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want to ask
18 another question and then we'll follow up, or do you want to
19 wait? Sorry. You're asking a harder question from where
20 the data is hidden.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Board Member Mazanec.

22 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question, what was --
23 excuse me, I did not write down your name. What was your
24 name?



1 MS. MORIE: And I may not even said it. My
2 name is Suzanne Morie.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I think you did say it. And
4 then when I heard Morie, I wasn't sure if that was short for
5 Mooreen or something else. I didn't write down your names.
6 Can you tell us a little bit about your background, and how
7 long have you been with the district?

8 MS. MORIE: So this is my fourth week with
9 the district. So I really -- I was present in this board
10 room at your last meeting on April 24. That was before I
11 was officially hired. But knowing that I was very
12 interested in the position, I just attended as an audience
13 member. And so I've been following the needs and requests
14 from the Board of Education, what was needed.

15 My background is that I have been a principal
16 at all three levels. So elementary, middle, and high school
17 levels, particularly in turnaround schools. I was a
18 turnaround principal, for example, at McGlone Elementary in
19 Denver. When we started the DSSN in Denver, McGlone has
20 been quite successful, and we were able, in two years, to
21 get out of turnaround there, and in fact, even Secretary
22 Arne Duncan came and recognized us for being a successful
23 turnaround school.

24 My first principalship was actually in Aurora
25 Public Schools. I was at Crawford Elementary. At that



1 time, the school was identified as a corrective action
2 school and ended up receiving the Governor's Award for
3 significant improvement, and was able to get that school out
4 of corrective action.

5 So my boss had district-level experience in
6 training leaders and instructional leaders, deans of
7 instruction, as well as principals and supporting curriculum
8 efforts as well. So that's my background.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How is it going?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I got it. Sorry for the
11 delay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I'm ready. It only
13 took one (...?).

14 MS. MORIE: So in 2016, Bessemer fourth
15 graders in English Language Arts, there is 22 percent of
16 students met or exceeded the expectations with 100 percent
17 participation.

18 MS. RANKIN: So 22 percent were proficient in
19 reading?

20 MS. MORIE: Yeah. That level four or five.

21 MS. RANKIN: And I wanted to bring that to
22 light. It's been a question of mine. Twenty-two percent is
23 kind of low. However, in 1997, 12 percent of the fourth
24 graders at Bessemer Elementary School were proficient in
25 reading. It was lowest in the state.



1 We have a great example of evidence-based
2 learning here. Evidence-based learning comes up 60 times in
3 ESSA. Actually, it's more than 60 times, from the article
4 you gave me. Evidence-based programs, under the right
5 leadership will change reading and math scores for students.
6 Unfortunately, we never have a direct correlation between
7 evidence-based programs with exactly the same student
8 environment and culture until now.

9 Again, 1997, 12 percent of the fourth graders
10 were proficient in reading, lowest in the state. They
11 brought in a program called Lindamood-Bell learning program.
12 It included teacher development, stakeholder support,
13 administrative leadership, and district support.

14 The academic achievement scores improved in
15 three years. From 1997 to 2000, the scores went from 12
16 percent proficient in reading to 80 percent proficiency.
17 State average that year was 60 percent. Bessemer was
18 highlighted nationally for their success.

19 I believe this could have been repeated. I
20 was wondering, why we didn't try this program again? Was it
21 even in the offering? And I have to say, I'm not convinced
22 that the program that was presented to us is going to make
23 that dramatic change, and especially change takes time, and
24 this was three years that we saw this dramatic improvement,
25 and it was in the past. History can repeat itself.



1 I'm not quite sure that dramatic change
2 required by the Board to make these decisions from 2009
3 legislature --legislators is in this program we currently
4 have.

5 The outside management here, to me, needs to
6 be the ultimate decision maker. It's that outside
7 management that turned Bessemer Elementary School around
8 before, and I feel it might do it this time, even though
9 it's not the Lindamood-Bell program, but I'm not sure why we
10 haven't tried that. I think we've got to focus again on the
11 students in Pueblo. I'm very concerned about the students.
12 I always have been. I brought this up numerous times. But
13 we have to make dramatic change in management, and that is
14 the direction that our last meeting, we were voting for and
15 we're pulling for it. I think we need to work on that a
16 little bit more. And I just wanted to bring this to light.
17 Thank you for those scores, CDE. Thanks for the work that
18 you do.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec, did you
20 lead me to believe you had some more questions?

21 MS. MAZANEC: I do. I would like to ask some
22 questions of the management partner, we're calling you so
23 far. Do you feel able and willing to take over the
24 management of all three schools?



1 MS. DIECK: Yes. My name is Catherine Dieck.
2 I'm an executive director of our Colorado network. And I do
3 because of our continuation of our collaboration, because we
4 have been working successfully with schools, including
5 Risley being one of them -- and Heroes this year. I feel
6 very confident because of our established relationship and
7 collaboration, we are able to take it over, in a sense,
8 where we'd see change.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Well, you have some more?

11 MS. MAZANEC: One more question. It doesn't
12 look like Pueblo's latest proposal includes that the
13 management company would be in charge. Is it your wish that
14 you still collaborate and make decisions together, or did --
15 the district would still be in charge, have the final say?

16 MS. DIECK: So within the management plan
17 that we are -- that we have submitted, really outlines a
18 partnership, and we have really identified the matrix in
19 regard to the decision-making around the various operational
20 elements and structures with -- within the school. And so
21 I'm not sure what page that is. On page 68 of the
22 management plan clearly articulates the various decision-
23 making, whether it's collaborative or --

24 MADAM CHAIR: 64 through 66.



1 MS. DIECK: Yes. Or whether it lies with the
2 management partnership. But clearly, it's a collaboration
3 and a partnership from our view.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Well --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can speak more --

6 MS. MAZANEC: So --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- about that if --

8 MS. MAZANEC: So I'm a small business owner,
9 and my attorney always said you can't have a 50-50
10 partnership. Somebody has to be able to be the tiebreaker.
11 So that's my concern here. I think we discussed it the last
12 time you were before us and somebody has to be the
13 tiebreaker, and that's why I asked. I think that it's
14 important that a management partner who is maybe a little
15 more objective be the tiebreaker in this case. Did -- go
16 ahead.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you want to speak to
18 that a little bit?

19 MS. MORIE: Sure. So ANet leaders and myself
20 and our schools spent quite a bit of time talking through
21 all the different systems that would be in place in a school
22 and identifying the specific decision areas that would need
23 to be made. and then in any area that ANet is providing
24 direct support to us, who -- and who would be the final



1 decision-making authority if there could not be an agreed
2 upon decision collaboratively.

3 And so for each of the areas -- and this is
4 where the matrix comes in -- for each of the areas, we
5 identified either ANet would have final decision-making in
6 that area, or the district school would have final decision-
7 making? And this is again, if we couldn't collaborate on
8 the final decision. or in the event that this -- that you
9 see X's in both of the columns, if we couldn't agree, then
10 the final decision-making authority would go to our
11 superintendent.

12 We were very thoughtful about where we put
13 these X's and why some were collaborative as opposed to just
14 giving ANet final authority. We really wanted to respect
15 the integrity of the innovation plans and the stakeholders
16 who voted on them, and the autonomies that innovation plans
17 do provide to schools to make school-based decisions for
18 their stakeholders, and the waivers that were approved. And
19 so if it was something very specific to a waiver, for
20 example, we made sure that that was a collaborative
21 decision. And it was out of respect for the innovation plan
22 and the stakeholders who voted that plan in.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

24 MS. FLORES: I mean, that -- that's -- I
25 would tend to agree with you except when you're looking at



1 innovation, which in a sense is different, it's a new look,
2 it's a new path that the school is taking, and then you have
3 a management plan. I mean, a management company that really
4 is -- I mean, you're paying the money to have them devote
5 the time for that path and that plan, so it's almost as if
6 for the worth -- worth the money to kind of allow them to
7 help you kind of look in a different way, a fresh way,
8 through the school.

9 It was that last question that was asked and
10 how you answer that kind of led me through -- to thinking
11 this because my question was going to be on curriculum, and
12 I'm still going to ask that question. But I -- I'm just
13 wondering whether you could just mull in your mind a little
14 bit more of why you brought in this management company. And
15 think about, you know, the newness of kind of seeing it that
16 way.

17 I'll go into my curriculum. Are you -- and
18 I'll ask this of the management company. Are you thinking
19 of a curriculum? Have you discussed a curriculum, and would
20 you share that with us?

21 MS DIECK: So at this time, we would be
22 honoring the schools and the curriculum offered them
23 currently at the schools. In our role as the management
24 partner, we would be looking at how to deepen teachers'
25 understanding of that particular curriculum.



1 MS. FLORES: And so what is the curriculum?

2 MS. DIECK: The curriculum. (Inaudible) .

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, so so I know that
4 Bessemer is a STEM school so there is some curriculum that's
5 very specific to that. Journeys, for example, is the
6 elementary reading curriculum. But again, curriculum is a
7 resource, and it's not the only end sole -- and sole -- and
8 resource. We need to make sure that our teachers understand
9 the standards and they understand the students in front of
10 them.

11 MS. FLORES: Well, we -- you would hope.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then select and make
13 strategic decisions around the use of the curriculum that is
14 best going to support the grouping of students and so forth,
15 in attainment and progress toward the standards.

16 And so again, we are using the investment
17 case. For example, we're using the district reading
18 curriculum as the base curriculum. But that is something
19 that as they go on and they see, "Oh, we have some holes in
20 our curriculum. Do we want to suggest a change in
21 collaboration with ANet," that would be -- that would be
22 part of the ongoing discussion and progress monitoring of
23 success.

24 MS. FLORES: Okay. So that would be an open
25 kind of discussion. But you're not going to look at the --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If it came up as a need.

2 MS. FLORES: You haven't had success. No,
3 remember, you haven't had success with the curriculum. So
4 you're going to look at it in a fresh, new way. And I was
5 thinking that the curriculum that you chose would have
6 embedded in it the standards, the state standards that are
7 there and probably, you know, that's...

8 MS. DIECK: Sure. It absolutely is aligned.
9 We -- the Journeys -- Houghton Mifflin is aligned to the
10 state's standards. ANet provides us an opportunity to dig
11 deeper into the standards for teachers to have a deep
12 understanding of the standards and then how to effectively
13 deliver quality instruction as a result of that. So the
14 curriculum resources are merely a resource, and then
15 identifying what is the highest leverage standards to teach
16 it at what time, the schedule of assess standards and so
17 forth.

18 MS. FLORES: So am I correct to think that
19 it's a STEM program that's Houghton Mifflin is responsible
20 for that includes the standards, that those standards are
21 embedded?

22 MS. DIECK: The curriculum resources are
23 aligned to the standards, yes.

24 MS. FLORES: Very good. Thank you.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.



1 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair, and just
2 a couple questions for the ANet people. Tell me a little
3 bit about your company. How big is it? How many employees?
4 How many states are you doing business? Gross revenues if
5 you know it off top your head, that sort of thing.

6 MS. BRINKMAN: I think I can answer some of
7 those. My name is Laura Brinkman, and I serve as our
8 regional director of new partnerships with the Achievement
9 Network. Our organization, we are 11 years old. We were
10 founded by educators for educators back in Boston 11 years
11 ago. We currently support over 700 schools across the
12 nation. Our work in Colorado began four years ago with a
13 very small pilot in Denver Public Schools with four schools.
14 And we have now -- we're the fastest-growing network in our
15 organization. This year, we've had over 100 partners, and
16 next year we're going to land in -- at around -- like,
17 around 50, 60 partners here in the state.

18 I don't know our gross revenue. I don't know
19 those numbers. We are, you know, we're in -- we're a
20 nonprofit. We obviously still have to make money, right,
21 but we don't come at it from the way we judge our impact.
22 We're obsessed with student outcomes and teacher outcomes
23 and district outcomes. So we position ourselves that that's
24 the bottom line we pay the most attention to the impact that
25 we're having.



1 Our impact that we have across the nation
2 we're very proud of. Three years ago we did a very in-depth
3 study, part of the Harvard i3 work and in that work is where
4 we have really deeply codified the practices that we have in
5 support of our schools. So what we have found is that where
6 we have these more intensive partnerships, and we have more
7 intensive what we call system support, which is part of what
8 -- which is what this management plan is grounded in -- that
9 these are these -- the areas where we're seeing very rapid
10 results, much like the results that were pointed out earlier
11 back in 1997 with the Bessemer work, to see that kind of
12 work happened in a three-year period of time.

13 What our data shows is that where our schools
14 have -- where the partnership has led to what we call level
15 two, where we are seeing those students have six to eight
16 months additional learning in that year. So those are the
17 schools where we're closing the gap across the nation. We
18 have those kind of results very deliberately in
19 Massachusetts and some of our work in Illinois. And that's
20 the kind of planning we're bringing forward with this. So I
21 don't know our gross revenue. And as far as employees in
22 our organization --

23 MS. DIECK: One hundred fifty-six.



1 MS. BRINKMAN: Oh, 156 employees in our
2 organization, I just had the -- Kathryn Dieck whispered
3 that in my ear. So --

4 MR. DURHAM: That's a pretty tight estimate,
5 yeah.

6 MS. BRINKMAN: That -- I know. That was
7 really good, wasn't it?

8 MR. DURHAM: That's very good. So can you
9 describe your -- what you believe is the ideal relationship
10 between your company in a school district that is -- in
11 having some degree of problem?

12 MS. DIECK: Sure. You want me to do that?

13 MS. BRINKMAN: Sure

14 MS. DIECK: Yeah. I think the ideal
15 relationship -- and I'm going to answer this from the
16 perspective that I also had when I worked in Denver Public
17 Schools. I was instructional superintendent there, and ANet
18 was a partner, and I think the ideal relationship started
19 with trust. We had a lot of relational trust. We were --
20 you have to be vulnerable, so being vulnerable with each
21 other about what has -- what hasn't worked and and being
22 able to face a lot of hard facts together. I think it's
23 also a perfect relationship when you're willing to really
24 look at equity, and you're really willing to look very
25 deeply at the students in your school district and schools



1 that aren't being served and having those honest
2 conversations. So I think it's ideally a lot of relational
3 trust, ability to -- you want to be honest, you want to be
4 vulnerable --

5 MR. DURHAM: Let me interrupt you. That's --
6 those are a little too touchy feeling for me.

7 MS. DIECK: I'll get to the hard core.

8 MR. DURHAM: Let's focus on the hard core --

9 MS. DIECK: Okay.

10 MR. DURHAM: -- of span of control, who makes
11 decisions, how those decisions are made, how those decisions
12 are enforced.

13 MS. DIECK: So the balance of accountability
14 and responsibility, I mean, I believe that as the
15 superintendent has stated, you know, that there is -- the
16 decisions that we have agreed upon with them, that decision-
17 making matrix, because they're the ultimate accountability
18 when it lies within the superintendent, her team. I mean, I
19 believe she has to be in a position with her team to operate
20 an exercise that she has ultimate accountability. I believe
21 it's our responsibility as their management partner and as
22 an instructional support team with them to --

23 MR. DURHAM: There's at least one reading of
24 the statute that would dictate an opposite result.



1 MS. DIECK: Well, an opposite, but in this
2 position --

3 MR. DURHAM: That you're in charge. How do
4 you feel about you being in charge?

5 MS. DIECK: -- from the field charge -- about
6 us being completely in charge of everything?

7 MR. DURHAM: Of everything that by law you
8 would be allowed to be in charge of.

9 MS. DIECK: I believe the way that we've
10 entered into this agreement, the way that we've written it,
11 we haven't written it with that perspective We haven't
12 written that that we are ultimately in charge.

13 MR. DURHAM: Do you have any 00 do you have
14 any agreements in any place in the country were that would -
15 - that would tend to be the result?

16 MS. DIECK: No, as an organization, we don't
17 have any agreements where we are ultimately like the
18 absolute final decision maker in that broad spectrum. There
19 are agreements where made -- more decision-making influence
20 over principal hiring, more decision-making over maybe
21 budget things, more decision-making over, like to the
22 question of like tighter dictating what kind of curriculum
23 or resources you may use. But we don't have any thing where
24 we are like ultimately now that final decision maker now.



1 MR. DURHAM: When you look at this matrix,
2 and you see some of the things that I would at least think
3 perhaps one of the most critical as curriculum selection.
4 You apparently have no input on that at all -- if this -- if
5 -- page 64, is that correct?

6 MS. DIECK: So I --

7 MR. DURHAM: Is that what the matrix says, am
8 I right?

9 MS. BRINKMAN: You're absolutely right. that
10 is what the matrix says, since this has been turned into
11 you. However, we've had this conversation, and we have
12 agreed to shift that to be collaborative because we had a
13 long conversation about how curriculum and the impact of
14 that. So you're right. That's what it says in what -- but
15 that has been changed but not in your document yet.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Where else?

17 MR. DURHAM: So this -- oh, I'm sorry.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Where else -- oh.

19 MS. BRINKMAN: That --

20 MADAM CHAIR: Where else have you made
21 changes, if you --

22 MS. BRINKMAN: That's the only change that we
23 have officially made at this point.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead MR. Durham. I'm
25 sorry.



1 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

2 MS. BRINKMAN: And I do like our -- we have
3 strong -- we do have strong opinions about curriculum, but
4 we've entered into a partnership with Pueblo where they have
5 some curriculum chosen, and one of the organizing principles
6 we work with is that alignment of your curriculum, your
7 professional development aligned to assessments. So I mean,
8 we enter in with that orientation, and if we -- when we see
9 things that aren't aligned, we're going to say something.
10 We're going to call it out. I mean, that's our obligation
11 as part of this management partnership.

12 MS. DIECK: I think more importantly than the
13 selection of the curriculum is really about the process that
14 ANet comes forthwith in terms of executing in how that
15 curriculum is delivered.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Right. It's execution.

17 MR. DURHAM: So how much time are you -- are
18 you two individuals the one who -- ones who will be the
19 primary overseers of this agreement?

20 MS. BRINKMAN: Go ahead, because it's a
21 combination --

22 MR. DURHAM: One or both of you?

23 MS. DIECK: It's a combination --

24 MS. BRINKMAN: -- of school and district.



1 MS. DIECK: Yeah, it's a combination of
2 school and district. So between the two of us, I will be
3 directly coaching the executive director of innovation, and
4 then working with Suzanne Morie as well. And then we have
5 instructional coaches that are trained to work at the school
6 level. So each of the schools will receive an instructional
7 coach that will be there on a weekly basis. So and then,
8 Laura Brinkman will be helping with the monthly and
9 quarterly site visits to be able -- to be sure that we are
10 having full lens in our organization as well in what is
11 working and what needs to be adjusted.

12 MR. DURHAM: So approximately, from the
13 average week, how many hours would you spend in Pueblo
14 either in district or in one of the schools?

15 MS. DIECK: As an organization? As an
16 organize --

17 MR. DURHAM: Well, how many? I mean, are
18 there other than you -- other people?

19 MS. DIECK: Yes, there are others, so two
20 other --

21 MR. DURHAM: How much time will they spend?

22 MS. DIECK: So they will spend once a week,
23 approximately one day a week, in the district, at each of
24 the schools will have one day a week, and then I would be
25 there at approximately three times a month.



1 MS. FLORES: But they'll -- but they'll be --
2 excuse me, may I just ask?

3 MR. DURHAM: Okay, please.

4 MS. FLORES: But you'll have one person that
5 will be there every day?

6 MS. BRINKMAN: No.

7 MS. DIECK: No. Once a week for a full day.

8 MR. DURHAM: In your experience, I mean, this
9 has been -- now obviously, we don't, we didn't get to this
10 point overnight. There have been six consecutive years of
11 what the legislature would define as unacceptable
12 performance. Do you generally get called in only when
13 there's a crisis, which I would characterize this, or on
14 occasion do people bring you in to avoid a crisis?

15 MS. DIECK: Yes. So we do not only get
16 called in for a crisis. we currently work in Colorado with
17 some of the highest-performing charter CMO districts as well
18 in districts and schools. So we do both work with higher-
19 performing schools and then also targeted work, more
20 intensive work like this management plan, with schools like
21 the ones in Pueblo.

22 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

23 MADAM CHAIR: So I want to clarify what I
24 think the commissioner just pointed out to me. I believe
25 this started out as an innovation plan with management, and



1 I think there is a strong feeling given the innovation plan
2 that it just wasn't really strong enough. We are talking
3 about a manage -- a management. And so Board Member
4 Durham's questions about whether you've ever actually
5 completely controlled comes from one of the options that we
6 have, which is something on that order. And I think the
7 concern that we had was partly with this sharing and the
8 fact that ultimately it's the district that continues to
9 control pretty much is -- what's happening here and whether
10 that's going to be sufficient.

11 So I think -- I just want you to get a sense
12 of where we are here. We're really not sure just exactly
13 what we're going to be recommending. I have to tell you
14 that because we got everything as late as you got
15 everything, we're not prepared to take a vote today. We're
16 going to put this off in the hopes that we will have
17 something maybe by tomorrow to vote on, but we still have
18 questions. Please.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, I would
20 like to just say that we did submit and bring forth what we
21 believe to be a viable innovation plan for both Bessemer and
22 for Heroes, which the last time in April 24, we didn't have
23 a fully comprehensive plan.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Exactly.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we really do feel
2 like we do have one now. CDE has reviewed that and they do
3 -- did say that it meets all of the requirements of the
4 rubric and all of the standards that do --

5 MADAM CHAIR: No actually. No, there are
6 places where it's only partial, and that's our -- that's my
7 concern today. There are places for --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. The overall
9 rating was that it met all all of these standards.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then there are some
12 suggestions. absolutely.

13 MADAM CHAIR: There are some specifics that
14 we probably want you to be thinking about and want staff to
15 be thinking about.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Any the other comments,
18 questions, concerns, folks? Are you ready to table this
19 until tomorrow? Do you -- I mean I'm struggling with not
20 having -- I guess maybe I should listen to staff. You know,
21 we got this stuff way, way, way too fast. Understandably
22 everything is on a delay, but do we have a motion?

23 MR. DURHAM: Well, let me ask one question
24 maybe.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Please.



1 MR. DURHAM: How did we end up being so late?
2 Do you want to blame the staff, or do you want to -- is it
3 the fact you were slow in providing materials? How do we
4 end up? I mean, we've been out this off and on for six
5 years, and here we are up against June 1 or yeah, June 1 --
6 or I'm sorry, June 30 deadline. How did we end up at this
7 point with Pueblo? and I don't think we've ended up in this
8 -- quite this time frame with any -- or this time crunch
9 with any -- anybody else that's on the clock.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Board Member
11 Durham, for the question. Both of these schools, Bessemer
12 and Heroes, specifically had a Pathways implementation --
13 Pathways planning grant that we went to the stakeholders,
14 and we were operating from that we would go forth with an
15 innovation plan. And the last time that we came in April,
16 that recommendation and the recommendation from CDE that we
17 got at that time was that it was a management partnership
18 plan. There was some confusion in regard to how we feel
19 that we had been consulted in terms of what the definition
20 of a management partnership plan was. And so I think that
21 confusion contributed to where we were.

22 Within the time that we were last here, merely six
23 weeks, I think that we have really placed ourselves in a
24 position of strength. That we have really been diligent
25 about bringing forth the documents and the plans necessary



1 that we were asked for in terms of an innovation plan, and
2 to really look strategically and intentionally about what
3 are the needs for these schools? What is the possible
4 partnership?

5 We have an existing working -- very positive
6 working relationship with Achievement Network that we have
7 had very much success with and with several of our schools
8 in the innovation zone. And so we feel like Achievement
9 Network really did meet the needs that were presented in
10 those two schools. And so going with the definition that we
11 -- was our understanding of a management partnership plan,
12 that's why we brought forth those plans in conjunction with
13 an innovation plan.

14 MR. DURHAM: Did you have a hard time getting
15 your stakeholders on board? Anybody -- any difficulty with
16 that? And do you think the stakeholders gave up enough or
17 brought enough to the table to make this a worthwhile
18 exercise?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we had full
20 support of all of our stakeholders. They really worked --
21 they worked diligently.

22 MR. DURHAM: In your opinion, did they give
23 up anything? Did the stakeholders gave up anything?
24 Anybody gave up anything in the union contract?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the waivers
2 through the innovation -- they're giving up obviously a lot
3 in the union contract with the waivers.

4 MR. DURHAM: Do you have a list of that some
5 place?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those are listed in
7 specifically in innovation plans of each of the schools.

8 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Thank you, Madam
9 Chair.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually, Chairwoman
12 Schroeder, before we get a motion potentially to table the
13 issue --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think one important
16 question to ask, at least for my clarity, and if in advising
17 the Board is -- about the willingness of the external
18 management a partner here to take on full management
19 everywhere permitted by law, if they're willing to do that.
20 So I think, if there is potential option for a full takeover
21 suggested by the department's plan, is that going to be them
22 or could -- would it be somebody else potentially who's
23 doing at? Something that would really guide the order that
24 would be written about a potential takeover of management.



1 MS. RANKIN: I thought I asked that, and I
2 thought they said yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, perhaps, it was
4 my misunderstanding, but I just want to make sure that, at
5 least for my purposes, that's it's clear.

6 MS. DIECK: Yes, so in the '17-'18 school
7 year, we would not have the capacity for a complete
8 management takeover of these three schools, if we were
9 talking about full authority in all decision-making areas.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Rebecca?

11 MS. McCLELLAN: Would you have the capacity
12 at one of the campuses, two of the campuses? When would
13 capacity be present, or in the event that the Board wanted
14 to move forward with such a model, would it be necessary to
15 find a different management partner?

16 MS. DIECK: I mean, I think yes, if we were
17 just talking about a full intensive partnership, full
18 management of one of the campuses. Then that would be
19 possible. We would have to shift then away from the support
20 of the other schools, which I would not necessarily be in
21 favor.

22 MS. McCLELLAN: May I ask a follow-up?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.



1 MS. McCLELLAN: Is this just a capacity
2 issue, or is it with respect to the size of the staffing at
3 ANet presently?

4 MS. BRINKMAN: Correct.

5 MS. DIECK: Correct. And I think we
6 historically, would want to go into a strong partnership
7 with the district. We'd not want to come in as a full
8 authority without that collaboration.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's important
10 to understand that we selected ANet based on very -- a very
11 specific areas -- area of need. And so we are targeting a
12 specific area of need, not all of school operations with
13 ANet and in terms of what they can provide.

14 MS. McCLELLAN: May I ask one more follow-up?
15 As we're looking at the plan that you submitted, it looks
16 like an almost 50-50 partnership until you get right down to
17 the wire, and then the district has final authority under
18 your submitted plan. If that partnership really is as 50-50
19 as it kind of sounds like, then I'm having some confusion as
20 to why it is that there is absolutely not the capacity to be
21 the final decision maker if you can be 49.999. I guess
22 that's what I'm struggling with right now, because what
23 we're looking at is final authority to make sure that the
24 management partner has the traction that they need to make
25 the substantial changes that are necessary, and I speak only



1 for myself and not for the entire Board obviously, but
2 that's what I'm struggling with right now.

3 MS. DIECK: And I think, when we're speaking
4 in areas of instruction and assessment, those will be the
5 areas I would say we would have -- we could take full
6 authority. But when we're talking about general operation
7 of the school, those are not areas that we typically focus
8 on in our partnership.

9 MS. GOFF: No, we're not asking I think in
10 the area of parent -- parents or any such thing. But
11 academically, cognitively, I --

12 MS. DIECK: Yes.

13 MS. GOFF: I think that would be the sense
14 that we -- I think we're thinking about.

15 MS. BRINKMAN: So if I could just clarify,
16 and going back to what you said, Board Member Flores, in
17 regard to, I think we all have the same goal, and that's
18 increased student achievement, and we know that those are --
19 those are some of the systems that need to be in place, like
20 the data driven instruction and so forth. In the event that
21 we're talking about a calendar for example, and ANet says,
22 "We need these specific days built into the calendar," and
23 the school says, "Well, we have innovation, and we have the
24 authority to build our calendar," and they can't come to a
25 collaboration, just as an example, then they would -- it



1 would resort back to MS. Morie and I, and we would say,
2 "Here's what we're trying to advance." So absolutely, we're
3 going to build a calendar to include those particular days
4 at this particular time to analyze the data and so forth to
5 advance that initiative.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay. So then --

7 MS. BRINKMAN: And so that's our thinking.

8 MS. GOFF: The 49.99 end thing.

9 MS. BRINKMAN: Right. That's what I -- that
10 was our thinking, right. That was our thinking behind the
11 ultimate authority, if there's a dispute with the
12 superintendent, would settle that. That was the thinking.

13 MS. GOFF: Well, that's still not -- maybe
14 the .99 -- maybe if we said 49 and 51, I guess, would that
15 be such a big difference if it was the management company
16 doing 51? Meaning, they really have the authority
17 ultimately in those areas dealing with academic success,
18 would you? --

19 MS. BRINKMAN: Absolutely, because it would
20 be a partnership, and if they are our consultants telling
21 us, "This is what we need in order to advance, this process
22 within the school," I as a superintendent, I'm going to
23 support that.

24 MS. GOFF: Okay.



1 MS. MORIE: And we absolutely have that
2 capacity. Yes, it would just be -- if was more time, then
3 yeah.

4 MS. GOFF: That capaacity. Okay. Thank
5 you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Still a clarifying
7 question for the staff at ANet. Do I understand that you do
8 have capacity to be a final decision-making authority?

9 MS. DIECK: Correct. In areas of academic
10 instruction, yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And assessment?

12 MS. DIECK: And assessment.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Does that include coaching?

15 MS. BRINKMAN: Coaching? Yes. And higher
16 and -- would be in collaboration of -- could be hiring of
17 principals and instructional coaches as well.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Right, and that's where I got a
19 little frustrated, and I apologize for the mess that I have
20 here in terms of looking at it. But the hiring of teachers,
21 it looks like it's only at the district level. Coaching of
22 teachers is -- the authorities only with the district and
23 not you. Supervision of teachers. Well, supervision of
24 teachers that's -- I mean, some of these, it seems to me
25 should be both.



1 MS. BRINKMAN: And so that is based on
2 resources. The ANet staff is not going to engage in the
3 teacher evaluation process, so to speak. They are not going
4 to be necessarily have the -- have the staff to sit in on
5 interviews. But we are going -- we have a plan to
6 collaborate in regard to what processes we can develop to
7 ensure that we're hiring appropriate staff members.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Coaching of teachers is not one
9 of the things that ANet's doing?

10 MS. MORIE: So the one-on-one coaching of
11 teachers in terms of the time capacity, we want every one of
12 our teachers to be coached weekly. And so given the time,
13 they -- we had agreed that they would support the training
14 for our instructional coaches, for our administrators in
15 coaching and support the coaching but they wouldn't
16 necessarily be coaching teachers one-on-one. They very well
17 may be supporting the PLC facilitation, professional
18 development for teachers, but not necessarily having full
19 responsibility for coaching every one of the teachers in the
20 school.

21 MADAM CHAIR: I got it. We're in the weeds,
22 and I'm sorry, we're in the weeds.

23 MS. BRINKMAN: No, it's fine.

24 MADAM CHAIR: But you provided the weeds, so

25 --



1 MS. BRINKMAN: It's really about providing
2 the capacity, so ANet would provide the capacity of our
3 instructional coaches to be able to provide the daily
4 coaching that teachers would need.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Thank you. Board Member
6 Rankin?

7 MS. RANKIN: We are under a time limit as far
8 as June 30 goes, as you understand. We also seem to be a
9 little bit in a communication difficulty here. And in order
10 for us to write a precise order, I think this would be a
11 good time to maybe have an executive session for just maybe
12 10 or 15 minutes?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yes?

14 MS. RANKIN: Would that be acceptable?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Folks?

16 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we just get a formal
19 motion and then do a vote? Thank you.

20 MS. RANKIN: I move for an executive session
21 to receive legal advice.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second it.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Anyone opposed?
24 Sorry folks, I'm going to ask you to leave and enjoy our
25 beautiful hallway.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder? Board
2 Member Schroeder, may I read the executive session?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Go for it.

4 MS. CORDIAL: An executive ses session has
5 been moved for today's Wtate Board meeting in conformance
6 with 2464023A0S to received legal advice on specific legal
7 questions pursuant to 2464023A0S, to receive legal avice and
8 specific legal questions pursuant 2464023AII0S in matters
9 required to be kept confidential by federal law or rules or
10 state statutes pursuant to 2464023AIII0S.

11 (Pause)

12 MADAM CHAIR: So I want to talk to the school
13 district people, and I want to say we are apologetic to the
14 extent that we are struggling with this, too. We want to do
15 the very best for your kids. They're all our kids. And so
16 I hope that, you know, I'm just going to pore on your
17 patience. Tomorrow, we will have something figured out.
18 Many of these have been different, and so we've had to try
19 to figure out how do we do this the right way, how do we
20 have some level of consistency? But also address the
21 uniqueness of each of the districts that we have to face.
22 So thank you for coming back. I mean, I guess you could've
23 just driven home. You don't need to come back tomorrow,
24 hopefully. Right. But I want to thank you for your
25 patience. This has been a struggle, and thank you for all



1 the work that you've done the last six weeks. I don't want
2 to suggest, with this pile this high, that you guys haven't
3 been working very, very hard to look at this.

4 MS. DIECK: Thank you.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan, and
6 I'll see if I can speak (inaudible) in a few minutes.

7 MS. MCLELLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
8 move to table item number 14.02, accountability
9 recommendations concerning Bessemer Elementary, Heroes
10 Middle School, and Risley International Academy of
11 Innovation in Pueblo City 60 Schools. Case Number 17-AR-06.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Do I have a second?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Any objections, ladies and
15 gentlemen? Yes, continue, please.

16 MS. MCLELLAN: I move to amend the --

17 MADAM CHAIR: Agenda.

18 MS. MCLELLAN: I move to amend the agenda for
19 Thursday, June 15, to include the accountability
20 recommendation for Bessemer Elementary, Heroes Middle
21 School, and Risley International to be included in
22 tomorrow's agenda at approximately 10:00 a.m.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Can I have a second?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any objection?
2 Thank you. Thank you, folks. You do not have to come back.
3 But we will make sure that we're communicating with you all
4 in the morning.

5 MS. DIECK: Thank you.

6 MS. MORIE: Thanks.

7 MS. BRINKMAN: Thank you.

8 MR. DURHAM: I've got so much paper

9 MADAM CHAIR: We'll have a call-in -- we will
10 have a call-in number, etc.

11 (Pause)

12 MADAM CHAIR: All right, we have item number
13 1601. Okay, guys. Thomas School District requests for
14 designation as a district of innovation and innovation
15 application on behalf of Winona Elementary School and Monroe
16 Elementary School. Commissioner?

17 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd
18 like to call the Thompson School District up, and I'm going
19 to turn this over to Dr. Stan Scheer, and he's the
20 superintendent in Thompson and he can introduce the rest of
21 his team who are with him. Hello Dr. Scheer, thanks for
22 making the trip down.

23 MR. SCHEER: Stan Scheer, I'm school
24 superintendent in the Thompson school district, and I'm
25 going to turn this over to Anne Marie Sanchez, she's our --



1 one of our elementary directors of education in the Thompson
2 School District and has worked directly with these two
3 schools in developing the grant -- the applications.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Proceed, please.

5 MS. SANCHEZ: Madam Chair, Commissioner
6 AntHes, and members of the Board, I'm glad to be here today
7 to discuss the designation of innovation schools in Thompson
8 School District representing Monroe Elementary and Winona
9 Elementary School and just wondering what questions you may
10 have. We're here to support your decision.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to tell us in two
12 minutes about your two schools?

13 MS. SANCHEZ: Sure. So around -- a couple --
14 I would say the beginning of last school year, as teachers
15 were creating their school improvement plans, the teachers
16 had come up with a couple ideas that seemed outside of the
17 box, and some of those would require some additional funding
18 as well as some flexibility in some of the -- part of our
19 agreements with the Thompson Education Association. I'm
20 sorry, I'm totally drawing a blank on words right now. And
21 so they -- the schools got together and they came up with a
22 list of things that they thought were hindering the
23 achievement in their buildings. Both of those schools are
24 high free and reduced schools. One of them is the highest
25 in the district, and the other one has the most students



1 that are free and reduced just because of the size of the
2 school, and they're in close proximity. They both have
3 really -- their missions are to be student-centered and want
4 to do what they feel is best for their parents in the
5 community as well as the students. So they came up with
6 some of these innovations together as a team, included
7 parents and some of that decision-making as well, including
8 Spanish-speaking parents community at the Monroe Elementary
9 School. They sent out surveys to the parents at Winona
10 Elementary. Got some good feedback that they're all in
11 favor of moving towards some of these innovations that are
12 around possibly extending the school year, the school day,
13 additional days on the contract for teachers for
14 professional development, with the innovations moving
15 towards personalized learning with our school district and a
16 competency-based education system. Some of the
17 instructional practices and -- as well as some of the
18 programs that they want to use are a little bit outside of
19 the box from what we are currently using.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Colleagues,
21 any questions?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a...

23 MADAM CHAIR: Please.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many -- I, I -- this
2 is for CDE. How many innovation schools do we have in the
3 state? do we know?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Around 90.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you say 90?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Around 90.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Around 90. And how long
8 has the longest one been an innovation school?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think 2009.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that's what I was
11 thinking because I think this came out of 2008. So do we
12 have a track record of how those are doing? Do we get that
13 every year?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have I missed something?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. There's a report.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: There's a report that we get a
19 copy of that is sent to the legislature, and I think MR.
20 Durham and I are the ones who looked at that -- one of the
21 more recent reports -- maybe not this year's, but last
22 year's -- and said, you know, of the districts that wanted
23 to make changes, it didn't make necessarily a significant
24 difference in getting the kid -- these schools off the
25 clock. And that



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you talking about
2 ones that have been there a long time?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Ones that have been there a
4 long time. Right. Which is one of the reasons I think
5 where's -- in terms of like, this is not your problem, but
6 in terms of the turnaround discussions, one of the reasons
7 that we've been seeing both innovation and management,
8 because just because you change the calendar itself, you
9 don't change a lot of the classroom practices. You are not
10 going to get different results. And so -- and that's the
11 history about it.

12 MADAM CHAIR: There's been a lot of stuff
13 written about that recently and I was just kind of concerned
14 how our state amended, but...

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. I think chalk beats(ph)
16 has been hitting us up on that one too on whether it makes a
17 big difference, but that doesn't mean that there aren't
18 schools where it's made a huge difference all on its own,
19 so.

20 MS. SANCHEZ: I feel like that we've done a
21 lot of research, and some of the practices that they're
22 putting in place next year to personalize learning, and some
23 of the districts that we've studied across the nation that
24 have really embraced the personalized learning movement,
25 they have seen some great growth. And I think when we were



1 looking at the innovation schools applications that are out
2 there, ours is very unique compared to theirs.

3 So just even knowing how they're going to be
4 scheduling next year with grade bands, some of the blended
5 learning opportunities that they're gonna be providing
6 students with really rigorous and and important follow
7 through on the, the personalized instruction specific to
8 those programs to make sure they're implemented with
9 fidelity. We're just really confident that we're going to
10 get some great results out of -- out of our plan.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Great. Good luck. Here comes
12 a motion.

13 MS. MCLELLAN: I move to designate Thomas
14 School District as a district of innovation by approving --

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thompson.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thompson?

17 MS. McCLELLAN: Oh, it's Thompson School
18 District, as district of innovation by approving the
19 innovation school applications for Winona Elementary School
20 and Monroe Elementary School.

21 MS. GOFF: I second it.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any objections,
23 colleagues? You're on. Thank you, very, very much.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much,
25 appreciate it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, I didn't know. I just
3 noticed Thompson. Just a little typo.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Next item on the agenda is the
6 consideration of Denver Public Schools amended innovation
7 application on behalf of Valdez Elementary School.
8 Commissioner?

9 MS. ANTHERS: Yes. Thank you. I think I'm
10 going to turn this over to Gregory Hatcher -- come on up --
11 and Angie McPhaul. And just to let you know, this is a
12 little bit of a different one. This school has already been
13 designated an innovation school. So this is an amended --
14 amended waiver to their already existing approved innovation
15 plan. And you guys wanted them to just come answer a few
16 question in addition to this.

17 MS. MCPHAUL: Hi. So I'm Angie McPhaul. And
18 I'm -- oh, go. I'm Angie McPhaul. I'm the manager of
19 accountability at Denver Public Schools.

20 MR. HATCHER: Gregory Hatcher, director of
21 public affairs in the superintendent's office. Thanks for
22 having us.

23 MS. MCPHAUL: We're here on behalf of Valdez
24 Elementary School, which is seeking an innovation plan
25 amendment. This is a school in Northwest Denver, and it's



1 one of the highest performing of our elementary schools. It
2 has 63 kindergartners, or it did last year. And so my team
3 supported Valdez Elementary in preparing this innovation
4 plan amendment. The CDE staff has found that it meets the
5 statutory requirements under the Innovation Schools Act, so
6 we're just here to answer your questions.

7 MADAM CHAIR: So are you not waving
8 kindergarten readiness? I'm trying to find it here.

9 MS. MCPHAUL: That is the amendment they are
10 seeking to make to their plan is to waive the Kindergarten
11 Readiness Assessment for their kindergarten.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Why?

13 MS. MCPHAUL: So I can't speak as the
14 principal of the school or anything like that. My
15 understanding is that the school has a number of other
16 assessments that they use that are vertically aligned with
17 their rest of their elementary school program, but they have
18 systems around for continue coaching and teacher
19 professional development that they want to use instead of
20 their TS Gold assessment.

21 MADAM CHAIR: And do they know that there are
22 other assessments besides TS Gold that the Board's been
23 working very hard to find additional assessments that are
24 require less identifiers -- or I can't remember what the
25 terminology is -- to make it easier?



1 MS. MCPHAUL: I have not discussed that with
2 the school.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Did you listen to our
4 discussion this morning?

5 MR. HATCHER: Yeah, we did -- we did hear
6 around the D11 discussion that took place absolutely, Madam
7 Chair. And I think from our perspective and, you know, this
8 being a little bit different request than what D11 was
9 requesting in terms of the full district waiver on this
10 issue. You know, as you -- many of you know, Denver Public
11 Schools certainly values ensuring that around kindergarten
12 readiness, be it TS Gold or other assessments that our
13 charters use, that our innovation schools, district-run
14 schools use, and meets the standards that you all have set,
15 and it's something that's very important to us on the early
16 literacy, kindergarten readiness piece as we continue to
17 move forward.

18 And as Angie said, I think, from our
19 perspective, we're here to support Valdez with its request,
20 knowing that you all may want additional information from
21 Valdez directly about kind of the request, but they are
22 doing this under the auspices of their current innovation
23 plan from the State and Denver Public Schools.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: So you, you two are with the
2 district?

3 MS. MCPHAUL: Correct.

4 MS. MAZANEC: But the school who wants the
5 kindergarten waiver is not here?

6 MS. MCPHAUL: Correct. That's been our
7 standard process when we are bringing forward innovation
8 plan amendments or charter school waivers.

9 MS. MAZANEC: But you're not entirely sure
10 why they want the waiver?

11 MS. MCPHAUL: I sat in on some of the
12 planning meetings, and I'm speaking from the experience of
13 having heard them talk about it, so that's my understanding
14 from that experience.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham?

16 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. MR. Dill, since this
17 is now in the innovation waiver request, is the Board now --
18 the statute has changed in standards is not yet in affect.
19 I think.

20 MR. HATCHER: I, I believe that's correct.
21 It's likely July 1?

22 MR. DURHAM: And so we --

23 MS. MCPHAUL: It's actually August 9th.

24 MR. HATCHER: August 9.



1 MR. DURHAM: August 9, and so so we're under
2 the old statute, which is we have to find -- in order to
3 reject this, we would have to find that there's harm.

4 MR. HATCHER: That is --

5 MR. DURHAM: I mean, am I -- how close am I
6 from memory?

7 MR. HATCHER: Yeah, the, the, the, the way
8 I've generally put it is that you have to find that it
9 would, would not -- if it doesn't make anything worse.

10 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

11 MR. HATCHER: As I recall, it's a decrease in
12 educational achievement or, or budgetarily --

13 MADAM CHAIR: Academic achievement.

14 MR. HATCHER: Yeah. Academic achievement.

15 MR. DURHAM: They were -- Colorado Springs is
16 not looking for an innovation waiver, and I think the
17 standards are different. Now, I think we've equalized those
18 standards effective August 9.

19 MS. MCPHAUL: Correct.

20 MR. DURHAM: But I would suggest that the,
21 the legal standard for this is significantly different than
22 the one that we applied to Colorado Springs.

23 MR. HATCHER: Yeah. The, the --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I still wanna apply it.

25 MR. HATCHER: -- the actual language is --



1 MR. DURHAM: No, you don't. No, I agree with
2 you. We don't have to like it.

3 MR. HATCHER: It is likely to result in a
4 decrease in academic achievement in the innovation schools
5 or innovation school zone or is not fiscally feasible.

6 MADAM CHAIR: And what's the status of the
7 school?

8 MS. MCPHAUL: The status isn't -- the status
9 is that they are currently an innovation school, and they
10 have been renewed now as well.

11 MADAM CHAIR: I'm talking about their
12 accreditations there.

13 MS. MCPHAUL: Oh, they are -- sorry.

14 MADAM CHAIR: I'm sorry. I didn't ask that
15 right.

16 MS. MCPHAUL: They are green on our SPF.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

18 MR. HATCHER: And have been, I think, you
19 know, as Angie -- sorry, Madam Chair. As Angie -- excuse
20 me.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Green on the SPF?

22 MR. HATCHER: As Angie mentioned, I think in
23 terms -- earlier in her comments in, in Northwest Denver,
24 has been and continues to be one of our strongest, strongest
25 elementary schools in the region.



1 MADAM CHAIR: And have you been using TS
2 Gold, the light or the full strength?

3 MS. MCPHAUL: The school has been using TS
4 Gold in compliance with state law.

5 MADAM CHAIR: So which one, the light or the
6 full strength?

7 MS. MCPHAUL: I'm not prepared to answer
8 that.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Oh. Do the schools have a
10 choice in your district --

11 MR. HATCHER: Actually --

12 MADAM CHAIR: -- between which -- between
13 which kindergarten readiness assessment they use, or just
14 the district mandate one of them?

15 MS. MCPHAUL: I believe they have a choice.

16 MR. HATCHER: Absolutely.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Between the ones that we've
18 approved?

19 MS. MCPHAUL: Yeah.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

21 MS. MCPHAUL: The ones you've approved.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec. Move.

23 MS. MAZANEC: I have to find it. I didn't
24 say I was ready.

25 MR. DURHAM: I'll do that.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Where is it?
2 MADAM CHAIR: It's in 16.02.
3 MS. MAZANEC: Here we go.
4 MR. DURHAM: Now, obviously, it's the age.
5 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know because we have --
6 I have a different one than you do parents.
7 MS. MAZANEC: Do you? Okay.
8 MR. DURHAM: Do you need a motion on that?
9 MS. MAZANEC: It's -- I find -- I found it.
10 MADAM CHAIR: She's struggling with it.
11 MS. MAZANEC: I move to affirm the amended
12 Innovation School Application from Denver Public Schools on
13 behalf of Valdez Elementary School.
14 MADAM CHAIR: It's a proper motion. Is there
15 a second?
16 MR. DURHAM: Second.
17 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. I'm going to call the
18 roll.
19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham?
20 MR. DURHAM: Yes.
21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?
22 MS. FLORES: Yes.
23 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?
24 MS. GOFF: Yes.
25 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan?

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

5 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

7 MADAM CHAIR: No.

8 MS. MCPHAUL: Thank you for your time.

9 MR. HATCHER: Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: No. You too.

11 MR. HATCHER: Forgive me, Madam Chair

12 MR. DURHAM: Don't come back after the 9th of

13 August. You'll run into that other standing.

14 MR. HATCHER: Can we amend tomorrow's agenda?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know there's still...

16 MR. DURHAM: You should rush them all

17 through.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mentioned that other

19 standard. it's not a lot different.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I see this.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right?

22 MR. DURHAM: But it gives us enough to work

23 with if we decide it.

24 MS. MCCLELLAN: Let me ask.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Well, if we haven't had enough
2 of this, folks. Here we go.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: Well...

4 MADAM CHAIR: What?

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: Madam Chair, I do -- we -- we
6 did work on a little three side by side piece of these
7 different waivers now that the new law has taken effect.
8 Would you like a handout on that?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What do you mean, now
11 that --

12 MR. DURHAM: Do we need it before the 9th?

13 MADAM CHAIR: -- now that we've already
14 voted?

15 MS. MCCLELLAN: No.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Do we need it before this next
17 item?

18 MS. MCCLELLAN: It's -- we've been using it
19 just as our own cheat sheet to explain the differences.

20 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible) innovation?

21 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yeah. The differences
22 between Innovation Charter School Act and the district. And
23 I mean, we've been using it to kind of talk you through it,
24 but I just thought it might be helpful to make a copy.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.



1 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes, you did.

2 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: Now, I -- didn't correct MR.
4 Durham because he was exactly right. That's the cheat sheet
5 that you see. I'm just kind of holding that off.

6 MR. DURHAM: Okay. All right. I haven't
7 been right all day. It's nice.

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: So you'll see on the
9 Innovation Schools Act column current, and then you'll see
10 new effective August 9th, and so you'll see how the language
11 shifted.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Are we ready to move on?

13 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. We're ready to move on.

14 MADAM CHAIR: 16.05, consideration of
15 Strasbourg 31J School District's request for a waiver from
16 CERS 22710142A, school ratings assessments. Commissioners.

17 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll
18 turn this over to Monica Johnson, superintendent, Mark
19 Taylor, principal, and kindergarten teachers in the
20 district, and thank you all for driving all this way to be
21 here to present your plan. I appreciate it.

22 MS. JOHNSON: It's really not that far.

23 MS. ANTHES: Okay. It's still a drive.

24 Yeah.

25 MS. JOHNSON: In mind.



1 MS. ANTHES: I know.

2 MADAM CHAIR: We're thinking of Strasbourg,
3 France, actually.

4 MS. ANTHES: Is that where you'd like to be?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. They have wonderful food.
6 They have the best chefs in the world.

7 MS. JOHNSON: So I heard, you Madam Chair,
8 say here we go again, OR something to that effect as we were
9 coming up, and we do know and recognize that -- that you
10 hear this a lot, and we appreciate the time that you're
11 giving us today and the opportunity to come and share one --
12 one more perspective on this.

13 I am going to turn this over to Mark Taylor
14 and the kindergarten teachers. I think getting an
15 opportunity to speak to the teachers as well who work on it
16 and work with it on a daily basis might give you also
17 another perspective, and I'm sure you've heard those as
18 well. But again, thank you so much for allowing us to be
19 here.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you for coming.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Hi, members of the Board. My
22 name is Mark Taylor. I've been with Strasbourg for 20
23 years. I'm actually resigning to move to Ireland so not
24 Strasbourg, France, but Ireland. My wife got a job over



1 there, so I am leaving, but I am hoping to make one last
2 good note for us and hopefully get this waiver approved.

3 We are a very hardworking school. We are
4 about 30 teachers, about 15 to 17 paras, depending on the
5 year, and we have about a 1,000 kids in the district, and
6 the elementary houses half of those students. It starts in
7 preschool. We have our preschool, which we have three-year-
8 old classes, as well as four-year-old classes, and through
9 the Strasbourg Recs District, they have some preschools.

10 Those preschools work in tandem. They have
11 to do things on the same level. So they both work -- they
12 all work with strategies goals for students who are either
13 on the CPP program or have special needs. They do work with
14 the strategy's goal.

15 We, over the last two years, based on the
16 Kindergarten Readiness Act, tried two different programs. We
17 first tried the DRDP-K two years ago. we found that to be
18 very labor-intensive, and then we used TSG Lite last year.
19 And once again, found it fairly labor-intensive.

20 I will be honest. I am not familiar with
21 some of the new items that are mentioned for next year. But
22 that being said, our teachers over the years have created a
23 kindergarten readiness checklist. I don't know if you have
24 copies of that. I hope you do. I did send all of these



1 ahead of time, but I -- we can easily pass you some. We
2 have some copies here, if that would help.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I -- isn't -- and I would love
4 to have a copy.

5 MR. TAYLOR: Okay. We're going to give you
6 two packets. One is the single form of the kindergarten
7 checklist. the second is the stapled packet that shows the
8 benchmarks through the year, that bounces off of or
9 progresses from the readiness checklist we already have in
10 place.

11 Our school believes in what we call roaming.
12 And so at least for grades one through five, it's pretty
13 much a two and a half week period where we're getting to
14 know the kids. We give them some pre-assessments, we get to
15 know them socially, as well as get an idea academically how
16 they are, and then pretty much after Labor Day week weekend
17 -- Labor Day week -- weekend, we start our academics.

18 In kindergarten, based on again for -- even
19 though it's preschool, we have full-day preschool, it is
20 getting -- or for kindergarten, it's full-day kindergarten,
21 they are getting used to that. And so they take
22 approximately four weeks to do that roaming, get the
23 procedures down, get everything in place. So in that four-
24 week period, they are able to do that checklist and find out



1 everything about it, and you are welcome to ask the
2 teachers, they can absolutely speak more to that than I can.

3 Then again, the stapled list shows you the
4 benchmarks. So you'll notice that we have academics, and on
5 the other side, social skills. We have looked at the DRDP
6 and the TSG to say we were missing some things, we were
7 missing some social aspects, so we wanted to make sure we
8 include that.

9 The one thing we find about this versus TSG
10 or DRDP-K is that this is quick. This -- we can do
11 observations. But versus sitting at a computer or with an
12 iPad, where again we're focusing on that and not focusing on
13 the academic sort of social aspects, we're missing out on a
14 lot when you're doing that. We had paras for preschool, and
15 they were still working with the academic side, if you will.
16 But now the paras are gone. we don't have them for
17 kindergarten. I'm sorry, thank you for correcting. But now
18 those paras are gone. We had -- we've added a fourth
19 teacher instead to have lower numbers, so we can again
20 academically meet the needs versus having 24 and 25 in a
21 class. So I will stop talking and see if you guys have any
22 questions, and hopefully you'll have some questions for our
23 teachers who are on the frontlines with us.

24 MADAM CHAIR: What are you reporting to the
25 department?



1 MS. JOHNSON: Strategies.

2 MR. TAYLOR: So last year, we reported
3 through Strategies GOLD. And that -- but through this, we
4 can still report, if that's -- is that what you're asking?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. And would you report --
6 how would it be comparable to what you reported before?

7 MR. TAYLOR: So I'll be honest, we, so far,
8 working with Emily Killmier, really haven't been asked to
9 report anything. And so but based on the data we're
10 collecting, which we do find reflective of TSG, whatever
11 they're going to ask of us, we can report on that.

12 MS. MCCLELLAN: Just haven't seen the format
13 yet that had that rule be reported.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues? Board Member
15 Rankin?

16 MS. RANKIN: How many students did you say
17 you have in kindergarten?

18 MR. TAYLOR: We have approximately 78 until
19 next year.

20 MS. RANKIN: And how long have you been in
21 performance at that level in your schools?

22 MR. TAYLOR: I can't -- the elementary has
23 not been below performance since we've been given the
24 rankings.

25 MS. RANKIN: Okay.



1 MR. TAYLOR: We in fact received a Governor's
2 Distinguished Improvement award this past year.

3 MS. RANKIN: How many schools are we talking
4 about here?

5 MR. TAYLOR: One.

6 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

7 MR. TAYLOR: Absolutely.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, did you say
9 one?

10 MR. TAYLOR: One elementary. Yeah.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec?

12 MS. MAZANEC: You have a preschool, and did
13 you say you have a preschool and you also have a -- a rec
14 center?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Preschool.

16 MS. JOHNSON: It has the preschool as well.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Does your preschool do
18 screening --

19 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

20 MS. MAZANEC: -- assessment? what is their
21 assessment?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Teachers try to use --
23 yeah, they use TS --

24 MS. MAZANEC: So you do -- do use TS GOLD
25 then?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 MS. MAZANEC: So most of those students come
3 into your kindergarten then?

4 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

5 MS. MAZANEC: And is the data --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: About 75 percent.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Then the data is transferred to
8 you, so you know?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

11 MR. TAYLOR: It is interesting that the
12 students who come from those preschools, how much more ready
13 they are than the students who are either in daycares or
14 with families at home. And so again, that's between 70 and
15 75 percent of the students who are already ready based on
16 that.

17 MS. GOFF: May I -- well, I'll just ask.
18 What about the free and reduced lunch? What is the
19 percentage of kids in kindergarten that are free and reduced
20 lunch?

21 MR. TAYLOR: We --

22 MS. JOHNSON: Across our district, we -- it's
23 very low. We have about 20 percent to 25 percent across our
24 district who are free or reduced.

25 MS. GOFF: Okay.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

2 MS. GOFF: It's a good thing.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 MADAM CHAIR: How many -- what percentage of
5 your kids don't go to preschool? You just said that?

6 MR. TAYLOR: We figure about 20 to 20 -- or
7 excuse me, 25 percent to 30 percent do not. And in
8 fairness, we have a -- a limited, a limit, 16 kids per class
9 at most in the four-year-old programs that we have. And so
10 those are pretty full.

11 MADAM CHAIR: So you have a capacity issue?
12 You have a capacity issue?

13 MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many -- how many
15 students is that altogether?

16 MR. TAYLOR: So we have three --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Estimate what's the
18 total surrounding figure?

19 MR. TAYLOR: We have 45 preschool students
20 every year approximately in the 4-year-old program that will
21 go into the kindergarten the following year. That's at the
22 elementary. And then, there are approximately 30 more, I
23 believe, at the rec center because they have the morning
24 program and an afternoon program. I believe they have app I
25 think they have built for a four-year-old. So again, that's



1 another -- that's approximately another 30. So that's where
2 we get about 70. And then, we have again the students who
3 didn't come. So that's where we get about the next 10 or so
4 after that.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Do you -- y'all maintain --
6 keep pretty much the same number of kindergarten kids who
7 then -- then move to first grade. So through the preschool-
8 kindergarten transition, it's pretty stable, isn't it?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Yeah. We have a
10 little fluctuation, but not a lot.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Thanks.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we each had 23, 24,
13 25 kids this year. And so -- and we've lost our paras now
14 for this next school year. So we've added a fourth teacher,
15 and our numbers right now look about 17 to 18 per class
16 without a para.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: I would just want to thank you
19 all for coming today. It's very impressive. I move to
20 approve the waiver request from Strasbourg 31J School
21 District for CRS 22-7-1014, paren 2 paren A, School
22 Readiness Assessments.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Second. Wanna call the roll,
24 please.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Steve Durham, or Board Member
2 Durham, I'm sorry.

3 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: Yes.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

7 MS. GOFF: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

11 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

13 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

15 MADAM CHAIR: No. We're never gonna get this
16 figured out, and I'm not blaming you.

17 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Woo-who.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, ma'am.

21 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you so much.

22 MADAM CHAIR: We should all go into analysis,
23 I think.

24 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. We should.



1 MADAM CHAIR: This is nuts. Next item is
2 School Turnaround and Leaders Development Grant Program.
3 Consideration of Recommended. MS. Mazanec.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sit down, MS. Mazanec.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Pam?

6 MR. DURHAM: Wait. Which number, Madam
7 Chair?

8 MADAM CHAIR: 17.01.

9 MS. MAZANEC: 17.01.

10 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Consideration of Recommended
12 Districts and Schools for Funding for the Second Round of
13 School Turnaround Leaders Development Grant Program.

14 MR. DURHAM: All right.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Commissioner, is staff is
16 prepared to give an overview?

17 MS. ANTHES: Yes, I believe so. I believe
18 I'm turning this over to Peter Sherman. Come on up, MR.
19 Sherman. This is the proactive side of the other work you
20 all are doing.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought it was
22 tomorrow.

23 MR. SHERMAN: Good afternoon. I think I may
24 be the last agenda item or close to it. So thank you for
25 your patience.



1 So this agenda item today is to present our
2 recommendations for the participants for -- through the
3 School Turnaround Leaders Development Program to reward the
4 remaining funds that we have left over from this year.

5 In April of this year, we awarded \$1.7
6 million with -- and change to 11 districts and a number of
7 schools. There were \$213,000 -- \$213,402. No, I'm sorry.
8 I must (inaudible), \$213,402, excuse me, for the second
9 round, and so we've decided to run a second round of
10 participant RFP, to expend those dollars. In that, we had a
11 very shortened application process. But in that time, we
12 received 10 applications for a total requested award of
13 \$960,000. So quite a bit of interest in the second round.

14 All of the applications went through our
15 standard competitive grants application process. And we are
16 recommending today approval for four of those applicants,
17 which include four district schools and two charter schools.
18 That, if those awards are approved, that way, we would be
19 able to allocate and award out all of the remaining funds
20 for this year.

21 So just in review, this grant provides --
22 this grant program identifies leadership development
23 programs for low-performing schools and districts. And it
24 also supports and awards funds for school districts, for
25 school leaders, charter school leaders, and district



1 leaders, and aspiring teachers, excuse me, and teachers that
2 are aspiring leaders, to be able to attend any of those
3 identified leadership development programs.

4 The Board's role in this process is to
5 approve these funds, and that's necessary in order to award
6 funds. And then, these are the districts that we're
7 bringing for recommendation, and I apologize profusely, but
8 slide five had to be updated. There were some numbers that
9 were not quite accurate. So Bizzy[ph] just passed out a
10 revised version.

11 But these are the four districts and charter
12 schools that we have recommended for funding. West End
13 School District, Charter School Institute with one of their
14 schools, Montessori Del Mundo, Denver Public Schools for one
15 of their charter schools, Rise Up Community Charter School,
16 and then Denver Public Schools for three of their district
17 schools. And that again, those awards would utilize the
18 remaining funds.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores, question?

20 MS. FLORES: Yes, I do. How many
21 administrators will be -- will take advantage of this in the
22 Montessori Del Mundo Charter School?

23 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you for your question. I
24 believe there are two.

25 MS. FLORES: And Denver Public Schools?



1 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you for your questions.
2 Just give me a moment. I'm sorry. I don't have exact
3 numbers. I can certainly look that up. It'll just take me
4 a minute. But those -- the participants are, for Denver
5 Public Schools, are both principals. And I believe there --
6 I believe there may be a district leader -- staff leader as
7 well within that pool.

8 MS. FLORES: So that's three.

9 MR. SHERMAN: Are you asking for the
10 difference between administrator participants versus teacher
11 participants? Because there are some teachers that are --
12 that are in some of these.

13 MS. FLORES: Yes. I'm asking for all of the
14 participants. And if you have teachers --

15 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

16 MS. FLORES: -- I'd like to just, you know, I
17 look at the difference between Denver Public Schools at the
18 University of Denver, and then that catapult. Why can't
19 they go to the Denver -- I mean, University of Denver, which
20 is, that's a -- that's a big difference unless there are so
21 many.

22 MR. SHERMAN: So the -- so amongst the -- I'm
23 sorry that I don't know the answers exactly. But there are
24 13 participants that are -- that have been identified in
25 those applicants. Applications -- those four applications



1 to participate. So 13 individuals, and I'm -- so I
2 apologize. I just don't know how many of those are teachers
3 versus administrators.

4 MS. FLORES: So that's with the Montessori
5 Del Mundo Charter School you're talking about 13?

6 (Inaudible).

7 MR. SHERMAN: No, 13 in total.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At the very bottom.

9 MR. SHERMAN: Thirteen total.

10 MS. FLORES: No. I know, but --

11 MR. SHERMAN: Montessori Del Mundo, I believe
12 there are four individuals, and I believe two of them are --
13 are administrators, and two are teacher leaders, is my
14 recollection.

15 MS. FLORES: All right. But \$83,000, that's
16 a lot of money. So is \$80,000. So I'm -- I was just hoping
17 that you would tell me that, you know, you had 12. I didn't
18 see the individuals up here. That's a lot of money for
19 catapult. So that means that each one is about \$40,000.
20 Forty thousand -- catapult, sorry, is about 40,000 per
21 leader.

22 MS. ANTHES: Per leader. Is that a --

23 MR. SHERMAN: And it's for a two-year
24 program, is what they're -- how the program works.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So to go back to the
2 conversation we had this morning about budget and school
3 improvement funds, and what's available and we allocate.
4 This is what the work we want to do this summer, and think
5 about where -- where we're at. We do have resources. The
6 State is investing \$2 million into this program every year.
7 And thinking about, is this the best of return on investment
8 possible the way the funding is allocated through the School
9 Turnaround Leaders Grant? Or is it this important
10 component, and there are some other components that are
11 important too in terms of systems support? So this -- this
12 is all the kind of thinking we want to around these grants.

13 MS. FLORES: So I'll ask another question.
14 Is this kind of leftover money from the year that you have
15 to spend?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. This was -- you
17 all, when you voted in February, I can't remember what month
18 it was, in April for the first round, we didn't have
19 applicants that -- that used all the entire money of the
20 grant program. So they reopened the grant to be able expend
21 the money that the State invests into turnaround leaders.

22 MS. FLORES: And so we only had four
23 applicants? I mean, four different districts that applied,
24 or how many districts applied for this?



1 MR. SHERMAN: Sure, and I'm sorry I breezed
2 through that quickly, I think. But we had 10 applicants
3 that applied for up to \$960,000 on the second round. So the
4 -- the applications that we're bringing you today are a
5 subset. So 4 out of 10 applications, and for the remaining
6 \$213,000 out of about \$960 requested.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: I always feel like I have start
9 at the beginning. What -- what are these grants actually
10 for? Like -- so it says the School Turnaround Leaders
11 Development Program. So that makes it sound like there's
12 one program, but they're actually going to different
13 programs that have different costs?

14 MR. SHERMAN: Yes. So...

15 MS. MAZANEC: And who decides -- do -- do the
16 participants say this is the program we want to go to?

17 MR. SHERMAN: Sure, and if we -- if I may,
18 I'll back up three years when we -- when this grant for it
19 was first established by statute. And what it allowed for
20 was a certain -- there were -- there was a first round of
21 RFPs that we would release for providers. So looking for
22 organizations that are leadership development providers,
23 specifically for low-performing schools and districts. And
24 we've come to you with, I believe, four different -- had
25 four different times for -- to identify providers. And so



1 we now have a list of -- I think there is eight or nine
2 different providers on our list that have been identified in
3 this program. And then each year, there's a second round
4 and sometimes a second -- another round for participants,
5 for districts to apply or for charter schools to apply for
6 funding to -- in order to be able to attend. So to pay
7 tuition and travel expenses for -- to attend some of those
8 identified leadership development providers. So the
9 districts, when the RFPs go out they say, "Here are the
10 identified programs that you can apply for and the
11 application which we've shared with you." It asks for them
12 to extensively provide rationale around what are the needs
13 of the school, and the leadership development that you need,
14 and how would we ask them to, to identify a leadership
15 development program.

16 So we ask them to identify one or more of
17 those if they want to apply for funds to -- in order to be
18 able to attend, and they have to really rationalize and
19 justify why that would -- those programs would support them
20 and change the leadership practices at the school.

21 MS. MAZANEC: What's the difference between
22 round one and round two?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So as Alissa was saying,
24 there's \$2 million dollars that are allocated to this grant
25 program each year. There's \$100,000 that can go to FTE. So



1 there's \$1.9 million throughout the year that can be
2 distributed through grants. So in April of this year, just
3 two months ago, you approved -- it was 1.7 -- where'd I
4 write that -- \$1.7 million in participants, and that went
5 out to 11 different districts that had applied. So those --

6 MS. MAZANEC: But why did we only do 1.7?
7 Why are there two rounds is my question.

8 MR. SHERMAN: We didn't give out -- we didn't
9 award all of the money that year or -- excuse me, earlier
10 this spring, because there -- there were -- there --

11 MS. MAZANEC: Did it have to do with the fund
12 -- the funds available?

13 MR. SHERMAN: It had to do with the
14 applications. And so a number of -- there were -- there
15 were some costs that were in some of the applications that
16 we felt like were not acceptable, that didn't quite meet the
17 standards. So in a lot of out cases, we offer awards for
18 less than what are requested. But we were able to award to
19 11 districts. And I believe all but one that applied were -
20 - received some award in April.

21 MS. JOHNSON: And the one that didn't receive
22 awards in April wasn't actually eligible. They weren't
23 Priority Improvement or Turnaround. So all the requests
24 were honored, maybe not the full amount that they were asked
25 for, but at the amount that was reasonable to CDEs. So we



1 went back to the districts and said, "Look, there's still
2 money left."

3 MS. MAZANEC: Did you say Priority
4 Improvement or Turnaround are not eligible?

5 MS. JOHNSON: Or turnaround, yeah. The -- it
6 -- the school wasn't Priority Improvement or Turnaround that
7 had applied, because they're the only ones that are
8 eligible.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. What about -- what about
10 who -- I don't -- I know I've asked this before, and I get
11 frustrated that we don't see who's applied, and who was
12 rejected, and why. And I know there's multi-online district
13 or schools that would like to participate more fully in this
14 kind of stuff, and they're in Priority Improvement and
15 Turnaround. And I don't understand why they're not getting
16 these opportunities.

17 MR. SHERMAN: Yeah, I mean, I don't know that
18 it's our practice to -- to -- to make public all of the --
19 all of the -- all of the applicants that have applied. I'm
20 not quite sure what our policy is around that, you know, if,
21 if we've shared that.

22 MS. JOHNSON: We can -- we can share that,
23 yeah.

24 MR. SHERMAN: Okay. So I think we -- I mean,
25 I'm happy to provide that information for you if you'd like.



1 MS. MAZANEC: I would like to have that, yes.

2 MR. SHERMAN: Okay.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, and what -- what is the --
4 what's the \$100,000 FTE? What's the role of that person?

5 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. Those funds go to
6 support in a number of different positions, mostly I
7 believe, all in my office, that are for the administration
8 of this grant program.

9 MS. MAZANEC: So it's not one person?

10 MR. SHERMAN: It's the equivalent of one
11 person but we -- there are a number of people including
12 myself, and a couple of my staff members that do the work.
13 So we allocate those funds according to the percentage of
14 work and roles that we play in that.

15 MS. MAZANEC: To -- to -- I mean, to monitor
16 the...

17 MR. SHERMAN: So the work that -- the work
18 that's involved, is that what you're asking?

19 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

20 MR. SHERMAN: Yes. The work that's involved
21 in managing this program has been communicating with
22 provider organizations, and with districts writing RFPs and
23 releasing those and going through the process of reviewing.
24 We have -- we bring in teams to do the actual reviews, but
25 there's work around that. There's a fair amount of



1 communication that occurs with districts and with our
2 providers once awards are made. So managing and ensuring
3 that folks that have applied to be -- to go through
4 different training actually go through those trainings, and
5 then there are annual reports that are written that, so
6 there's work involved in that as well. And there are
7 probably some things I'm not remembering.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Finally, I'm just -- I'm
9 wondering about return on investment too. What can you tell
10 us about it? And again, I would -- I would want more
11 specifics on that too, about how many have participated, and
12 what kind of an impact it's having in terms of how are their
13 schools now doing, schools and districts?

14 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. I --

15 MS. MAZANEC: Cause they're -- they're
16 turnaround or priority improvement schools, where -- are we
17 seeing move the needle?

18 MR. SHERMAN: We have, and I think there are
19 a number of schools. And so our goal is, as was discussed
20 this morning a little bit, is to really try to align some of
21 our supports, and some of our, ESSA work is to try to bring
22 some of the -- some of this leadership development and these
23 providers into alignment with the rest of our supports, but
24 we have seen a lot of -- a number of these schools that have
25 made changes. There -- we are challenged by an -- a formal



1 evaluation of the program, because let's say you send an
2 assistant principal to a training that goes -- that, that
3 goes on for a year or two, how do we measure, and be able to
4 track, and thread through sort of the impact that the leader
5 has had on school performance? It's been challenging to do
6 that.

7 You've had access -- we've -- we've completed
8 two of the reports so far that we've submitted to you all
9 and to the legislature, and the, the reports are not as
10 thorough as we would like them to be. We've shifted our
11 strategy around the evaluation this year by creating
12 surveys, and we're hoping that that information will be
13 synthesised and analyzed by the early fall, and I'd be glad
14 to share that with you as well.

15 MADAM CHAIR: And a number -- in a number of
16 cases, you have more than one program directed, and the, the
17 rub comes when you -- it's as same as what helps kids,
18 usually more than one intervention? And then isolating the
19 return on investment of just one piece of it is pretty much
20 impossible.

21 MR. SHERMAN: One of our parameters is we
22 won't award funds to multiple programs within a school, but
23 there are certainly districts that have multiple pro -- that
24 are engaged in multiple programs.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, okay. Well, that's good.
2 That's helpful to know. Board Member Rankin?

3 MS. RANKIN: I think Board Member Mazanec
4 asked similar questions, but I, I, I had the same ones, and
5 also, I'm sure what Pearson is looking at, a lot of this
6 money, how well it's spent, and return on investment, and
7 all that. Does the person themselves, like if I'm a
8 teacher, do I submit my own, or does the principal of my
9 school submit it for me, or how does that work?

10 MR. SHERMAN: The applications are submitted
11 by districts or by the Charter School Institute of a -- or
12 by a charter school directly.

13 MS. RANKIN: So a teacher would have to go to
14 the district, say, "I'm interested," or the district might
15 say to the teacher, "You, you need to be interested in
16 this," kind of...

17 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

18 MS. RANKIN: Okay, thank you.

19 MS. JOHNSON: Madam Chair, I do just want to
20 clarify one thing. So in round one, we did fund a number of
21 districts, and charters, and an online charter was in round
22 one, so just wanted to clairfy.

23 MS. RANKIN: For very small amount versus
24 other districts was getting a ton.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Hmm. Do I have a motion, if
2 there no further comments?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move to approve the
4 recommended -- recommended districts and schools for funding
5 for the School Turnaround Leaders Development Grant program.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Proper motion. Is there a
7 second?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

9 MADAM CHAIR: You second it? All right,
10 okay, good. Any opposition?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm too tired.

12 MR. DURHAM: Me too. I give up. I
13 surrender.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, it's Groundhog Day. Next
15 time on our agenda is a notice of rulemaking for the rules
16 for the operation, maintenance, and inspection of school
17 transportation vehicles, 1 CCR P01-26. Don't say anything
18 about being early.

19 MR. DURHAM: I move we give notice of
20 rulemaking.

21 (Chorus of "I second")

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are we doing?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know.



1 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think we need an
2 overview, 'cause we just had an overview last time, right?
3 Any opposition to that motion?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Good. Awesome. Nice work,
6 Board Member Durham.

7 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Yeah.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Notice of rulemaking for the
9 rules for the Colorado READ Act 1 CCR 301-92.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Commissioner?

12 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, you guys. You
13 (inaudible) me by moving so quickly.

14 MR. DURHAM: You never know when I'm going to
15 just spring.

16 MS. ANTHES: I love that. I really am very
17 pleased. So I believe I am turning this over to Dr.
18 Colzman. This is the READ Act rules, right? So I believe
19 I'm turning this over to Dr. Colzman and Alisa Dorman, who
20 is probably on her way here because we're a little early.

21 MADAM CHAIR: We're flying.

22 MS. COLSMAN: So I'll use my --

23 MS. ANTHES: Stalling tactics?

24 MS. COLSMAN: Yes, exact -- I was going to
25 say entertainment tactics.



1 MR. DURHAM: Do you sing?

2 MS. COLSMAN: Very, very poorly.

3 MR. DURHAM: We could do a duet then.

4 MS. COLSMAN: Oh, I don't think so. My
5 father and I always joke about that, how we could be like
6 the least talented father-daughter team ever.

7 So, so, so as Alisa comes in, I know that
8 there were a couple of questions this morning. Board Member
9 Mazanec had some questions just around the, the amendments
10 to the READ Act that just passed during this legislative
11 session. So we've set up our presentation for you today to
12 just kind of give really very broad overview of a few things
13 and then provide opportunity for questions that you might
14 have about how the changes to the READ Act will affect the
15 rulemaking process for today. So now, we are really
16 stalling.

17 MADAM CHAIR: She may not even be listening.
18 You know what, we're 50 minutes early, so she may not even
19 be listening.

20 MS. COLSMAN: Well, we were -- we were just
21 texting a moment ago, so hopefully.

22 MS. ANTHERS: She should be.

23 MS. COLSMAN: Yes.

24 MS. ANTHERS: Momentarily.

25 MS. COLSMAN: Right.



1 MADAM CHAIR: You don't want to wing this?

2 MR. DURHAM: So I --

3 MS. COLSMAN: I don't want to wing this.

4 MR. DURHAM: At least may I ask a couple of
5 questions?

6 MS. COLSMAN: Sure.

7 MR. DURHAM: So are these -- was there a
8 statutory change that has triggered this proposal, and that
9 statutory change was what?

10 MS. COLSMAN: So within the READ -- within
11 the READ Act, there was a change to the identification of
12 students who are in -- here she is -- to students who are
13 English learners, and identifying them as having a
14 significant reading deficiency. What we're proposing in the
15 READ Act rule change is almost a word-for-word revision of
16 the rules to align to the READ Act.

17 MR. DURHAM: And the bill just passed.

18 MS. COLSMAN: That's correct.

19 MR. DURHAM: So we're talking about the most
20 recent.

21 MS. COLSMAN: Exactly. And because this is
22 something that could affect the process for this coming
23 school year, given that districts have the first 60 days to
24 conduct the initial READ Act assessment, we thought it was
25 really important to get the rules in alignment with statutes



1 so that districts aren't confused as to begin the year. And
2 now, I will completely hand off the time to my colleague --

3 MS. DORMAN: Sorry, I was listening --

4 MS. COLSMAN: -- Alisa Dorman.

5 MS. DORMAN: -- but we just grabbed
6 everything quickly and started to try to run at the door,
7 and our data person was trying to solve one quick question,
8 and I was away from my desk.

9 So thank you for the opportunity to be here
10 to share with you the information related to this item. As
11 Melissa was saying, because of the recent passage of House
12 Bill 1160, thank you, we are wanting to move forward so that
13 schools and districts have the opportunity to begin this
14 school year on this path, instead of having this come at a
15 time later in the school year. So we would like to call
16 your attention to the following items: You have a board
17 memo that describes this particular item. You also have a
18 set of PowerPoint slides that we'll briefly go over, along
19 with a redline version of the rules and an alignment
20 document that shows what statute says to these amendments to
21 our Board rules.

22 So if I could just take you briefly through
23 the PowerPoint and just show you this is what it says in
24 statute basically that a READ Act interim assessment is.
25 this is what it measures. It measures the students' reading



1 skills and phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary
2 development, reading fluency, including oral skills and
3 reading comprehension.

4 So we have Board-approved assessments that
5 you have adopted, and they have been in place now for some
6 time. School districts began using those -- all of them
7 began using those Board-approved assessments this school
8 year, and are reporting those, and there are both English
9 and Spanish assessments on our Board-approved list.

10 The second slide here shows you the timeline
11 for assessment implementation according to the READ Act.
12 What you'll see on this particular slide is that your Board
13 rules ask that students be screened for their reading risk
14 at the beginning of the school year. This also aligns with
15 the statute that was passed in 13 -- House Bill 1323. There
16 are different timelines for students depending on if they
17 are in kindergarten or first, second, and third grade.

18 We also have per statute assessment that's
19 required at the end of the school year for data collection.
20 And so we collect scores on students at the end of the year
21 to determine if they do have a deficiency, and that is how
22 we also calculate the per pupil monies that are distributed
23 back to schools. Also you'll see on this timeline that the
24 requirements in statute and in rule both have that students
25 be monitored for their progress across the school year.



1 If you'll look at the next slide, you'll see
2 basically what the rule changes that you have in front of
3 you would change or keep the same regarding READ Act
4 implementation. So districts continue to have the authority
5 and power to select the Board-approved assessments from the
6 list. that would not change. They would still give the
7 assessment at the beginning and end of the year. that would
8 not change. And what they have here is, again, the ability
9 now, according to the statute and in the proposed rules, the
10 ability to determine for the English learner if they're
11 going to administer that assessment in English or in Spanish
12 And then it goes ahead, and it asks for some other things in
13 the statute, like a communication to parents, so that
14 parents would know at which point in time a student would
15 move from a Spanish assessment to an English assessment.

16 And again, they don't have to do this. this
17 would be an option to districts that they can choose for
18 their English learner population. It does say that at least
19 one of these interim assessments in English would have to be
20 given once the child had demonstrated partial proficiency or
21 higher.

22 What we've done already and will continue to
23 do across this process -- this is our rulemaking timeline --
24 is we've already presented this information to our English
25 learner literacy task force. So they've already seen this



1 information and have been given the opportunity to provide
2 feedback.

3 We're here today in June to be noticing
4 rulemaking. If you approve the notice of rulemaking, then
5 we will announce that again through our communication
6 outlets to schools, districts, advocacy groups, etcetera.
7 And we'll spend the month of July, during that period of
8 interim, collecting information and feedback from schools
9 and districts and any adjustments or changes, revisions
10 they'd like to offer, as well as feedback.

11 And then we would come back to you in August
12 for you to conduct a rulemaking hearing, and we would bring
13 to you all of the information we would have collected during
14 that period of time. If you vote to approve unanimously in
15 August, then we'll move forward with execution,
16 disseminating information, updating guidance. If it goes to
17 a second hearing, that would be pushed back one month to
18 September. So yes.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Can I ask a question?

20 MS. DORMAN: Sure.

21 MS. FLORES: And it's going back to the READ
22 Act implementation, and it's point, and it's, it's this one.
23 If choosing to administer an approved interim assessment in
24 Spanish, the district may also administer an approved
25 interim assessment in English at the request of the



1 student's parents. And you, you did state that districts
2 would choose to send this information to the parent or not.
3 I would say there should be -- parents should be notified
4 throughout, I mean.

5 MS. DORMAN: This was a conversation that the
6 English Learner Task Force had when we met in that, in the
7 development of guidance that would go forward in the field
8 in light of this change, I think our guidance document would
9 reflect what you just said. It would reflect that the
10 districts need to, as far as things that they would need to
11 do to implement this particular change in statute, it would
12 have criteria for parent communication.

13 MS. FLORES: Okay. So it's -- even-

14 MR. DURHAM: Have you seen the guidance as
15 opposed to the rule that makes it optional?

16 MS. FLORES: It shouldn't be optional.

17 MS. DORMAN: I would say that guidance --
18 statute rule guidance. So guiding -- when we guide the
19 field, the guidance is often used to implement towards the
20 best practice, but it doesn't hold the same weight as your
21 statute or rules would.

22 MR. DURHAM: There's no reason why that
23 couldn't be incorporated into the rule.

24 MS. DORMAN: That would be correct as I
25 understand it.



1 MS. FLORES: I think it should be
2 incorporated and I think that --

3 MADAM CHAIR: But if it -- only if it's in
4 the law. I don't think it is --

5 MS. DORMAN: It is in the law.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

7 MS. DORMAN: This is directly from the law.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

9 MS. DORMAN: So I think maybe you would wish
10 to clarify so I could take the notes, and we could consider
11 that in any revisions. I think what I heard you say is you
12 would -- you would like, even though the law says that
13 districts should do this --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

15 MS. DORMAN: -- at the -- at the parents'
16 request, it may not require that -- that communication be
17 sent to the parent.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Right. And I think it should
19 be.

20 MS. DORMAN: And you're asking for that
21 communication to be a part of your rules.

22 MS. FLORES: That's right. Or else it's
23 moved. And then, I think that the same should happen to
24 rule number 2, districts may choose to administer it. I
25 think at that point, parents should be notified, should be



1 notified on all these, actually. And it's so important, you
2 know? I mean, who -- what we speak is who we are, and, and,
3 and parents need to, at the very least, be, be notified as
4 to what the district is choosing to do.

5 MS. DORMAN: Thank you for that feedback.

6 MS. FLORES: You know, I, I would go even
7 further and say that the parent should have the right to
8 choose.

9 MADAM CHAIR: They do.

10 MS. FLORES: Well, they don't. They -- the
11 district has the right according to the law.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I think that both
13 the district and parents --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Parents can ask that
15 their kids test (inaudible)

16 MS. FLORES: No, no, no. Well, no. That's
17 information. But should the parent -- like for instance,
18 let's say I have a child, and I want my child to -- to be
19 taking -- I, I asked for dual language, but I refuse to do
20 what Denver Public Schools is doing and that is I, if it's
21 not a dual language program, then I don't want my child to
22 be in a -- what is their term for -- they -- their program
23 is they put them in Spanish only for three years, and then
24 after three years, you know, there are -- then they're given
25 English. And so I really believe that reading takes -- it -



1 - it's not only language acquisition. We're talking about
2 kids getting the ability to -- to learn to read. and
3 learning to read is -- most of the time, there's a few kids
4 who can, you know, teach themselves to read but most of the
5 time, somebody has to teach them. And so we're -- they're
6 missing out on the language of commerce.

7 MADAM CHAIR: I thought we were talking here
8 about the asesment.

9 MS. FLORES: Well, this is -- these are
10 points that are very, very important.

11 MS. MAZANEC: But Alissa, it's, it's true
12 though, isn't it? That as we talked about this morning it
13 was left out of the -- or the, the summary that we got this
14 morning. But it's true that if a parent wishes their child
15 to be assessed for reading proficiency in English, they can
16 upon their request.

17 MS. FLORES: That's right, but they have to
18 be notified. They have to be --

19 MS. MAZANEC: They had to be notified that
20 they have that choice?

21 MS. FLORES: That's right.

22 MS. DORMAN: I think that's a --

23 MS. FLORES: Or else it's moved.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. So -- all right.



1 MS. DORMAN: And I think -- so I think, if,
2 if I, if I may clarify so that if we were going to bring
3 back some potential language for your consideration in this,
4 I think that two things that I hear. One, it says that the
5 district, if choosing to administer in Spanish, may choose
6 to administer in English at the request of a parent. So
7 that's already what the statute says, right? And that's
8 what the rule is right now. But you're actually saying that
9 you believe that there should be some consideration for a
10 requirement for a notification to parents.

11 MS. FLORES: Yes.

12 MS. DORMAN: Okay. That's what I thought. I
13 wanted to just clarify.

14 MR. DURHAM: Does the statute say may or
15 shall?

16 MS. DORMAN: It says may.

17 MR. DURHAM: Yes. So parents really...

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They don't (inaudible).

19 MR. DURHAM: So the, so the districts were --
20 the districts were clever enough to cut the parents out of
21 the process.

22 MS. FLORES: Yes.

23 MR. DURHAM: That was Denver, who doesn't
24 care about parents --

25 MS. FLORES: That's right.



1 MR. DURHAM: -- in this process.

2 MS. DORMAN: And I just --

3 MR. DURHAM: Because I recall their lobbying,
4 just for the record.

5 MS. DORMAN: I just am reading -- I -- and
6 I'm -- I think we just checked over here that it does say
7 may. So I'd -- I'd -- I think it does say may as -- as the
8 language in the statute.

9 MR. DURHAM: I think this was the Denver
10 amendment as I recall, and just for the record. I think
11 it's one more example of -- of Denver not to -- not really
12 being willing to serve the parents' wishes.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin?

14 MS. FLORES: That's right.

15 MS. RANKIN: This can either be Ellisa,
16 Melissa, or Alissa.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is -- we're dying to
18 say that one.

19 MS. RANKIN: What is partial proficiency?
20 What's the definition of that?

21 MS. COLSMAN: That is -- that -- that's
22 actually, I'll take that one. That's actually a little
23 ambiguous, because the determinations on our English
24 language proficiency assessment doesn't specifically use
25 that terminology. And so I think that leaves some



1 discretion up to local school districts as to how they would
2 define partial proficiency. And as Alisa noted, through
3 guidance what we can do is actually provide some -- some
4 suggestions about how districts might do that so that there
5 could be some of that consistency across districts and what
6 they determine as partially proficient.

7 MS. MAZANEC: I could have sworn I was told
8 this morning that that was -- there was a definition for
9 partially proficient.

10 MS. FLORES: If it's partial, then I mean it
11 could be one-eighth, one -- one -- tenth, one-twelfth.

12 MS. RANKIN: Is there any way we can make
13 rules so that we do have a uniform definition for partial
14 proficiency?

15 MS. DORMAN: I think that's the question for
16 -- for our attorney general's office.

17 MR. DILL: I, I believe so. I, I, I think
18 the first thing you do is look to see if there is a
19 definition in the statute or -- or a definition, you know,
20 related to English language acquisition that -- that is
21 currently in use, which could be referenced but -- but
22 otherwise I think that -- that -- that would be a purpose of
23 the regulations to clarify such ambiguity to statutory
24 position.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Isn't there a fully sufficient
2 and a partially proficient in a lot of the reporting?

3 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. Alisa, do you wanna --

4 MS. FLORES: FPs and PPs.

5 MS. COLSMAN: Because it's changed in the
6 system.

7 MS. DORMAN: An English proficient authority
8 (inaudible) proficient. But that's based on -- in part the
9 access assessment but also body of evidence for students
10 too.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure enough. Just
12 making sure.

13 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

14 MADAM CHAIR: Sir?

15 MR. DURHAM: Well, it would appear that if we
16 were to define that, we might be able to overcome some of
17 the unwillingness to test in English because a reasonable
18 definition of partial proficiency in the statute, or
19 apparently the statute (inaudible) ensure that the student
20 takes at least one of the State approved, you know, reading
21 assessments in English. So maybe some ability to ensure
22 that some progress is made in English. And be able to be
23 able to measure that progress.

24 MS. DORMAN: Madam Chair, I think there's one
25 clarification I think could be important right now, because



1 actually within the amendment that has precipitated this
2 rule change, in section two, it indicates that if a student
3 scores within the range that the local education provider
4 determines demonstrates partial proficiency in English. So
5 it's giving that -- it's explicitly giving that over to the
6 local education provider.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's totally subjective.
8 It's totally subjective and determine it by district.
9 Correct?

10 MS. RANKIN: And they can change it anytime
11 too.

12 MS. DORMAN: Right. I mean the statute does
13 -- does seem to leave it entirely up to the local education.

14 MADAM CHAIR: And so?

15 MS. RANKIN: But we could offer guidance.

16 MS. DORMAN: For some consistency. For
17 consistency's sake. I think that that came up in our, just
18 to clarify, in our English language learner literacy
19 taskforce, meaning, both the point Melissa made and the
20 point that is being made here is there -- there is some
21 inconsistency, and there are districts who would like the
22 guidance provided so that they can have some consistency and
23 that's -- was a request. It was also noted by a district
24 that the authority was in statute now given to the district
25 for that determination.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what about the
2 limited proficiency, which may in fact be based on more than
3 assessment? That is a classification for our English
4 learners, right?

5 MS. COLSMAN: So I think Alisa may want to
6 ask, but I would ask for clarification as she said. So
7 right now, when -- the way we do our read data to match it
8 up is we do look at whether or not the student is non-
9 English proficient met, limited English proficient, but you
10 know, former English, but -- so we look at the matching of
11 data under those criteria. I think -- I think part of the
12 scale of your -- your consideration that you're having right
13 now is, if -- if non-English proficiency is pretty
14 determined, right, and no longer being limited English
15 proficient is determined, there's probably a pretty wide gap
16 --

17 MS. GOFF: There is.

18 MS. COLSMAN: -- in that development
19 continuum on what is considered to be limited English
20 proficiency.

21 MS. FLORES: Excuse me, may I, may I just
22 make a suggestion? I would like to sit down with you. I
23 know I'm -- I'm -- my brain is dead right now.

24 MS. COLSMAN: Sure.



1 MS. FLORES: But I would like to sit down
2 with you and work on this.

3 MS. COLSMAN: Okay.

4 MR. DURHAM: I need a copy of the statute
5 before I leave today, please. Thank you.

6 MS. GOFF: We need to cut score.

7 MR. DURHAM: Pardon me?

8 MS. GOFF: We need to cut score.

9 MS. FLORES: Where did you find that? I
10 don't, I don't...

11 MR. DURHAM: It's under 19 in your -- 19. --

12 MS. DORMAN: I would say for a quick
13 reference to Chairman, I mean, to Board Member Durham and to
14 the rest of you, if you were to look at the document that is
15 the side-by-side document provided, for the two redline
16 copies -- I mean, two red line changes you see, you see the
17 exact statutes here on the -- on this side, and then you see
18 how we've mirrored that with language that where we could
19 eliminate some of the verbage we did, and to just make it
20 cleaner and easier to read, but the full statute that we
21 copied from is here.

22 MS. MAZANEC: So the determination by the
23 local education provider, is that new? Is that the new?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, she is, and I
25 think she understands.



1 MS. DORMAN: That was in the stack in the --

2 MS. RANKIN: So we have notes, yeah.

3 MS. DORMAN: -- that was in the amendment to
4 the READ Act, to the 1160 language.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan?

6 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to approve the notice
7 of rulemaking for amended sections of the Rules for
8 Administration of the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic
9 Development Act 1 CCR 301-92.

10 MADAM CHAIR: I have a That's a proper
11 motion. Is there a second?

12 MS. FLORES: I'd like to have a discussion.

13 MADAM CHAIR: We don't have a second. Thank
14 you. Proceed.

15 MS. FLORES: I think that before we, we, we
16 vote on this session, I think we need to clean up the
17 language some.

18 MS. DORMAN: And this is the notice.

19 MADAM CHAIR: This is just a notice. This
20 is just a notice of rulemaking.

21 MS. DORMAN: So we have 60 days that we can
22 work on this before you have to bring it to a vote.

23 MADAM CHAIR: So we'll got a lot of input
24 from elsewhere as well.

25 MS. FLORES: Okay.



1 MR. DURHAM: Can I go -- I would like to make
2 a substitute motion to sway over until the August meeting.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, well, you didn't put the
4 sub forever statement.

5 MR. DURHAM: I can.

6 MADAM CHAIR: I, I think that...

7 MR. DURHAM: I don't know forever, but I
8 think, you know, I need to look at the statute and have some
9 -- some of the interest groups who care about --

10 MADAM CHAIR: That's what's going to come in
11 the next two months. You're going to put that off.

12 MR. DURHAM: I want to make sure all of the
13 interest groups have a chance to participate.

14 MS. FLORES: We're not giving notice for two
15 more months?

16 MR. DURHAM: Well, we don't meet next month.
17 I'd move the delay until July, but we're not meeting.

18 MADAM CHAIR: I'm going to vote against that.
19 I think that's a little unfortunate.

20 MR. DURHAM: That's, that's fine. I'd just
21 make the motion, if there's a second.

22 MS. RANKIN: I'm sorry. I missed it.

23 MR. DURHAM: Substitute motion to lay this
24 over until August.

25 MS. FLORES: I heard --



1 MS. RANKIN: I'll second that.

2 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

3 MS. FLORES: I third it.

4 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. if this doesn't pass.

5 MS. CORDIAL: For Board Member Durham's

6 substitute motion. Board Member Durham?

7 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

9 MS. FLORES: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

11 MS. GOFF: No.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

13 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan?

15 MR. MCCLELLAN: No.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

17 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

19 MADAM CHAIR: No.

20 MS. FLORES: So we have...

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're putting off two

22 months -- for the people in school districts, I feel like

23 we're putting this off up two months now.

24 MADAM CHAIR: We're putting this off four

25 months now.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's crazy.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Because you don't like the
3 bill.

4 MS. FLORES: It's pretty badly written.

5 MADAM CHAIR: All right, Board Member
6 reports. We're done. We're not doing anything.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We still have one more.

8 MADAM CHAIR: MR. Durham, do you have a Board
9 Member report?

10 MADAM CHAIR: I don't believe I do, Madam
11 Chair. I didn't accomplish much in the intervening time
12 between this meeting and the last so.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores?

14 MS. FLORES: No, just been talking to people
15 about -- I did get calls about why we didn't graduate on
16 time. So I've been spending time returning calls on that.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Why we didn't't graduate on
18 time?

19 MS. FLORES: Why we -- why on that report.
20 everybody heard it on NPR.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, yeah. Okay, I got it.

22 MS. FLORES: So I still have to return some
23 calls.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin?



1 MS. RANKIN: It's past and future and the
2 last month, I can't say I didn't do too much, but in, in the
3 next month, I just would like to draw your attention to the
4 fact that Commissioner Anthes and I were born on the same
5 day. she just looks a lot better than I do.

6 MS. ANTHERS: Oh, yeah, that was very
7 exciting.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Born on the same day or the
9 same date?

10 MS. RANKIN: The same day.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I said day.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Born the same day.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we don't know
14 that.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Board Member McClellan?

16 MADAM CHAIR: I had the pleasure of meeting
17 with constituents in Aurora and constituents in Highlands
18 Ranch. And I also attended the new member training last
19 weekend from June 9th through 10th at the National
20 Association of State Boards of Education. So that was very
21 informative.

22 I appreciated the opportunity to attend a
23 Bill signing for House Bill 17-1294, MR. Weissman's Bill,
24 regarding counting assent programs students in graduation
25 rates. And I'm looking forward to participating in the



1 Executive Education Program for senior officials in State
2 and local government at Harvard during the month of July.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're going to Harvard?

5 MS. MAZANEC: Mm-hm.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec?

7 MS. MAZANEC: I don't have anything.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff?

9 MS. GOFF: I know. It was actually a delight
10 to get back to normal communication routine with Westminster
11 schools. I attended the launch of their summer meals
12 program, which actually covers, I think it's 8 to 10 -- 8 to
13 10 elementary school locations and others in Adams County
14 and Westminster district. So a lots -- thousands, thousands
15 of kids in that community are served through the meal
16 program every year.

17 I spent -- have spent considerable time
18 following the back-and-forth and up-and-down and round about
19 proposals at -- in Washington D.C., one of which is
20 including the proposed federal budget, as it impacts
21 education in '18-'19. More on that to come depending on
22 what -- where it goes. It's kind of -- everything is just a
23 little bit in limbo right now.

24 Spent time again with the Adams County
25 community, especially the youth initiative groups and so



1 forth and are getting ready to welcome Jefferson County's
2 new Superintendent, Jason Glass, who arrives 1st of January
3 -- or July, sorry. July. So I'm looking forward to the
4 school year when it's ready to start. So thank you.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. So I had a really
6 busy month. I attended a two-day program in Houston, along
7 with some staff, a legislator, etcetera, supported by the
8 Hunt's Institute, I guess, which is a deeper dive into ESSA,
9 which is very interesting, and I actually learned quite a
10 bit. Different ideas. I attended a -- I guess, a
11 celebration that was sponsored by PEBC and Comcast. They
12 gave out 57 scholarships to students. I think they usually
13 celebrate that at the PEBC luncheon, but this time it was
14 held at the Cable Center, which was nice to get a tour of
15 the memorabilia of the cable industry for the last 50 years,
16 plus sort of a nice happy celebration.

17 I also got to attend a kindergarten event at
18 Brown International. A hundred and six of the cutest little
19 boogies. It was just so nice to be in that situation. I
20 miss being on the school board and not getting to go to
21 events where there are little people.

22 I also attended the -- I was at NASBY at the
23 at the same time as Board Member McClellan and I. They had
24 a Board Member in. we got to meet a number of the new, new
25 Board Members which was very nice.



1 I attended an education round table this week
2 where I listened to a number of AEC administrators and also
3 students from around Denver, and to hear some of the
4 concerns they have and some of the challenges they have, and
5 it sort of occurred to me that I don't know that we have a
6 really effective way to hear from these kids and what some
7 of their challenges are and what are some of the things that
8 we could be doing to help them.

9 MS. FLORES: Kids hear from whom?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Students, alternative education
11 campuses.

12 MS. FLORES: Oh, thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: And then finally I wanted to
14 point out to everybody that we're going to have a conflict
15 this -- late this fall between the CASB Conference and the
16 Excellence in Education National Summit. They are at
17 exactly the same time. And I know that I'll have to go to
18 CASB Conference, because we make a presentation at CASB. So
19 for November 29 to December 1, we've got conflicting
20 conferences that we often -- many of us at least tend to
21 attend both, and it's going to be a conflict for sure. Just
22 really too bad.

23 MS. RANKIN: You make a presentation at CASB

24 --

25 MADAM CHAIR: We all do.



1 MS. RANKIN: Is it just you or --

2 MADAM CHAIR: No, we all do. Which is a --
3 which makes it --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That panel.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, that panel. Plus, for me
6 at least, it's an opportunity to interact with a lot of my
7 School Board Members in Colorado. But that makes it kind of
8 difficult.

9 Okay. So I think we have -- we do not have
10 anyone coming to speak. So we're adjourned until tomorrow
11 morning at 9:00. Oh, we're gonna hammer? Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hammer.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Hammer.

14 (Meeting adjourned)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

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

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



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5