



Colorado State Board of Education

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

August 17, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on August 17, 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: Next item on our agenda,
2 debrief conversation -- I'm sure you heard me. Be part of
3 the conversation. I want to thank -thank you all from
4 districts for coming. Commissioner, do you want to make any
5 comments about this before we turn it over to Ms. Pearson?

6 MS. ANTHERS: I don't know. I think we can
7 just turn it over to Ms. Pearson. I've lost track of what
8 we're doing today. So, yeah. So, I might be- I -- I probably
9 am supposed to say something, but I think we'll turn it over
10 to Ms. Pearson.

11 MADAM CHAIR: We're going to turn it over to
12 Ms. Bautsch.

13 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Hi, Ms. Bautsch.

15 MS. BAUTSCH: Hello.

16 MADAM CHAIR: You all look much calmer today
17 than you did back during the hearings.

18 MS. BAUTSCH: It's okay. Had a little bit of
19 summer vacation. All right. So, we are going to dive into
20 this debrief. We're going to -- I'm going to give a very
21 brief overview of what did happen this past -- these past
22 few months with the accountability clock cycle. We're going
23 to hear from -- we have two superintendents with us today
24 we'll hear some remarks from and we will also summarize
25 other feedback that department staff has collected from a



1 variety of different stakeholders and there will be
2 opportunity throughout all of this for the state board to
3 engage in discussion and ask questions and of the
4 superintendents, of CD staff, of yourselves. All right.

5 So this past year, the earlier this year, the
6 state board considered actions for 12 schools in five
7 districts over about 40 hours of public hearings -- of
8 public hearing time spanning about four months. And you
9 considered over probably two to 3,000 pages of documentation
10 and ultimately produced 13 written determinations directing
11 districts to take actions that would significantly and
12 rapidly improve student learning.

13 This slide summarizes the actions that were
14 directed towards schools. There were actions around partial
15 closure, innovation, management, reconstitution of a
16 governing board. The majority of directed actions did
17 involve the management pathway or an external management
18 partnership to some extent. The districts that were at the
19 end of the clock, four of the five directed actions were
20 around external management and the other directed action was
21 around partial closure of a school, and that was for
22 Julesburg.

23 Were there any questions around -- I just
24 wanted to provide a very, very brief highlight of the main
25 orders that were issued. Were there any questions before we



1 turn it over to our superintendents? Okay.

2 MADAM CHAIR: My apologies, what?

3 MS. BAUTSCH: Don't worry. No worries. All
4 right. We're going to go ahead and dive in so we can
5 actually hear from those folks that are with us today. We
6 have superintendent Rico Munn from the rural public schools
7 and we have superintendent Deirdre Pilch from Greeley. So,
8 if you guys want to come up.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Please.

10 MS. BAUTSCH: Okay. Thank you.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Come on down.

12 MS. ANTHERS: Brenda, while they're coming up,
13 could you just highlight that we did ask everyone to
14 participate? All the superintendents, we invited everyone
15 for this feedback.

16 MS. BAUTSCH: Yes, Yes. In terms of providing
17 in person feedback, we did extend invitations to any of the
18 districts that had come forward. And we also gave the
19 opportunity for them to provide written feedback if they
20 weren't able to attend in person. Many of them, it's their
21 back to school week and they are kicking off-

22 MADAM CHAIR: Only districts and not
23 principals?

24 MS. BAUTSCH: We -- yes, we did yes. We just
25 reached out to superintendents.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So that explains why.
2 Yes, that was my question because I have to see a principal
3 back there.

4 MS. ANTHES: We did invite Hope and others.

5 MS. BAUTSCH: Oh and Hope, sorry, Hope
6 counted as-.

7 MS. ANTHES: To participate as well.

8 MS. BAUTSCH: -- a (indiscernible) given that
9 they're a charter school, yes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did we get any written
11 feedback?

12 MS. BAUTSCH: We did. Yes. Yes. And I'll
13 share some highlights of that after we hear from the
14 superintendents.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Tell me how many.

16 MS. BAUTSCH: Oh, how many? We received
17 written feedback from three districts.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you so much.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Welcome folks. Glad to have
20 you. Dr. Pilch, I'll let you start. If you had some
21 comments, you want us to ask few questions, you tell me.

22 DR. PILCH: It's your pleasure, Madam Chair.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Got some comments?

24 DR. PILCH: Well, you know I do. So, I want
25 to I say that I did leave my staff back at the district. We



1 have not started school yet. Our teachers are all back this
2 week and our students start on Monday.

3 So, when I gave them a free pass to stay
4 back, they chose to, but I have had some conversation with
5 our principals who were part of the process this past year,
6 and -- and with our district leadership who -- who have been
7 involved in the process. So first, I want to say thank you
8 very much to Commissioner Anthes and her staff.

9 We -- we actually had tremendous support and
10 I think our big takeaway would be that we wish we had
11 engaged earlier with the department and the department staff
12 and that we might have been further along sooner if we had
13 done so. And, you know, part of that is on me in that I was
14 finishing up year one as superintendent by the time I really
15 got my arms around what was available to us from the
16 Colorado Department of Education in terms of support.

17 But I think also that the staff who have been
18 in in District Six for a while, feel like had they engaged
19 earlier and more actively with some of the staff, it -- it
20 could have been a benefit to us, you know. And I -- I did --
21 I want to recognize Alyssa especially who came up with her
22 team and presented to our Board of Education, I think about
23 two years ago now and really talked about the school
24 improvement process and talked about the process for schools
25 that were on the clock.



1 And so, I think that was really helpful and -
2 - and I know you've continued to offer to do that. So, thank
3 you. And, you know, and then, the calls that have come in
4 regularly from Peter Sherman and -- and from Lisa Medler
5 just offering support and trying to help us to navigate
6 these very complex waters.

7 One of the things that -- that I think is
8 important for us to point out is that we could not have done
9 the work that we have done over the last year without the
10 grants that have been made available to us, so the
11 turnaround network grants, the Catapult grants, have been
12 tremendous in what we've been able to do.

13 And because we are very resource tight in
14 District Six, we would not have been able to send our staff
15 to the trainings we've been able to send them to, and we had
16 teachers in last week, a week prior to the other teachers
17 coming back and we were able to stipend them to come in and
18 do additional work in our priority improvement schools, our
19 turnaround schools, because of the grant dollars that we've
20 received.

21 So, we're very appreciative of that. And I
22 think that's an important piece of districts being able to -
23 - to continue this work. I -- I do have some pieces where
24 I'd make some suggestions, do you want me to do that now?

25 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.



1 DR. PILCH: Okay.

2 MADAM CHAIR: The floor is yours.

3 DR. PILCH: Okay. Thank you. So I -- I want
4 to talk first about the school review process. So I have the
5 privilege of being a part of multiple school review
6 processes. We actually asked for more than one on a couple
7 of schools -- of a couple of our schools.

8 And I -- I need to be honest about that some
9 of those school review teams were stronger than others. Some
10 were more capable of analyzing, evaluating, and then really
11 assessing what they were learning and being able to
12 articulate that accurately than others.

13 The other piece that I think would be a real
14 asset in that school review process is we just, you know, be
15 -- those of us on the ground, and I think, I can speak at
16 least for the staff in my district, we want to know that the
17 people who are reviewing us have actually done the work. Not
18 just been trained to teach people how to do the work or
19 trained to know how to look for -- for the right work going
20 on.

21 We want to -- we want people on the ground
22 who've actually done it and I know there is a shortage of
23 those people because not a lot of people who have really
24 done truly successful turnaround work. But I think that's a
25 critical growth area and a responsibility for all of us. And



1 so, you know, I made the commitment that -- to Katy. I said,
2 "We're going to do this work and then you'll have people who
3 you can use to say yes they've done the work and here's how
4 they do it."

5 But -- but that's -- that is some capacity
6 that has to be developed to lend credibility to the process.
7 And I think also to really make sure that the school review
8 that's taking place is -- is really accurate of what's
9 happening there at the school site. So I -- there is some
10 work to be done there I think.

11 The other area where I think there's some
12 work to be done is in terms of looking at years one, two and
13 three. Once a school goes on priority improvement or
14 turnaround and, and especially once you get into the year
15 two and three, are there some indicators that could be
16 developed? And I know you all don't need more work. But are
17 there -- are there some indicators that could be developed
18 that are showing that they're moving towards success?

19 MADAM CHAIR: So, you would call this year
20 one for you? I'm trying to figure out when you're talking
21 about one, you just-

22 DR. PILCH: Yes, or also, yes, Angelika. And
23 also when -- when a school hits turnaround because of their
24 data and they drop into turnaround or they drop into
25 priority, that's a year one also.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So that would have been last
2 year.

3 DR. PILCH: Yes.

4 MADAM CHAIR: So this would be-

5 DR. PILCH: Yes.

6 MADAM CHAIR: As you implement-

7 DR. PILCH: Yes.

8 MADAM CHAIR: -- what we all talked about.

9 DR. PILCH: Yes.

10 MADAM CHAIR: So you're talking year two.

11 DR. PILCH: Yes.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, so I just want to get-

13 DR. PILCH: So what are those indicators of
14 success that would say, you know, we're -- we're moving in
15 the right direction and we're -- and we're getting there?
16 And we've got our own indicators of success.

17 And I know you all have the state testing,
18 but what are the other look-fors you would be looking for?
19 And then how -- is there a way that CDE staff or the school
20 -- school review team can come in to see if -- if that is a
21 -- if -- if those things are actually happening.

22 MR. MUNN: I think you're talking about
23 different things. She's talking about --

24 DR. PILCH: After we -- after we start --
25 after you -- at the end the clock is what you're talking



1 about, Angelika?

2 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I'm trying to figure out
3 exactly-

4 DR. PILCH: No, I'm actually, I think yes you
5 could do that after you're at the end of the clock. But
6 we've identified those in our innovation plan. So I think
7 we're okay there. I'm talking about when a school first --

8 MADAM CHAIR: First gets turnaround.

9 DR. PILCH: Yes. That first year or second or
10 third year that they're on turnaround.

11 MADAM CHAIR: That is something we've been
12 talking about also.

13 DR. PILCH: Yeah.

14 MADAM CHAIR: There's a difference between
15 whether you're turnaround or priority improvement.

16 DR. PILCH: There is. Yes.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Please go ahead.

18 DR. PILCH: Yes, that's what I'm talking
19 about-

20 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

21 DR. PILCH: -is that when you first hit that,
22 then what should -- what should -- what are the look force
23 that -- that CDE staff would be looking for, that the state
24 board would be looking for, that we should be looking for,
25 that says we're move -- now we're moving in the right



1 direction to get out of turnaround? So that we don't get-.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Before the clock hits.

3 DR. PILCH: Yeah, that we don't get to year
4 five. So thank you, Rico, for helping me with that.

5 So then the other thing I think I want to
6 share is there's a -- there's somewhat of a disconnect I
7 think for us at the local level around, you know, going to
8 our board to have a school say approve for innovation status
9 and then to come to you all with a school for innovation
10 status, and if that school is also in turnaround, there's
11 some, that's a disconnect for us.

12 So for example if we bring Billie Martinez
13 Elementary which we did this past spring to our board for
14 approval on innovation and then, and to your board for
15 approval on innovation and then they come up next year on
16 year five of prior -- of turnaround. That's a disconnect.
17 And what do we do it. What do you do logically at that
18 point? So that, that is a disconnect. I think for us at the
19 local school district. And-

20 MS. ANTHES: Can you say more about why it's
21 the disconnect?

22 DR. PILCH: Well because, well because I
23 think we feel like we have to come with a new plan in year
24 five. Rather than the plan that we just had the state board
25 approved the year before. So, so how do we-



1 MADAM CHAIR: Let me, let me just su-

2 DR. PILCH: I know you all will help me to
3 navigate that.

4 MADAM CHAIR: -suggest that when you come to
5 us for approval for innovation status, we're not looking at
6 it in quite that way, in fact, it only as a result of a
7 change in the law-

8 DR. PILCH: Right.

9 MADAM CHAIR: -do we even get to look at it
10 as an, as a potential improvement. We actually had to accept
11 it unless things were going to go downhill or there was a
12 financial problem. So the criteria on, in our, at our level
13 was nothing --

14 DR. PILCH: Right.

15 MADAM CHAIR: -- legally was nothing related
16 to what we've been talking about with just to-

17 DR. PILCH: Right. Which leads me to my next
18 suggestion because of that. So that's a disconnect for us.
19 And so, so I would suggest that, well so let me just say it
20 like it is, we, we knew we needed to do a major restructure
21 and reprogramming and a redesign at our schools and we
22 didn't see charter or school closure, or outside management
23 is exactly the right thing for them.

24 And so we cobbled it together to fit into the
25 innovation pathway because we had to bring a plan forward as



1 a part of our turnaround clock. So I would suggest that
2 there, there be a consideration for a pathway that is a
3 significant restructure or reorganization kind of pathway.

4 That isn't external management, that isn't
5 school closure or charter takeover, but we, and I'd be happy
6 to work on this, where you have certain criteria that would
7 have to be met for it to be considered a significant
8 restructure or a significant redesign of a school but that
9 that could be a possible additional pathway.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Instead of innovation.

11 DR. PILCH: Well, or in addition to
12 innovation. But I think we would have chosen it instead of
13 innovation in the case of our turnaround schools.

14 MADAM CHAIR: And can te -- can you tell me
15 why?

16 DR. PILCH: Because that's really what we
17 did. We didn't start from, we want to be a school of
18 innovation and here's the criteria for innovation. We said,
19 "Here's what we need to do to turn this school around and
20 now how do we make this fit into an innovation pathway."

21 MADAM CHAIR: And what's this --

22 DR. PILCH: 'Cause it's not going to fit into
23 these other pathways.

24 MADAM CHAIR: What were the challenges by
25 putting it into innovation?



1 DR. PILCH: Well, so one of the challenges of
2 course was really identifying what are those waivers. 'Cause
3 you really may or may not need waivers but to be innovation
4 you have to have waivers. So we, you know, we had to spent
5 time muddling through that on waivers, when the waivers were
6 not the significant redesign for us at least at two of the
7 schools.

8 Now one of the schools, the waivers are a
9 part of the significant resign -- redesign and they make
10 sense there.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Brief, I would like to have
12 them speaking.

13 MS. FLORES: If you recalled yesterday, we
14 had, Denver Public Schools had no problems, Denver Public
15 Schools had no problems. Going into the various areas. In
16 fact, they just ma -- made teachers sort of ancillary.

17 MADAM CHAIR: It's a -- it's a -- that's a
18 different school.

19 MS. FLORES: And -- and going through
20 waivers, but they were ready with the waivers with all the
21 laws and stuff. And I thought, you know, here's a new idea
22 or, but the idea it didn't matter, what mattered was all the
23 waivers, bill this, bill that, bill that.

24 And, you know, I just think that this what
25 she's saying. It's having a great idea, and that's



1 significant. And, you know, may not deal, deal with waivers
2 but may deal with helping kids. And that's I think you're on
3 target.

4 DR. PILCH: So I have one more piece that-

5 MADAM CHAIR: Please go ahead.

6 DR. PILCH: -relates back to that, I think.
7 So, I think that when District 6, they hit their first
8 school that was really in trouble on turnaround and that
9 school was East Memorial. And so the decision was made to
10 close East Memorial and to reconstitute. So staff were
11 released, leadership was changed all of that and it has,
12 and, and we deve -- we built and desi -- you know, we
13 restructured into Bella Romero K-8 Academy; and it's been
14 very successful.

15 So in that case, the school closure and a
16 significant restructure of school really worked for us. But
17 when I look at the number of schools that we had on
18 turnaround, we were looking at nearly at one point a quarter
19 of our schools. And there was, there would have been no way
20 we could close and restructure that many schools.

21 I mean, there simply isn't the teacher pool
22 out there to hire that number of teachers or even the
23 leadership pool out there to, to lead these turnaround
24 schools. And so, you know, there still seems to be a gap in
25 what is available to districts and in terms of th -- the



1 pathway to take. And that's why I suggest this significant
2 restructure pathway or reorganization pathway I don't know
3 what it's called. And I'd be happy to help on it. And then
4 I, I guess-

5 MADAM CHAIR: Can I do a real quick call a
6 friend? Are our various categories in our rules, or were
7 they in 163? Do you remember?

8 MS. PEARSON: They are in 163.

9 DR. PILCH: Yeah.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, so you're talking about-

11 DR. PILCH: Yeah, I'm thinking about-

12 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, I just want to get the,
13 the respective-

14 DR. PILCH: I was afraid I was talking
15 legislation. I thought I probably was, but that was-

16 MADAM CHAIR: But I thought I wanted to
17 clarify that, just-

18 DR. PILCH: Yeah. Thank you.

19 MADAM CHAIR: That -- that shouldn't
20 discourage us. I'm not suggesting that, Dr. Pilch. I'm just,
21 I just want to have the perspective of what's -- where we go
22 -- what direction we're moving.

23 DR. PILCH: And then maybe this is allowable.
24 And I did not have the opportunity to ask staff, the
25 question I had that time, but one of my staff members sent



1 the question to me if is it allowable to say, I want to be
2 up on the clock now rather than wait the five years and come
3 in with the plan and say, you know, I want-

4 MADAM CHAIR: We have -- we have talked about
5 that -- for turnaround?

6 DR. PILCH: Yes, for turnaround.

7 MADAM CHAIR: We have talked about that and
8 we talked about it at the wrong time because we had gone
9 through this particular process and the thought of doing it
10 every year all year long.

11 DR. PILCH: Yeah, I get -- on you all, I get
12 that. I -- I have to say I think for-

13 MADAM CHAIR: But for kids, it's probably the
14 best thing.

15 DR. PILCH: And I think for us I think I, you
16 know, I don't need five years, we need to get a plan in two
17 years. And I'm ready to bring you that plan and tell you
18 time is up.

19 And if you don't see a change in the next 18
20 months, we've got a serious, serious issue beyond the other
21 serious issue we already had tha -- that is going to take
22 even more dramatic action. So I think we would -- we might
23 have some interest in that to create more urgency. I mean
24 the kids are there.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Five years is a long



1 time.

2 DR. PILCH: Yeah. Five years is a long time.
3 Okay, those were my comments. I'm happy to answer questions
4 you might have.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to make questions
6 now or do you want to wait?

7 MS. ANTHES: Let's wait-

8 MADAM CHAIR: Let's wait.

9 MS. ANTHES: -18 months.

10 DR. PILCH: I know.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Munn? Councilor Munn.

12 MR. MUNN: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank
13 -- all the members of the board and the staff for having us
14 here today. As the board, I hope is aware, we are here on
15 two separate but dis -- and distinct issues, but there is
16 some relation between the two.

17 The first is related to the DPF process and
18 the SPF process itself. But then the second is to provide
19 whatever commentary or thoughts we can around the 163-
20 hearing process. So, unless you have some objection, I'll
21 start with first that framework discussion.

22 MADAM CHAIR: And do you guys all remember
23 the letter that we got last February? Okay.

24 MR. MUNN: All right.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Go-.



1 MR. MUNN: And just to set that up and to
2 give you -- remind you of some history. So, last year after
3 Aurora Public Schools received its district performance
4 framework, the initial one we submitted a request to
5 reconsider to the department of the department in December,
6 granted some of those requests and denied some of those.

7 We've been following an appeal for -- with
8 you around three specific issues of that requests. After
9 some discussions with staff, we've sent a proposal to you,
10 about how we would withdraw that appeal conditioned upon an
11 opportunity to have a discussion with this board around
12 those same issues.

13 We first suggested that discussion happened
14 in June. We understood that you were a bit busy at that
15 period in time. And so, the request came back could we move
16 this back to August? We said that would be fine so long as
17 that discussion was in time to impact this year's frameworks
18 and this year's request to reconsider an appeal process. And
19 so that's the understanding that we have coming to the table
20 today.

21 We've raised three questions in that letter
22 and in that appeal. The first was, how can or should the
23 performance frameworks account for school districts that
24 preemptively undertake significant turnaround efforts?

25 The second was, should the accuracy of the



1 district performance frameworks be recognized or prioritized
2 in light of the increasing public scrutiny of those
3 frameworks? And then the third was, to what level should the
4 inclusion of charter schools and district level
5 accountability metrics be evaluated, given the different
6 dynamics of how charter schools are authorized and the state
7 board's role in that authorization process?

8 So, going to that first question, how can or
9 should those frameworks account for school districts that
10 preemptively undertake significant turnaround efforts? As we
11 take a look at the law and the statute, the state law at --
12 and Ms. Tolleson and I can discuss this in great detail, but
13 at 22-11-207 talks about how the department and the board
14 must consider and create objective measures for evaluating
15 the interventions and the improvement strategies that
16 districts and schools utilize and must consider that in the
17 frameworks themselves.

18 We see in no way where that is considered in
19 the framework itself. It is not. There are no objective
20 measures for those, those, that work. There is no way of
21 looking at that, how there might be points gained for those
22 strategies in the framework. There's nothing that the
23 department or the state board is doing to account for that
24 piece of the statute.

25 It's very specifically called out. It's



1 called out as one of the minimum things that must be in the
2 framework. It is nowhere in there. And we believe that is of
3 concern particularly for a district like ours that is
4 aggressively taking turnaround efforts and turnaround
5 actions to improve our schools and that should be accounted
6 for in both our district and school performance frameworks.
7 So, we'd like to know where is that conversation and how can
8 that be accounted for.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have a comment?

10 MS. PEARSON: I think my understanding of
11 when those decisions were made back at the beginning was
12 that, because of the intense resources effort needed to be
13 able to really comprehensively include that information in a
14 framework, that it was moved to the request reconsider
15 process. So it would be something that would be considered
16 there then the district could put forward and be considered
17 in that way.

18 But it wasn't done uniformly. And that, the
19 amount of research it would take to evaluate a school and
20 district on their implementation would be tremendous.

21 MADAM CHAIR: In the request to reconsider,
22 how is it handled?

23 MS. PEARSON: It's an area where districts
24 can submit additional information and say, this is where we
25 are in the process of implementing our plan, and what we're



1 doing in that area.

2 MADAM CHAIR: And then are points granted
3 based on that?

4 MS. PEARSON: It's looked at, it's looked at
5 for turnaround and priority improvement, they also need to
6 submit data. So both things are looked at together. And, our
7 policy has been that that alone can't take over what the
8 performance data is showing.

9 MR. MUNN: So respectfully, there are three
10 problems with that. One is the law itself fairly explicitly
11 calls out that it has to part of the initial assignment of a
12 performance framework. And so, waiting until the end for the
13 request to consider does not follow state law.

14 The second is that including in the request
15 to reconsider a problem is problematic because under your
16 Rule 5.06, part of that request must demonstrate that the
17 request to reconsider will move it up in the framework. We
18 can't show that unless there are points assigned to it.
19 Unless, there's some way of demonstrating that we can
20 actually move it up into the framework.

21 And so, by process itself that is not even
22 considered in that process. To our review, no district has
23 ever been granted any kind of change in their framework
24 based upon those interventions and those strategies. That's
25 particularly problematic because the statute 22-11-207, at



1 sub two, sub D, calls out and specifies that these things
2 should be considered even if you're not meeting state
3 performance targets, which means that you can't say, we're
4 going to consider it only if the data tells us you're
5 meeting the target.

6 It specifies in state law that it's for
7 consideration if you're not meeting those targets. And so
8 you have to set measures, set points and look at the actual
9 work that's happening. We understand and respect that it's
10 resource intensive. But the law says what it says.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I'm trying to understand
12 this in a layman's terms. You want points for trying?

13 MR. MUNN: I -- I want the law to be
14 followed.

15 MADAM CHAIR: No, no. But, what do you --
16 you're saying the law says that, if you're kind of trying to
17 turn things around, even if you're not successful, if kids
18 are not successful, you should get points for that? For
19 effort?

20 MR. MUNN: No, what the law says, and what it
21 recognizes is that there should be points awarded for
22 significant improvements or interventions that are put in
23 place.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Well, when there are
25 improvements that are measurable, my understanding is that



1 points are granted. When there are other assessments brought
2 in that are not part of the statewide assessments, those are
3 seriously considered and so correct me what I'm, what I'm,
4 what I'm saying, they are given.

5 It's a question of whether the efforts are
6 showing results in some other measure, other than the one
7 that's our statewide assessment that in fact, we do grant
8 points.

9 MR. MUNN: That's what happens, but that's
10 not what the law says.

11 MADAM CHAIR: So, what should we be doing for
12 kids, E for Effort or actually showing improvement?

13 MR. MUNN: We should be doing all of those
14 things, but right now, I'm -- I'm trying to bring to you in
15 a conversation around policy and process that what is
16 happening is not in compliance with the law and we're trying
17 to understand both how we do those things in compliance as
18 we have to do as responsible people in the system. But also
19 what we're doing for kids, all the other things we know that
20 we have to do, and the work that's so important for kids.
21 But we can't conflate what is our responsibility there with
22 some of those underlying efforts.

23 MADAM CHAIR: So, Ms. Tolleson, do you see
24 this the same way? I -- I don't think the intent there was
25 to give E for effort. It was an attempt to give an



1 opportunity to demonstrate in some of the other -- in other
2 measures that more points should be granted. Am I?

3 MS. TOLLESON: Well, Madam Chair, this --
4 this aspect of the statute is written with the same level of
5 perfect guidance and clarity as every other aspect. It talks
6 about that --

7 MADAM CHAIR: So that Rico would have plenty
8 of opportunities.

9 MS. TOLLESON: It talks about--

10 MR. MUNN: I'm just reading, Madam Chair.

11 MS. TOLLESON: -the rules, you know. Take
12 into consideration. Right. The -- the, and it doesn't talk
13 about it, you know, in terms of what does it mean to take it
14 into consideration. Does it -- does it mean to do what we're
15 doing? Does it mean to have points specifically associated
16 with the fact that while they haven't borne fruit yet,
17 interventions have been implemented.

18 I -- this is one of those how many angels
19 dance on the head of a pin thing that lawyers could argue
20 both sides of until they're blue in the face.

21 MADAM CHAIR: And so, we have a conversation
22 here on the board. We're not going to get anywhere either.

23 MS. TOLLESON: Yeah.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Given the -- given that the law
25 is so inconclusive.



1 MR. MUNN: I'm not here today to try and --

2 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member, Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: It -- would it be -- is it your
4 suggestion that perhaps we have a really kind of an
5 objective policy that says if you -- if you have an
6 innovation status and have obtained these kinds of waivers
7 that it ought to be in the short run worth -- and I don't
8 know how many points we assign to any of this, but -- but if
9 we had that as a matter of policy, that it was worth so many
10 points if you did that two years in advance of actually, you
11 know, getting on the clock that -- or it might help you get
12 off the clock, is -- would that be the procedure you'd --
13 you think should be followed as-

14 MR. MUNN: That kind of procedure makes some
15 sense. What I'm -- all I'm saying here is that the statute
16 says there has to be objective measurable criteria, and that
17 at a minimum must take into consideration these things. And
18 so, you could-

19 MADAM CHAIR: It doesn't say you have to have
20 points.

21 MR. MUNN: Objective measurable criteria.

22 MR. DURHAM: It's getting pretty close saying
23 have points.

24 MR. MUNN: You know, there -- there could be
25 other objective measurable criteria, but certainly a point



1 system would make some sense. To say look, if you have
2 implemented certain research-based proven improvements or
3 strategies, within certain period of time that is worth X
4 points of the framework or something like that. That gets
5 much closer, I believe, to both the letter and spirit of the
6 law.

7 Because ostensibly, particularly, for
8 district performance framework, if it's supposed to evaluate
9 what is a district doing to improve and change outcomes, it
10 makes sense, I think, to say that you actually also evaluate
11 that work, that you also then look at that work and say that
12 we believe there is value to that particularly, where the
13 statute has said there are certain specified things that we
14 believe there is value to.

15 The statute says we believe there is value
16 essentially to an innovation plan. We believe there is value
17 to closure. We believe there is value to conversion. The
18 statute framework identifies that as having some value,
19 obviously. So, why we don't go the next step and then saying
20 that should be recognized, that work earlier in the
21 framework? It's unclear to me why we can't do that or why we
22 haven't done that aspect.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Well, one could be the -- the
24 results that choosing innovation status doesn't do a darn
25 thing.



1 MR. MUNN: That could be-

2 MADAM CHAIR: I mean, that's -- that's been
3 the result of the-

4 MR. MUNN: That certainly could be argued.

5 MADAM CHAIR: -- quote research of the last
6 X number of years is the fact that that in and of itself
7 isn't a mechanism to improve outcomes. The -- the innovation
8 status has to have substance.

9 MS. FLORES: And closing schools causes
10 chaos.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Val, Val --

12 MS. FLORES: And that -- that has also been
13 shown.

14 MR. MUNN: I'm not advocating for any of
15 those things. Don't hear me wrong.

16 MADAM CHAIR: That's not the point. Yep.
17 Exactly.

18 MR. MUNN: All I'm saying is that, so, for a
19 district like ours and for others that are taking aggressive
20 actions, that are doing things to -- to turn things around,
21 for example. We -- one of our lowest performing schools, we
22 converted to a charter school. It's going to take two or
23 three years for that process to happen. While that plays
24 itself out, that data is still residing on our district
25 performance framework, and in -- in no way recognizes that



1 we've already taken the action to address that and so it's
2 going to change things there.

3 And so, why shouldn't that be recognized
4 formally within that structure? You have leeway. You have
5 the authority by statute to draft those rules. I'm saying
6 you are constraining yourselves unnecessarily in a space
7 that could be helpful to both the work that you're
8 interested in and the work of districts. That's point number
9 one.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Proceed.

11 MR. MUNN: Point number two is the accuracy
12 of the DPS. As I mentioned earlier, the rules themselves, as
13 far as the procedures that CDE follows, says that a request
14 for reconsideration will not be considered unless it will
15 change the level of performance of the district or of the
16 school.

17 We fully understand that's a resource issue.
18 We fully understand and respect that. However, there can be
19 significant improvement that happens within a band of a
20 level, moving from the bottom of the band of improvement up
21 to the top of the band improvement can be significant
22 improvement for a district. It's also a worthwhile
23 conversation to have with your parents and your community to
24 demonstrate that growth year over year.

25 We are de facto accepting that those



1 performance frameworks are inaccurate when we say we will
2 not consider them unless they move out of that level when we
3 know that there is improvement or decline there, but we
4 won't consider it as part of that process. So we have to
5 consider how important is that, how public are these things,
6 and whether or not we should be dedicating more resource to
7 doing that.

8 I fully understand that that would result in
9 a flood of requests to reconsider to the commissioner, but
10 we think it's important to talk about because we certainly
11 look at that. We think about it, and we want to be able to
12 evaluate our people, our leaders, myself, are we making
13 progress within those things? And if we can't accurately get
14 that data about whether or not progress is being made, that
15 makes just an even tougher conversation as we're trying to
16 look at our performance data.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Noted. And I think we can talk
18 about that as we -- as we look at it. I think you've clearly
19 identified the -- the dilemma that we have.

20 MR. MUNN: It is a tough issue to recognize.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Between what the public -- with
22 a tough issue. It is a tough issue between what your
23 community's seeing and what you believe might be some
24 errors, or just more information that would change your --
25 your -- I recognize that and I think that's probably one of



1 the things we want to talk about.

2 I don't know where we can go given exactly
3 the problem that you identified, which is that we will have,
4 how many schools do we have? A thousand eighty?

5 MS. PEARSON: Eighteen hundred about.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, 1800. Oh.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's close. You were
8 close.

9 DR. PILCH: Yeah.

10 MADAM CHAIR: No, that wasn't close. I know
11 numbers.

12 MR. MUNN: It's not an easy one, but-

13 MADAM CHAIR: It's not an easy one. I do, I
14 understand that-

15 MR. MUNN: -- it's one we have to have a
16 conversation about.

17 MADAM CHAIR: -- the conversation. And I'm -
18 - one of the things that I am wondering about is whether the
19 discussions that we're having statewide about additional
20 indicators and about having sort of a dashboard of all the
21 things that are important for kids learning that can be
22 measured that may or may not be part of the accountability
23 system, but, in fact, are part of the information that we
24 provide for parents, isn't going to help us do a better job
25 of reflecting what's really going on in the school



1 districts.

2 That's not directly do what you're speaking
3 to, but it does sort of talk about what is it that we want
4 parents to know and community members to know about our
5 schools. And it's more than just the score that we're
6 talking about as well because that's not really the only
7 thing.

8 MR. MUNN: Well, and I think -- I think you
9 framed it well. But I think there are all kinds of embedded
10 challenges. Rule 5.06 that I mentioned earlier, part of it
11 is, the State Department rules, as it relates to requests
12 for reconsiderations and appeals, one of the -- subpoint B
13 talks about, submitting an appeal, and part of that is you
14 have to make an argument about how you're demonstrating
15 progress towards the next achievement level.

16 Well, if you're only demonstrating progress
17 toward the next achievement level, you de facto can't submit
18 it because it's not getting to the next achievement level.
19 So, you're both required to do it on one hand and prohibited
20 from doing it on the other. I'm not sure how to fix that.
21 Well, I've got some ideas on how to fix it, but from a --
22 the district standpoint and submitting something, there's
23 not a whole lot we can do in that standpoint.

24 That takes me to my third point, which is the
25 inclusion of charter schools. Again, to the extent that the



1 district performance framework is meant to reflect the work
2 of the district, what the district is doing to make changes,
3 what the district is doing to impact education in its
4 different school sites, I believe there is a challenge as it
5 relates to charter schools that are authorized by
6 essentially direction of the state board.

7 Where we have perhaps said we don't believe
8 this is a good quality charter school, we don't believe this
9 is appropriate in the district. But the state board, through
10 the appeal process, has disagreed with that, and essentially
11 directed that a resolution be adopted to move forward with
12 chartering that -- that charter school.

13 The authority that a local board has with
14 charter schools is essentially to close them or to not open
15 them or whatever else. And if that is overridden by the
16 state board in those circumstances, I believe we should
17 consider whether or not that school should be part of the
18 district performance framework.

19 Now, as it relates to the Aurora Public
20 Schools, this is a hypothetical. We are -- we are not in
21 that situation. But as it relates to conversations that
22 we've had, specifically around Hope online and other schools
23 like that, we, our board, are just starting to have to
24 consider the conversation around if this is going to be the
25 posture where the state board might overrule schools that we



1 have genuine concerns about, what's the broader implication
2 of that? What are the impacts of that?

3 And this is one of those things that we
4 started to think about as far as is this an impact where we
5 have said we don't believe that this is a good quality
6 choice. For whatever reason, the state board disagrees with
7 us for whatever reason, they currently have the authority to
8 do that. We don't dispute that.

9 But if that's the case, then why is that
10 reflected on us as authorizers within our performance
11 framework. We believe that is a policy concern, is a policy
12 issue and we think that's something you should consider in
13 this framework, but also something you should consider in
14 the appeal framework as well.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham?

16 MR. DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Tolleson, is there any
17 legal reason why we couldn't make that adjustment in
18 consideration of district performance framework? And it is -
19 - it is a hypothetical.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is for us.

21 MR. DURHAM: You don't have any of those,
22 but-.

23 MS. TOLLESON: I think that -- that's the
24 question and I would want to double check the precise
25 statutory language in terms of how -- how -- but once the



1 district's the authorizer, although that status may have
2 come about involuntarily.

3 MR. MUNN: I'm not talking about Hope for us.

4 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

5 MR. MUNN: I was talking about that in the
6 context of the appeal relationship.

7 MR. DURHAM: I can --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As opposed to --
9 (indiscernible) they turn it into a charter school.

10 MR. DURHAM: I always hate to separate
11 authority and accountability and personally, I think if it's
12 something you didn't want, and you got forced on it, and
13 you're not responsible for it, I don't know that -- I don't
14 think it ought to count against you.

15 So, I don't have any problem with that,
16 personally, and -- but if it's -- if it's something you've
17 chartered and perhaps defensively as a -- as a mechanism to
18 get some points for maybe not to get on the clock in the
19 first place. I don't think you have it both ways.

20 MR. MUNN: No, I agree. We believe that if
21 our board, if board members said we want this, we believe
22 this should be part of our district, we are accountable for
23 that and we should be accountable for that. But, where we
24 haven't, that's -- we believe that should be a different
25 conversation.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Well, another part of the
2 conversation.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, who would be held
4 accountable then?

5 MADAM CHAIR: No, no, no, no, we're not
6 talking about -- it's completely different --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jeffco is already
8 responsible to sort the performance of Hope online and --

9 MR. MUNN: Yes, I'm not talking about Hope, I
10 just -- I used that in the context of just the conversation.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What he's talking about
12 is if during the accountability process and one of our
13 options is to turn a school into a charter, then he would
14 not want Aurora to be if we did it to Aurora.

15 MR. MUNN: No. I'm talking about ABC
16 Charter School.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Let's use Cherry Creek School
18 that we authorized over the objection of Cherry Creek.

19 MR. DURHAM: Yes. Any -- any --.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, you're talking about
21 any cha -- not through the accountability process?

22 MR. MUNN: Not through the accountability
23 process, no.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So any charter that-

25 MR. MUNN: ABC Charter School we-



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -you said no to, or any
2 district said no to and came to the state board and the
3 state board voted in favor of the charter, then you would
4 not want to be -- that district would not be responsible.

5 MR. MUNN: Correct.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Well, and that depends in part
7 on the contract that you have. You could eas -- I think you
8 could have a contract that says if this charter school goes
9 on priority improvement or turnaround it's closed. I mean,
10 there are -- the -- the school board doesn't necessarily
11 lose all authority over a charter if we override a refusal.
12 There is still a contract to be worked out.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, there's still --
14 yeah, there's still a contract.

15 MADAM CHAIR: So they're still -- they're
16 still your kids. If they don't belong to the chartering
17 authority or to another school district, they're still your
18 kids and I think we have to be really careful how we do this
19 well with our charter schools, which is that in the contract
20 you set some reasonable expectations of what you want this
21 charter and if they say no, we don't want those kind of
22 criteria, then I think you ought to come back to us, because
23 if that charter school says we're not accountable for being
24 on priority improvement or turnaround, then we've got
25 serious things to consider.



1 So I don't think it's necessarily an
2 either/or piece. I think you can have a contract that holds
3 them accountable because they are still the kids in your
4 district, your school board's district, there -- they still
5 own them. And I think it's really healthy when you think
6 about kids in your school district whether they're in
7 charter school or not a charter school.

8 MR. MUNN: We always think about the kids,
9 but we're talking about the entity or the charters.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Right. But they're accountable
11 -- they should be accountable to your board for achievement.
12 Without -- without any question not only to the parents.

13 MR. MUNN: So long as this board will defend
14 us when we hold them accountable for that, that makes all
15 the sense in the world.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

17 MR. MUNN: It's unclear --

18 MADAM CHAIR: That's a good -- It's a real --
19 a good a good point that you have. But, I'm pretty convinced
20 that sometimes we haven't -- folks haven't looked carefully
21 enough at the agreements that are being made between the
22 charters and the -- and the school board because there are
23 opportunities there.

24 MR. MUNN: Well, we're fully willing to use
25 that agreement and that accountability. The question is what



1 will happen when it comes to the board, to the state board.

2 Will that be -- will that be supported by this entity?

3 MADAM CHAIR: So my recollection having gone
4 through more -- quite a few of these, is that the contract
5 itself has not been the issue. There are terms in the
6 contract that are sometimes an issue. And that particular
7 one has never -- has never come up, achieve -- holding them
8 accountable for student success. Somebody want to correct me
9 on that? Ms. Goff?

10 MS. GOFF: I don't want to correct you. I
11 just want to clarify a couple of things.

12 MR. MUNN: The closest example we have is
13 Hope.

14 MS. GOFF: If we're talking about that final
15 determination in a priority turn around decision or not.

16 MR. MUNN: I'm talking about it in our
17 standard process, if we deny a charter application, they
18 appeal to this board and this board through your traditional
19 processes send it back and direct us to enter into a
20 contract negotiation with the charter.

21 MS. GOFF: So any charter -- any chartering
22 situation not connected to accountability?

23 MR. MUNN: Correct.

24 MS. GOFF: How can it -- well, they're --
25 ultimately everything is connected to accountability. But



1 we'll just take it -- a normal --

2 MR. MUNN: The universe is all connected.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 MS. GOFF: This is a normal chartering
5 connection, right? All right. So -- so you -- the charter
6 school and the district are working out a contract. I agree
7 with Angelika's point about the contract. I don't mean to be
8 redundant.

9 I'm just saying, to say that either -- either
10 the state board or the local district board is required to
11 be accountable or back up something that would be an unknown
12 for unknown reasons -- I mean, to make a predetermined
13 guarantee that either our board could back up the district,
14 I don't know. I don't know that that's a good way of
15 thinking ahead.

16 MS. FLORES: Well, for one, I don't think we
17 should force -- I don't think we should force a charter on a
18 school. The school has a right or the district has the right
19 to know the way it's-

20 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Well, let's not --.

21 MS. FLORES: Well, the District has the right
22 --.

23 MS. GOFF: This is why I didn't want to get.
24 Yes. I'm sorry.

25 MADAM CHAIR: We don't want to get



1 philosophical here.

2 MS. GOFF: We don't want to talk about this
3 more. Better, more better later.

4 MS. FLORES: Well they do have a right to do
5 to have a school of their own.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Munn.

7 MS. FLORES: They do.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry.

9 MR. MUNN: So those were the three points I
10 wanted to raise around the DPF. Thank you for-

11 MADAM CHAIR: I think they are very
12 thoughtful. I really appreciate it and I think we will look
13 at it to say -- got him to say -- I'm not sure the necessary
14 insolvable but, in some cases, we've got some real tradeoffs
15 that we need to be thinking about.

16 MR. MUNN: That's certainly the case. We
17 would love to know if what the next steps might be or a
18 process to engage further in those conversations and to hear
19 back from the --

20 MADAM CHAIR: Our discussions about the
21 frameworks are not over as of today. They're going to be
22 ongoing.

23 MR. MUNN: Okay.

24 MADAM CHAIR: So yes, we'll make sure they
25 come back in.



1 MR. MUNN: We obviously have a particular
2 interest in the first item as it relates to this year's DPS
3 and SPS.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

5 MR. MUNN: We believe that is -- can be
6 solved relatively easily. But again it's relatively easily I
7 understand, but we hope to hear back soon about that.

8 MS. TOLLESON: Thank you.

9 MR. MUNN: Let me pivot if I can to 163.
10 I've taken up a lot of your time, so I want to be receptive
11 to any questions you might have about our experience there
12 or anything in particular that you may want to ask me about
13 the Aurora Public Schools or Aurora Central's experiences
14 related to the 163 process.

15 Let me echo some of what my colleagues said.
16 We certainly think that the board and the department need to
17 develop an early action strategy. It's just -- it doesn't
18 make sense that, and as you know, we came to the board year
19 and a half before Central reached the end of its clock to
20 try and suggest an early action strategy.

21 We believe that's essentially the right
22 framework to do that obviously which is why we did it. We
23 think that in year two or year three, it makes all the sense
24 in the world for the board and the district to have the
25 ability to enter into some kind of MOU or are something that



1 says, "We are taking this action now, it is accepted and
2 recognized as the 163 action and to move forward from
3 there." If a district comes forward voluntarily and does
4 that, enters into agreement, I can't see why there would be
5 any prohibition or constraint on doing that.

6 I would suggest, and I do that with whatever
7 regulatory experience I have in my background, that in that
8 year two or year three timeframe, this board being
9 incredibly flexible and work with districts around that to
10 develop what makes the most sense. And you save to whatever
11 extent you have a hammer for year five if somebody hasn't
12 come forward in a way to try and work progressively towards
13 that.

14 If you did that, you would essentially
15 eliminate all hearings because you are going through what is
16 essentially a consent decree or an agreement that you could
17 do as a matter of course, and a lot simpler through staff
18 procedures and processes. I would strongly recommend that.

19 My second suggestion is, we still believe
20 that under a state law, you need to restart the clock once
21 you implement one of those significant frameworks. There is
22 no mechanism in state law to simply extend the clock. The
23 clock continuing to -- to go essentially loses any all --
24 and all meaning to what it is or what it's meant to be, and
25 it becomes quickly meaningless at that point. And so, we're



1 not sure what the point or benefit, just kind of saying the
2 clock continues to run, or what the authority is quite
3 frankly to do that.

4 MADAM CHAIR: We know that there is something
5 lacking there. We've discussed that. But what the solution
6 is I don't know. Across the street.

7 MR. MUNN: I suggested that one.

8 MADAM CHAIR: I know. I know.

9 MR. MUNN: I don't believe you are
10 constrained by law, certainly Ms. Tolleson and I could
11 debate that. I don't believe you've got any constraint
12 around that.

13 And this is quite frankly an issue that we
14 looked in quite heavily 10, 12 years ago as well, and -- and
15 came up with the -- those same solutions around which can
16 you do.

17 Finally, I would say that the state review
18 panel process, we did not find helpful you've heard me say
19 that before. We didn't find it helpful for a couple of
20 reasons.

21 One, in fairness to that process, we were the
22 very first and we were early out of the gate, we asked
23 people to come early and do that. So, we recognize that it
24 certainly may have improved since the time that we
25 experienced it.



1 That said, there are two areas of potential
2 value for that process. One is substance, the other is
3 process. From a substance standpoint, quite frankly, when we
4 first went through that process, we did not have the
5 expectation that the commissioner and CDE would be doing as
6 extensive as a review as you did. We thought that was high
7 quality and valuable, and there wasn't anything in the state
8 review panel process that we didn't get from that process.
9 So, why were we just then looking at this third thing for
10 anything of substance was questionable to us.

11 MADAM CHAIR: But, it's in the law, right?
12 Councilor?

13 MR. MUNN: I believe it's in the law, that
14 you are allowed to do that, I'm not sure if you're required
15 to do it.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

17 MR. MUNN: Yeah, and certainly not required
18 to do it at that level. Certainly, when we were offered a
19 state review panel this year we said, "No, thank you." And
20 said, "Don't come." And eventually they didn't show up. So,
21 that worked out well for us.

22 And from a substantive standpoint as well,
23 given the really short timeframe and the resources dedicated
24 to that process, I'm not sure what it adds. What we
25 essentially got in our state review panel was two or three



1 days of some folks getting some anecdotal information about
2 the school that quite frankly, was largely wrong.

3 And so, what you saw was Commissioner Asp at
4 the time issuing a letter that essentially said, "We're not
5 sure if this makes sense." We said this doesn't quite make
6 sense, and so it was largely ignored in the process.

7 On the process side, it -- that panel's
8 opinion only matters to us to the extent it matters to you.
9 And in my tracking of your hearings as it related to the 163
10 process, it didn't really seem to matter to you. So, if you
11 don't care, I don't care.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Got it.

13 MR. MUNN: So, I say we collectively not care
14 and move on from that.

15 MADAM CHAIR: I hear you.

16 MR. MUNN: To the extent I was subtle, I'm
17 happy to go into more detail.

18 MADAM CHAIR: So, it's not necessarily clear
19 that it can't be useful if done better or done differently,
20 et cetera?

21 MR. MUNN: Well, anything can be use --
22 useful if it's done better, right? If --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Right. We got off to a pretty
24 rough start, and the timing certainly was off, simply
25 because of the additional year. So that made -- that made



1 the information so outdated.

2 MR. MUNN: Yeah.

3 MADAM CHAIR: And that added to it.

4 MS. FLORES: But they've been doing it for
5 years.

6 MADAM CHAIR: But I will say that the report
7 this -- this -- the report that I think the department put
8 out about innovation results certainly changed our
9 perspective, given that we were granting innovation based on
10 the law, which was just don't do any worse, and the reality
11 was there was very little improvement in way too many of our
12 innovation schools, which caused us to feel like it can be a
13 tool if other things are happening as well, not just the
14 status and the waivers themselves.

15 MR. MUNN: Well, we have always held the
16 position that the governance structure of a school, be it
17 charter, be it innovation or whatever else, has utterly no
18 connection to the success of students in the school. It's a
19 tool. It's a tool --

20 MADAM CHAIR: It's a tool; exactly.

21 MR. MUNN: -- and a framework and it's about
22 what's the work within that.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Who are the people?

24 MR. MUNN: The people and the work.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Dr. Pilch, do you



1 have any more comments to make in relation to --

2 DR. PILCH: So, I think. Yeah, I just have
3 one you more piece I would add.

4 So, I have some of the same concerns around
5 school performance frameworks and district performance
6 frameworks that Rico has and I, but I -- I get -- this
7 charter piece I think is really a delicate dance, because,
8 do we -- we have charters with 30-year contracts.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

10 DR. PILCH: Yes. That -- so I inherited
11 them, they're -- so to try to -- to undo some of that is
12 would be really, really, complex. I have a charter that's
13 coming up that is on turnaround status. They're in their
14 fourth year of operation. They're coming up for renewal.
15 And my board is of the mindset that they would like, you
16 know, I think they have talked about what would be the
17 process to not renew their application. And yet, they really
18 -- each of them have said to me but they'll get it turned
19 over at the state board.

20 So, I think, I think that's a meaningful
21 conversation. Rico, you and I have not actually had that
22 conversation around charters, but that's a reality in -- in
23 my school district that I think would be an important piece
24 to consider around the district performance framework.

25 The other thing I didn't mention that I --



1 that I meant to mention is that -- and I've had this
2 conversation with most of the CDE staff in the room, is that
3 as we're doing this work and as we're looking at schools
4 that are on the clock, I suspect like Greeley, that many of
5 these districts have significant turnover in their executive
6 leadership. And I don't -- I don't know what that means that
7 you all should do or that CDE staff should do, but there is
8 no question that there is a leadership lag as the executive
9 leadership turns over and has to get up to speed with
10 schools that are on the clock. And -- and the staff from CDE
11 were (indiscernible) and reached out almost day one when I
12 got there, to support -- to support me and to support my
13 team.

14 But, you know, I've turned over most of my
15 cabinet who does this leadership work. And there's no
16 question that will have a positive impact in the end in
17 terms of student achievement. But my guess is that we had a
18 time period in there -- it's more than a guess. I -- I
19 fully believe we had a time period in there were we were not
20 taking action and were not moving, simply because we were
21 transitioning to new leadership.

22 And in my case, there was an interim
23 superintendent in for a year, after (Indiscernible), then
24 the interim, and he couldn't take any big risks or any big
25 steps, and then I get hired. And I've got to get up to speed



1 pretty darn quickly in order to not lose yet another year
2 around leading turn around work in our district. So, I -- I
3 don't know what you do about that, but I want to make sure-

4 MADAM CHAIR: We saw that.

5 DR. PILCH: -you all have that on your radar.

6 MADAM CHAIR: We saw that in some of the
7 other districts and the other schools. It's very real. It's
8 a leap of faith and it's a lot of work. Totally understand.

9 DR. PILCH: Yeah.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you both. Would you like
11 to stay at the table as we continue this discussion, or do
12 you want to go back hide in the corner? I'd love to hear
13 your reactions to other reactions if you're willing.

14 MR. MUNN: I'm comfortable.

15 DR. PILCH: I will be happy to stay.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Bautsch.

17 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: We're now getting other
19 feedback from others.

20 MS. BAUTSCH: Yes.

21 MADAM CHAIR: I didn't ask. Guys, do you have
22 any questions? Good.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I noticed you didn't
24 ask.

25 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know that's ever



1 stopped any of us, but hey.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I took that as a signal
3 that we weren't supposed to ask any questions.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have a question, ma'am?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Sorry. It's day two,
7 afternoon.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted you to
9 ask.

10 MS. BAUTSCH: Thank you and please feel free
11 to ask questions as I go through this feedback.

12 We solicited feedback from the districts that
13 had participated in this process this past year, as well as
14 from different advocacy groups, the Colorado Association of
15 School Boards, all of yourselves. We tried to sit down one
16 on one with, I think we got, we were able to have a
17 conversation with each of you or most of you. Internal
18 staff, as well, who were involved in creating different
19 portions of the Commissioner's recommendation or involved in
20 the process, as well as we talked with the rural alliance.
21 We did in-person and phone interviews to collect this
22 information, and we did receive also written feedback, as I
23 mentioned, from three districts.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Forget the districts.

25 MS. BAUTSCH: Yeah. I know. So, we have



1 several themes that emerged and several of these two will be
2 reiterating what we just heard back from these two
3 superintendents next to me -- next to me. So, the first one
4 was starting early in the process.

5 We heard from the districts that went
6 through. This hearing -- these hearings this past spring
7 that they had wished there was an opportunity to start in
8 Year Three or Year Four. One district said that having --
9 they're in the process of having a pathway implementation
10 grant right now to implement their pathway. And they said
11 that if a similar grant or resource is available at Year
12 Three, then they could have started implementing this
13 pathway earlier.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me?

15 MS. BAUTSCH: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they -- they wish
17 that they could have had a grant in -- not that they
18 couldn't have started, because they could have, right?

19 MS. BAUTSCH: Well, yes, it was a resource
20 issue. This was a management partnership, so this was a
21 small rural district that had wanted to contract with this
22 management entity earlier.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But these aren't small
24 rural districts-

25 MS. BAUTSCH: Correct.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -and they're saying the
2 same thing.

3 MS. BAUTSCH: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The CDE -- CDE does not
5 prevent any of these districts from going to work on
6 improvement, but they're saying they can't do it without
7 resources.

8 MS. BAUTSCH: That's part of it.

9 MADAM CHAIR: And are the grants limited to
10 districts that are at the end of the?

11 MS. BAUTSCH: The grants -- so the current
12 grants, and these were -- these are new grants we've
13 developed since we got to the end of the clock is, so we had
14 a grant that was available for implementation once these
15 year, this cohort of year five schools and districts
16 finished the hearing. So, we just opened up this
17 implementation grant a month ago and, or a couple months
18 ago, we just started awarding in the past month.

19 I think part of the issue is resource, part
20 of it is what we heard here from Superintendent Munn, is
21 around the incentive of coming early if you know that
22 there's the potential that you have to come for a hearing a
23 year or two later and be potentially directed to do
24 something different. So, what's that, you know, that risk if
25 you're going to completely change and restructure your



1 school, but then have to do something different a year or
2 two later. So, that was something we heard reiterated from -
3 - from the districts that just came through.

4 MADAM CHAIR: I do remember though, we did
5 try to tell you that this wasn't the hearing a year and a
6 half ago when you came, because the criteria were completely
7 different.

8 MR. MUNN: Well, we had two of those, where
9 we first came to you and said we would like to implement a
10 163 pathway and have this board formally recognize it as
11 such.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Right. And we said no.

13 MR. MUNN: And you said you weren't ready for
14 that conversation. When we came again for a hearing just for
15 the innovation plan-

16 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

17 MR. MUNN: -and up until a week before that,
18 it was unclear as to whether it was going to be a 163
19 hearing or not.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Got it. Okay. That clarifies-

21 MR. MUNN: So we just kept going and had to
22 say you guys got to do what you got to do, and we are going
23 to hope that it all works out in the end.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Right. And I don't know if it's
25 clear to the participants, there was definitely a difference



1 in the expectations that we had for districts and schools
2 that were on the move, that had already begun, and those who
3 just never were going to be ready, except for they were
4 forced to. So, there was a difference, there was an effect
5 of an early start. But it was -- the effect wasn't to
6 actually get, get you off the clock and just get, get you
7 rolling and not have to come back again. But there
8 definitely was a difference in the approach that districts
9 had -- who came before us had used. It was clearly
10 different.

11 And I'm not sure that was obvious to the
12 folks on this side of the table, but we were very cognizant
13 of which districts were moving forward and which weren't.

14 MR. MUNN: Yeah, we just believe there should
15 be a structural difference.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Understand. It's a good --
17 it's a good suggestion.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Start early.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Start early.

20 MS. BAUTSCH: Another recurrent theme was
21 considering how to make all of the pathways feasible, given
22 the outcomes of the hearings. There was a heavy leaning
23 towards management and in some cases innovation. There was
24 not a charter school conversion, there was not, there was a
25 partial school closure of just one.



1 So, when we just heard is there --
2 structurally is there something that could be done
3 differently so that all options, if there was a -- the
4 thought being that there was perhaps a, a consideration
5 given to the timing of it, so if a school were to be
6 directed to convert to a charter school, they wouldn't have
7 the time to necessarily do that. It takes time to find an
8 authorizer and build up a charter school. And so that wasn't
9 felt like it was -- really was a feasible option.

10 And so is there a way for us to think about
11 the process differently from -- really from a staffing
12 perspective or a structural procedural way to get those
13 pathways to all be equally feasible.

14 We also heard from many stakeholders that the
15 local school boards are a key player in all of this, and how
16 can we engage, how can we, as CDE staff, engage with them
17 earlier. So, we talked with the Colorado Association of
18 School Boards and they also had similar reflections about
19 the process too and were eager to partner with the
20 department to try to do some of that training earlier and to
21 really get out to boards, not re -- you know, not just at
22 year five, but even thinking earlier and starting to get to
23 those that are year three or year four and starting to
24 explain the accountability process and engage them in that.

25 Multiple individuals voiced that they thought



1 the collaborative approach of working with districts in
2 helping and having them have the ability to own their
3 pathway, have a voice in their directed action, that that
4 was likely to have the greatest return and have the greatest
5 likelihood of insining -- improved student success for those
6 districts.

7 We heard from many stakeholders that the
8 management pathway continues to be confusing in terms of
9 where do all the different parties stand.

10 So, I heard from one -- one of the
11 individuals I spoke with said that there seemed to be that
12 there was confusion from -- between the State Board, the
13 Attorney General's office, the districts and staff, and CDE
14 staff. So, they -- they, you know, the alignment of the
15 perceptions of what the management pathway can do, and so
16 we're, as staff, going to continue to work on how we could
17 better define and clarify that, and particularly, as I put
18 on the slide, the continuum.

19 So, you -- in what cases do we have a full --
20 say a full takeover where a management partner comes and
21 fully operates the school, versus where we saw some in this
22 past round, having a managing partner come in and have
23 decision-making authority over -- over a few areas as
24 opposed to the whole school. So, how do we define when that
25 should happen?



1 And there are, as we've discussed today, many
2 concerns around what does happen at the end of the clock.
3 And now that we've moved into this next phase with this
4 group of schools and districts, we have a written
5 determination in place for them that did outline some
6 components of what we expect to see from them.

7 And as staff, we've started to think about
8 what that means from a progress monitoring perspective, but
9 procedurally, and how we're moving -- moving the clock
10 forward, if that school or district doesn't improve and it
11 does continue to go into year eight, nine, 10 of the clock,
12 what does that mean?

13 And lastly, the quasi-judicial hearing
14 structure was a challenge for all parties involved and we
15 heard that. We felt that as well and would like to continue
16 to think about how we can make that more -- or less
17 challenging, more helpful.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Tolleson -- Julie, we're
19 talking about you.

20 MS. TOLLESON: Sorry about that.

21 DR. PILCH: This will be ongoing
22 conversation.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, if it helps
24 someone (indiscernible).

25 DR. PILCH: I do -- I don't want to put you



1 on the spot.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I also-

3 MADAM CHAIR: The quasi-judicial hearing
4 structure was challenging.

5 MS. TOLLESON: Yes.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have an out for us?

7 MS. TOLLESON: An out for you in terms of how
8 best to do it?

9 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know how you can talk
10 about collaboration at the same time that you talk about,
11 you can't talk to each other. And I realize that there was
12 collaboration between the staff and the district, but --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) got to
14 talk to them except us.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We were abandoned. We
16 were so totally isolated.

17 MADAM CHAIR: You know, we're a citizen
18 board. We really needed to have resources, not just in a --
19 a different attorney, but also the capacity to ask
20 questions.

21 DR. PILCH: And if I may-

22 MR. MUNN: Well, if you do it early through
23 an MOU process, then you don't have that.

24 MADAM CHAIR: That's one option, thank you.

25 DR. PILCH: And if I may, we had actually



1 wanted -- we had -- we had reached out and wanted Pam to
2 come visit our district and we were actually told no.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I was going to go, too.

4 DR. PILCH: During this process, she can't
5 even come.

6 MADAM CHAIR: I know.

7 MS. MAZANEC: I know, I was going to go.

8 DR. PILCH: Yeah, so.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Exactly. So, we're all mad at
10 Ms. Tolleson, but we don't know if --

11 DR. PILCH: And we weren't inviting her
12 (indiscernible), we just wanted to meet her.

13 MS. MAZANEC: That's right. Well, I don't
14 know if Brenda's done yet, but-

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

16 MS. MAZANEC: But along those lines, and this
17 is what I told Brenda and Alyssa was that, you know, we were
18 told this is a quasi-judicial hearing. We are like the
19 judge. And so the judge hears the evidence from both parties
20 and makes his decision. I said, even a judge on occasion
21 goes to the scene of the crime or the scene of the accident
22 to see --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To the scene of the
24 crime?

25 MS. MAZANEC: Right, himself, that's -- you



1 know.

2 And -- and second of all, it's -- in a
3 courtroom, it's an adversarial process. And we've got two
4 parties who are -- who may actually feel adversarial toward
5 each other but --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't want to.

7 MS. MAZANEC: -- it doesn't behoove them to,
8 to act adversarial toward each other. These are two parties
9 who have to continue to have a relationship. So, neither
10 party may be telling us the truth of what they think. It's -
11 - it's not ideal.

12 I'm not exactly sure how to fix that, except
13 that I -- I do feel like, as members of the board, in our
14 role, we need to have access to more information. We need to
15 have more of an ability to talk to both parties and make our
16 own decisions. Somebody has to trust our judgment to -- to
17 be able to make those judgments. That troubles you, doesn't
18 it?

19 MS. TOLLESON: Yeah. Well, no. Member --
20 members of the board, I think that I would like to find a
21 way to help you all do that. I think it was ver -- a great
22 frustration to have everyone --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Everyone.

24 MS. TOLLESON: -- to staff, to districts, to
25 you all, and of course, then the grand impediment always



1 seems to be the lawyers.

2 The big challenge is, think of the one or two
3 districts, let's say, where it was a little less clear that
4 there was going to be a -- an outcome or a resolution that
5 everybody could live with. And, you know, we get kind of an
6 idea who at least one of those might have been. And if -- if
7 we would have wound up in a judicial review context, then
8 all of a sudden, we would have had well, board members spoke
9 to -- we learned the board members spoke to staff before we
10 had our hearing, and heard, you know, fill in the blank X,
11 Y, and Z.

12 So, part of it may be, and I -- I think the
13 MOU idea is an interesting one, or something that involves
14 almost round-tabling with districts at the time they're just
15 getting ready to enter that final year. One of those times
16 before you've gotten to a moment where, either by statute or
17 by commissioner recommendation, you're faced with a
18 situation where you really are going to be making a decision
19 on accreditation status and mandatory actions. So, if -- if
20 you front-loaded that information gathering before it was
21 postured where you're really wearing that robe, maybe that'd
22 be another option. So --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Rico?

24 MR. MUNN: Respectfully, I would encourage
25 you to go back and look at the MOU that we presented to you



1 in June of 2015, for both Central and Boston K-8, that
2 provided a format, an opportunity to have that conversation;
3 for us to have that open dialogue for you to come out and
4 look at the schools and to do that. And, if at that time you
5 felt like, you know what, we don't believe this is the right
6 pathway forward, we could have had that conversation. And
7 two years later, if we didn't move forward, whatever else,
8 then we are in a quasi-judicial setting. That's fine.

9 I'm the wrong person to ask. I was quite
10 comfortable in the quasi-judicial setting, but -- you know.
11 But, if you -- if you engage in that dialogue and create
12 that structure for that early action, then most of those
13 concerns just go away.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I think that the problem
15 is that at -- at that time, we hadn't --

16 MADAM CHAIR: This isn't learning --

17 MS. MAZANEC: This was our first time to do
18 this process.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 MS. MAZANEC: And I think it looked to us
21 like -- like making those decisions early. We didn't feel
22 like -- if I'm remembering this right, we didn't feel like
23 we could make those decisions now. Whether we can change the
24 process starting now, going forward I'd like to see some of
25 that.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I think we can.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

3 MADAM CHAIR: I mean, I think that's why
4 we're doing this and I'm grateful for the -- for all the
5 feedback because it gives us an opportunity. Board Member
6 Flores.

7 MS. FLORES: Yes. Dr. Pilch?

8 DR. PILCH: Yes, Ma'am.

9 MS. FLORES: Earlier you were talking about
10 the Billie Gonzalez School, which is --

11 DR. PILCH: Billie Martinez.

12 MS. FLORES: Billie Martinez.

13 DR. PILCH: Or Bella Romero. I-

14 MR. MUNN: Billie Martinez.

15 DR. PILCH: Yeah. Billie Martinez, I spoke
16 about --

17 MS. FLORES: Billie Martinez. Okay. So, you
18 were -- you knew that there were issues and problems in that
19 school, and before the five years, or whatever, was up, and
20 you wanted to change that. And -- but you didn't -- you had
21 to go through -- look at all the statutes and such so that
22 you could turn it into a charter, but you might have wanted
23 to turn it into a magnet school, where you found some really
24 creative individual, a leader out there, that had an idea of
25 how to change the school, and -- but under the auspices of



1 your district, without having to bring an outside, third
2 party in.

3 DR. PILCH: So, I think my -- I'll clarify.
4 I think -- well, my concern about Billie Martinez, so, we --
5 we just received Innovation Status.

6 MS. FLORES: Well -- well-

7 MADAM CHAIR: Le -- le -- let her speak.

8 DR. PILCH: So, we just received -- we did --
9 they've been approved as an Innovation Status school and
10 they're going into year five. Now, fortunately, we just got
11 the school review process review back, and they're
12 recommending innovations status; thank goodness. But, the --
13 the issue is that, had that come back, and they had said
14 we're recommending outside management, or we are
15 recommending conversion to a charter, we -- we are coming
16 before you then next year, again, asking for approval on
17 innovation status even though the school review process said
18 something different. So, that -- that's the disconnect for
19 us.

20 MS. FLORES: Well, maybe that's something I
21 don't understand. So, Julie, is it possible for Dr. Pilch,
22 if she did find a very innovative leader that wanted to come
23 into the district that she could hire, but not as a -- not
24 as a charter school, but as a magnet school within the
25 district, and to change that whole school around, say in the



1 third year, without having to go through, you know, all of
2 these convulsions and such? Is it possible for her -- I
3 mean, you could do it without -- I think you could do it
4 without anything else, without coming to us. You could
5 change it into a charter.

6 DR. PILCH: Right.

7 MS. FLORES: And I think that we need to give
8 districts that ability.

9 MADAM CHAIR: They have had it for as long as
10 I have been involved, and we won't talk about how long that
11 is.

12 MS. FLORES: Well, but we --

13 MS. TOLLESON: Now, if -- if they don't use
14 it.

15 MS. FLORES: No, no, I don't think we talk
16 about it, and I think you're getting at it.

17 MADAM CHAIR: You might not know about it,
18 but the reality is it's a local control state, and school
19 districts can create their own charters.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can do exactly that.

21 MS. FLORES: Well, I know Denver doesn't want
22 to because that's -- the reason I was told is because they
23 would have to then provide -- provide buses for them,
24 transportation, which for some reason they don't want to
25 provide transportation for a magnet school, as opposed to a



1 charter school. So --

2 MR. MUNN: Dr. Flores, I believe there's-

3 MS. FLORES: -it's -- it's a learning-

4 MR. MUNN: I believe there's a level of
5 comfort around school districts that we can do those things,
6 and that we have the authority and the ability to do those
7 things.

8 DR. PILCH: Yeah.

9 MS. FLORES: Well, I hope you feel so.

10 MR. MUNN: Yeah. We certainly do.

11 MS. FLORES: That you can do that.

12 DR. PILCH: Yeah, we absolutely do. And I
13 think even in districts where there's -- where there's more
14 urgency, we even have more freedom to do those things.

15 MR. MUNN: Yes.

16 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Board Member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Dr. Pilch was saying that, you
19 know, they -- they tried to make innovation fit their plan.
20 So, one time we had the ability to do something other for
21 districts, right? Did that go away?

22 MR. MUNN: Yeah. That was a --

23 MS. MAZANEC: That was one of our options.

24 Did that --

25 MR. MUNN: -- during the '15-'16 school year,



1 there was a one-year provision of another category for the
2 districts to implement. That went away after one year.

3 DR. PILCH: And that's exactly what I am
4 recommending.

5 MS. MAZANEC: I think we need that back.

6 MADAM CHAIR: With some clarification what
7 other means.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Well, yeah. I mean at least it
9 offers -- it offers some options.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Bautsch, do you have some
11 more input?

12 MS. BAUTSCH: We just had one more slide that
13 was on that next steps that CDE staff had begun working on,
14 just to give you a sense of where we've started to move.
15 But, also wanted to get your feed -- continue to get your
16 feedback on what else should be on this list, and what else
17 you -- the board would want CDE staff to pursue.

18 We are creating a template for district
19 plans. As part of the feedback, we also heard was, if that
20 there was a standardized template, that it would be easier
21 to -- to read each one. Reach out to the next round. Oh yes,
22 we are reaching out to the next round of school districts
23 already, so we're starting to move into the next phase as
24 well. So, trying to get early on that. And we have already
25 -- so to that extent we've also started administering the



1 new round of Pathway Planning grant funds, which we heard
2 from districts was helpful to them.

3 We're also looking at the Commissioners'
4 recommendation template, and then coming up with a plan to
5 monitor the progress of those schools and districts that
6 just had their directed action.

7 We are working, as I mentioned with CAS. We
8 just think about how to engage with local boards and do some
9 trainings around that; and come up with some clear guidance
10 throughout the management pathway. And then, if possible,
11 thinking through how to clarify the legal structure and work
12 with -- with Julie on that.

13 MADAM CHAIR: So, in terms of a template for
14 school districts, I think I might be one of the guilty
15 parties on that one. I do want to be careful to not have a
16 district feel like they can't put in all the information
17 they want to put in. The problem was, for me, one was red --
18 redundancy, and then just finding certain facts that I
19 needed; that we needed.

20 So, I think we should be really careful to
21 try to clarify what are the things that we want every
22 district to answer so that we can look in that. Just as --
23 I mean, it took a little while for me to figure out that in
24 the Commissioners portion, I pretty soon -- When I had the
25 questions I was reading, I pretty soon knew exactly where to



1 go to find the information about the district.

2 And frankly, that was the challenge that we
3 all had, was to get enough background information to make us
4 comfortable with the recommendations. So, I kind of figured
5 out where to go. I did request more. When it was a school,
6 it was on the clock, more district-wide background. So, I
7 wasn't looking at a school in a vacuum, that I could see it
8 in the -- in the whole thing.

9 But then, in the, in the portions that came
10 from the school district, I would have to hunt, and hunt,
11 and hunt for certain pieces of information. But I also think
12 they provided some relevant information that were not
13 answers to questions that we had, that they thought was
14 important. And I don't want to -- I don't want to turn that
15 off, right? There are things that I don't know, that we
16 don't know about that community, that they felt we ne --
17 needed to know and it needed to be in there. So, I -- I want
18 us to be really careful with the whole template idea because
19 it can actually restrict --

20 MS. MAZANEC: The way I asked for that was I
21 -- I would like to see the template that says we -- we
22 definitely want to know these things --

23 MADAM CHAIR: This and this and this, uh-huh.

24 MS. MAZANEC: -- about your district, or
25 about your school. And, if you want to provide more detail



1 on any of those, you're welcome to do that. But I would
2 still like to see a form document where I know where to find
3 everything I am looking for.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Certain facts.

5 MS. MAZANEC: And if there's more info, glad
6 to see more of it.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Right. What else do you
8 want us to know about your school district, your students,
9 your community, et cetera? Yeah. No, I had the same
10 frustration. Board Member, Rankin?

11 MS. RANKIN: Superintendent Munn, I -- I was
12 wondering, I -- I don't have a clear picture of what you
13 were talking about on the second year, and the MOU. Would
14 you send us just a bulleted version of what you were talking
15 about?

16 MR. MUNN: Certainly. It was prior to your
17 time. In fact, immediately prior to your time as I recall,
18 that we had that meeting, but we're happy to send that back
19 out to the whole board or -- okay.

20 MS. RANKIN: Your suggestion of when that is
21 -- comes about, I -- I got the impression, it's the second
22 year of the five years where -- as a district or school has
23 been designated turnaround, is that correct?

24 MR. MUNN: I think the timeframe is
25 debatable. What -- what we believe is that it should be



1 probably the third year on the accountability clock is the
2 right time frame.

3 MS. RANKIN: I -- I guess --

4 MR. MUNN: For a host of reasons.

5 MS. RANKIN: -- I -- I just don't understand
6 if it's a third year, and -- and we get into an agreement,
7 then does the clock start in again because you've come in
8 early? I -- that's the whole thing that I -- I need a
9 little clarification on. And if it's on this earlier letter
10 and I --

11 MR. MUNN: No.

12 MS. RANKIN: -- get it, that's fine.

13 MR. MUNN: No. What -- what I would propose
14 would be one of two directions. Either that, at that
15 period, be it second year, third year, whatever it is, if
16 you enter into a MOU with a district, that the MOU
17 essentially say that this is -- that -- this -- this will
18 bind the board essentially, this will be the decision once
19 we hit year five, to let you continue on this pathway for X
20 period of time or --

21 MS. RANKIN: Do you have --

22 MR. MUNN: -- under certain conditions.

23 MS. RANKIN: -- an idea on that X period of
24 time?

25 MR. MUNN: I think it depends on the



1 circumstances probably. The second would be that if you
2 have entered into that MOU, then perhaps there is a
3 mechanism to restart the clock at that point. I think
4 that's a more controversial conversation, but I -- I think
5 either mechanism is possible under existing law, and
6 existing processes.

7 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

8 MR. MUNN: Uh-huh.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues, how about comments
10 on what you'd like to direct to staff as we move forward in
11 these discussions? Please?

12 MS. FLORES: Before that, may I ask a
13 question?

14 MADAM CHAIR: Of course.

15 MS. FLORES: So, if districts have the
16 ability to create magnets, and if buses are not the issue,
17 driving kids from one point to another, why -- why don't
18 school districts use magnets, or --

19 MADAM CHAIR: They do.

20 MS. FLORES: -- the idea, or the process, or
21 --

22 MR. MUNN: So.

23 MS. FLORES: -- a school where they --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They do.

25 MS. FLORES: -- go out and -- excuse me. So,



1 why don't I hear more about it?

2 MR. MUNN: Well, in this context, what -- and
3 we're strictly talking about 163, as we understand it,
4 magnet schools are not one of the accepted pathways under --
5 under 163. So, if we did it, we would come to you, and you
6 would say, "That's nice." But you have to now do something
7 else."

8 MS. FLORES: So but, if you were doing it
9 before the fifth year, back in -- back in the second year or
10 the third the year, something's really wrong with the
11 school, we just must find a new leader, we have to change
12 it, why can't you just do that, and change it? I mean, with
13 your board?

14 MR. MUNN: Well, because there -- you could
15 do that, and you certainly have the ability, but there's an
16 inherent risk in that, because what -- what the appropriate
17 thing to do to convert a school like that, would be the
18 spend probably a year, engaging with your community about
19 the change and the shift, and all those things. And then --

20 MS. FLORES: But your community -- a lot of
21 the times, your communities are already going to you, and
22 telling you that things are not going right.

23 MR. MUNN: Yeah, I don't dispute that.

24 MS. FLORES: So --

25 MR. MUNN: The issue is that you would spend



1 a year doing that, you go through that process, and then you
2 get to only a year later, perhaps the end of the clock,
3 because you probably need two or three years for there to be
4 some significant turnaround on the data. Then, you're in
5 front of the state board who -- that is directing you to go
6 a different direction. And so, you will spend a year
7 telling your community you're going to do one thing, you do
8 it for a year, and then you have to do something else. You
9 have -- you have hurt the community in that process.
10 There's no doubt we can do a magnet school, but the
11 structure that you have kind of --

12 MS. FLORES: So then the board is -- is --
13 isn't helpful. I mean, this --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, Board Member
15 Flores, and -- and Superintendent Munn, my thought on that
16 would be you probably could do that type of a process within
17 the innovation school process. You know, that could be a
18 part of your innovative plan for moving forward as
19 restructure a school towards a magnet school, and so, I
20 don't think there's anything prohibiting that.

21 MR. MUNN: No, just the issues that Dr. Pilch
22 brought up --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

24 MR. MUNN: -- where perhaps you've got a
25 square peg in a round hole.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Totally.

2 MS. FLORES: Do that.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. So do we have to have the
4 waivers if you're a school of innovation?

5 MR. MUNN: Yes.

6 DR. PILCH: Yes.

7 MADAM CHAIR: There are some mandatory --

8 DR. PILCH: Yeah.

9 MADAM CHAIR: -- waivers?

10 MR. MUNN: Well, no. That's the only basis
11 for an application, is that you're asking for waivers.

12 DR. PILCH: Yeah. It's in statute.

13 MS. FLORES: Got to be just one, or there're
14 -- it has to be all the automatic waivers? I'm asking the
15 wrong question. That's unfair. Ms. Pilch.

16 DR. PILCH: Okay. I think it's --

17 MR. MUNN: I think there has to be at least
18 one. But the question is whether that would pass muster
19 with you -- with you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. So, I think that
21 was the point Dr. Pilch was making was, if there was another
22 option that was like a restructure, or something, that you
23 wouldn't be fitting a square peg in a round hole.

24 MS. FLORES: Right.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Right.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You would just be doing
2 what you wanted to.

3 DR. PILCH: Well, and the other piece on the
4 innovation -- school innovation is a -- a vote of the staff.
5 And so, who is the --

6 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

7 DR. PILCH: -- staff? So, one of the -- the
8 -- the questions is -- is -- is it the current staff, who is
9 the staff? Or is it the staff that you're going to
10 reconstitute?

11 MADAM CHAIR: Right. DPS got into that one.

12 DR. PILCH: Yeah, yeah. Right. So you know
13 --

14 MADAM CHAIR: And I think that one has been --
15 -- I think that one has been resolved. Board Member Mazanec?

16 MS. MAZANEC: Like your feedback too on -- I
17 -- I'm almost reluctant to say this, we're back to the
18 quasi-judicial, and how normally, in -- in the real world,
19 it's an adversarial process. Do you feel like it -- it
20 worked to have you coordinate, or collaborating, or trying
21 to come to some agreement on what to do with the department,
22 and -- and I actually feel the same way about the
23 department. You guys have a relationship. You've had a
24 relationship, you're going to continue to have a
25 relationship. It -- it concerns me that you might have



1 differences of opinion about what is best, or why you're
2 where you're at or what -- what should happen next, you
3 might have differences of opinion, but it seems that both of
4 you are incentivized to agree.

5 DR. PILCH: Well, so, I'll -- I'll answer
6 first, and then I'll let Rico answer, because I think we had
7 very different relationships with the department through the
8 process.

9 So I will say that we absolutely had a strong
10 relationship -- a strong productive relationship, and I
11 would say that my staff and I absolutely knew that we could
12 disagree, and the -- the thing that worked especially well
13 was because we had the turnaround grant at one of the
14 schools, we had Nicole Monet as a direct contact there, and
15 she was on the ground every single week.

16 And then, she and CDE staff agreed to have
17 her also work in the second school, even though we did not
18 exactly have that grant in the second school. So, we had
19 Nicole also as liaison between staff here, and staff in
20 District Six. And then -- I, you know, I felt very
21 comfortable calling anyone of these people, and asking
22 questions, and seeking clarification.

23 And we did throughout the process. And we did
24 in preparation for the hearing. I felt very comfortable with
25 the hearing. I know it freaked the principals out that



1 they had to be here, I mean, that, you know, for principals,
2 that was scary for them, but I -- I, you know, it was -- im
3 -- I think Katy did -- and her staff did a fabulous job of -
4 - of clarifying for us what that would look like, and feel
5 like that day, and making sure we were prepared, and I -- I
6 think tried to make us as comfortable as we could be. So --
7 and I -- I think we -- there were things we disagreed on,
8 and we worked through.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Munn? Come on.

10 DR. PILCH: So, I went first.

11 MR. MUNN: Sure. Well, let me just say, I -
12 - I -- as -- as many of you know, I -- I come from a legal
13 background, but I also spent three years as a State's chief
14 regulatory official. And so I come with a particular
15 mindset around some of this work. I think it is fundamental
16 to understanding regulatory work to understand that you
17 cannot be both regulator and consultant. It is inherently a
18 conflict of interest; you cannot wear both hats.

19 And so, once this -- once the relationship
20 shifted from the opportunity to sit down and have an MOU and
21 have a conversation with you to where we're heading towards
22 a quasi-judicial hearing, the department by necessity, has
23 to shift to a regulatory hat. And at that point, I'd like
24 them as far away from me as possible. Not because they're
25 not well intentioned, or not because they don't work or do



1 good work (indiscernible) true, but because you start to get
2 into a conflict of interest where we are sitting at a table,
3 and they may make a suggestion which is a good strong
4 research-based suggestion, which we don't take for whatever
5 reason.

6 But then it comes to you essentially as, we
7 didn't take this good suggestion and it -- it -- it starts
8 to count against us in that hearing, as opposed to being in
9 a position of saying, we had some advice, we -- we decided
10 not to go with it and move forward.

11 So, when you -- what it all culminates, and
12 it's setup for that quasi-judicial hearing, I don't believe
13 the board sets up the department in a good place to really
14 work and collaborate with districts.

15 MS. MAZANEC: What would you think would be
16 the -- the answer to that? Should each party have -- have a
17 representative like an attorney or -- wouldn't have to be an
18 attorney necessarily, but someone who's advocating for them?

19 MADAM CHAIR: No, Rico is suggesting we don't
20 get there.

21 DR. PILCH: Right.

22 MR. MUNN: Right. Well, I -- I think --

23 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I think that's --

24 MR. MUNN: Yeah.

25 MS. MAZANEC: -- in an ideal world. But --



1 MR. MUNN: I think there are a couple of
2 things.

3 One, and this is getting in the
4 commissioner's business, and I certainly don't intend to,
5 but we've had these conversations, where there -- there
6 might be some consideration to create a firewall between
7 parts of the department. There's one part that deals with
8 the consulting side essentially, the graft -- the grants,
9 the pathways, all those things, the other side that deals
10 with the more regulatory side of things, and kind of focuses
11 on that effort, is one way of dealing with that.

12 Another way of dealing with that is creating
13 that -- again, that MOU structure, whatever else that -- the
14 third year, where you are -- have a very collaborative
15 relationship up until that point, you get there, and then
16 after that, then the relationship shifts. Everybody
17 recognizes that, and understands that, and you move forward
18 in that framework.

19 It doesn't mean it has to be adversarial, but
20 you have to understand, much like when you deal with the
21 SEC. You can send the SEC a letter that says look, I'm
22 thinking about doing this, tell me if I'm going to go to
23 jail. Right? They respond to you and say, yes, you will if
24 you do that, or no, you won't. And -- and they can do that
25 in an open letter, and kind of give guidance around those



1 things.

2 You can have a collaborative relationship in
3 that framework, but you can't have your regulators sitting
4 beside you, trying to figure out what your next step is
5 going to be because that doesn't work.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff?

7 MS. GOFF: Are there any parts of any change
8 to this? I'll -- I'll refer to it as the quasi-judicial box
9 right now, but any of this that has to be done through
10 statutory changes? Julie?

11 MR. MUNN: I don't think so.

12 MS. GOFF: So -- so where -- where -- where
13 are you looking at it? Are you looking at --

14 MR. MUNN: I'm sorry.

15 MS. GOFF: -- looking at mostly through our -
16 - our regulations or --

17 MR. MUNN: I believe it can be done, not
18 everybody agrees with me, but I certainly believe it can be
19 done that way.

20 MS. GOFF: That way?

21 MR. MUNN: Through -- through your rulemaking
22 authority and process, yes.

23 MS. GOFF: Okay.

24 MS. PEARSON: You mean specific to outgoing
25 or having early MOU, is that it?



1 MR. MUNN: Yes.

2 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

3 MS. GOFF: So you -- Alyssa, you're referring
4 specifically to the statute though, right?

5 MS. PEARSON: No, I wanted to make sure that
6 because some of the ideas that have come out about different
7 pathways, that's probably statutory. Do you think that --

8 MR. MUNN: On different path -- yeah.

9 MS. PEARSON: But specifically to -- to
10 Rico's suggestions around could a district come forward at
11 year two or three and say this is the pathway and have the
12 board endorse that, y our perspective is that we could do
13 that through board policy?

14 MR. MUNN: I believe so.

15 MS. PEARSON: Board rule? Okay.

16 MS. GOFF: Okay. So, I guess that does tie
17 in, but when I started the question, it was specific to the
18 quasi-judicial limitations, obligations, whatever, that any
19 one of these entities involved in apply to any of those
20 entities. I mean, there is a perspective on that from the
21 department's angle, from the district's angle, and our angle
22 as a board and I would wonder if anyone here shares my
23 individual angle on it.

24 I think, you know, there were -- there were
25 times in there that it was frustrating because of a -- you



1 know, this isn't -- this isn't really the legalese
2 interpretation of it, but because of the long term
3 association or familiarity and knowledge of the districts
4 and what the context is, and when each single one of us was
5 unable to communicate among ourselves to start with, much
6 less it be at liberty to approach you, to call you, that on
7 an individual board member basis and from all perspectives,
8 my knowledge as a educator, attached for many years to two
9 of those districts we had hearings for, and the third
10 somewhat, but -- and having nowhere to go, not even among my
11 colleagues on the board to -- to get a little bit more
12 insight.

13 I'm very respectful of the fact that if this
14 has to be approached statutorily somehow, yeah, let's study
15 the possibility. I'm thinking for future boards because we
16 are lucky, we got to start this process off for the first
17 time, but we probably are leaving it at some level, maybe
18 not like the first time, but for the future.

19 And I just think there's -- there's room for
20 discussion at least about some different ways to do this. So
21 statute maybe if it's just rules, which would also apply to
22 -- not just, but you know, that's one thing, too, but that's
23 my take on it and before we get finished here today, I
24 wonder if the staff or the commissioner could -- do we have
25 a just and running rough draft summary of the things that



1 we've talked about today so that we will be able to know
2 where we're going next on some of this?

3 MS. FLORES: May -- may I just make a --

4 MS. GOFF: Because see, we're just -- we tend
5 to float. Wait, wait, can we just do this?

6 MS. FLORES: No it, it has to do with this.
7 Julie, there is another thing that happens too. When we are
8 at CASB and we know board members and we know other
9 administrators. Socially it's very awkward.

10 I mean, I didn't know -- I know I met some
11 people, I would call them friends from Aurora who I would
12 have to say, you know, I can't talk to you, you know,
13 because we can't discuss this or maybe I shouldn't have done
14 that, but it is socially very awkward to be at a conference
15 -- to be and to just have conversations and not -- and --
16 and then to know that you can't, and -- and know that there
17 are rules and -- so it's very awkward. I think one of you --
18 .

19 MADAM CHAIR: I think one of the things --

20 MR. DURHAM: The trick is not to have any
21 friends.

22 MADAM CHAIR: No comment, no comment.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are hearing -- here's
24 something consistent thematically right -- it sort of ties
25 in with the MOU suggestion which is to say the time of that



1 dialogue for a publicly elected board to be able to engage
2 in a more free flowing way and gather information about
3 what's going on in the district, is -- is before we hit
4 that, you know, statutorily mandated potential, you know,
5 the death penalty phase of the proceeding, right? I mean,
6 the time to sort of gather those -- build those
7 relationships and gather that information is in the years
8 before you get there. And whether it's through a formal
9 structure like an MOU or through that it's in -- that you
10 are in your communities --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No but -- but --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- continues to --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But the relationships
14 are already there.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we did. That's not
16 the whole time involved here.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But then I would -- I
18 would hope at that point when districts really know they're
19 scheduled in two months to come in and decide whether
20 they're even going to remain accredited or be thrown into
21 reorganization or have some of their schools closed, but to
22 that point, I would hope it wouldn't be too socially awkward
23 to say I really can't talk to you about accountability right
24 now because as you know, you guys are about to come before
25 us.



1 MS. FLORES: No but to say because it's very
2 -- it's a small world. And to say, you know, I can't talk to
3 you.

4 MADAM CHAIR: No, you didn't listen. You
5 can't talk to me about this particular topic. You can say
6 ha -- and how are the children and did you like the dinner?
7 Okay. You don't need to become an outcast.

8 MS. FLORES: Okay.

9 MADAM CHAIR: The commissioner was asked to
10 make some comments.

11 MS. ANTHES: So board member Goff, to your
12 point around sort of is there a running list, I think we are
13 keeping track of these things. Our staff have some guiding
14 questions that might help us get direction from you on how -
15 -.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, that's where I was going.

17 MS. ANTHES: -- we -- on how we move these
18 conversations forward. I'm not sure if that's exactly what
19 it is about Alyssa.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, I mean, we -- we just
21 pull -- after talking with different stakeholders and
22 hearing areas where there is commonality of response and
23 then some differences of response, these were some of the
24 questions that we pulled together if you all wanted to talk.
25 I think I want to be mindful of time and see how much more



1 time you want to spend today.

2 But I think there were some things on here
3 that we had if you have any specific direction for us on any
4 of those topics that we are very welcome to get today as we
5 start moving forward beyond those next steps that Brenda
6 already talked about.

7 MADAM CHAIR: So, as we look at this -- these
8 questions we can certainly send some concern. I certainly
9 would like to talk about the concern that was expressed
10 regarding pathway options. It's my understanding that if
11 there's ever to be a pathway option for charter that that
12 process needs to be available. There need to be charter
13 schools who are actually interested and there need to be
14 conversations with those districts.

15 I don't know that we should be doing that,
16 but we should be able to clarify what it is we're looking
17 for in a charter school to even be qualified to contact a
18 district and make that offer as a solution. Am I right on
19 that?

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think one thing that
21 you probably read in the reports is, we had some information
22 of charter operators or anybody who was interested in
23 opening a charter in any of the districts or schools, but we
24 didn't have solid information. So, that was one thing in
25 terms of talking about timing when we wait till the end of



1 the clock. If we wait and then and there is -- then you have
2 to do a whole process to see if anybody's interested and
3 then for the school and the district to go through that
4 process if that's the direction that things go.

5 So it would still be another few years before
6 schools could open in that way and I think there was a
7 hesitancy after we had been at five years, which is really
8 seven years, to wait any longer. And so some ideas that have
9 popped up are if the board would like to have that be a more
10 accessible pathway, that the department or we could put out
11 a call for, are there anybody interested in any of the
12 communities where there may potentially be schools or
13 districts coming forward at the end of that clock? So that
14 was something that if you all think that would be something
15 that is helpful, you can ask us to do that. Does that makes
16 sense?

17 MADAM CHAIR: You can ask for charter
18 operators.

19 MS. PEARSON: You could have us ask if these
20 charter operators that would be interested in operating in
21 any of these communities and then --

22 MADAM CHAIR: Well, ideally ones that have --
23 that have the experience.

24 MS. BAUTSCH: Yeah.

25 MADAM CHAIR: I mean I don't -- I -- I'd want



1 to be very careful that somebody really only knows how to --
2 how to be supportive of those schools before we have just
3 somebody -- just --

4 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

5 MADAM CHAIR: -- any operator come in.

6 MS. PEARSON: So that you could add that into
7 the is anybody interested and what is your experience in
8 doing this.

9 MADAM CHAIR: In the same way that I think
10 the districts looked at different management organizations
11 to see what do they have to offer and how does that fit.
12 They -- they ought to have that same option in building a
13 relationship with any kind of charter organization some.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, if you -- if you
15 have and ask -- call charter operators that believe they
16 could step in, then we could also make the determination or
17 staff could based on an interview and their experience on
18 whether they would be appropriate.

19 MS. PEARSON: Uh-huh. And then doing that
20 wouldn't say this is what a community would do, right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

22 MS. PEARSON: It would just be that -- to
23 know better what the options --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have a --

25 MS. PEARSON: -- might be and what might be



1 available, and it would not be making decisions.

2 MADAM CHAIR: It's an option for a community.
3 I'm not sure every district wants --

4 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

5 MADAM CHAIR: -- to do it on their own.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

7 MADAM CHAIR: In the same way that they had a
8 management organization, they might very well want to have a
9 charter operator come in and help them out. Do you have
10 your hand up, Ms. Goff? I can't tell.

11 MS. GOFF: Well, kind of, yes. Thank you.

12 MADAM CHAIR: I can never tell.

13 MS. GOFF: I --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not a proper hand
15 up I think, but -- there you go.

16 MS. GOFF: How -- it would seem that that
17 disc -- would be a heavy enough discussion to really talk
18 about that and what are all the underlying shades around
19 doing that and if it's related at all to a decision by the
20 board about a pathway. And I keep thinking back about your
21 example or not; it was a good one.

22 The district has been working on an
23 innovation plan and working up to it and looking at a remedy
24 called innovation for school or more schools. And then the
25 state board or whomever, some entity comes in and puts the



1 square peg into your round hole. And where would -- where --
2 where would that have ended up if that had happened?

3 If a district is working toward a current
4 pathway, on a current pathway, it's the same thing, and then
5 all of a sudden, this new decision is upending that amount
6 of work. Where do -- where are we? Are we -- is -- is it
7 our obligation to enact the decision that we make?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think that's in
9 the law.

10 MS. GOFF: No, but -- but -- is -- I don't
11 know, I just want to know. What kind of language is in the
12 law that -- that actually it spells out what we have to do,
13 what is required of the board? If it is encouragement like
14 we operate around here, collaboration and decision making
15 jointly on the part of districts and the department then
16 that's one thing. But if it was a charter school and the
17 board determined you need to authorize a charter to take
18 care of your issue, where are we with that? I just think at
19 some point we're going to need those details written down
20 someplace.

21 MS. TOLLESON: I'm sorry, is your question
22 about though how you would enforce that?

23 MS. GOFF: Yes. What -- what are the
24 enforcement principles, the guidelines? What are the -- the
25 options really in the current language of the law.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well if you -- if you --

2 MS. GOFF: What do we have to do? What can
3 we do?

4 MS. TOLLESON: One of the struggles with this
5 statute and I know you all saw this, it has some fairly
6 mandatory language that I think there was a general
7 consensus was so draconian is not necessarily to be in the
8 best interest of kids.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

10 MS. TOLLESON: So how do you work through
11 language that says, for example, under no circumstances are
12 you supposed to even allow a school to remain accredited
13 when it heads in, you know, beyond that sixth year. And
14 that's where we talked about well, can you -- can you revoke
15 accreditation conditionally and try to find school
16 improvement another way.

17 So, I think a lot of the statutory language
18 is difficult. If you ordered an action and the district
19 didn't want to take it, we'd probably wind up one of two
20 places. We'd wind up with litigation from the district side
21 on a local control issue, I mean, raising some of the
22 objections we all know floated around about this statute for
23 a long time, or you all would pound the table and say go get
24 a district court to enforce the order that we made last
25 summer that's being disregarded. And we hope to not land in



1 either of those positions as we move forward in future
2 years.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Board Member
4 Goff, I think the issue is that that law remains silent.
5 It's sort of after you I'll direct a local board to take
6 action, the law sort of becomes silent. So, I think that's
7 part of the discussion that we've been having.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham.

9 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
10 just looking at the questions up there I think first, one of
11 -- one of the conclusions I reached is that the
12 recommendations of the state review panels were not
13 particularly helpful or timely and I really think that
14 process should be done away with. And that would require a
15 statutory change.

16 Secondly, I think the -- the other -- one of
17 the real problems is most of the options in the law I think
18 are impractical to impose on the timelines at which those
19 decisions come to us.

20 If we had -- if we had said to -- to Weld
21 County 6, you know, turn this school into a charter and do
22 it by the start of the school year, that first of all,
23 wouldn't have been possible. I mean, you -- If you'd wanted
24 to comply, you -- I don't think you could have done it. And
25 I think that's, you know, the same thing was true if we said



1 close the school as a practical matter that's certainly not
2 good for kids on that short of notice. And so, while even
3 if we concluded those were good options, I don't think they
4 were practical. And so, I think we ended up with the -- the
5 collaborative approach that was worked out and -- and only
6 time will tell whether -- whether those yield significant
7 improvements and we hope they do, but there's really --
8 there's really no way to know.

9 And I think the last flaw with the process is
10 that I really -- I wouldn't be a bit surprised if virtually
11 all of the schools and districts that were in front of us
12 are likely to be off the clock in a year or so, that they
13 will -- they will meet the improvement standards. And I
14 also wouldn't be surprised if some of them don't backslide a
15 year later and are right back at it. So I think there needs
16 to be some requirement that not only do they get off the
17 clock, but they have to stay off the clock for a period of
18 time to demonstrate that they've really made the kinds of
19 changes necessary to move things forward.

20 So I think those were the were the primary
21 flaws in the -- in the process and I think we ought to talk
22 to the legislature about the state review panel. We should
23 talk to them about what happens at the end of the clock and
24 do they want -- do they want it -- do they want in year --
25 do they want after one year of decent performance and then



1 do they want to count to six or five again. I -- I would
2 hope they don't, but I think that that's potentially a
3 problem.

4 So I think given the statute with the flaws
5 in the statute and the practical problems of implementation,
6 I think we can all hope it works and we may have no way to
7 tell but we'll wait and see.

8 MADAM CHAIR: I think there's one thing we
9 need to keep in mind about getting on and off the clock and
10 I might be wrong, but the size of the district, the numbers
11 can also affect that.

12 MR. DURHAM: Oh yes.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Is my understanding of that.
14 So we need to be very careful --

15 MR. DURHAM: Right.

16 MADAM CHAIR: -- with that one. There is a
17 size factor in there that makes it very challenging in the
18 districts.

19 MR. DURHAM: Agreed.

20 MADAM CHAIR: In terms of the questions,
21 here's a question that I would actually open to you too as
22 well, but what information does the board want or do you
23 want to share with us to provide yearly updates on the
24 progress of schools and districts that have been directed
25 action? We got a brief report yesterday, but what are the



1 look for? I'd like to hear from each of you if you have
2 some specific items. And what would you see is the
3 indicators of things are rolling around? Why don't you guys
4 go first.

5 Mr. Munn, what would you want to be providing
6 us over the next two or three years of -- no, I didn't say
7 want. I didn't mean want. What do you recommend because I
8 know what you want.

9 MR. MUNN: Well, I think I have to in
10 fairness say to the board, I think the board actually
11 doesn't have the authority to do the monitoring and I think
12 the framework of the statute is unconstitutional. I think I
13 have to preface that so that I'm honest and transparent with
14 the conversations I've had with your staff and with your
15 counsel.

16 That said, if -- if we are compelled to do so
17 and if we don't choose to go to district court, I think the
18 kinds of things we would provide to you would be the typical
19 indicators that you would see around our growth and
20 performance what we would one, to provide you leading
21 indicators that are specifically related to our -- our plan,
22 right, here are the things that we are planning to do and
23 the leading indicators of that plan in particular. And then
24 secondly, the additional lagging indicators that come
25 through the state assessment data.



1 So, those two, that -- those two sets of
2 data, and it will be very different for each school and for
3 each district by essence of that plan, but those are the
4 kinds of things we would think about providing.

5 DR. PILCH: I agree with all of that. Well,
6 not the first part about going to district court. I don't -
7 - I don't have the money to go to district court, so I don't
8 agree with that part. But the indicators --.

9 MADAM CHAIR: That doesn't serve kids; sorry.

10 MR. DURHAM: So Mr. Munn's over-funded.

11 DR. PILCH: No, he's over educated.

12 MADAM CHAIR: In the wrong things.

13 DR. PILCH: Yeah. I agree with his
14 indicators. I would also add the -- that internal
15 assessments are really important. And I -- and I know I'm
16 really stretching it here, but I have to say it, you know,
17 we just -- we just looked at our growth and achievement data
18 and to compare districts, Greeley District 6 against the
19 state averages, when the demographic of Greeley District 6
20 is nowhere close to the state average, is -- is really a
21 disconnect from -- it's a mismatch for us.

22 And -- and I know it sounds like I'm making
23 excuses around poverty, I absolutely I'm not. When you
24 stack up -- when you stack up my high schools and their
25 demographic against other high schools with similar



1 demographics, you'll see that our high schools are
2 outperforming those high schools. I think. They were last
3 year. I think we'll see the same thing this year. And so,
4 that's important to me that I'm outperforming schools with
5 like demographic.

6 And so -- so the way we measure with --
7 against our state demographic where the state number of
8 students who qualify for free and reduced lunch, does not
9 match the number of students in District 6 who qualify for
10 free and reduced lunch, I think it's -- I think it's a
11 mismatch. And I don't think it's an accurate -- an accurate
12 way to measure growth or achievement in the state of
13 Colorado for students.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Colleagues, what
15 other information do you want to hear? Staff to be
16 presenting to us how often, quarterly? I don't know what we
17 agreed to.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're doing it -- we're
19 at a minimum do a yearly update after the next frameworks
20 are out, so the schools will have had a year to demonstrate
21 improvements. About this time next year, you would hear a
22 full update on the last group of schools.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Commissioner?

24 MS. ANTHERS: Yes. And I just -- I did want
25 to loop back to Superintendent Munn's early comments about



1 the SPF, DPF. I -- that -- that process is barreling down
2 on us like a train, that's probably what Alyssa and her team
3 feel like. Because pretty soon, we'll have 200 or so
4 requests to reconsider a process. So, I would like some
5 direction.

6 I -- I -- I'm not quite sure how to do this
7 in the process. But I mean, I think our staff need to know
8 sooner rather than later if -- if we're going to make any
9 shifts or changes in how frameworks can account for early
10 interventions and some of the questions that Mr. Munn
11 brought up. But I -- I -- I'm sure my team is like
12 stressing out by me saying this, but it's sort of -- Alyssa,
13 do you want to --

14 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I mean, I think -- I
15 think it's a great question for 2018. It's an extremely
16 difficult conversation for 2017 for the actual framework
17 calculations.

18 MS. ANTHERS: Because the framework
19 calculations have been --

20 MS. PEARSON: Because we're validating them
21 right this moment. Yeah.

22 MS. ANTHERS: -- in the process right now.
23 But -- but in terms of the request to reconsider.

24 MS. PEARSON: Request to reconsider, there's
25 some space. My team might kill me for saying that. So, I'm



1 just passing it down.

2 MADAM CHAIR: It sounds like it's on the
3 agenda next month, but I'm not sure.

4 MS. ANTHES: Well, that will be too late.

5 MS. PEARSON: And that's going to be too late
6 if it's for 2017 decisions, and it's different than what we
7 have in our policy with what we've been doing.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For request for
9 reconsideration?

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Because drafts are due
11 from districts September 15th, we need to get feedback on
12 the draft. Since some people like to have that, we're
13 putting our guidance out next week with the frameworks on
14 what the criteria is. So, I think we're just still a little
15 mismatched in timing for this year. 2018, we can have all
16 these conversations.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Did you just say that you -- on
19 frameworks on criteria?

20 MS. PEARSON: Uh-huh.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Rubrics what -- is that -- you
22 said that's all set for this year, it's not going to change
23 until 2018 if it -- if it changes?

24 MS. PEARSON: So, I mean, if you got -- you
25 all -- this is your authority, so we can do it. We have the



1 framework calculations based on where we've had
2 conversations with you and points, and weightings, and all
3 of that, those have been calculated. We're in the process -
4 - well, they're -- they're being calculated and validated
5 right now, so they're about ready to go out to districts.

6 The request to reconsider guidance, we have
7 updated from the prior year based on conversations we had
8 with all of you about policy on that. That if there's
9 something very strongly you'd like to change, we can talk
10 about it, but we really need to talk about it now or very
11 soon.

12 MS. MAZANEC: But we've looked at this over a
13 year, right? On the frame.

14 MADAM CHAIR: And that's just shooting from
15 the hip?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've looked at this
18 over a year.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 MADAM CHAIR: That's just shooting from the
21 hip.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Without -- yeah. First of all,
24 I would --

25 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.



1 MADAM CHAIR: -- I would be grateful if you
2 could give us a written sheet that talks about what are the
3 processes under the request for reconsideration.

4 MS. PEARSON: Okay. We can send you the full
5 guidance, but we'll send a summary of it, high-level
6 summary.

7 MADAM CHAIR: And then also, what are the
8 considerations that we just talked about? I just am very
9 reticent to just suddenly decide we're going to do something
10 very different.

11 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

12 MADAM CHAIR: That's a very --.

13 MS. PEARSON: That makes me nervous, but I
14 just want to be open. And if you all want to send us in
15 that direction, we will figure it out. But I agree, it
16 makes me a little nervous to try and change things right
17 now.

18 But we will get you a kind of overview of
19 request to reconsider process, how it works, the major
20 criteria, and then we'll also attach the full criteria and
21 the guidance that we put out for districts for that process.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Right. And this is what we've
23 been using for the last five years, seven years?

24 MS. PEARSON: So, yes. It's been -- it's
25 been changed every year. Every year, there's different --



1 there's different contexts, right? With, you know, this
2 year, we've added PSA -- or SAT at 10th -- or at 11th grade,
3 so what does that do with the frameworks? Are there
4 considerations we need to give because of that?

5 So every year there's something a little bit
6 different. It has to get added just to account where we're
7 at with the date and what might be arising for schools and
8 districts with the frameworks. So it's changed, but for the
9 most part, it is the same. It's built on the same guidance
10 that started in 2010.

11 MADAM CHAIR: What I was suggesting are some
12 additional items get in there.

13 MS. PEARSON: Either in there or at I had
14 more so in the frameworks themselves.

15 MADAM CHAIR: That I know is how we can do.

16 MS. PEARSON: That we can do for 2017, yeah.

17 MADAM CHAIR: But even a request for
18 reconsideration I think we're in a little bit of a time --

19 MS. PEARSON: I would say so.

20 MR. MUNN: All I can say, Madam Chair, is we
21 raised this issue in February with the understanding that if
22 we came to this meeting, that it will -- can be done in time
23 to address this year's framework. That was the
24 representation made by you and the department in that
25 conversation.



1 If you're saying that that can't be done,
2 that's concerning and that's troubling. But understand that
3 that certainly may be the basis of requests for
4 consideration and appeals for myself and others if there are
5 situations --

6 MADAM CHAIR: That would make a difference.

7 MR. MUNN: -- that it would make a difference
8 and, you know, it's -- it's concerning because we obviously
9 -- we waived certain rights based upon that representation.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Noted. Any other comments,
11 colleagues? Thank you. Thank you so much for coming and
12 sharing. This is very helpful.

13 MR. MUNN: Thank you.

14 DR. PILCH: Thanks for listening.

15 MS. PEARSON: I have a few little as -- in
16 closing, in comments if that's okay.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, sure.

18 MS. PEARSON: Really quick. Is that all
19 right? So, we -- we want to really thank you all for taking
20 the time. I know this was a lot of our board meeting that
21 was already a really packed board meeting to take the time
22 and step back and reflect on all of this and how the
23 policies and implementation played out so far.

24 There's a lot we don't know yet. We know
25 that we're waiting on data, and that data actually, you



1 know, is really early data and that most of these actions
2 aren't really fully being implemented until starting this
3 year. But to be able to step back and learn and reflect on
4 what we've done and what our policies have said is really
5 important to us, so we really appreciate taking the time to
6 do that.

7 We wanted to share one more observation about
8 this work. With that deep work we've had with the 12
9 schools and five districts especially that were at the end
10 last year, we knew that there's work that teachers, and
11 principals, and districts can do to help those students grow
12 at a higher rate to increase achievement. We know there is
13 work to be done in terms of instruction and curriculum and
14 the work in the classroom.

15 We think the plans that the districts and
16 schools have put into place will really help with that, and
17 that there's room to grow there. But at the same time,
18 there's also some additional accountability and
19 responsibility beyond the school and district that we --
20 that we want to talk about or think about quickly.

21 Looking at the students in the schools at the
22 end of the accountability clock, 78 percent of them were
23 eligible for free and reduced lunch and 77 percent were non-
24 white. And that's very different -- you heard Dr. Pilch say
25 -- very different from the state population, right? The



1 state population, we've got 42 percent of our students
2 eligible for free and reduced lunch and 46 percent that are
3 non-white.

4 And then even if we disaggregate further, if
5 we look at schools that were on the accountability clock in
6 2010 but came off, their population was different. They had
7 69 percent of students eligible for free reduced lunch and
8 68 percent non-white.

9 So, still higher than the state average, but
10 not to those same high needs as we saw at the schools that
11 ended at the end of the clock. So, we know that there is
12 room for our schools to grow and what they are doing in the
13 acts of teaching, and learning, and assessing, and helping
14 students academically, but we also think there's factors
15 beyond the school walls that are really impacting how
16 students are doing and the needs they have to come to school
17 ready to learn.

18 We've put a lot of accountability on our
19 schools and districts for this, right? And they're --
20 they're working really hard to own that. You heard that from
21 our superintendents today.

22 But I think if we all really are committed to
23 this school of all students being fully prepared upon
24 graduation for what they want to do that there might be
25 additional accountability that we want to think about as



1 adults here around how we ensure students enter school ready
2 to learn, with food in their bellies, with security in their
3 home, what do we do for those kids so that they can come to
4 school and so that the educators can do the jobs that we're
5 asking our educators to do.

6 Our commissioner has raised some of these
7 issues already talking about where we can go and thinking
8 about our performance plan going forward. How do we really
9 focus on decreasing that or decreasing the impact of the
10 negative effects of poverty on students and learning for the
11 whole system so that kids can really be students when
12 they're at school. We don't have an answer for all of this
13 at all. It's an observation that we think is important to
14 share and start talking about.

15 We think we have a role to play in this, all
16 of us here in this room today. We're committed as a
17 department to working with partners across the state to
18 discuss and determine how we can support children so that
19 they can excel as students. And as we move forward, we'll be
20 thinking of ideas and actions that we can take in this area
21 and want to share that, and we'll be sharing that with you
22 and having ongoing conversations.

23 But just having dug in so deeply to these
24 schools and districts over that since January when we
25 started really digging in and writing these recommendations,



1 when you look at the struggles kids are facing and the
2 schools are addressing beyond just the academics, we just
3 felt like this was a really important thing that we wanted
4 to say and share as we wrap up and reflect on the process.
5 So, thank you for that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thanks very much for all your
8 hard work. That was an important reality check that we
9 probably don't talk about enough, but we do all recognize
10 it. So, we thank you and we thank all the schools, and
11 districts, and teachers for what they are doing for their
12 accomplishments because there have been -- there has been
13 real progress. It's our job probably to go beyond our little
14 sandbox to talk about this. Thank you.

15 MADAM CHAIR: The next item of our, on our
16 agenda is presentation of the three research requests
17 received for students of PII. Commissioner?

18 MS. ANTHERS: What about --

19 MADAM CHAIR: He's coming.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're going to have
21 dinner after.

22 MADAM CHAIR: These folks need to catch
23 planes.

24 MS. ANTHERS: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 This is -- these will start to probably become regular board



1 agenda items.

2 As you recall, you all passed a process that
3 any research requests that comes to us must come to you for
4 final approval, once it makes it through the gauntlet of our
5 process. So I will say these researchers have been patient
6 for a quite a few months, and so we're trying to get these
7 through to you in a timely way.

8 So I believe we have three requests, and I
9 would just ask that since we are running late, you know, the
10 quicker we can get through, you know, the better. Since we
11 have more, more to do today yet, after these three requests.
12 So with that, I'll turn it over to Jill Stacey, who is our
13 CDE Data Privacy Analyst. Ms. Stacey.

14 MS. STACEY: Thank you very much. And thank
15 you guys for sticking with us to the end of this meeting.
16 We are going --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we have a choice?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're thinking about
19 bolting.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have more after
21 this. So

22 MS. STACEY: Are you going to? Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have even more, so --

24 MS. STACEY: Yeah. So we're going to go fast
25 and we're going to try to get this done quickly. We have



1 three research requests to bring to you this time. They are
2 all evaluations of existing programs. These individuals
3 would like to have data on students in order to evaluate the
4 success or the impacts of their various different programs.

5 And so, we're going to give you information
6 on what those programs are and understanding of the data
7 that they are requesting, give you an understanding of the
8 questions that we had during the research approval panel
9 review process, and then, I believe, this is an
10 informational item only at this point, and we'll take this
11 back to you probably in September for a vote. So, let's see.

12 So, this is Katie Stringer and she is going
13 to be our first researcher. If you'll look through your
14 information, she is seeking to evaluate a -- a program
15 called SEED, System for Educator Effectiveness and
16 Development. And she is partnering with the Northwest
17 BOCES. The Northwest BOCES which granted a federal grant to
18 develop a teacher evaluation system and development tool.

19 Now, they are seeking information to
20 determine the success of that program, to determine if it's
21 made any effects on student achievement. If there has been
22 any impacts to teacher performance or classroom practices
23 and determine if there were any specific impacts on high-
24 need areas. This is the data that they are specifically
25 requesting for this research. They are requesting obviously



1 standardized test scores for PARCC and PSAT, and then they
2 are requesting information on the student's grade level and
3 various demographic information on each of the students.

4 They are also requesting information on the
5 schools or districts themselves including whether they're
6 rural, urban, et cetera, the student-teacher ratio, and a
7 school identifier for those schools. We reviewed this as
8 part of our research approval panel process, and we had a
9 few questions that came up. One of the things that was
10 raised is that there were only certain schools that were
11 selected, and we felt that if you were only selecting to
12 receive information on certain schools or districts, then we
13 would want to know if they're okay with being selected as
14 part of this review.

15 The researcher did gain consent from those
16 participating schools, so that was addressed and that she
17 was able to do so. There were some slight differences in the
18 insti -- the original institutional review board approval
19 and submission. A lot of that is down to the fact that IRBs
20 tend to have a slightly different understanding of what PII
21 is than we do. We take a far more conservative approach. So
22 it wasn't based on any sort of inaccuracies or anything like
23 that, but there was just some slight differences. Katy was
24 happy enough to, maybe not happy, but was willing to
25 resubmit her IRB approval document, and I believe you got



1 approval --

2 MS. STRINGER: Yes.

3 MS. STACEY: -- this week. Yeah. One other
4 thing that was mentioned in the IRB approval and in the
5 request is that they will be conducting a survey of
6 students, and she has confirmed through that that parents
7 may opt their students out of that.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. She got
9 approval from who? You said IRB?

10 MS. STACEY: Yes. Yeah.

11 MS. STRINGER: But then, McREL has an
12 institutional review board, and at least about two.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Who was it?

14 MS. STRINGER: McREL Organization. Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because we don't have an
16 IRB, right?

17 MS. STRINGER: Right. Correct. And neither
18 does the Northwest BOCES or the districts that we're serving
19 in this evaluation. So we got approval from them to get a
20 waiver of informed consent. So basically, we sent an
21 information letter home to parents, and then the parents are
22 allowed to opt their students out of doing the survey.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But if they don't opt
24 out, they're in?

25 MS. STRINGER: Yes.



1 MR. DURHAM: You have copies of the survey?

2 MS. STRINGER: Not on hand, I do not. It
3 involves questions on student engagement. So how engaged
4 they feel in their different classes, and how supported I
5 feel and by my teachers.

6 MS. STACEY: We can provide that to you if
7 you would like a follow up.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't like that.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham?

10 MR. DURHAM: This program that you're trying
11 to test, System for Educator Effectiveness and Development,
12 is that it?

13 MS. STRINGER: Yes.

14 MR. DURHAM: What is it that's done
15 differently by these particular teachers that's not done in
16 every classroom?

17 MS. STRINGER: So the teachers, so the whole
18 professional development program is offered by the Northwest
19 BOCES, and it's based on the State Teacher Evaluation
20 Rubric. So they have aligned all of the topics and the
21 professional development either online or through teacher-
22 learning communica -- communities which are collaborative
23 groups that feature coaching and collaboration with peers
24 across the different districts that the BOCES serves. And
25 so, every element of the professional development is aligned



1 to one or more teacher evaluation quality standards, and --

2 MR. DURHAM: So you're doing this in what, I
3 forget how many counties in Northwest BOCES is? How, how
4 many?

5 MS. STRINGER: It's six districts.

6 MR. DURHAM: So, it -- it's six districts and
7 you need statewide data --

8 MS. STRINGER: So in order to --

9 MR. DURHAM: -- to -- to evaluate this? And
10 then you're going to ask questions, you're going to send
11 questionnaires to students all over the state. How many
12 students?

13 MS. STRINGER: So the students are within the
14 schools that the Northwest BOCES serves. And so it's only
15 students who have teachers who are receiving the
16 professional development. And then the professional
17 development is considered to be schoolwide, so teachers can
18 participate in the teacher -- learning communities or they
19 can do the online professional development. It's voluntary,
20 however.

21 We expect that teacher, that students of
22 these teachers will become more engaged over time as a
23 result of the teachers' changing practices, because we hope
24 that they're improving on the teacher-evaluation rubric. So
25 that why, this is why we're assessing student engagement



1 only in the schools that the Northwest BOCES serves, where
2 teachers are participating. So we need to answer --

3 MR. DURHAM: So there's no data being
4 collected any place else, and, or you don't want any data
5 from El Paso County, for example?

6 MS. STRINGER: Well, so because of our
7 research design that we are required to do for this, for the
8 federal government, we were requesting school level and
9 demographics and scores for schools that we match. So it's
10 -- and as one of the superintendents who's talking about
11 earlier, we want to compare schools who are similar to the
12 schools we are serving, and see how they do on their
13 performance, student performance at the school level in
14 comparison to the teachers who are participating or the
15 schools participating in this program. So there's no
16 student-level data being requested for schools that didn't
17 give permission.

18 MR. DURHAM: Didn't give permission.

19 MS. STRINGER: Correct.

20 MR. DURHAM: Well, but the school -- you're
21 asking permission from schools to expose the data from their
22 students even though they're not in your BOCES. Or is it in
23 your BOCES only?

24 MS. STRINGER: So we're asking first student-
25 level data only in the BOCES which we've gotten permission



1 from all the superintendents for. And the other data that
2 we're requesting are school-level statistics such as
3 performance, average performance of the school level --

4 MR. DURHAM: So that's not personal data,
5 then?

6 MS. STRINGER: Correct. So this is from my
7 understanding going for you all because we're requesting
8 student-level data for the schools that we're serving who
9 gave permission.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 MR. DURHAM: Well, I think before we proceed,
12 I'd certainly want to see the questionnaire you intend to --
13 to --

14 MS. STRINGER: Absolutely.

15 MR. DURHAM: -- ask and see how intrusive
16 those questions might be. And I certainly think you all have
17 an opt in instead of an opt out.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many students are we
19 talking about?

20 MS. STRINGER: We had, there's about six --
21 600 students that participated last go around in the survey.

22 MR. DURHAM: So you've already done a survey?

23 MS. STRINGER: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You've already done it?

25 MS. STRINGER: We've done a student survey



1 which has been approved by our institutional review board.

2 And the direct -- the districts have approved us doing so.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When you say you've done
4 the survey; the students have answered the survey?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. What are we here
7 for? This is-

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The state -- the state
9 data on testing.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, they have not --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they've asked the
12 survey, they want --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly, when they come
14 to us asking for any state data, then they en -- enter into
15 our research review process. There's nothing stopping from
16 researchers working with districts on their own data. We
17 can't -- we don't interfere with that. If -- if a district
18 enters into a contract or an agreement with a researcher, we
19 don't have anything to say to that. It's only when they're
20 coming to the state asking for state data or state
21 permission to do something then do, they enter into this
22 process.

23 MS. STRINGER: That's correct.

24 MR. DURHAM: Did I see someplace that you'd
25 gotten \$2.6-million for this?



1 MS. STRINGER: Correct. So this is a \$3-
2 million grant from the federal government and so part of
3 that is, you know, we want to be able to do what we are
4 supposed to do with these taxpayer dollars and that is do an
5 external evaluation on students' outcomes.

6 MS. ANTHERS: The million dollars is not, the
7 multi-million dollars is not for this evaluation, it's for
8 the actual grant program.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The whole --

10 MR. DURHAM: No, I understand that, Dr.
11 Anthes. Just -- so are you an indepen -- are you
12 independent of the people who got the grant?

13 MS. STRINGER: So we're subcontracting.

14 MR. DURHAM: You've been hired to do the
15 study.

16 MS. STRINGER: Yes.

17 MR. DURHAM: You've been hired -- but you've
18 been hired by the people who designed this program and have
19 expended the money, the federal dollars, for this grant.
20 Correct?

21 MS. STRINGER: Correct. So it's a requirement
22 of the grant.

23 MR. DURHAM: So I do my Great Carnac
24 imitation? 'Cause I think I can predict the result.

25 MS. STRINGER: We've been -- we've been -- as



1 required by the grant, they -- you are supposed to have a --
2 an external evaluator and so McREL is serving as the
3 external evaluator for the Northwest BOCES. So, it's to put
4 a firewall between the developers and the evaluation so that
5 we provide an objective evaluation of the program.

6 MR. DURHAM: One last question, Madam Chair.
7 Can you or someone describe to me exactly what is -- what
8 this SEED program is? Exactly, what is it you do besides
9 provide some sort of training and how extensive is the
10 training, how long is it? How many teachers participated?
11 And I mean, I really would like to see some real details
12 before I could conclude it's worth evaluating or not. What
13 is it you do different that you think's going to produce a
14 better result?

15 MS. STRINGER: We believe that using data
16 driven professional development, so connecting teacher
17 performance, connecting them based on the state evaluation
18 rubric, my performance --

19 MR. DURHAM: May I interrupt with just one
20 que -- apparently, 95 percent of all teachers in Colorado
21 are effective or better. So how do you differentiate when
22 you're -- when you're trying to measure teacher
23 effectiveness, you're starting out with them all being
24 effective or highly effective? So -- so exactly, what is it
25 you're -- you can't draw any distinctions there, so what is



1 it you're trying to test?

2 MS. STRINGER: So we're ultimately trying to
3 test whether, if I get professional development that is
4 geared towards elements on the quality standards that I --
5 I'm showing to need some improvement and --

6 MR. DURHAM: Elements on what quality
7 standards?

8 MS. STRINGER: There is -- so there are five
9 different quality standards. The first three are the ones
10 that the professional development focus on and those are
11 mainly on teaching practices because this is a teacher
12 professional development. There's over 250 different
13 professional practices that teachers can be proficient on,
14 depending on their subject content area.

15 And so from this professional development, it
16 gets down to the element level. So under each element there
17 are a number of professional practices. So each different
18 professional learning activity is connected to one of the
19 elements on a teacher evaluation rubric.

20 So we're saying that, or the Northwest BOCES
21 is saying that their program becomes -- is data driven
22 professional development. It's not just professional
23 development because I think this is interesting. It's
24 because my principal and I have decided that this is
25 something that I should work on.



1 MR. DURHAM: So which data, which data has
2 already been evaluated to drive, to, to, to direct the data
3 driven development? What is it that you know about this
4 teacher and his or her shortcomings or, or outstanding
5 qualities that have driven, that have driven you to provide
6 that individual with a specific program? What data have you
7 already evaluated?

8 MS. STRINGER: So in the conversations that
9 teachers and principals had, they're looking at their
10 performance on a state evaluation rubric. So those are the
11 data they're using to make the determination of which
12 professional development activities through SEED that
13 teachers should participate in. And the first year, about
14 25 percent of all teachers voluntarily participated in a
15 semester long teacher learning community. I mean that's
16 pretty good because it's voluntary and it's a long
17 professional development in which research supports is
18 effective in professional development. It's not just the
19 one shot I get one day of professional development includes
20 collaboration with your peers and coaching from innovation
21 coaches within Northwest BOCES have hired as part of this
22 grant.

23 MR. DURHAM: Okay. Thank you.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Questions? Board Member
25 Rankin.



1 MS. RANKIN: Where does the students survey
2 come in and -- and engagement? Is that the way they judge
3 how the teachers are doing is with the students' survey?

4 MS. STRINGER: So with the student survey,
5 it's -- it's only for our evaluation of the program, it's
6 not linked to specific teachers. The survey is completely
7 anonymous so we're analyzing all the data at the school
8 level. So we're understanding whether a school's average
9 student achievement improves over time.

10 And so we think that before we can impact
11 achievement, you need to impact engagement. So that is kind
12 of our theory of change through teacher practice change we
13 get student engagement change which then leads to seeing
14 achievement change.

15 MS. RANKIN: So you will look at the -- those
16 students, the achievement gains they've made in that year
17 that the teachers are --

18 MS. STRINGER: Correct. And then we'll
19 compare the school level engagement, not engagement --
20 achievement with schools who did not participate.

21 MS. RANKIN: And -- and what does -- what
22 does the Northwest BOCES have to do with it? Are they going
23 to get this program?

24 MS. STRINGER: They're the ones who develop
25 the program and McREL was hired to evaluate whether they're



1 achieving their goals and objectives.

2 MR. DURHAM: Same as who applied for a
3 federal grant in the Northwest BOCES?

4 MS. STRINGER: Yes, they're the ones who
5 applied and received a grant.

6 MR. DURHAM: So the grantee, grant to them.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you're in essence --
8 it's an audit of what we did?

9 MS. STRINGER: Correct. And we hope to
10 provide recommendations for improvement along the way as for
11 collecting implementation data.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are there questions?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Should we move onto the
15 next one?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. All right. So
17 now we are discussing an evaluation again of the safe
18 schools. I'm going to get this wrong, safe community, safe
19 school program. And this is a program that is also being
20 researched by the American Institutes of Research. It is a
21 valuation of 46 Colorado middle schools to obtain practical
22 information about whether or not schools are safe places for
23 students to learn and develop.

24 The funding was originally from the National
25 Institute of Justice and what they are trying to do is to



1 understand what extent middle schools are able to implement
2 this program, and if this program improves Middle School
3 Safety and achievement.

4 The data they're requesting is from 2016 to
5 2019. So, this will be an ongoing request. They're
6 requesting truancy rates for each grade and demographic
7 group. They're looking also at demographic information such
8 as race, ethnic -- ethnicity, gender, et cetera and then
9 they're also looking for assessment information. This is --
10 we did approve it to be moved forward to you.

11 The -- the researcher did request attendance
12 data which is not something we can provide because we do not
13 have. So they'll get that information through other ways.
14 Again, they're focusing on very specific schools, so we
15 asked for their approval to participate. We did -- did
16 determine that truancy rate data is a little bit more
17 sensitive than just average student personally identifiable
18 information which is sensitive on its own.

19 But we determined that the information is
20 necessary to determine if truancy rates decrease in relation
21 to a safer feeling of students in the school. So, if they
22 feel more safe. There -- they did get IRB approval and we
23 did see -- think that you know, providing safe communities
24 for schools and safe schools for students is an important
25 thing to study and to improve. So I will turn it over to



1 Alyson who can give you more information on the benefits of
2 the research and then answer any questions you have.

3 MS. DYMNICKI: Hi, such a pleasure to be here
4 today and thanks for sticking out. It's a long day for you
5 guys. I'll try to make this quick. I do have to introduce
6 colleagues in the audience only because I'm 12 weeks
7 pregnant and I'm throwing up a lot. So, I'm really hoping I
8 make it through. It's a little bit unusual situation.

9 I have two colleagues from the University of
10 Colorado, Boulder and they're both from the Center for the
11 Study and Prevention of Violence. Beverly Kingston is the
12 primary investigator of this grant and Sabrina Arredondo
13 Mattson is another co primary investigator with me doing a
14 lot of the work with the schools in implementing this model.

15 So, in terms of highlighting a few things for
16 you about why we're doing this work and what's important
17 about it, I want to explain, and you asked a great question
18 Steve about what's different about what we're doing co --
19 compared to what schools are normally doing. And we know
20 schools are doing lots of programs simultaneously.

21 Some are to improve academic achievement,
22 some are to improve teacher performance, some work to you
23 know improve safety and they're oftentimes overwhelmed by
24 the sheer volume of programs and they oftentimes struggle to
25 know how to align these efforts and how to actually



1 implement, evaluate and move forward with the ones that are
2 helping them achieve the intended outcomes.

3 So, what's unique about this model is that
4 researchers and practitioners from the University of
5 Colorado, Boulder are actually walking through this process
6 with the schools in a multi-year implementation process and
7 they're helping them develop school-based teams, there
8 helping them learn to use and gather data and they're
9 helping them actually select and implement evidence-based
10 program and evaluate that. And throughout the way we
11 developed the school's capacity to do the work.

12 So, the schools capacity continues after the
13 -- the study ends. Another key thing to highlight is that
14 there aren't a lot of rigorous evaluations of comprehensive
15 frameworks and how those roll out in schools and
16 particularly middle schools, which is one of those void
17 areas where we know there's lots of things that come up and
18 we're not quite sure yet how to address that population as
19 well.

20 And so, this is really addressing a need in
21 the field and because of this generous funding from the
22 National Justice, it really gives Colorado an opportunity to
23 become a leader in how to implement a model at scale like a
24 prevention intervention approach at scale that really none
25 of these approaches to our knowledge have been tested at



1 scale across the country in a rigorous evaluation. So, what
2 we hope will happen is that we'll have really useful
3 information.

4 You know, even if we can't say at the end of
5 this all 46 schools improved from this model, we'll be able
6 to understand more of the how and the why about the
7 improvements that we did see. And the only way we can really
8 do that is getting this individual level data about truancy
9 and about attendance and about achievement because we
10 understand there's attendance is available at the school
11 level. Because we need to understand the variation in
12 program effects.

13 So, we want to make sure that actually the
14 speech that was given right before we started really speaks
15 to this. If the program helps only certain groups, like only
16 white, middle income students, or it helps you know, other
17 types of students. So, the program has unintended effects
18 for students with learning disabilities for example. These
19 types of things are really important for us to understand
20 about the model and also guide program improvements
21 throughout the process.

22 So like Katy said, we're collecting
23 implementation data throughout to really try to guide and
24 improve the process as we do it and as we work with these 46
25 schools. I think that's about it. Questions?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any questions?

2 MR. DURHAM: Where -- where are the 46
3 schools?

4 MS. DYMNICKI: So there are actually across,
5 they're mostly on the front range but there -- we have gone
6 through IRB approval with every district and every school
7 we're working with. So there's probably about 11 districts
8 that we are -- well there is 11 districts or so that we're
9 working with. And you know, sometimes it's all the schools
10 and all the middle schools in a district and sometimes it's
11 just a select few.

12 MR. DURHAM: And there is a list of those
13 available, I presume?

14 MS. DYMNICKI: There is. Yeah, I'm happy to
15 provide that.

16 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, you're just working
18 with specific schools that you already have permission from
19 the schools they've been selected somehow.

20 MS. DYMNICKI: Right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then you are getting
22 data that those schools are providing to you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are also requesting
24 data from us.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, from us and from



1 the school.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

3 MS. DYMNICKI: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And are there any
5 surveys or any things that you will be giving out in the
6 schools that's different from just sucking up the data so to
7 speak?

8 MS. DYMNICKI: Yes, yes. So we're doing a
9 number of other data collection efforts to really understand
10 more about the implementation of the program activities and
11 then we're also doing climate data that's really closely
12 aligned with the Colorado Healthy Kids survey that you guys
13 do. And so, it asks more about risk behaviors and those
14 kinds of things.

15 That is not what we're asking about today
16 because we have gotten permission and IRB approval and
17 parent consent. It's not an opt out, it's an opt in process
18 for us to do all of the survey collection. So, we have
19 additional data sources. This -- this request is really
20 about the achievement, truancy and school level attendance
21 data.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are there any other --
23 is there any other information than I guess the information
24 that will be gleaned from those opt in, that -- that's
25 separate from just the amount of information that we have?



1 MS. DYMNICKI: So, besides the climate
2 surveys and the implementation motoring surveys, is there
3 other information outside of the attendance achievement?
4 No, that's really what we're banking on.

5 MR. DURHAM: So, can we get copies of the
6 surveys and the opt in consent form, so we can see how
7 explicit that and understandable it is as to what they're
8 really opting into.

9 MS. DYMNICKI: Sure and I can say all those
10 forms have also been viewed and approved by every district
11 and every school. And we have signed MOUs from every school
12 principal, but we are having-

13 MR. DURHAM: Who said, it added a little high
14 level of confidence for me, but it doesn't.

15 MS. DYMNICKI: Okay, we'll be happy to
16 provide those for you.

17 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

19 MS. MCCLELLAN: I just want to make sure that
20 I'm understanding what our concern is here today. We're just
21 primarily concerned with the data request for the
22 information held by the Department of Education and not so
23 much about what is being released at the district level. Am
24 I correct in understanding that?

25 MS. DYMNICKI: That's right.



1 MS. MCCLELLAN: And that it's safe.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions?

4 Okay we'll move onto the next one. Again, we're doing
5 another evaluation. This is for a program with the Colorado
6 Youth for Change initiative. Alison Maylin is here with us
7 today and she is working with CYC to determine if schools
8 and districts who use this program -- well, it's basically
9 to evaluate the suc -- success of the program in various
10 schools and districts.

11 So, they want to use this information to
12 improve their products and expand the program to other
13 schools and districts. They are looking at whether or not
14 this program benefits different student demographic groups,
15 whether or not the frequency and duration of the services
16 being provided affect income or affect the outcome of these
17 results, and then determine whether or not the types and
18 different kinds of support does make a difference as well.

19 They are requesting data from 2005 to the
20 present for grades nine through 12, which is what is covered
21 in this program. They only need certain information from
22 us. They really only need the name, the say said, the end
23 date in which they left the school or district, the exit
24 code related to that, and they would like this to update
25 that data on a yearly basis.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Why do we have to have name and
2 student ID?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I can't speak
4 necessarily to that, but most likely, it is because of the
5 two, four five, John Smiths in the school, making sure that
6 you have the correct information on the school, you kind of
7 need both data items, but --

8 MADAM CHAIR: No, there's only going to be
9 one numb -- there might be 50 John Smiths --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

11 MADAM CHAIR: -- but there's only going to be
12 one-

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Number.

14 MADAM CHAIR: -- student number to go with
15 each of those. So, my question is more about the name than
16 --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Removing the name, okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we're certainly
19 open to that. I think that the benefit of having both is
20 just to check on that student, I'm sorry, that's the state
21 ID and making sure that it matches with the information we
22 have. So we're just looking to -- we collect information
23 about the students we're working with through our contracts
24 with the schools and districts that we partner, and so, we
25 just have a chunk of students who, based upon whether they



1 might have left that that school or district or how long our
2 partnership is with that school or district. We have some
3 students who we can't track them a little bit more long term
4 to see did they graduate, did they earn a GED, and so, for
5 that group of students, we're seeking information from the
6 department about kind of what their educational outcome was.
7 So it's really just that name and state ID to track or -- to
8 make sure we're talking about the same student. But you're
9 correct that those state IDs totally should match.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And this --

11 MADAM CHAIR: I can't -- I'm trying to fig --
12 I thought that that was one of the ways that we were
13 protecting students was by use of the number, and that if we
14 can get away from the name, maybe some folks will be more
15 comfortable.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. We can definitely
17 be open to that since we do collect -- we have access to our
18 students' state IDs and --

19 MADAM CHAIR: And they stay with them, right?
20 As they move through the system?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, and see, this is a
23 little bit different from the other two programs where
24 they're looking at a general data. Youth for a Change
25 integrates and works directly with the schools and the



1 students and their families through this program. The one
2 thing that they weren't able to do as part of their ongoing
3 work with these individuals is track them once they leave
4 the school or district.

5 So that's why they only really need exit
6 codes and the dates. They still have the, the continual
7 partnership with the students, so they kind of already know
8 who the students are, they just need us to identify who --
9 when they left the school and why. We can certainly then
10 just redact the names and provide them with only the SASSEDs
11 if that's necessary. We can easily do that.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Well, it's not about what -- to
13 me it's not about whether it's necessary, but whether it's
14 necessary to give the name --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MADAM CHAIR: I mean, just as a --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't give the name.

19 MADAM CHAIR: -- just as a procedure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Yeah. We can
21 certainly do that.

22 MADAM CHAIR: What is -- what does your
23 organization really do? I mean --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. That's a
25 great question.



1 MADAM CHAIR: -- is -- is it prof -- for
2 profit, nonprofit?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a non-profit
4 organization. Our mission is to solve the dropout crisis in
5 Colorado. So with a few different program areas where we
6 work for that mission, we have our re-engagement program
7 that works with students who have left school, and we have
8 specialists who reach out to those students, do phone calls
9 and home visits and talk to their grandmother and their
10 employer and try to get in touch with them, figure out what
11 their needs are, what motivates some other barriers to
12 staying in school originally, and how we can support them in
13 returning to school, and then maintaining their enrollment
14 in school. So we have specialists who support them through
15 that whole process.

16 We also have our Educational Intervention
17 program that works with primarily ninth graders who could be
18 at risk of falling off track to graduate, based upon failing
19 core courses. And so, we have specialists based within the
20 schools to provide direct one-on-one or small groups support
21 to those students. And then, we also have a school option
22 in Aurora called Futures Academy, that was created to meet
23 the needs of out-of-school youth, and so, those students
24 within that school are able to work towards their GED at the
25 same time as potentially being concurrently enrolled at



1 Aurora Community College or Pickin -- Pickens Technical
2 College. So, those of the older -- older students farther
3 behind in projects.

4 MADAM CHAIR: And who -- who funds you?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have funding from a
6 few different areas. A lot of our funding comes from the
7 contracts with the schools and districts where we partner.
8 Similar to other nonprofits, we also receive foundation and
9 grants support, individual giving. We have annual events.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Who are your largest --
11 name three of your largest funders.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, that's a great
13 question. I mean, the biggest funders are our schools and
14 districts that we work with. That's where the majority of
15 our funds currently come from.

16 MADAM CHAIR: And you call it of -- a
17 nonprofit?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are a nonprofit, yes.

19 MADAM CHAIR: But yet you charge the schools.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have contracts with
21 those schools and districts to provide those services.

22 MADAM CHAIR: And how much would a school
23 have to pay you to --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It depends on the
25 position and the partnership with those schools and



1 districts. If that information is required for this
2 process, I can certainly get that.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Well, it would be interesting.
4 I mean -- board member Rankin.

5 MS. RANKIN: Jill, I have some questions for
6 you. When I go and talk to superintendents, they, they are
7 always asking for more money. Of course, I -- I don't have
8 any money to give them, but -- but we do have these
9 discussions all the time. I'm kind of lost on why a -- a
10 district would pay for something like this, and are all --
11 every time we get asked for these, is it something that is
12 charged to the district? What's the benefit there for them?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm afraid I don't have
14 any information on that. I'm looking at it from a process,
15 procedural --

16 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and a privacy point
18 of view.

19 MS. RANKIN: It's so -- some of these -- some
20 were grant programs. So, you still get paid by the
21 district? Or does that --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, no.

23 MS. RANKIN: -- district --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We give the districts
25 money in ours.



1 MS. RANKIN: Okay. The -- those are the
2 things I was looking for.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin, I
4 may be able to answer some of those. I mean, so an
5 organization like Colorado Youth for Change, districts work
6 with all sorts of programs and nonprofits on a myriad of
7 issues that they're challenged with, and so, they would
8 identify an organization that would meet their certain
9 needs, and they would decide if they would like to pay for
10 services. If they're getting good outcomes for that, then,
11 then that's a value choice that they have. You've seen that
12 our dropout, you know, and they can continue on. This is
13 not a one time --

14 MS. RANKIN: Exactly.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And, and
16 actually, in my previous life, I did some of these
17 evaluations. So districts would hire, you know, districts,
18 sometimes in order to get grant funding and use these
19 services, have to have an evaluation of the, you know,
20 effectiveness of those services, and so, a lot of these
21 requests that come to us are a part of that evaluative
22 process, and so, that's, that's some of an answer to where
23 the value would come in.

24 MS. RANKIN: So do you see any conflict with
25 -- between us in our districts by approving or disapproving



1 -- well, maybe disapproving -- if they already have
2 approvals? I -- I just -- I worry about coming in between.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Could you wait, please?

4 MS. FLORES: Just --

5 MADAM CHAIR: We've got a number of people
6 wanting to speak.

7 MS. FLORES: No, no, but you didn't let me
8 finish. I was going to finish with is United Way -- is
9 United Way one of your funders? United Way?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do have receipts to
11 seek funding from United Way. Yes.

12 MS. FLORES: And would you say that's one of
13 your biggest funders?

14 MADAM CHAIR: This is totally irrelevant.

15 MS. FLORES: No, it isn't. No it isn't.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. So, how long have you
18 been acting as a -- working for districts to help them with
19 the dropout prevention, right?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

21 MS. MAZANEC: So how long you've been doing
22 that?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Our organization was
24 founded in 2005, and so we are this data request, we're
25 hopefully be taking data, of course, it means that we've



1 worked with, in the past as well as potentially on an
2 ongoing basis as we continue work for very many.

3 MS. MAZANEC: But where -- so where have you
4 gotten the data before. I mean, how do you know who you --
5 and you're going in actually talking to these students,
6 right and their families and how do you get that
7 information?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. So while we
9 have partnerships with those schools and districts, are
10 actively working with those students, our contracts with
11 those schools and districts provide us access to that
12 information. So, for example, in our education intervention
13 program that I was referencing earlier that works with ninth
14 graders, we have that data on what happened to those
15 students following our support of them for about 80 percent
16 of our students. So really, we're looking to the department
17 for that other 20 percent of students who perhaps they left
18 that school or district where we have access to that
19 information and so we're missing a chunk of that data.

20 MS. MAZANEC: So you are looking for missing
21 data?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry?

23 MS. MAZANEC: You're looking for the missing
24 data that you don't have?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That we don't have



1 access to, yes, correct.

2 MS. MAZANEC: And -- and is this something
3 that is a one-time request, or do you think you'll be coming
4 back every year with this?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we hope that --

6 MS. MAZANEC: You wanted -- was this the
7 ongoing one?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, exactly.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Till 2019.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We hope that if were
11 gained -- that we gain approval, that we would have -- I
12 mean, ongoing relationship to have access to that data as we
13 have students that we lose access to what their education
14 outcome was.

15 MR. DURHAM: So there is no terminal state on
16 this?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry?

18 MR. DURHAM: Your access to data is for how
19 long?

20 MS. MAZANEC: Till 2019.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, ours is ongoing.

22 MR. DURHAM: I think it's more than that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 MS. MAZANEC: What?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What would likely happen



1 --

2 MS. MAZANEC: I thought I just asked that,
3 and it was 2019.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hers is 2019. Hers is
5 ongoing. So the both of them are sort of ongoing long-term
6 research projects. What would happen is that as part of our
7 data sharing agreement that we would sign in place should it
8 be approved, that requires a yearly update even if their
9 data sharing agreement extends through multiple years, we
10 would go through and evaluate the benefits, concerns, et
11 cetera, of the program and determine whether or not we would
12 seek to continue at that case, if the data sharing agreement
13 would terminate per law the individuals would delete the
14 data.

15 MR. DURHAM: Well.

16 MS. MAZANEC: We are not ruling on this today
17 though, right?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

19 MADAM CHAIR: But we need to identify what
20 additional information we want to have for next week -- next
21 month.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

23 MR. DURHAM: I do think a terminus date on --
24 a termination date on all this would be appropriate. That
25 ongoing forever's a little long, and -- and certainly, you



1 shouldn't -- you know, you should be deleting data on a
2 student once you know the final outcome as a student
3 graduated. Though it's really what you're trying to track.
4 You -- you beat the drop out, that data should be delivered,
5 should be deleted at that time. Once you know the outcome,
6 then you can check the box either or after a certain number
7 of years if they haven't completed, then you check box there
8 too. So I -- I don't think it ought to be, none of these
9 projects should have eternal life.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's certainly
11 something we can put into our data sharing agreement and
12 ensure that it happens. Yeah.

13 MR. DURHAM: And they're going to get renewed
14 and renewed, and then kind of come to back -- come back
15 here.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions, any
17 other information that you'd like to have these folks
18 provide?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of course.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like, but -- I
21 think it was board member Mazanec. Somebody asked this is --
22 is who is behind all of these research? Companies or
23 schools or whatever it is, who is behind it? And -- and
24 that should be part of this template I -- I get the
25 impression that we have semi type of template that I -- but



1 this is quite confusing to me. I -- I'm not quite sure of
2 where we are here, and also when -- when we come and ask for
3 the name of the students and -- and it's comes to us with
4 that, that shouldn't even be, that -- that should be a non-
5 issue, I believe.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That we don't provide
7 the student names?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. We can do
10 that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I -- we should know
12 that. And so when I have a problem like that that's a
13 pretty major to me, I'm looking for other problems and I --
14 I just don't quite understand. So I'd like more of those.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah and -- and what
16 just speak to that, one of the things we would like to bring
17 back to you at a later time is an understanding of whether
18 or not we're providing you with the information you need to
19 make these assessments. And so we're planning that for
20 either September or October, so we can get your feedback on
21 what you need in order to -- to review these.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, next month on the
24 agenda.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Thank you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

2 MADAM CHAIR: We have another item that we
3 missed, and I believe it's 5.0 for today. Action item which
4 was laid over from yesterday. This is a continued
5 conversation on the reconsideration of Julesburg School
6 District's accreditation rating. You all have any
7 additional questions?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question on
9 clarification, I'm sorry. It's been a long time since
10 yesterday.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's been about 100
12 years.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, as I understand it,
14 Dr. Anthes, the reason staff recommended that we grant the
15 request was because of historical precedent, Jervis School
16 District and Vilas?

17 MS. ANTHES: Yes, we -- we do have precedent
18 for doing something like this.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But you also said that
20 the context was a little different. So, would you explain
21 again the difference when we did it for Karvis -- Karval and
22 Vilas, and how it's different than Julesburg?

23 MS. ANTHES: Sure and I may need Alyssa. I
24 know she's coming, but because I -- I wasn't around for the
25 Karval and Vilas decision. So, I think part of it has to do



1 with timing in terms of timing in the process. That it was
2 this -- this was after the re -- the request to reconsider
3 full-blown process with this, with Julesburg. This is the
4 part of that turnaround grand process.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you saying Karval
6 and Vilas was a part of a request to reconsider?

7 MS. ANTHES: I believe so.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

9 MS. ANTHES: Yes, we will have to confirm
10 that when Ms. Pearson gets down here. And here they are.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They can't stay away

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thought you were
13 leaving, didn't you?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, I totally
15 forgot that this was still on the agenda. I'm so glad you
16 texted me.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just pulled you out
18 of a bar. I know that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wish.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She wishes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wish.

22 MS. ANTHES: She was probably working on the
23 frameworks. So, Ms. Pearson, I don't want to get -- I don't
24 want to say anything incorrectly. So board member Mazanec
25 just asked that -- that when we talked about this yesterday,



1 we talked about the context being slightly different for
2 this situation than Karval and Vilas, and she wanted us to
3 explain the difference of context and I started fumbling
4 through that.

5 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

6 MS. ANTHES: So, I would rather you take it.

7 MS. PEARSON: Sure. So there's two
8 differences. I think the one that we were mostly talking
9 about yesterday was around the participation rate in those
10 districts. So I can go back and look, but because we
11 haven't historically had participation challenges like we
12 have currently, I don't think the participation rate was an
13 issue then with Karval and Vilas.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And when was that? Can
15 you tell us --

16 MS. PEARSON: It was 20 -- hold on, it's in
17 that memo. Let me pull it up. 2014.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Karval and Vilas.

19 MS. PEARSON: Karval and Vilas. They closed
20 their schools the 2013-14 school year. So the 2014
21 frameworks we removed, sorry they closed school, because the
22 -- that information was in the frameworks for 14 and we
23 removed it. So they even closed for the '14-'15 school
24 year, we took it out from the prior. So and that was
25 request to reconsider, so it was different in that way that



1 it was a little bit of a different process. But I think
2 that those are the two main issues -- the two main
3 differences in context. And is the participation rates and
4 request to reconsider. Does that make sense? But those
5 districts really, they kind of took their earlier action.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those schools also had
7 participation in their brick and mortar?

8 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham.

11 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Is it ready for
12 motion to --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Should we wait for Board
15 member Mazanec to come back?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, yeah. I asked for a
17 motion. I don't know why Board member Mazanec just left.

18 MS. RANKIN: I move to approve Julesburg RE-1
19 School District's request to be assigned a 2016 accredited
20 with improvement plan rating for the district based on the
21 closure of grade six, eight at Destinations Career Academy
22 of Colorado.

23 MR. DURHAM: Second.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Are you ready to come vote, Ms.
25 Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Any further discussion? I
3 think we discussed this pretty extensively yesterday. Ms.
4 Cordial.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Let's go do it.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

8 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Call the roll.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham?

10 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores?

12 MS. FLORES: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff?

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

18 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

20 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder?

22 MADAM CHAIR: No.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Folks, I think we did it. I
24 think we are done. So any future business -- Board member
25 Goff?



1 MS. GOFF: Can I just clarify a question? I
2 think it's all right to ask. So this means this coming
3 cycle?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

5 MS. GOFF: Have they already or -- or is
6 there a plan that they will -- will they not have to reapply
7 for recons -- to request to reconsider?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For 20 -- so this was
9 about their 2016 district rating. So depending on how 2017
10 comes out, they may want to request to remove the sixth
11 through eighth grades that they closed from the framework.
12 Or depending on how the results come out, they may not.
13 Does that make sense?

14 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. For the 2017
16 framework because you all are reinstating for 2016.

17 MS. ANTHES: Since they took it off, can't --
18 don't you just take it off then for the 2017?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't -- we --

20 MS. ANTHES: Based on our -- the vote we just
21 made?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We haven't done -- we
23 haven't been in this situation before.

24 MS. ANTHES: Okay. We can move.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so, we can figure



1 out -- when we've seen the results and where we're at, we
2 can figure out what makes sense to do.

3 MS. GOFF: So the -- so the six to eight is
4 still on their -- it's still in their '17 plan folder?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So, when we run
6 the '17 data because in '16-'17, the sixth through eighth
7 grade was still open, of those sixth through eighth graders,
8 the ones that tested, that we have results for, will go into
9 those calculations and come out that way. If that impacts
10 their rating, they can say, can you please take out those
11 schools -- or those grades, the sixth through eighth
12 graders? Because we've closed that school, just like you did
13 for Karvel and Vilas, and we'll say yes and then we'll
14 recalculate it for them.

15 MS. GOFF: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or we'll probably
17 recalculate it for them and give it to them ahead of time
18 and work with them to do it.

19 MS. GOFF: What if it doesn't need -- what if
20 it's --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

22 MS. GOFF: The school is already closed,
23 right?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The sixth through eighth
25 is already closed, yes. They've already made sure those



1 students are in a different -- a different place, a
2 different education is what I meant.

3 MS. GOFF: But they still have 9 through 12?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. They still have
5 their 9 through 12.

6 MS. GOFF: But they're working on that?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

8 MS. GOFF: Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that make sense?

10 MS. GOFF: What I am also wondering, maybe
11 this is really a question or comment for you, Dr. Anthes.
12 Given the change in the participation issue, whether we can
13 expect to see different messaging, more messaging from
14 district superintendents about participation. I know I have
15 seen it myself and some -- some counties, you know, where
16 they're -- they're trying to impress upon parents how this
17 makes a difference. So I'm -- I'm assuming this can really
18 change --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That depending on where
20 you all want to go with it, I think it could. That just
21 depends on where you all want to take it.

22 MS. ANTHES: Well, there's other messaging
23 too. Today, when we went through the -- this year's data,
24 the piece about the information that's available to parents
25 was, you've seen this before. I'm not going to talk about



1 it. I don't -- I'm not convinced that that isn't a real
2 weakness in the state's messaging to families and to
3 districts as to what is it that parents don't get when they
4 don't get all this information. What are the opportunities
5 for them to be able to monitor so they don't find out later
6 on, oops. Like, that's probably one of the hardest parts
7 when I was on the school board. Those parents coming to me
8 with, I didn't know. My kid's teacher said my kid was doing
9 just fine till we got to different levels. Sometimes
10 college. Yeah. And to the extent that we can do a better
11 job helping them and helping the kids monitor their own
12 progress, we stand to see greater improvements over time.
13 That's just about messaging and nothing else.

14 MS. GOFF: Yeah. Well, and not only the
15 messaging, it's -- it's the conveyance mechanisms, and at
16 some point, somebody's got to take responsibility for that,
17 you know?

18 MS. ANTHERS: So, the parents that don't get
19 any information because their kids opted out have no idea
20 what they didn't get.

21 MS. GOFF: I know.

22 MS. ANTHERS: I think teachers know. I mean,
23 I think tests or --

24 MS. GOFF: I know. They do, some of them.

25 MS. MAZANEC: And there's other tests too



1 depending on right, you know? It's not as if there's only
2 one test that can give a feedback.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Parent -- some of the parent
4 groups are becoming more instrumental in spreading the words
5 -- word, about what is available.

6 MS. GOFF: The words.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Spread those words. I'm sorry.

8 MS. GOFF: Those are really appropriate right
9 now.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

11 MS. FLORES: Seriously, PTA and my nephew
12 failed and was failing in classes all the time, but yet the
13 achievement -- he would do -- he was in the 98th percentile
14 in these tests, but yet he was failing in class. So it's --

15 MS. ANTHERS: Is this future business?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Maybe.

17 MS. MAZANEC: I move that we adjourn the
18 meeting.

19 MS. ANTHERS: See me hit this?

20 MS. MAZANEC: I do.

21 MS. ANTHERS: All right.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Hey, we'll see you in
23 Burlington.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

25 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you. Congratulations for



1 your survival for this meeting.

2 MR. DURHAM: Still here.

3 MS. ANTHERS: Still here.

4 (Meeting adjourned)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23



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