



Colorado State Board of Education

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

November 8, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 1

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

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



1 MADAM CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and
2 gentlemen. We'd like to call the board meeting to order. Ms.
3 Cordial, would you please call the roll.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham is excused.

5 MADAM CHAIR: He is excused, he will be here
6 shortly.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you. Board member Flores?

8 MS. FLORES: Here.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff?

10 MS. GOFF: Here.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

12 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

14 MS. MCCLELLAN: Here.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

16 MS. RANKIN: Here.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Here.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Would you please rise for the
20 pledge of allegiance? Ms. Tolleson, would you lead us,
21 please?

22 MS. TOLLESON: I would. I pledge allegiance -
23 -

24 ALL: Allegiance to the flag of the United
25 States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands;



1 one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
2 for all.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Is there a motion
4 please to approve the agenda as published?

5 MS. MAZANEC: So moved.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Second?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. All in favor?

9 (Chorus of "ayes").

10 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So, the agenda is
11 adopted.

12 Next will be the consent agenda. Board
13 member Mazanec, would you be kind enough to read that for
14 us, please.

15 MS. MAZANEC: I move to place the following
16 matters on the consent agenda. Do I have to read the
17 numbers? 9.02

18 MADAM CHAIR: Nah, I don't think so.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Yes.

20 MS. MAZANEC: I get some nodding yes and --

21 MADAM CHAIR: Well, that's the boss over
22 there, so.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, exactly.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Approve the 9.02. Approve the



1 amended 2017, State Board of Education operating procedures.

2 16.03, regarding disciplinary proceedings,
3 concerning a license and authorization. Charge number
4 2016EC1569. Reinstate the credential holders suspended
5 Colorado professional teacher license and Colorado
6 substitute authorization and dismiss the proceedings to
7 further suspend or revoke the credential holders license and
8 authorization.

9 16.04, regarding disciplinary proceedings
10 concerning the license and authorization. Charge number
11 2016EC1774, signify acceptance and approval of the
12 stipulation for the revocation of the credential holder's
13 license and authorization and adopt the order by directing
14 the chair of the state board to sign the final agency order.

15 16.05, regarding disciplinary proceedings
16 concerning an application. Charge number 2016EC1818,
17 directive- direct department staff to issue a notice of
18 denial and appeal rights to the applicant pursuant to 24-4-
19 104 CRS.

20 16.07, regarding disciplinary proceedings
21 concerning a license. Charge number 2017EC777, signify
22 acceptance and approval of the stipulation for the
23 revocation of the credential holders license and adopt the
24 order by directing the chair of the state board to sign the
25 final agency order.



1 16.08, approve the 10 initial emergency
2 authorization request, as set forth in the published agenda.

3 16.09, approve centennials school district's
4 request for its individualized alternative prep- principal
5 preparation plan for Gilbert Santana Apodaca, as set forth
6 in the published agenda.

7 16.10, approve Colorado River posse's request
8 for authorization as a designated agency with a special
9 education generalists ages five through 12 endorsement.

10 16.11, de-authorize Global Village charter
11 collaborative as an approved alternative education
12 preparation program in Colorado.

13 17.01, approve the proposed methodology for
14 setting PAST 910 assessment targets for use in the 2018
15 school and district performance frameworks.

16 17.02, appoint Sean Bradley, Veronica Palmer,
17 Sofia Estav and Kay Trotter to fill vacancies on the state
18 advisory council for parent involvement in education,
19 effective November 10th, 2017. This is the end of the
20 consent agenda.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. That's a proper
22 motion. Is there a second to approve the consent agenda as
23 well?

24 MS. FLORES: I can do that.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. I need to --



1 MS. MAZANEC: I would like to-

2 MADAM CHAIR: -- any discuss -- yes. Board
3 member Mazanec.

4 MS. MAZANEC: I would like to remove from the
5 consent agenda, see if I have this right -- 16.03 and --

6 MADAM CHAIR: It's 9.02.

7 MS. MAZANEC: 9.02. Thank you.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Any other questions, concerns or
9 items?

10 MS. RANKIN: I have a concern.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, board member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: 16.01 and 16.06, we vote on?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

14 MS. RANKIN: Can we have more of a discussion
15 than two minutes?

16 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, those will be discussed in
17 an executive session.

18 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. Which was -- was the
19 other one? Excuse me.

20 MADAM CHAIR: 07? 16.01 and 16.07.

21 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Thank you.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Am I right? 06? Oops.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There you go, Val. It's
24 actually 06.

25 MS. RANKIN: Okay.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not 16.03.

3 MS. FLORES: Thank you very much.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, those are just the
5 two --

6 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. 16.03 has just been pulled
7 and --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And 9.02.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Are there any objections to
10 those? So, the consent agen -- so, I had a first and a
11 second. Are there any objections to the consent agenda,
12 having pulled 16.03 and 9.02? In backwards order. Thank
13 you. So that's the order of the consent agenda.

14 Next item on the agenda is a report from the
15 director of board relations. Ms. Cordial, what do you have
16 for us today?

17 MS. CORDIAL: Good morning Madam Chair,
18 members of the board, and Commissioner Anthes.

19 As a reminder, please speak clearly and
20 directly into your microphones and please remember to turn
21 them back on if you've turned them off when you're not
22 speaking. Those of you needing to connect to CDE's guest
23 wireless, you'll want to locate CDE hotspot and the password
24 is Stillsilver.

25 In your board packets, you have your quick



1 glance expense reports and your events calendar. And a few
2 of the upcoming events, to remind you of include the
3 National Summit on Education Reform, which is November 29th
4 through December 1st in Nashville, Tennessee. The CASB
5 Annual Convention, November 30th through December 3rd and
6 the Springs and the PEBC superintended forum on December
7 7th.

8 Also in your board packets and/or available
9 on board docs, are the following materials for Wednesday,
10 November 8th. Item 8.01, your 2017 legislative priorities.
11 Item 9.01, your state board legislative operating --
12 operating procedures. For 9.02, the draft 2017 state board
13 operating procedures. 11.01, a memo regarding the 2017
14 district performance frameworks and accreditation ratings.
15 The embargoed PowerPoint and embargoed district performance
16 framework rate -- final ratings from 2010 to 2017.

17 For item 12.01, a memo regarding the
18 individual career and academic plans rules. A red line and
19 clean version of those rules and the rules to statute
20 crosswalk.

21 For Item 14.01, you have ma -- materials
22 pertaining to the charter school appeal of Sports Leadership
23 and Management Academy versus Denver Public Schools.

24 For Item 15.01, you have a memo regarding the
25 teacher grants for computer science education program rules.



1 A draft copy of those rules and rules to statute crosswalk.

2 For Item 16.08, you have a memo regarding the
3 10 initial emergency authorization requests. For item 16.09,
4 a memo regarding Centennial school district's request for an
5 individual alternative principal preparation program.

6 For 16.10, a memo regarding the Colorado
7 River both these requests for authorizations as desig -- as
8 a designated agency.

9 For item 16.11, a memo regarding the
10 deauthorization of Global Village charter collaborative
11 alternative program.

12 For item 17.01, a memo regarding the 2018
13 school and district performance framework targets and the
14 accompanying PowerPoint.

15 For item 17.02, a memo regarding the
16 appointment of the -- appointments to the state advisory
17 council for parent involvement in education and those
18 supporting materials.

19 For item 18.01, a memo regarding the
20 standards review and revision process, their accompanying
21 PowerPoint, and the summary of the proposed revisions for
22 dance, drama and theater arts, mathematics, and
23 comprehensive health, and physical education.

24 Your materials for Thursday, November 9th
25 include 3.01, a memo regarding the graduation guidelines and



1 the accompanying PowerPoint.

2 Item 4.01, a memo regarding the school
3 counselor corps grant program rules and the red line --
4 redline and clean copy of those rules.

5 For item 5.01, a memo regarding the school
6 health professional grant program rules and the red and --
7 redline and clean copy of those rules.

8 For item 6.01, a memo regarding the
9 administrative procedures -- procedures for state board
10 accountability actions and proposed revisions to those
11 procedures.

12 For item 7.01, a memo regarding the waiver of
13 statute and rule- rules, a redlining clean copy of those
14 rules and the rules to statute crosswalk.

15 For item 8.01, you have a memo regarding the
16 Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee annual report
17 and their accompanying PowerPoint.

18 For item 10.01, a memo regarding -- a memo
19 and the accompanying materials pertaining to the Safe
20 Communities Safe Schools research request.

21 Item 11.01, a memo regarding the
22 accountability and educator support for English language
23 learners and their accompanying PowerPoint.

24 11.02, a memo regarding the educator shortage
25 report and the educator shortage town hall fact sheet.



1 During this presentation, we will provide you with the
2 final, I believe, final report and PowerPoints as this is a
3 collaborative ongoing working report. And so, we just want
4 to make sure that you have the latest version possible.

5 For item 3 -- 11.03, you have a memo
6 regarding the upcoming education- educator preparation and
7 license -- licensure rulemaking for the next 8 to 12 months,
8 and the accompanying PowerPoint with that road-map.

9 So, that concludes my report in terms of the
10 materials you have in your packet. Just one additional
11 thing I would like to announce is, I'm excited to share that
12 we will launch the external video streaming of board
13 meetings at the December board meeting.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, great.

15 MS. CORDIAL: So, thank you.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any questions for
17 Ms. Cordial? Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why are you excited about
19 that?

20 MS. CORDIAL: You know, I just try to --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because you're pretty
22 negative behind the camera.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Well, we could do something
25 about that.



1 MS. CORDIAL: No, I --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, there you go.

3 MS. CORDIAL: I know. I'm -- I'm on there.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sure we have more

5 than one camera.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff.

7 MS. GOFF: Is this meeting being piloted?

8 MS. CORDIAL: Internally, yes. Internally

9 only.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What?

11 MS. CORDIAL: Internally.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Internally.

13 MADAM CHAIR: So it's just --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not broadcasting

15 out.

16 MADAM CHAIR: It's not broadcast out.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just (indiscernible)

18 everywhere or?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, this meeting.

20 MADAM CHAIR: No, today.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This meeting is piloted.

22 MADAM CHAIR: This is practice.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Practice.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mm-hmm.



1 MS. CORDIAL: We're testing the system.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: System.

3 MS. FLORES: So it is, but internally.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. FLORES: (Indiscernible).

6 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. The next item is an update
7 from Commissioner Anthes. Turn it over to you.

8 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you. Madam Chair,
9 members of the board. Good to see you all. Have a couple
10 updates for you.

11 It's been a busy couple weeks as usual. Did
12 want to let you know that we announced our 2018 Teacher of
13 the Year. I think it was last week. Christina Randle is a
14 first-grade teacher at Soaring Eagles Elementary School in
15 Harrison School District. And she was -- we went down and
16 Jane Goff was there. She would -- served on the committee
17 to select the teacher of the year along with the others.

18 But we had a wonderful all-school ceremony.
19 You've heard about this before, but just really touching
20 moments to be able to celebrate our excellent teachers and
21 educators. So she has done amazing work at Soaring Eagles
22 Elementary School, so we're really proud of her.

23 We also honored a Millikan award winner. So
24 many of you know the Millikan Foundation invests heavily in
25 rewarding and supporting teachers. And they -- they always



1 say that just as we reward and support sports stars we
2 should do the same thing for teachers and give them those
3 same honors.

4 So they do something every year called the
5 Millikan Teacher Award. About 45 honorees from across the
6 country get that award. It's very prestigious. And we were
7 lucky to have another Colorado educator. It's -- you don't
8 always -- they don't always land in your state, but we were
9 lucky enough to have another one, Lisa Rogers.

10 She's from Grandville Grandview High School
11 in Cherry Creek and board member McClellan was there with me
12 to honor her at awards ceremony as well. So that was
13 excellent. We also co-hosted Graduation Guidelines
14 Conference over the last couple weeks. This was a summit
15 that centered on the theme of graduating every student post
16 secondary and workforce-ready and leveraging that graduation
17 guideline mama -- menu in order to do that.

18 And so it's clearly still a really hot topic
19 and there is a lot of desire for districts to collaborate on
20 that and share what they're doing. So we had over 300
21 attendees at that summit. Board member Goff was there at
22 that summit as well. Board member Goff and I have just been
23 traveling the state together. But it was really excellent.
24 We had school districts presenting their -- on their
25 graduation guidelines including Archuleta County, Colorado



1 Springs, Fort Collins, Grand Junction, Greeley, Jeffco, Park
2 County presenting how they're outlining those graduation
3 guidelines.

4 So that was a -- a very successful event. We
5 also hosted an Equity and Excellence Conference and that's
6 in partnership with multiple units across the department
7 focused on a lot of areas that are in our strategic plan
8 recruitment and retention of excellent teachers especially
9 in some of our shortage areas like special ed. And that work
10 meeting individual learning needs of underserved students,
11 supporting early learning birth age th -- three or birth for
12 third grade and effective parent and family engagement.

13 So we had a really good conference. I'm not
14 sure what the final participation rate was but I think at
15 least the part that I spoke out was over 300 or over 200 it
16 seemed like. I'm not sure -- I'm looking at Pat, but we did
17 have as I mentioned the second Education Leadership Council
18 meeting in Pueblo.

19 We spent the majority of time, that was
20 really only a two-hour meeting. So we spent the majority of
21 time with the University of Colorado at Denver School of
22 Public Affairs giving an outline of just kind of the lay of
23 the land. Like what -- what is the lay of the land in
24 Colorado. What policies and reform initiatives that we
25 worked on. Just giving some detail there. So that was what



1 we spent the time on.

2 I will send you the PowerPoint that was
3 delivered. I forgot if I already sent that to you. I think
4 in my mind I sent it to you and then when I looked back at
5 my e-mail, I was like maybe I didn't send that. So this is
6 my reminder to send that out to you.

7 Our strategic plan and performance plan. So
8 you remember we talked about this a little bit at the -- our
9 a fair amount at the retreat. We've been polishing it up,
10 putting the language to it, putting a little more detail to
11 it. We're putting the finishing touches on it.

12 We originally -- and Ms. Mello might talk to
13 you about this; I'm not sure. Originally we were working on
14 the scheduling for when we have to present that to the
15 legislature. It was originally January 9th and we've gotten
16 it bumped up quite substantially to December 5 which is
17 right around the corner.

18 So that's going to provide a little awkward
19 timing so I'm going to be something out to you when we put
20 the final touches on it. It's based on the structure and
21 the drafts that I sent you. So it's -- it's just going to
22 look all put together. But it's -- it's what we talked
23 about at the retreat. So there shouldn't be any surprises
24 there. I'll send it out to you via e-mail because we're
25 going to have our SMART Act hearing before our next board



1 meeting and that change really just happened a day ago or
2 two days ago. So we thought we had a little more time.

3 MADAM CHAIR: This is part of the SMART Act?

4 MS. ANTHES: This is part of a SMART Act
5 hearing, so we're required to share it. Sometimes --
6 sometimes the committee members like us to go through that
7 performance plan. Other times they just want to see it and
8 then they want to ask us a series of questions of things
9 that they're interested in. So we'll see what that balance
10 Is this year.

11 But we'll make sure that you get anything we
12 prepare for them and make sure you get that invitation
13 again. It's all being solidified right now so I don't know
14 if I have all the exact timing and what room it's going to
15 be in and all that right now.

16 The last thing I wanted to mention is it's
17 just a little follow up on some of the recommended actions
18 that we are starting to take, that we talked about through
19 the ESSA process. We talked about our desire and our f ---
20 and the field our district's desire to have us streamline
21 several processes around school improvement grants. But
22 that -- at the Department of Education we have several
23 different types of schooling cr -- improvement grants that
24 districts can apply for.

25 And it can be confusing: multiple grants,



1 multiple applications, finding all of that. And so we've
2 got a lot of feedback from districts and from others saying
3 "Can we streamline that process?" So we have created an
4 application, one-stop single application for districts to be
5 able to access the Federal ESSA School Improvement Funds.
6 And so this is quite actually a big step for us in hopefully
7 streamlining, decreasing paperwork, decreasing burden and
8 making it easier for districts to see what options are
9 available and not having to go through five different hoops
10 rather than one set of hoops.

11 So we have released that. And I'm just
12 looking at my notes, see what else I believe Ms. Pearson, do
13 you know when the -- the deadline for that is? I'm sorry.

14 MS. PEARSON: Yes, sorry. It's due in
15 December.

16 MS. ANTHES: December 6th.

17 MS. PEARSON: December 6 (indiscernible).

18 MS. ANTHES: So it's sort of out there. We're
19 starting to get feedback from districts. We're starting to
20 share that process with districts, but the goal is for us to
21 really help, articulate, see the needs that they have and
22 then us be able to help do something about matchmaking and
23 brokering for them so they don't have to navigate all of the
24 crazy.

25 MADAM CHAIR: So the feedback is for the form?



1 It's not the actual applications, December 6?

2 MS. ANTHES: Yes, it is the actu -- actual --

3 MADAM CHAIR: It's the actual application.

4 MS. ANTHES: What I was talking about feedback
5 is we'll see since this is the first time we've run it this
6 way. We'll start to get some feedback on it if it's working
7 and -- and we can refine the process as necessary based on
8 that feedback so with that, I believe -- I believe that
9 concludes my commissioner report.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Questions
11 colleagues?

12 So I have -- I have a question. So the
13 applications that are coming in now, these are for school
14 districts that know that they are entitled to -- that they
15 are Title 1 schools or do they have some under the --
16 probably under the prior was in our agreement that we had
17 rather than ESSA?

18 MS. PEARSON: So we're in this awkward timing
19 this year. If you want to jump in, feel free to jump in. If
20 I get anything wrong or if you just want to jump in instead.
21 We are in this kind of awkward timing with implementation
22 without having the -- the plan approved yet.

23 So with the U.S. Department of Education said
24 to us is that for the funds that we have available now, we
25 have two choices. We could either use a list of schools



1 identified through kind of the the waiver process and all
2 that from four years ago or we could rerun based on what we
3 put forward in our state plan even though our state plan
4 hadn't been approved.

5 So we went forward with where we were with
6 the state plan at that point in time. In August when we,
7 you know, when we had submitted but hadn't resolved
8 everything with them. So we've got schools that -- that
9 were identified under that plan, and those are the ones that
10 are eligible for the federal funds this year because we
11 didn't -- we wanted to get it closer to schools that we know
12 have performance challenges now than compared to four years
13 ago when the U.S. Department of Education was okay with
14 that, us moving forward in that way.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And off the top of your
16 head, this might not be fair. Can you tell us how many
17 schools under the different definitions?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yes, I can.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

20 MS. PEARSON: There's -- I know they're in 63
21 districts. There's 36 schools that are comprehensive, lowest
22 5 percent because it's 5 percent of the Title 1 schools that
23 ends up with 36. There's 49 that are comprehensive, low
24 grad.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's 80 or 81



1 (indiscernible).

2 MS. PEARSON: I have the file right here; give
3 me one moment.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just curious how
5 different is it or is it different than what we've been
6 experien --

7 MS. PEARSON: It's different. I have a Venn
8 diagram. I showed that to you all last month I thought with
9 the overlaps. We've got about -- now, you guys are -- my
10 brain is blurry this morning.

11 There's about a hundred state schools up
12 based on the preliminary readings that are not identified
13 under the federal system. There's about 78 schools that were
14 overlapped and then there was about 180 schools that were
15 federal only. I could pull all of this up if you --.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

17 MALE SPEAKER: It's 130.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Well, maybe not today but
19 when you --

20 MS. PEARSON: I got it right here.

21 MADAM CHAIR: -- when you answer all our
22 questions, if you could actually fill in that.

23 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

24 MADAM CHAIR: That Venn, that would be really
25 helpful.



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, yeah. I've got it right
2 here if you want and then we can send it to you as follow up
3 too.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Super. Yep. That'll be great.

5 MS. PEARSON: So there's 78 schools that are
6 identified under both a hundred and one schools that were
7 state only and again, that's the preliminary framework so
8 once you all finalize the schools next month, that'll change
9 and then there's 152 schools that were federal only.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 MS. PEARSON: So we -- and then we can give
12 you all the breakdowns of how many are comprehensive low as
13 5 percent in graduation and targeted and additional
14 targeted.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. Appreciate that.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Any other
17 question folks? Alright, let's proceed. I want to recognize
18 that Board Member Durham is joining us which is great
19 because we're coming to legislate matters. Good timing.

20 MR. DURHAM: Sorry. I'm late.

21 MADAM CHAIR: It's okay. Ms. Mello, please
22 join us.

23 MS. MELLO: Good morning. This is on?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good Morning.

25 MS. MELLO: Okay. I'm official now. I have my



1 own name tag, you see? A permanent name tag. Five years.
2 That's all it took. It is nice to see you all.

3 So there are a couple of topics I was asked
4 to discuss today. One is an update on the school finance
5 interim committee that is happening at the legislature. The
6 other is just kind of generally what's going on, what we
7 anticipate coming up in the 2018 session and then if you
8 want, we can have a conversation about your legislative
9 priorities or you can say, we like the same ones we had last
10 year.

11 That's really your prerogative but I think
12 now would be a time to- to talk about that. So I don't know
13 if you have any preference in terms of the order. I do all
14 of that. Maybe we could start with the legislative
15 priorities just so we have a sense of whether that's a
16 conversation you want to have or not?

17 MADAM CHAIR: Sure. Colleagues? Included in
18 our packet, were -- was the legislative priorities updated?
19 Are there any comments, changes, confirmations that you'd
20 like to make? Board Member Flores?

21 MS. FLORES: I really do think that we need to
22 have more money for -- for our districts, especially because
23 we have -- we're not kidding. The teachers that we -- that
24 we need.

25 I mean we do have districts such as -- I mean



1 -- I'm sorry, states like Massachusetts and Connecticut and
2 I guess, our friend up here. Our next door neighbor, Wyoming
3 that is. They don't have problems, but we have problems in
4 this state and I'm hoping that we can support legislation
5 that will increase the money so that we can pay teachers
6 more and be compatible. I mean be --

7 MR. DURHAM: Competitive.

8 MS. FLORES: -- competitive. Thank you, Steve.
9 So that we can be competitive with other states.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores, do you
11 think that's missing in our legislative agenda? Look on the
12 second page.

13 MS. FLORES: No. I just -- I -- I don't think
14 it's -- it's really missing but I do believe that I -- I
15 wanted to reinforce.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any other
17 comments? Board Member Goff?

18 MS. GOFF: Thank you. At one point, I think, I
19 brought up the notion of more support for rules, on rules
20 and that my one suggestion at that time was pretty -- pretty
21 granular. The idea that we -- we promote and support any
22 policies that will alleviate, improve the broadband capacity
23 situation in parts of the state.

24 As I've given that further thought, I've -- I
25 have not changed my mind about the importance of that but I



1 do think it would be worth doing some research into where
2 the state new IT office is where the general Colorado broad
3 bound -- broadband office is and their work. I know that's
4 been a -- a part of their project list, but I'm not -- I
5 don't know that it's necessary to get that specific in our
6 priorities.

7 I do think there are -- are places for it in
8 other of our categories already defined but it also -- to --
9 to not get too specific leaves us the flexibility throughout
10 the session to -- to come back and -- and watch how any of
11 these ideas or built content fits into where we are with
12 that. So as far as a -- a new concept to introduce, at this
13 point, I don't have anything I would add as a general
14 concept to these priorities.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff, I'd be
18 happy to get some information about where we are on the
19 broadband topic. I -- I don't know its at the top of my head
20 but I can get that for you.

21 MS. GOFF: Well, thank you. It might -- it
22 might help just to give us some framework but --

23 MADAM CHAIR: I notice that we don't have a
24 topic of equity and I think -- I think that access is about
25 equity and I'm not sure whether we shouldn't think about



1 whether we want to have that discussion. Board Member
2 Durham, can I throw you off with that?

3 MR. DURHAM: I think.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

5 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, it's all right, yeah. The -
6 - these are very generic objectives. On the specific side, I
7 know we'd had some very preliminary discussions about the
8 accountability process and the way that our hearings played
9 out and the actions that were available to the board for
10 improvements in districts that were -- had come to the end
11 of the accountability clock.

12 And I don't know if there's any desire to --
13 to convert any of those to specifics. For example, the- and
14 I'm trying to remember the name of the review panels.

15 MS. PEARSON: State review panels?

16 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, the state review panels. I
17 mean, we -- I think we spend a fair amount of money on
18 those. I didn't find them helpful. I didn't -- as far as I
19 could tell no other member of the board found those
20 recommendations to be particularly helpful. That perhaps
21 just on a money saving mission that we might try and amend
22 that out of the statute as a requirement that we might also
23 look at some of the accountability and the timing of the
24 accountability options.

25 To that, I think were the biggest issues that



1 came up during the past year. Those are tough issues to deal
2 with, probably legislatively, but if there is some appetite
3 for the board to deal with those then, I think, we should
4 see if there's a consensus on what should be done and try
5 and move forward with that.

6 Those would be proactive pieces of
7 legislation. But I do think the -- and I would suggest that
8 on a specific basis, these accountability panels should be
9 eliminated. There just -- and I -- from what I can tell on
10 this, the districts raved about them either. So I don't know
11 that anybody thought they were a good idea.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think they're
13 statutory.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are statutory.

15 MR. DURHAM: They are statutory. And so we'd
16 have to change but this is an opportunity to --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

18 MR. DURHAM: -- change the statute and remove
19 that sp -- maybe make it optional as opposed to mandatory or
20 something. Commissioner could do or could order to have done
21 but we don't -- I don't know how much money we spent on it
22 but appeared to be fairly significant.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, Board Member
24 Durham, would -- would you like me to maybe come up with
25 some draft language reflecting what you just said, and then



1 we could circulate that ahead of the next board meeting and
2 you all could decide what you want to do with that in terms
3 of your legislative priorities in December? With -- is that
4 an acceptable way to proceed?

5 MR. DURHAM: It's fine with me, if there's --
6 if there's so -- some consensus and I -- maybe we need to
7 talk about that.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Anyway, I think we need to take
9 some time to talk about it.

10 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's a good idea.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It kind of jumps apart.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. So we're jumping here. The
14 question is, is there anything in here that either supports
15 or blocks that kind of a conversation?

16 And I say the same thing to Ms Goff's comment
17 because that's also something that we have talked about in
18 the past, on and off, that would require legislation, if
19 we're actually going to have equitable distribution of
20 internet access across the state. Do we want that in our
21 legislative priorities?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, its so important.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good choice.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No argument there.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Goff?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

4 MS. GOFF: I deferred to Joyce, she has a
5 comment.

6 MS. RANKIN: I -- I agree with Board Member
7 Durham that thi -- this document is a generic flexible
8 document and I think what you're asking is a little more
9 specific than what this document should have in it. I mean,
10 this should not get in the weeds in my opinion. So I'd like
11 --

12 MADAM CHAIR: Is there anything that blocks?
13 Are moving forward with that.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think so.

15 MR. DURHAM: I don't think so.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, and I think it's the same
17 with Ms. Goff's.

18 MS. RANKIN: Yes, but I do have some comments
19 on this document so --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

21 MS. RANKIN: -- when we get back to it, the
22 topic, I will jump in.

23 MADAM CHAIR: So will you make a note, would
24 you be kind enough to make notes of both of those concerns
25 and we will --



1 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

2 MADAM CHAIR: -- bringing them up over time?

3 MS. GOFF: Absolutely. I will note that just -
4 - I mean I've read this several times and I will just skim
5 through it again. I don't see a whole lot in your
6 legislative priorities right now around the topic of
7 accountability. Now, they are general and -- and because of
8 that we could probably stretch. So I just know that for your
9 consideration.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Same thing. That's also not --
11 that's not it.

12 MS. FLORES: I agree with you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A topic.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do too.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Goff?

16 MS. GOFF: A suggestion about how we structure
17 this conversation and the ultimate outcome that we would
18 vote to adopt this document today. Today, I think a
19 brainstorming or a collection of thoughts, original thought
20 and ideas.

21 If the board would be amenable, we could have
22 a subcommittee to put this into a new, you know, do -- do
23 the editing and the fun stuff. To put this into a discussion
24 form for the board and we could work with Jennifer on that
25 gathering of any information that we might need and then



1 bring out -- put a final copy or draft a final copy out
2 before the board to get some general feedback on it and then
3 vote.

4 MS. FLORES: I just want to say that we did
5 have equity at least when we were working, the three of us
6 and it became choice and engagement, so it was under that,
7 but I think I agree with you.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chairman?

9 MADAM CHAIR: I will -- I don't disagree. I
10 don't disagree at all. We do have the word equity,
11 equitable. It is interspersed throughout this document in
12 various contexts.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

14 MS. GOFF: If we -- if we would decide we want
15 to make more specific reference to that, on more of a
16 general but -- well, pointed area, we can actually talk
17 about that, the accountability conversation yes, I'm going
18 to -- I am kind of going back on what I said earlier. That
19 is something that we we have talked about legislation anyway
20 on that, in our conversations.

21 So I'm just -- I just want to suggest a
22 process for this right now because we could spend two hours
23 talking about semantics and the details of this document and
24 we -- I don't think that was what today was meant to be. So
25 just --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, if you want it --

2 MADAM CHAIR: So you're suggesting that we get
3 out our ideas and then a couple of folks will look at it and
4 see how they fit into what we have been working on. We're
5 working with Ms. MELLO now.

6 MS. GOFF: With Ms. Mello.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, what -- just a moment
8 please. Board Member Rankin?

9 MS. RANKIN: I agree, I -- I got some --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought you said --

11 MS. RANKIN: I do now, but if we end up with a
12 committee, I'll just throw it out to the committee.

13 MS. GOFF: Well, I'd (indiscernible).

14 MS. RANKIN: All right.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like to hear.

16 MS. RANKIN: On the bottom where it says data
17 collection and access that ensures the maximum protection
18 possible. I think we can throw in any adjective we want, but
19 protecting student information is -- is a lot more difficult
20 than what we have capabilities of. I would like to strike --
21 I was just going to strike a lot of those adjectives and
22 just say safeguard individual student data.

23 That's pretty much the best we can do. So I
24 mean maybe that has something to do with all the committee
25 approaches that, but further on today there are some other



1 discussions we're going to have about PII and I -- I think
2 this is an extremely important issue that we have to
3 continue to address.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 MADAM CHAIR: So that will be some more input
6 for you all.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Well I just wanted to add that, I
10 think all of that, we've just said kind of comes under the
11 heading of equity, equity for communities to have -- to be
12 wired up. To have the internet, have access. I think that's
13 -- that's inequitable, I mean they should be and I know that
14 all rural districts, especially the last district we visited
15 where we had our meetings is not and since -- since
16 computers are so important, you know, to the work.

17 Now, what students do especially in taking --
18 taking tests, I think that we should definitely make that --

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

20 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Are we ready to move on to the
22 next item, item nine? Next agenda item's consideration of
23 our state board legislative contacts.

24 MS. RANKIN: Jennifer is --

25 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, sorry I just flew right.



1 MS. RANKIN: (Indiscernible).

2 MS. MELLO: It's not a problem if you all
3 don't want to hear anymore.

4 MADAM CHAIR: No, no, no, I just, you know-

5 MS. MELLO: I could just go sit back down.

6 Okay. So, let me give you an update on the Interim School
7 Finance Committee. This was established by legislation, this
8 last legislative session.

9 They have -- all of they've met twice,
10 officially, as a committee, and then they've had a couple of
11 subcommittee meetings which don't count toward their meeting
12 total, but they all come to. So, that's one way of handling
13 things. And it has been completely organizational to this
14 point, they really have done nothing substantive.

15 The legislation specified that they would
16 hire an outside entity to assist with the work, it took them
17 quite a bit of time to make that decision. And so, that
18 really took up a good chunk of the summer and early fall.

19 They are now getting in, I think, more into
20 the substance of their work starting tomorrow. They meet
21 most of the day tomorrow. They also meet on December 15th
22 and on January 9th.

23 Tomorrow's agenda includes an overview of the
24 current finance and funding, formulas including enrollment
25 counts and district level adjustments, which I interpret to



1 mean things like size factor, and also federal resources.
2 So I think tomorrow, the committee is very much kind of in -
3 - in -- continue to educate themselves gather information,
4 that type of thing.

5 I will be there, I'll be covering the
6 committee and- and I can report back on anything relevant.
7 So, any other questions about School Finance Interim
8 Committee?

9 MADAM CHAIR: They did hire somebody.

10 MS. MELLO: They did-

11 MADAM CHAIR: (Indiscernible).

12 MS. MELLO: They hired a group called Cross &
13 Joftus. I called and got made sure I heard that name right.
14 Who apparently has partnerships with several other education
15 kind of consultant and -- and type groups including Ed
16 Strategies, Emergent Policy and Systems Inc.

17 So, it's -- I seems like I mean, I then, this
18 is not a comment whatsoever on -- obviously, they had a
19 quality proposal, and they wouldn't have been hire. It seems
20 like it's kind of an amalgamation of a couple of different
21 entities under this Cross * Joftus banner, if you will, but
22 they've hired to do the work.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. All right. Thanks you.
24 Any questions? Proceed, Ms. Mello. What else are you
25 hearing out there?



1 MS. MELLO: Okay, rumor time. You know, this
2 is -- I say this every time -- every year this time, that
3 this is one of my least favorite times of year in terms of
4 the legislative calendar because it is so much rumor and all
5 of that. I like it when we get into session, and we start
6 looking at bills, right? Because then we know, we actually
7 have to deal with. So, keep in mind, you know, this is
8 everything I'm going to talk about is what I'm hearing, what
9 is likely to happen, what might happen but none of this is a
10 guarantee of things that will happen.

11 I do think we will see legislation around the
12 Read Act. I think the focus of that legislation, at least
13 in part, will be, looking at students who fall between
14 having a significant reading deficiency, and are still below
15 grade level. Right now, the Act is very focused on kids who
16 are -- who have meet the definition of significant reading
17 deficiency.

18 You have a whole other group of students who
19 are below grade level but not quite that below. And so, I
20 think there are some folks out there who are interested in
21 looking at legislation to see how we can serve those kids.
22 That may entail putting more money into it, whether they can
23 find the money to do that or not, I think, it's obviously a
24 very open question.

25 MADAM CHAIR: So, these were the children who



1 don't read but have not -- don't have an identified reading
2 deficiency?

3 MS. MELLO: Correct. They're below grade
4 level but they're not so far below grade level that they've
5 been identified as having a significant reading deficiency.
6 That makes sense?

7 You probably all, I know you all are educated
8 consumers of the news. So, you probably have caught on to
9 the fact there's going to be a pretty substantive pair of
10 discussion at the capital this year. That's a pretty big
11 deal for school districts in particular, because obviously
12 salaries make up a big component of what they do, and their
13 parent contributions make up a big percentage of their
14 personal cost.

15 So, I raise it, not because you all, at least
16 historically, have necessarily wanted to engage in that
17 topic, but so that, I think it's important to know that for
18 districts and for some of the organizations that represent
19 districts, that's going to take up a lot of their time and
20 attention.

21 MADAM CHAIR: So, clarify for -- for our
22 school district staff, the employee pays into PERA, but the
23 district does as well, so it's a joint --

24 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair --

25 MADAM CHAIR: -- contribution.



1 MS. MELLO: -- that is correct.

2 MADAM CHAIR: And the percentage that the
3 district contributes may go up which will, in fact, impact
4 the district budgets. Am I -- I just want --

5 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, that is one
6 possibility, right. And I mean, I think the -- the world is
7 rife with possibilities right now. PERA itself has a
8 proposal the governors put -- put some ideas out there. I
9 think there are other groups working towards ideas.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. But that would be the
11 discussion.

12 MS. MELLO: I think the school district
13 perspective, that's where the discussion is, is if there's
14 more money needed in the system, whose hide this and come
15 out of essentially? Right?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Whose budget does it come out
17 of?

18 MS. MELLO: Yes, that's a nicer --

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

20 MS. MELLO: -- way to say it.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board member, Durham.

22 MR. DURHAM: I just like to disclose I will
23 have a conflict of interest on PERA issues and would request
24 to be excused on any -- any discussions or deliberations on
25 that issue.



1 MS. MELLO: Okay.

2 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Proceed.

4 MS. MELLO: Okay. There are some groups out
5 there, I think talking about just trying to do a rewrite of
6 the school finance formula. I will tell you that it's not
7 uncommon this time of year to have somebody thinking about
8 wanting to rewrite either in its entirety or in part, the
9 school finance formula. Whether or not that comes to
10 fruition, you know, to be determined.

11 I think we'll see some legislation around
12 concurrent enrollment. I certainly wish I could give you
13 more specifics on that. I can't, I have asked the people
14 that I know are working on it to, you know, fill me in as
15 soon as they feel like they can share that information. So,
16 all I can tell you right now is that I think we'll see
17 something around concurrent enrollment.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Well, that's a teaser.

19 MS. MELLO: I'm sorry. I know.

20 MADAM CHAIR: You have no examples of the
21 kinds of issues that folks have been talking about?

22 MS. MELLO: Well, you know, this conversation
23 has been ongoing for a number of years, and I think there's
24 lots and lots of topics within concurrent enrollment. You
25 know, how do you encourage more access to the program? How



1 does the funding get split between districts and community
2 colleges? How about, you know, math essentially works out?
3 And those are topics that people talk about in the past, so
4 I -- I -- It could be something like that.

5 I think we will -- as we have for the last
6 several years continue to see efforts around workforce
7 development and incentivizing workforce development and, you
8 know, career training and all of that, the governors budget
9 did include a one million dollar increase for the career
10 development success pilot program, which provides financial
11 incentives to districts whose students complete workforce
12 programs like internships or apprenticeships. That program
13 has had more demand than it can meet, and so the governor is
14 proposing additional funding for that. In terms of data and
15 -- and we're talked about this just briefly, I'm hearing two
16 things whether they turn into legislation or not to be
17 determined.

18 I think the rural schools continue to be
19 frustrated with the data collection burden that they -- they
20 perceive. On the other hand, I think there's a number of
21 groups who are concerned about the data suppression
22 practices, and how that -- what impact that has on the
23 ability of the public to kind of see what's going on in our
24 schools.

25 So, we could see some that are on that. Just



1 a couple of other really quick topics. I've -- I've heard,
2 you people are very concerned about the increase in teen
3 suicide or young people suicide. So, we may see some
4 legislation on that. I've no idea what it will look like, I
5 don't know what that is.

6 You've probably heard national discussions
7 around this lunch shaming issue where students -- if -- if
8 they don't have enough money in their account to pay for
9 lunch are kind of turned away and, you know, there's been
10 some kind of disturbing stories out there whether or not
11 that's Colorado practice I think, I don't want to say that
12 it is.

13 So, but I think we'll see some legislation
14 around ensuring access to -- to lunch, even if there's no
15 funding in the account. Again, the details of that are still
16 to be worked out. The early childhood committee had a -- has
17 a couple of bills they're doing. The one that primarily
18 impacts CDE is around the ECARE program, and adding some --
19 so, we already have a number of ECARE slots. Districts can
20 use those.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Describe what that means,
22 please? Sorry.

23 MS. MELLO: I wish I could. I don't know if
24 any of my colleagues here at the table. It -- it is a --
25 it's a preschool program, it's called ECARE. There is



1 funding.

2 MADAM CHAIR: It's not --

3 MS. MELLO: -- that comes through CDE.

4 MADAM CHAIR: -- it's not the normal slots?

5 MS. MELLO: It's in addition to whatever the
6 normal --

7 MADAM CHAIR: In addition start?

8 MS. MELLO: -- slots are. Yes, it's my
9 understanding. Again, I don't claim to be the expert on
10 early childhood. Well, or roughly much of anything. That -
11 - that's another's -- another topic for another day.

12 So, what they're trying to do, is say that
13 for these existing slots, if districts use them for full-day
14 kindergarten, which they're allowed to do under the law, the
15 students that are -- the full-day kindergarten students
16 using those ECARE slots have to meet certain criteria that
17 are already laid out in statute somewhere else. And it's --
18 it's students who maybe are homeless, or in foster care, or
19 have lagging's language development.

20 So, I think the attempt is to target those
21 ECARE full-day kindergarten slots a little bit better than
22 they have been in the past. So, that legislation will come
23 forward. I think we'll see a return of the early childhood
24 discipline bill that we saw last year, that had to do with
25 some restrictions around how districts, punish is not the



1 right word, discipline I guess is the right word, young
2 students and expulsions and suspensions and all of that.

3 As you all -- I think have probably seen the
4 governor's budget includes a \$70-million buy down of the
5 Budget Stabilization factor, you know, the JBC will-
6 typically, the governor's budget. I mean, it matters --
7 don't get me wrong, it matters but the JBC also matters a
8 whole lot. And just because it's in the governor's budget,
9 doesn't mean, it's going to happen, and, you know, there's a
10 long way between, when the governor's budget gets submitted
11 and described, and when the budget actually gets stabilized.

12 So, that was my list. I don't know if you
13 all have heard of anything else that you want to share with
14 me or if you have questions about anything.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues, I'm wondering if you
16 could help me with one item because it comes up every year,
17 which is the concerns that's rural dis -- or smaller
18 districts have about what information they -- the -- the
19 collection of data and the transfer. Are there any specific
20 report that identify what it is precisely that they were
21 talking about, so that, one, we can figure out which ones
22 are federal requirements and we don't have the options, two,
23 where can we be helpful?

24 So rather than having necessarily
25 legislation, can we have the BOCES and the district start



1 looking at other ways to handle the data? Or do you have
2 any information about that?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, I, I don't
4 know the specifics. I -- I wonder --

5 MADAM CHAIR: I don't either. I never get
6 into the specifics.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wonder if EDAC which is
8 -- I don't know what EDAC stands for. It is Education Data
9 Advisory Committee. Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Very good.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is staffed by the
12 department, but it is, it is made up of representatives of
13 districts. They have an annual report. So that might be a
14 place where we could look. I mean -- I mean, I'm happy to
15 put up the most recent one and I'm guessing there's one
16 coming up too soon. I don't know if it's done or not, but
17 that might be a good place to start.

18 MADAM CHAIR: I think we ought to have a
19 little bit more background before it turns into a Bill. So
20 we know what it is that we're going to support or not
21 support. Board member Flores, did you have a hand up?

22 MS. FLORES: Yes, I did. But it was just --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

24 MS. FLORES: Well, don't those -- don't those
25 centers that we have around the state -- don't they help in



1 that area?

2 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I don't know. I just
3 don't have enough background, but I'm pretty confident that
4 some of the data reporting requirements are federal. So we
5 need to isolate the ones about which we have some control.

6 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

7 MADAM CHAIR: And then see if there's a way to
8 do it better rather than eliminating it, right?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, Board member
10 Flores, I, I think in the past, they've introduced
11 legislation to get rid of reporting requirements that were
12 federal. So I, I can tell you. I mean some of it is
13 certainly federal. How much of it? I don't know.

14 MADAM CHAIR: So, we do have Congressmen and
15 Senators who --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Perhaps, we can help them
18 contact but --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Any other concerns, comments?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you at this time, do
24 you want to select who you would like on the subcommittee?

25 MADAM CHAIR: I'm getting to 9.0.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, no, no, no, no. For
2 the legislative priorities.

3 MADAM CHAIR: 9.0. I'm getting there.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What? Well, I think it's
5 a different commi -- it's a different like subcommittee.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Oh.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me. You're talking about
9 the -- yeah, I know. Well, I was going to get to that after
10 we have this piece.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As part of that? Okay.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Just wanted to
14 make sure we got that.

15 MADAM CHAIR: But I appreciate that. Thank
16 you. I get it now.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, unless you have any
18 questions that's, that concludes my presentation. I just
19 want to emphasize, you all are welcome to contact me
20 directly at any point in time if you have questions about
21 things you're hearing about.

22 I work for you all. So, please don't
23 hesitate to let me know if there's something specific that
24 we can be working on for you. Thank you.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you very much.



1 MS. FLORES: May I just ask a follow-up
2 question?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Please, go ahead.

4 MS. FLORES: If you have a different phone
5 number or address which you'd let us --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, Board member
7 Flores.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My phone number has not
10 changed and I do have a new e-mail address, and we'll make
11 sure we get that out again.

12 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Great.

13 MADAM CHAIR: So, the next item on our agenda
14 is consideration of the state board legislative contacts.
15 Does anyone object to continue with board members Goff and
16 board member Durham as our legislative contacts?

17 MS. FLORES: No.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Great. So, I would appreciate a
19 motion. Board member Rankin.

20 MS. RANKIN: I move to reappoint board member
21 Goff and board member Durham to continue to serve as our
22 State Board of Education legislative contacts.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, board member Rankin.
24 Is there a second.

25 MS. FLORES: I second that.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

2 MS. FLORES: I have a question about --

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes?

4 MS. FLORES: If board member Durham has to
5 recuse himself on issues around PERA, can we then have board
6 member Rankin step in to be his replacement with board
7 member Goff, to discuss that issue?

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Rankin, do you want
9 to comment on that?

10 MS. RANKIN: I don't know, your position is
11 somewhat --

12 MS. GOFF: No, I've -- I've done this before
13 and I'd be more than happy to substitute for either one of
14 them, if one can't make it.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Sounds fine.

16 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff.

18 MS. GOFF: I'm feeling a little hesitant right
19 now to be predicting what will all this is going to be. You
20 know, one part of our discussion would be how much does the
21 board -- what would be our decision about getting more
22 involved than we ever have been in financial issues?

23 So, however that would relate to legislation
24 is kind of an unknown right now. So, I mean, I would, I
25 don't know. I have no, sorry, I have no disagreement at all



1 with having a replacement, sort of in place, for anything in
2 general. I'm just -- I think we should just play it by ear
3 as the situations come up, then we'll know where we need to
4 go.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

6 MS. GOFF: It may not be something that
7 involves a big upheaval in our schedule or our process. So,
8 well, but I don't know that we need to do it officially.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Like right now.

10 MADAM CHAIR: And I appreciate the fact that
11 board member Durham has made us aware of it now, and I'm
12 going to count on you to help us -- help remind us when you
13 feel that you're going to conflict. Board member Mazanec,
14 did you have a problem?

15 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, I -- I would just say
16 that, that I -- I see this as a -- a way to make sure that
17 both parties are repr -- represented in any discussion.
18 It's not -- it's not in anticipation that it will be
19 discussed but I just wanted to make sure that the whole
20 board would be amenable to, to this possibility and have
21 board member Rankin step in in that instance. So, sure.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Board member
23 McClellan, did I see your hand up or you were just playing
24 around? We all do that. We'll have it on video. So, Ms.
25 Cordial, would you please call the roll?



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham -- oh, okay.
2 Board member Durham?

3 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores?

5 MS. FLORES: Yes.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff?

7 MS. GOFF: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

9 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

11 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

13 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

16 MS. CORDIAL: That passes 704. Jane -- board
17 member Goff and board member Durham to continue as the
18 legislative contacts.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you for helping with that.
20 It's actually a lot of work and I really -- we all really
21 appreciate it.

22 So, before we move to the next item, I do
23 want to make sure that each of you are really, have read the
24 operating procedures for state board activity regarding
25 legislation. It talks about the extra meetings that we have



1 each month and the process that we go through to either
2 support, oppose, monitor, take no position on Bills, et
3 cetera. I also want to remind us the very last item.

4 I'm not sure that we have been entirely true
5 to that, which is that, to the extent that a board member
6 objects to the position that we've taken as a board, you are
7 free to testify to that, but, there is an expectation that
8 you let our liaisons know about it, that when you testify,
9 you clarify that this is your position only, and that you
10 repeat the position that the board has taken. That sort of
11 helps every, keep everyone honest but it also makes-
12 ensures, that your voice is not in some way.

13 We did not talk about when we go to 19.02.
14 Do you want to do that right now?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 902?

16 MADAM CHAIR: 902, sorry. Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thi -- yeah, yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we -- board member
19 Mazanec, can you pull back an item?

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. So, my, my question about
21 this is on, see which article it is. It's Article 6; policy
22 making. It's on page 18, under miscellaneous additional self
23 governing policy statements, 4D vs. 3D. Public schools of
24 choice.

25 This says the Colorado State Board of



1 Education reaffirms its position in favor of the concept of
2 public schools of choice, which allows students to enroll in
3 any school or program within and between school districts,
4 subject to space available -- availability and compliance
5 with desegregation plans.

6 MADAM CHAIR: So now you can tell this is an
7 old?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So, that's why I'm
9 bringing it up.

10 MADAM CHAIR: You're right, that's a good
11 catch.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it -- and it --

13 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think we have any
14 districts, any longer.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, then we probably
16 need Ms. Tolleson to --

17 MR. TOLSON: I would explain this. I would
18 explain the questions coming up because you will see in the
19 desegregation circumstances, particularly if it's court
20 managed, a directive that school choice not be -- not allow
21 students to essentially flee the system that's under the
22 order. So, it's been known to happen and that's probably
23 the history here.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Denver was under a --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Still is.



1 MADAM CHAIR: -- desegregation.

2 MR. TOLSON: But I mean, this is an expression
3 of your legislative values. And so, you know, it could end
4 in the period after school districts. The subject to space
5 availability is sort of a "well of course". Subject to the
6 fact that a court can order something different. Well, of
7 course it will. I mean, here you're just saying here are
8 our policy positions that we value, so, whether the language
9 stays or goes, this is not functionally important.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Colleagues.

11 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec?

13 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I would, I would say I
14 agree with Ms. Tolleson that it may not be functionally
15 different. But I, I would -- I would propose that we do in
16 that paragraph with school districts period.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues.

18 MALE SPEAKER: Sir.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I just.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would literally have
21 no effect on -- on anything.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, if they're fleeing
23 -- if they're fleeing the school district.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, but that that's
25 still a matter of law.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a matter of law,
2 yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the fact that we take
4 it out of our procedures, has no effect on what will happen
5 in law. So, I'm -- I'm really proposing this. It's not
6 terribly meaningful, but I would like to see it just gone.

7 MS. FLORES: Well, do we take action on that?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I moved and Steve
9 second.

10 MS. FLORES: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would just like to add
12 to that if I may, that where it says, in any school program
13 within and between school districts really shines a
14 spotlight on our local control issues and I want to give you
15 like that. Well, it's really referring to open enrollment
16 policies.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Where -- Ms. Tolleson, where was
18 your recommendation that we stop?

19 MS. TOLSON: Well, I know -- the question is
20 specifically related to that last clause about compliance
21 with desegregation plans, but -- but frankly, I would
22 probably say pretty much the same things about subject to
23 space availability with the extent you're identifying your
24 position in favor of school choice. You could end it with a
25 period at school district.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Go on. We're going to take a --
2 we're going to take a five minute break.

3 (Off record)

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The Chairman's fine,
5 she's just having a little food. Taking a break. Mr. --
6 Mr. Durham, you seconded that motion. What I'd like to do
7 is just go through all changes here and then maybe get the
8 vote at the next meeting or let's just look at it. So, does
9 anyone else have any corrections on 9.02?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, not -- not that one.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have several and I
12 would like to go through them if everyone has their document
13 out.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do have one. I do have
15 one.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me get to you after
17 this one.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On page three paragraph-
20 Article 2A, where it says thorough, uniform, well-rounded
21 educational opportunities. The mission of Colorado State
22 Board of Education is to provi- provide all of Colorado's
23 children. I have an issue with that word children. I know
24 this seems odd but if you look at the root word which is
25 child, it means birth to puberty. Our charge is K12. That



1 disturbs me that we aren't specific about that. I think, if
2 we change the word children to students.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that will resolve
5 that issue and continue on equal access to quality,
6 thorough, uniform, well-rounded education -- educational
7 opportunities. But the -- the word I have trouble with is
8 well-rounded. I -- I can't quite find a definition of that.

9 I would like to just leave that word well-
10 rounded out. I think it means many things to many different
11 people. Anyway, that was just another one I have. I want
12 to continue on and then we can decide what to do here.

13 Let's move on to page -- page eight. General
14 Powers and Duties. To exercise general supervision, this is
15 number one A, over the public schools of the State and the
16 educational programs maintain and operates State
17 Governmental Agencies for persons who have not completed the
18 12th grade level of instruction. I may be incorrect, but I
19 thought it's 12th grade or have reached the age of 21.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I -- I believe we need
23 to add that in there, "or have reached the age of 21" to
24 make that correct. I'm sorry, 1A General Powers and Duties,
25 right at the top.



1 Okay. Then I want to move on to page 13. At
2 the very top, it says the official record of each State
3 Board meeting is an audio recording available for review.
4 Ms. Cordial earlier said starting in December, it's video.

5 I think we should state an audio/video
6 recording. I say audio and video because of the reasons why
7 we're even doing it emphasize. Ms. Tolleson?

8 MS. TOLSON: I think that's my early
9 recommendation maybe that using and slash or, you know,
10 there's some people hate this, only because if there were an
11 -- and at the event in which our video was down, it wouldn't
12 be lacking your official record.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I concur. I concur.
14 Thank you.

15 MS. TOLSON: Or we're not meeting here.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we have our --

18 The room. And I -- I'm sorry. Miss Goff.

19 MS. GOFF: Can I move on or can I --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to move on,
21 but do you have something on that one?

22 MS. GOFF: An added related question. The
23 executive portio- executive whatever --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Executive sessions?

25 MS. GOFF: Executive part of the board docs --



1 documents, is that considered minutes? How -- that's the
2 only place other than well, we do have it on tape but -- and
3 then we'll have it on videos. Is that the only place where
4 it's written out exactly what our actions are, and where the
5 -- the actual voting record itself in writing?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In board docs.

7 MS. GOFF: In board docs.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, that is where --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where it says so -- so --
10 so moved and so on and so second.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. All of that's has --
12 in board docs.

13 MS. GOFF: So if we were recalled upon, or
14 asked about where's your voting record, is that what we
15 would be giving to someone, is that right?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're sending them the
17 link to board docs.

18 MS. GOFF: And -- and where -- and this --
19 very quickly, are we -- what is the time -- the minimum time
20 on that that's required and for what, to maintain tapes or
21 recordings?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the executive session
23 or for a regular?

24 MS. GOFF: Yes, that would -- that would be my
25 call. Is it -- I know we have one for executive session, of



1 90 days, correct?

2 MALE SPEAKER: 90 days, isn't it?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, that's correct.

4 MS. GOFF: Does it have any kind of time
5 limit, minimum, to (indiscernible).

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. For the -- for the
7 rest of -- for the regular board meeting session, it's
8 indefinitely.

9 MALE SPEAKER: So all those notebooks are back
10 there for our record.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then they eventually
12 get archived and when we run out of space here.

13 MS. GOFF: So now that we're moving to
14 primarily a recorded version of our actions, other than
15 what's on board docs that could be printed, we have no
16 written archives.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. I don't see
18 that where a teacher can be --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have written
20 minutes, no. We have the audio or video recording is our
21 form of minutes for -- for our board meetings. And then
22 hopefully, you know, in the future we'll have the
23 transcription of board meetings, too. It won't be minutes
24 but it will be transcribed of the meeting; transcription of
25 the meeting.



1 MS. GOFF: We know, are other agencies whose
2 governing body operates in a similar way or are we unique?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we're unique, but
4 I can look into that. But if, you know, if the board wants
5 to start approving minutes, I think that's something we can
6 also look into, and it would just be another --

7 MS. GOFF: No. I don't want to -- I hope I'm
8 not coming across with some signing work here today, that's
9 not my intent. I'm just curious as to whether or not
10 there's precedent or other protocols -- in other agencies,
11 especially with governing bodies appointed or not, how they
12 operate. But we can follow up on that.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

14 MS. GOFF: I just want to find out exactly
15 what we have.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Goff, we did
17 do some research on that. Our communications department did
18 some research on that, and there are different state boards
19 that do it slightly different ways. We do have a couple
20 others that do it the same way. We kinda looked at that
21 when we were thinking about this so I can get that
22 information to you as a follow up.

23 MS. RANKIN: Continuing on page 13. On
24 electronic meetings, board members may attend board meetings
25 by electronic means.



1 At the bottom of that paragraph, it says,
2 additionally, a method for public access and partition, a
3 participation must be available. I -- I don't know that
4 we've ever had anyone participate online or am I incorrect
5 or?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, we have.

7 MS. RANKIN: Is that --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I'm not sure what
9 you mean by participation.

10 MS. RANKIN: A method for public access. So,
11 a public- somebody from the public that has something --
12 they want to --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, if they want to call
14 you?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that what it means?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, in public
18 participation we've never had someone --

19 MS. RANKIN: But they can, can they not? By
20 this paragraph, it looks like they can but we just have
21 never had it.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is my understanding,
23 I guess, I mean, they can under the language as it's
24 phrased, so -- and you said because of --

25 MS. RANKIN: C1, C1 on page 13 electronic



1 meetings.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

3 MS. RANKIN: Uh-huh.

4 MS. FLORES: And I -- I'm sorry.

5 MS. RANKIN: Go ahead board member Flores, go
6 ahead.

7 MS. FLORES: No, I was just going to say that
8 according to Julie that's not in -- in a statute and state
9 statute. That's in terms of state law doesn't obligate you
10 to provide a mechanism by which people can participate
11 telephonically, either board members or public for
12 operational decisions.

13 MS. RANKIN: So the additionally, should we
14 strike that sentence, that would be my recommendation.

15 MS. FLORES: Well.

16 MS. RANKIN: Or we should keep it in?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My -- well, it's a policy
18 judgment for you all. I don't -- I don't think there's a
19 wrong or right answer from a legal perspective.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My assumption was that
21 has -- that that's not referring to the public calling in.
22 My -- my assumption is that board members may attend by
23 electronic means. So a board member as we've had, could
24 call in during one of our meetings and participate
25 electronically. The part for public access and



1 participation, I'm assuming that that it refers to their
2 ability to listen -- to listen and know that that board
3 member is participating electronically.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Am I wrong?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's hard to know.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But -- but the phrase the
9 "and participation".

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think throws me in
12 terms of what the vision is here in terms of the public. So
13 if the idea is that a public member, the public could listen
14 telephonically or be aware that the board members
15 participate in telephonically, I would just strike the "and
16 participation" unless we are going to start facilitating a
17 call in.

18 MS. RANKIN: That is exactly my concern, so-

19 MALE SPEAKER: That would be difficult.

20 MS. RANKIN: Yes, I think that might be
21 difficult, so I don't know what to do with that sentence.
22 How to do that?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Scratch the "and
24 participation".

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we just scratch "and



1 participation". All right.

2 MS. FLORES: But what about we usually do? We
3 have those people come in. I mean, those meetings are
4 announced. We did -- if for some reason we had a person out
5 there that had something, I just hate to take out something
6 that makes it less accountable to, makes us less
7 accountable.

8 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Board member Durham.

9 MR. DURHAM: Well, thank you, Madam Chair, I
10 think the -- the chair has periodically allowed
11 participation from people that couldn't be here for specific
12 elements for specific parts, so they didn't have to drive in
13 or perhaps had schedule issues. And I think by taking that
14 out, you leave the chair of the discretion to do that which
15 I think is preferable to creating something resembles a
16 right particularly for the 30 minutes of public
17 participation.

18 I don't think we want to -- every time to go
19 through that. So I think we should strike it, doesn't
20 eliminate the possibility the chair can- can ask Elizabeth
21 to, you know, hook up and allow someone to call in.

22 MS. RANKIN: Okay, thank you. Any other
23 comments on that particular issue? Let's move on to page 18.
24 The article seven committees, commissions, and tasks -- task
25 forces. Is this -- page 18, I'm sorry.



1 The second line where it's a state boarding -
2 - well, let's go to the first line, "The state board
3 engagement with stakeholders and the public in several ways.
4 It should be engages with stakeholders and the public in
5 several ways." And then, continuing on, it says, "It may
6 create committees, commissions, and task forces" and then
7 the rest of it.

8 Now, go down to capital A, paragraph below
9 that. In the middle, it says, "The board provides for
10 public input to its decision making process through the use
11 of advisory committees, commissions." So it's repeating
12 what's above but it adds the adjective advisory committees.
13 I want to strike advisory because it -- it reiterates what
14 was said in the above paragraph and would allow if there are
15 other types of committees that we have. It doesn't limit it
16 just to advisory.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I have a question
18 on that.

19 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

20 MS. MAZANEC: What advisory committees do we
21 have or committees? I mean --

22 MADAM CHAIR: We're going to have a report
23 from the special education.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yeah, so we have the special
25 education, we have EDATs, we have --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, there's a whole 12
2 variety of them. Some of them are outlined and statute, some
3 are created to, you know, support us, so there's -- there's
4 actually a whole variety of them. There was like the Gifted
5 Education Committee and special ED and --

6 MS. RANKIN: And they are all considered
7 advisory committees, correct? And they -- they bring
8 recommendations to the board, correct?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or they'll just be report
10 --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Information.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Informational, ways that
13 you can connect with those constituents.

14 MS. FLORES: So they could be advisory or
15 just, you know, both kinds.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. For example,
17 you'll get one today or tomorrow and I don't think they're
18 bringing any recommendations to you. They're just bringing
19 you a report of sort of things they're working on and what
20 they've been up to.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So is that the only place
22 then the advisory pops up?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That I saw.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: I'm thinking that right now that
2 those -- the major ones the Special Education, the gift and
3 talented, the EDAC, they all have Advisory Committee in
4 their title. And I -- I'm pretty sure I looked at this for a
5 while. They are pretty specifically outlined in the statute
6 as to what that that they must exist, that they are a state
7 board, established and -- we did -- the state board did
8 those things.

9 So that part is clear. I -- Katie was right,
10 there's -- sometimes there -- and I believe they are
11 required to submit an annual report to the board. Any of
12 those board designate establish committees and they
13 sometimes do give recommendations.

14 It might be legislative in nature, advocacy
15 related somehow, but it is a requirement to be done annually
16 to us and then whatever the state board decides to do as a
17 follow up to that report is at our discretion. The gifted
18 and talented group will also be presenting their annual
19 report in the near future. Not this time, but it's coming
20 and that's what I know and that's what I've experienced.

21 It also designates the board's right to -- to
22 appoint or designate a board member as a liaison to those
23 groups and we have -- those are the main three, I believe.
24 If the board chooses to do that and so on.

25 MS. RANKIN: So the question is do we need



1 advisory in there or?

2 MADAM CHAIR: That's a title in statute. That
3 -- that's how they're named in statute with that -- with
4 that word in there.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Tolleson, is that
6 correct?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That the term --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it is, yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- statute? I believe it
10 is.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So therefore, if it's in
12 statute and we have it below then we need to add it above
13 "may create advisory committee" so that it's uniform.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Well, the state board doesn't
15 create those committees, the legislature creates it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well that's what, I was
17 just about to ask to is because this seems to say that the
18 state board may create or appoint.

19 MS. FLORES: Oh we can, well we do that.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we can, if we wanted
21 to create a new one even if it's not in statute.

22 MS. FLORES: Precisely.

23 MADAM CHAIR: For example, I believe it was
24 the state board that created the ESSA.

25 MS. FLORES: Yes.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Hub committee and the subs --
2 and I don't know if they would -- we call them advisory.
3 They would just --

4 MS. FLORES: Well, but they were, I mean, the
5 committees was -- were -- but it is an advisory committee
6 and there's -- well, I know, there's an early childhood one
7 and --

8 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a substantive
9 difference here, what we're talking about?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wouldn't lose a
11 moment's sleep over it.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wouldn't either.

13 MS. FLORES: So, I mean, you're basically,
14 you're just saying, remember, this is just a document that
15 describes how you operate both your own use and for the
16 public to know -- to say here's how we engage stakeholders.
17 We got various ways, so we got to statutorily create
18 committees that come from the general assembly. We have one
19 to create Ad Hoc as you did with the ESSA hub and spoke
20 committees.

21 So, I don't have a real opinion as a legal
22 matter about how that is expressed here and how you express
23 it here won't change how it operates under Federal law, so
24 how unhelpful is that?

25 MS. RANKIN: It's -- it -- it's not that big



1 an issue.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Depends on what you're charging
3 us.

4 MS. RANKIN: I don't think we should deliver
5 this with any more time but there were some minimal ones
6 there. Would it be acceptable if we --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well.

8 MS. RANKIN: What should we do? Should we
9 decide on redoing this with the changes and then vote on
10 that?

11 MADAM CHAIR: So it's been -- it's been my
12 hope that we can talk about items that we want to vote on at
13 one meeting and vote on them at a subsequent meeting. And I
14 find this to be an excellent example of the why, because we
15 have talked about this previously.

16 We made some changes between then and this
17 meeting. Several of you had opportunities to go back and
18 reread and come up with some more items. So I would suggest
19 that we go ahead and ask staff. You guys will work with
20 staff to make sure that your input.

21 I don't -- I haven't seen any objections to
22 the recommendations that have been made. That we go ahead
23 and put it on the consent agenda again next time. And then
24 if there are concerns, we can have the exact same thing, we
25 can call it.



1 But rather than having the vote today, I
2 would suggest that we, again, let this be written up the way
3 it's been recommended and then we look at it again the next
4 time. It gives us an opportunity. Board Member Flores?

5 MS. FLORES: I have another one and that's in
6 --

7 MADAM CHAIR: Here we go.

8 MS. FLORES: -- the composition of the board
9 and --

10 MADAM CHAIR: What page, what page are you on?

11 MS. FLORES: On page 4, and it's H. And Board
12 Member Steve Durham says that it's not on -- in -- in the
13 Constitution and I just ask Ms. Julie Tolle -- Tolleson
14 whether a person who is a teacher can serve as a board
15 member.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Where are you specifically,
17 please?

18 MS. FLORES: Page H, an officer employee
19 during his or her term of office a member of the state board
20 shall not be a member of the General Assembly, an officer,
21 employee or board member of a school district or charter
22 school in the state, an officer, employee, or board member
23 of the State Charter School Institute, an employee of the
24 state board or the Department of Education.

25 Now, I just don't see school district there.



1 Does that mean, employment of the state? Yes, but I mean, I
2 just heard of a case when I was in -- at Nachlaot in Santa
3 Fe last week dealing with a person who is like a BOCE, a
4 teacher and -- and helps the school districts and teachers.

5 And I mean, that went all the way up to, I
6 guess the -- they may have had an ordinance of that kind in
7 the state and they just decided not to take away the
8 livelihood of a person who wanted to -- to be a public
9 servant and wasn't paid but serving on a local school board
10 was taking away his livelihood.

11 Now, I think that -- that kind of -- I -- is
12 not right. A teacher should be able to -- to run.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores, there is a
14 law. It's really not all that old.

15 MS. RANKIN: It's in statute?

16 MS. FLORES: Is it?

17 MADAM CHAIR: It's in statute, yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's cited.

19 MADAM CHAIR: It's cited right there --
20 (indiscernible - multiple speakers).

21 MR. DURHAM: For the record. See, I was
22 right.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know this is still a
24 worthwhile conversation because I pulled it up in Section
25 105 not 105.5 so you've caught an important typographical



1 error.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it just 105?

3 105(6), but it does reference specifically
4 and I couldn't -- I could not remember -- Board Member
5 Flores asked me about that at the break. And it is an
6 officer, employee or board member of a school district. It
7 looks like our -- we're quoting verbatim here.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

9 MS. FLORES: Well, --

10 MADAM CHAIR: You don't have to agree with the
11 law but it is the law.

12 MS. FLORES: -- it could be changed. It
13 should be changed.

14 MADAM CHAIR: But not by us.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, we can't change it
16 until the law changes.

17 MS. FLORES: Well, no. Listen to this. We have
18 legislators that are teachers. Why is it possible for a
19 legislator, who -- who many of them are teachers and for a
20 board member and they get paid, we don't get paid and I
21 would like to -- I would like to do substitute teaching and
22 then I would like teachers to be able to hold public office.
23 Why shouldn't a teacher be able to run for the state?

24 MADAM CHAIR: I haven't met a teacher that has
25 that kind of time, but that's a whole different topic.



1 MS. FLORES: Well, what about these people in
2 the legislature that are teachers?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're given time off.

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: I just wanted to revisit Board
6 Member Rankin's suggestions on page 18 article --

7 MS. FLORES: I don't want to let go of that.

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: -- Article 7 subsection A.
9 Just in an effort to avoid having to put this off to a
10 subsequent discussion the next time it comes up, I just
11 wanted to maybe get an opinion with respect to the
12 possibility of removing the word advisory in the middle of
13 that paragraph in this following sentence.

14 The board provides for public input to its
15 decision making process through the use of advisory
16 committees because this refers to the board giving --
17 allowing for public input. If we remove that restrictive
18 advisory before the word committees, would we then be
19 opening up all of the board's committee making decisions to
20 public input?

21 For example, would someone construe that our
22 reelection of Board Members Durham and Goff without opening
23 it up to a public hearing for public input, would that have
24 been falling under criticism if we -- if we were to remove
25 the word advisory and maybe that's an abundance of caution.



1 And the only reason I bring it up now is, I don't want to
2 have it redrafted and then have to make a mess again.

3 So I just wanted to apply an abundance of
4 caution and I also appreciate Board Member Rankin's efforts
5 to keep this consistent, both in the paragraph above and
6 throughout this paragraph so that -- that next sentence
7 where it reads the board shall determine membership of such
8 committees, do we need to then say if we're being
9 consistent. If the decision is to leave the word advisory
10 before the word committees, would we then want to say the
11 board shelled the term the membership of such advisory
12 committees coma commissions blah blah blah blah? Just a
13 thought before we redraft. Thank you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a thought or two
15 about that. I think the sentence that's causing such trouble
16 and somehow I feel like I had a hand in crafting this.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's all your fault.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably, could -- if the
19 sentence itself were stricken because one of the things I
20 know that Board Member Rankin mentioned was there's a little
21 redundancy between the introductory paragraph and between
22 this paragraph and the fact that the sentence which I think
23 is designed to say, here's, the public has participation by
24 sitting on committees task forces whatever but that the
25 sentence has enough ambiguity to prompt that question. What



1 if you just strike it?

2 So you go straight from the statutory
3 reference without pointing advisory committees and then you
4 leap straight in to the board shall determine the membership
5 of such committees.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I like that.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Just going back to -- to what I
9 was saying before and that is, I mean, why should a segment,
10 and we know that teachers don't get paid very much but at
11 the same time, we give the legislature the right to teach
12 and their duties are incredibly, you know, difficult I think
13 during -- during the whole year, and December and --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Are you asking something of us?
15 I'm -- I'm very confused why we're talking about this.

16 MS. FLORES: In fact, I wanted to bring it up
17 when Jennifer was here and that is that I don't think we
18 should take people's livelihood away who want to continue
19 work, one; two, and we should allow a person who wants to
20 serve in public service and at the same time in public
21 service well -- as well as a teacher. I mean, why should we
22 just --

23 MADAM CHAIR: I appreciate your opinion, but
24 it's the law.

25 MS. FLORES: I know it's the law.



1 MADAM CHAIR: We kinda need --

2 MS. FLORES: The law is -- as we talk about
3 law changing laws. And I'm saying that that one is
4 definitely --

5 MADAM CHAIR: But that's not where we are. We
6 are looking at our work receipt.

7 MS. FLORES: I'm glad I go to other states and
8 -- and -- and listen to what happens in other states and
9 that was one case that came up in Texas and, you know, they
10 rescind it, if there was the law, they rescinded that and
11 they allowed a person that's like a BOCE person to run for
12 the board.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Durham.

14 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. It
15 appears we have two issues. One is, I would recommend we
16 let Ms. Tolleson rewrite the section that she may have
17 created the problem with and then bring it and submit it in,
18 and if it's okay with Ms. Rankin, maybe add it to the -- the
19 draft for approval at the -- the next meeting.

20 I think relative to Dr. Flores' concern, I
21 think the legislature is trying to ensure that there's not
22 an -- not only not a conflict of interest that occurs here
23 or as few as possible conflicts, but also eliminate the
24 appearance. And I think if you have an employee of a school
25 district there are very few issues that come before this



1 board that don't, in some way, affect school district --
2 school districts and their employees. And I just think they
3 would be, if they were being dutiful, they would be recusing
4 themselves.

5 MADAM CHAIR: All the time.

6 MR. DURHAM: Almost constantly and I think
7 that's the purpose of the statute. If Dr. Flores feels
8 strongly about it, she should move to remove that part from
9 our procedures. I'll be happy to give it a second, but I
10 will vote no.

11 MADAM CHAIR: So, ra -- thank you. We'll
12 revise the board procedures, put it on the consent agenda.
13 Everything that's on the consent agenda is something that we
14 are expected to read very, very carefully. And so, I
15 appreciate the input from you all who gave it another pass,
16 because I think we're improving it.

17 MS. RANKIN: Well, I would like to say that in
18 our defense, I -- I do think that -- that's -- that's how I
19 typically edit things too, is you -- you edit what you see
20 first and then it comes back and then you go your way.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

22 MS. RANKIN: You know, sometimes you just
23 don't see it that first time.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. No, I just really have-

25 MS. RANKIN: I apologize that it takes us a



1 few times but-

2 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think there's a problem
3 with that at all.

4 MS. RANKIN: We are all learning something
5 every time we look. Yes.

6 MADAM CHAIR: You know, one of the things we
7 can say is that we were supposed to have looked at these
8 every two years really carefully and we haven't. So, this
9 is excellent that we're- yeah, it's excellent that we're
10 looking at it. Okay? Thank you folks.

11 So, members of the public, do we have public
12 participation? Our apologies that it is so late. Mr.
13 Walker, I would like to remind you, sir, that we do not
14 engage. We also do not sp -- ask you not to speak about the
15 charter ap -- charter appeal that we have today. That's not
16 acceptable to talk about that.

17 And finally, to remind you that we have some
18 hearings today and if you want to speak to any of those
19 hearings, please speak to us at that time about those
20 particular rules.

21 MR. WALKER: I didn't quite hear everything
22 you said, but I didn't know anything about a charter.

23 MADAM CHAIR: So go for it.

24 MR. WALKER: And since you're talking about
25 public input and participation.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Three minutes, go.

2 MR. WALKER: He's back. So, Rhonda Thomas, Ms.
3 Thomas at channel nine over the weekend was doing some
4 things and getting public input on mental health programs
5 for our students in the schools and suicide prevention was
6 spoken of. And in the first of December, the report on the
7 strategic plan to address educators shortages is to be
8 heard.

9 And I spoke at one of the town hall meetings,
10 and I hope before the report goes to the legislature, the
11 public will have a chance to review it and add to it. And
12 the big issue are teacher shortages, mental health, suicide
13 prevention, opioid addiction is lack of funding.

14 And I've listened to the governor's report,
15 30 billion. And yes, housing is important, healthcare is
16 important, transportation is important. But during the 6th
17 -- the 17th year of the last legislative session, education
18 was severely neglected by the governor and the legislature
19 and now these changes are going to come forth during an
20 election year.

21 And I think it will take a tax increase, and
22 I think the possibility of it passing is doubtful from what
23 I'm hearing, particularly among the candidates for governor.
24 So, the issue is lack of funding.

25 To -- what I hear, we're about 40th per cap



1 funded in the nation, last in higher education. We're about
2 last in closing the ethnic achievement gap. We're about 46%
3 students of color in our schools. And from what -- what I'm
4 hearing, we don't have nearly enough teachers of color,
5 particularly Black and Latino teachers.

6 So, there's a lot of talk, but it takes --
7 talk is cheap. As Grandad Walker used to say, "Talk is
8 cheap. It takes money to buy land." It takes a lot more
9 money to have quality education.

10 As the sign on the wall says. We're not even
11 close. We're about seventh in the nation per cap income and
12 the lower quartile when it comes to funding higher
13 education. And the state of education is clearly separate
14 and unequal, and in my opinion, it's a disgrace for a state
15 as wealthy as Colorado is. It's a disgrace.

16 I'm 82 years old, I'm vitally interested in
17 education of young people, and yes, it's important. So is
18 security, health care, housing, but education is very
19 important to me and to you all. I don't question that and -
20 - or your integrity or commitment the least, but I certainly
21 question the governor's commitment and the legislature's
22 commitment.

23 I severely question if they're really
24 interested in adequate funding, excellence, and diversity.
25 It sure doesn't show it from the funding. Thank you for



1 listening.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Walker. I
3 appreciate -- I appreciate you coming. So our -- I want to
4 suggest that we take our scheduled 10:30 break now, please?
5 And I apologize for the prior --.

6 (Break)

7 MADAM CHAIR: The next item on our agenda is a
8 presentation on the commissioner's decisions concerning the
9 district accreditation ratings. Commissioner, I'll turn it
10 over to you, but I'll also ask you to explain the difference
11 between your role regarding district accreditation and next
12 month's --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: School.

14 MADAM CHAIR: -- school accreditation case.
15 Thank you.

16 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes. I
17 was learning that difference as well when I took on this
18 role. I was like, "Wait, I do what and they do what?".

19 So, I believe it is in statute where the
20 commissioner makes the decisions on district accreditation
21 and then we present those to you, but you make the decision
22 on school level accreditation. So, my team can add any
23 detail to that that they want.

24 MADAM CHAIR: So, this is not a voting item
25 because it's not our responsibility to vote on this?



1 MS. ANTHES: Right.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, thank you. I just want to
3 make sure.

4 MS. ANTHES: Right. We just wanted to make
5 sure you are aware of the work we've done and -- and where
6 we've landed in terms of these decisions. So, I will turn
7 this over to Alyssa Pearson, Ashley Piche, and Brenda -- oh,
8 that's not Brenda, that's Jessica Watson. And these are the
9 folks who have been working on this- this particular item.
10 Thank you.

11 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. Good morning
12 everybody. So, yes, we're going to share with you the final
13 2017 district accreditation ratings this morning. We'll go
14 through the process of the request to reconsider and how we
15 landed the final ratings, but the commissioner is assigned
16 by statute to assign the accreditation ratings for
17 districts. You all assign the school plan types.

18 Districts still do the school accreditation.
19 So, we do not accredit schools. That's the job of
20 districts. We assign school plan types. So, just to
21 clarify, it's a lot of nuance between all of these things.

22 So this morning, Ashley is going to give you
23 a little bit of background and overview. You all probably
24 know a lot of this in your sleep now, but we just -- when we
25 talk about it, we like to give the public the information



1 about where the ratings come from and why we have
2 accountability kind of the background on it.

3 So, Ashley will walk through on that.
4 Jessica will talk with you about the request to reconsider
5 process, how we do that process, the request we got this
6 year, and the outcome of those requests. Then Ashley will
7 talk about the results, what we're seeing this year compared
8 to prior years, and I'd wrap up with a little bit on the
9 results, and the accountability clock, and where we're going
10 next.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

12 MS. PEARSON: I'm going to turn it over to
13 Ashley now.

14 MS. PICHE: Thanks. So Senate Bill 9163
15 requires an annual review of district in school performance.
16 All districts receive their district performance framework's
17 reports and this determines their accreditation rating. All
18 schools receive their school performance framework reports
19 and this determines their plan types.

20 For districts, as we mentioned, the
21 commissioner makes the final determination for accreditation
22 ratings, and those are the ratings we're going to share with
23 you today. So, the purpose of the frameworks is to provide
24 a statewide comparison of student performance.

25 The frameworks allow us to direct state



1 support and intervention appropriately and recognize and
2 learn from our highest performing schools and districts.
3 Districts can receive one of seven accreditation ratings
4 from distinction through turnaround plus two additional
5 categories for insufficient data, small tested population
6 and low participation.

7 Descriptors are also included on district
8 performance frameworks to describe participation. The meets
9 participation descriptor was added this year and that's for
10 districts who are at or above 95% participation and two or
11 more content areas low participation.

12 Our districts received low receiver low
13 participation descriptor participation is below 95% into a
14 more content areas, and then a district will receive a
15 decrease to the participation descriptor if they are below
16 95% participation once parent excuses are removed in two or
17 more content areas.

18 And so, our school and district performance
19 frameworks are divided into three areas called performance
20 indicators. Data is aggregated within those performance
21 indicator and that data then rolls up to determine the
22 district accreditation rating or the school plan type.

23 For districts, performance indicators are
24 weighted so that academic achievement accounts for 40% of
25 the overall points. And academic growth counts for 40% of



1 the overall points and then post-secondary and work for--
2 work force readiness counts for 30% of overall points for
3 districts. I'm going to pass it over to Jessica to talk
4 about the request to reconsider process.

5 MS. WATSON: Hi. Good morning. I'll discuss
6 the request to reconsider process now. If the district's
7 analysis of performance for the district is different than
8 the department's initial assignment of an accredit-
9 accreditation category for the district then the district
10 may submit additional information for CD's consideration
11 through the request to reconsider process.

12 The next few slides will cover the request to
13 reconsider results for this year's district performance
14 frameworks. So, districts had until October 16th to submit
15 additional evidence for the commissioner's consideration. CD
16 supported districts by reviewing drafts of requests for
17 reconsideration by September 15th and providing detailed
18 feedback as well as offering individual office hours to
19 districts, 35 districts participated in the draft review
20 process and we received 12 district draft submissions and 57
21 school draft submissions. CD received overall fewer requests
22 in 2017 than 2016.

23 We received 26, a 20 district requests,
24 excuse me, compared to 41 in 2016 and over 140 school
25 requests includi- including 38 schools which CPS requested



1 for lower a rating which overall was compared to 239 in
2 2016.

3 MS. PEARSON: Jessica, would you mind if I
4 just jump in there.

5 MS. WATSON: Sure.

6 MS. PEARSON: That decrease was really based
7 around the participation coding. Last year we knew we had so
8 many requests because there were some challenges with
9 ensuring that schools and districts were able to code their
10 parent excusals correctly to the huge number last year, our
11 assessment and IMS accountability teams did a lot of work
12 with districts and support during the testing session this
13 year administration to make sure coding was done correctly,
14 so that's why we saw such a large decrease in the numbers
15 this year compared to last year.

16 MS. WATSON: Thanks Lisa. So, there were 10
17 considerations versus many requests for reconsideration this
18 year. The first, body of evidence, the second,
19 accountability participation impact was just two, third,
20 calculation error, fourth, impact of an alternative
21 education campus on the district performance framework
22 rating, five, retroactive AEC designation, six, for small
23 districts and schools, seven for districts with a single
24 school, eight, districts with a close quo, nine, for an,
25 requests for an insufficient seat data rating and 10



1 regarding English language newcomers.

2 So of the 20 requests, 80% were approved by
3 the commissioner. One district approval is pending until
4 December when the school plan types are presented to the
5 State Board of Education for approval as their district
6 request is dependent on the school requested it reconsider.
7 The board has received a handout of the district names,
8 requested ratings and rationale and the CD decisions for all
9 the districts.

10 The summary of approvals are; five were based
11 on the impact of alternative education campus students on
12 the district performance framework rating. Essentially this
13 means when the district rating increased when AC students
14 were removed and the AC received either a performance or
15 improvement rating and has improved performance since 2016.
16 So that is how they would qualify for that consideration.

17 Two, requests for views send using a single
18 school rating for the District, Seven based on miscoding on
19 the seat assessment which would be participation
20 calculations, two based on body of evidence and then two
21 based on request for insufficient state data.

22 As far as those that were not approved, there
23 were four districts, three were based on the fact that
24 additional supplemental data did not support a higher
25 rating, two based on the fact that AC impact did not meet



1 the requirements of the state board rule, and one based on
2 the removal of the closed and transfer school.

3 The reason why those numbers don't add up is
4 that districts can submit based on multiple criteria so some
5 are across the classroom or some categories. And so for the
6 district appeals of ratings, if a district receives a prior
7 to improvement or turnaround rating the local Board of
8 Education may submit an appeal to the State Board of
9 Education within 10 days of final notification from the CD.
10 So, thank you and I'll turn this back over to Ashley.

11 MS. PICHE: So now, I'll give an overview of
12 results from the 2017 district accreditation. So, this
13 slide shows district performance over time and we'll see
14 this represented visually on the next slide but you can see
15 from the data here that we've seen an upward trend with
16 districts ratings over the past seven years, which has
17 continued through 2017 where we have zero districts that
18 have received a turnaround accreditation rating this year
19 and we've got 30 districts that have received the
20 distinction rating, which is the highest number we've seen
21 in a single year so far.

22 And here's that visual representio --
23 representation of that data. So, the blue on the bottom
24 represents the distinction category, the green accredited,
25 yellow improvement, orange priority improvement and red



1 turnaround and that gray represents the insufficient state
2 data category.

3 For 2017, more districts are falling within
4 the top three accreditation ratings than we saw last year.
5 We've got your districts with insufficient state data this
6 year than we did in 2016 and only 2.7% of students in the
7 state were enrolled in districts with the priority
8 improvement accreditation rating this year.

9 So compared to 2016 results, 65% of districts
10 received the same accreditation rating in 2017 than they did
11 -- as they did last year, 13% of districts increased at
12 least one level. And of those 24 total districts that
13 increased, 12 were due to the request reconsider process
14 this year. Just under 15% moved down one or two levels.

15 And we also had eight districts that received
16 insufficient state data last year that were able to receive
17 an accreditation rating this year. I'm going to talk with
18 you a -- a little bit just about the participation impact
19 and what's going on with that. Students six- this year, we
20 had six districts with had -- that had an insufficient state
21 data rating and that is down from where we were last year.

22 Four of those districts received that rating
23 on their preliminary framework, and then two additional
24 districts asked for that -- for their request to reconsider
25 process. When they looked at the rating that they received,



1 they said that's not representative, that students that
2 tested aren't representative of our -- of our district as a
3 whole because of participation, and so they asked for ins-
4 for insufficient state data instead.

5 So, we've got six districts this year with
6 that. We have five districts whose final ratings were
7 decreased due to accountability participation rates below
8 95% and two or more content areas. Again, that's the
9 accountability rate. So, when we remove the parent
10 excusals, there were still five districts that were below
11 95%. And then we had 85 districts receiving plan types with
12 low participation descriptors. And that's the -- the -- the
13 participation rate for all students that didn't that
14 descriptor. So, just an overview of where we're at now.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we entertain a
16 question?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

18 MS. MCCLELLAN: Do you --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member McClellan --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you for doing kind of a-
23 a summary. Do you have that list of the fi -- specific five
24 districts.

25 MS. PEARSON: Yes. Yes. So they're -- they're



1 in your spreadsheet. But let me just read them to you right
2 now, because I don't want you to have to -- yeah. I don't
3 want you to have to sort through it. So, the five districts
4 that were lowered due to partici -- accountability
5 participation rate were Las Animas, Mancos, Plainview, South
6 Conejos and Weldon Valley. Those were the five.

7 And we contacted them all during requests
8 reconsider to see if they needed any help. But, at the end
9 of the day, that coding was the coding and that was the
10 concern.

11 So, as Ashley mentioned, we have 30 districts
12 accredited with distinction for 2017. We just want to spend
13 a moment to celebrate the work that they've done. One, two,
14 three, four, five, six, seven, 10 -- sorry -- 17 of those 30
15 all met the 95% participation as well. So, we've got a lot
16 of them that are really based on all their students testing
17 as well.

18 The largest district that's accredited with
19 distinction was Littleton with 15,000 -- over 15,000
20 students en- enrolled in the district. And we'll recognize
21 these districts later when we do our state awards as well.
22 And I'll talk to you real briefly about that accountability
23 clock. And before we start, I want to celebrate the
24 districts that came off this year.

25 So, we had three districts that were in their



1 first year last year Huerfano, Lake County and West End and
2 all of those three that were in first year last year moved
3 to an improvement rating or higher this year. Aurora Public
4 Schools are under an improvement rating. They were at year
5 five last year and now they're an improvement. And then
6 Julesburg and Cortez, who you both heard from last spring
7 have now moved to improve their ratings as well, based on
8 their -- their -- Julesburg was based on their preliminary
9 rating and Cortez through the request reconsider process.

10 So, we just want to commend them on the work
11 that they've done to get there. You all have seen basically
12 this chart before and we've added 2017 in there.

13 So, what this is, is it shows just the
14 districts that were identified on priority improvement or
15 turnaround in 2010. So, there are some others that have come
16 on and off in between but these show the ones that were
17 identified in 2010. What has happened over time.

18 So you can see, you know, of the six that
19 were- sorry the five that were at year six last year,
20 there's three that moved onto year seven. And then we have
21 four others that had been on in 2010 that have come back on.

22 And then we also -- beyond the ones that are
23 on this slide, we have three other districts that are on the
24 -- on priority improvement, that aren't shown on here
25 because they weren't there in 2010 and that's the Colorado



1 of digital both BOCES, East Otero and San Juan BOCES. San
2 Juan BOCES is on hold. They're in insufficient state data.
3 But they had been on previously so they're just in this -- a
4 little bit of a holding pattern, until they have enough data
5 to come on.

6 So, next steps, a reminder of where the
7 school plan types will come to you all in December for your
8 approval. We're going to do everything we can to get you all
9 the materials a week before because we know there's a lot to
10 make decisions on but we had over 140 requests.

11 So, we're working as fast as we can, as well
12 as being thorough and consistent in those reviews to get
13 that material to you. But I think it will be about a week
14 before the board meeting that we have that for your vote
15 that next week.

16 There is a possibility, like always, of
17 district appeals. We haven't heard about that from the
18 districts that had a request reconsider but didn't get
19 approved that are prior to the improvement in turn
20 turnaround. I don't know that'll happen but we'll know
21 within 10 days whether that is actually, if anybody's going
22 to appeal or not.

23 And then as, you well know, the
24 accountability clock hearings are something that results
25 from all of this. There's no districts coming up, as you



1 saw, there's no districts anywhere near year five at the end
2 of year five right now.

3 We have a potential probably for one to two
4 schools and I think they're thinking about April if were
5 coming, so we've got some time on that. So, this year will
6 be very different than last year. But you are probably
7 grateful for it as we are. That wraps up our presentation.
8 Of you all have any questions, we're happy to talk and
9 answer anything.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Questions colleagues, comments.
11 Board Member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: I hate to beat a dead horse but
13 I'm going to go after it. And hey Jane don't even look for
14 it, it's -- we're talking about 9.2. Again, back where we
15 were earlier and it talks about the state board duties and
16 on G, it says to appraise and accredit the public schools,
17 the school districts in the state and the Charter School
18 Institute.

19 Where am I going wrong when I -- when I read
20 accredit the public schools and school districts and then we
21 were just told that we accredit just the schools and the
22 commissioner accredits the districts? Is there a conflict
23 there? Am I -- I'm just reading something wrong? Page
24 eight of 9.02. And what we heard just now.

25 MS. PEARSON: I'm going to turn this to Julie



1 because my understanding of reading the accountability law
2 was that it's the commissioners role, but --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I love surprises.

4 MS. PEARSON: It's history.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you're sort of
6 both right. I mean, the -- the board acc- accredits school
7 districts because it is the board that approves the issuance
8 of accreditation contracts. For accountability purposes,
9 when they set an accreditation grading, that determination
10 comes out of the commissioner's office.

11 And of course, if we wind up in a full rating
12 here, as you'll recall we had one last spring. You could
13 wind up over, essentially, overruling the commissioner's
14 determination on that.

15 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. Just needed some
16 clarification there. And I have one more question, can I
17 continue?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Let me just --

19 MS. RANKIN: Go ahead.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Let my brain run around this. I
21 have -- haven't pulled that out but school districts
22 accredit their schools.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

24 MADAM CHAIR: What does that -- does that say
25 in there?



1 MS. PEARSON: No. It- it's talking about board
2 duties.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We -- we deci-

4 MS. PEARSON: We appraise and accredit, the
5 public schools and school districts.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Right. And that's something
7 that changed somewhere along the line in history because
8 it's the district and the District Accountability Committee
9 maybe or the school board that accredits the schools. But
10 the accountability rating is what we will vote on next
11 month. If you want to look at -- you want to look at that
12 to see if there's some, because that is a change that
13 occurred sometime in my school board lifetime, as I recall.

14 And I don't remember what legislation changed
15 that so that may be another case where our procedures are a
16 bit out of date. Then, the next question would be- that's
17 the accreditation part, is there any accountability piece
18 in- in our board?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Operating procedures.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Operating procedures? And do we
21 want one?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Steve, this is rule we
23 could make a change- this is a rule-

24 MADAM CHAIR: Because we didn't have- way back
25 when this was first drafted, we didn't have the



1 accountability piece, we have now.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have one in
3 there. And my recommendation is for those -- those
4 individual applications of the work you do. If you start
5 trying to insert some of them in there, the document is
6 going to become a beast. So, you -- you know, we've got
7 separate accountability procedures that the board had
8 approved and --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: --- we were submitting
11 some changes- keep- and keep it separate.

12 MADAM CHAIR: So let's just correct this one
13 to make sure. I'm fine with that.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I continue?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Continue please.

17 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Pearson. It's something I
18 read said, district created school performance frameworks.
19 So a district can create their own. Is that correct?

20 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

21 MS. RANKIN: How many districts do we have
22 that have done this?

23 MS. PEARSON: I don't know that I have the
24 current most accurate count Den- Denver Public Schools.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It just did.



1 MS. PEARSON: -- (indiscernible) has their
2 own, Charter School Institute has and then Falcon at times
3 has, and I don't know if they do currently.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're working on it.

5 MS. PEARSON: They're working on it. I think a
6 few other districts have -- have talked about it and I don't
7 know where they are in process right now.

8 MS. RANKIN: Do you know what percentage of
9 students that relates to?

10 MS. PEARSON: What does DPS have?

11 MS. RANKIN: Approximately?

12 MS. PEARSON: Approximately 90.

13 MS. FLORES: 90.

14 MS. PEARSON: They have got like 90,000 kids
15 so --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So, that's a little over
18 10% of our population. They have their own framework. That
19 said through -- and we'll talk about this more next month.
20 The state's school performance framework that's where your
21 ratings is on and if the district wants to change a rating
22 that the state assigns based on their- their local
23 framework, they need to go through the request to reconsider
24 process.

25 MS. RANKIN: I see.



1 MS. PEARSON: So they'll need to ask us. This
2 year they've asked to raise a lot more ratings than they
3 ever have in the past. So -- and they're getting reviewed
4 by the review teams internally at CDE. We'll go through
5 that process and then we'll bring you those recommendations
6 about whether to raise them or not.

7 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Thank you.

8 MS. PEARSON: Welcome.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec.

10 MS. MAZANEC: I'm curious about the movement
11 of districts on and off the clock. Mentioned Aurora Public
12 Schools came off.

13 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Where were they last year?

15 MS. PEARSON: They were at --

16 MS. MAZANEC: And where did they get to this
17 year? And I don't see them on this list.

18 MS. PEARSON: So, they're not on this list
19 because they were not identified in 2010. Back in 2010, they
20 went through a request to reconsider process that brought
21 them up to the improvement rating.

22 MS. MAZANEC: So, this solely includes
23 everybody that's on this since 2010?

24 MS. PEARSON: Yes. This chart we just made
25 just the districts that were on in 2010 to show the



1 movement. We can add in the other ones that have come on and
2 off. But it doesn't fit-

3 MS. MAZANEC: I would like to see that.

4 MS. PEARSON: Sure, we can we can absolutely
5 do that for you. So, Aurora Public Schools came on for year
6 1 in 2011 and then they were on three 2016. Last year they-
7 they in July 1, 2017, they entered year 5. But then this
8 August when they got their preliminary rating they had
9 earned and accredited with improvement rating. So they-

10 MS. MAZANEC: What was their rating last year?

11 MS. PEARSON: Last year was priority
12 improvement.

13 MS. MAZANEC: So they went from priority
14 improvement to improvement?

15 MS. PEARSON: They went up one level.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, I would like to see that.

17 MS. PEARSON: Sure, we can do that.

18 MS. MAZANEC: For all of the districts.

19 MS. PEARSON: Sure. So, we'll just get 2010
20 through 2017 with any district that's ever been on the clock
21 in any of those years? So you can see-.

22 MS. MAZANEC: So I think it's interesting to
23 see the movement.

24 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

25 MS. MAZANEC: And I'm very curious about how



1 that movement happens too. But we'll probably never know.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, I mean, I think that's one
3 thing if you all want to talk some more about schools and
4 districts that have made that progress over time and what
5 they've done to get there, because you heard a lot last year
6 from the districts that were -- hadn't quite made it yet.
7 Right? That are still working, but we can definitely get
8 you some --

9 MS. MAZANEC: For instance, Ignacio is now
10 back on.

11 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

12 MADAM CHAIR: So, are you finished, Board
13 Member Mazanec? Because I'd like to continue with your
14 train.

15 MS. MAZANEC: And also along that line, I
16 think it would be helpful to all of us and the public. Tell
17 us how the participation rates affect. I mean, we have all
18 these new designations now; low participation, meets 95%,
19 and then the, you know, insufficient data that's completely
20 different in a way, but how is a lack of participation
21 affecting the ratings for districts?

22 MS. PEARSON: That's a really good question
23 and it varies district to district, based on who's testing
24 and who's not.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Right. And I think there's



1 plenty of parents and taxpayers probably who have different
2 assumptions about what those things --

3 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

4 MS. MAZANEC: -- mean, so I think it would be
5 good to-

6 MS. PEARSON: To talk through that?

7 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

8 MS. PEARSON: So, based on the review we've
9 seen, and it's getting harder to do this because it's been
10 longer since students have tested. But statewide when we
11 look at the prior scores of students that are not testing
12 now, but tested in the past, they are on average- they had
13 on average scored higher than the students that are testing
14 now for the whole state. And that's, you know, what we saw
15 in 2016. We'll look.

16 Again for 2017, but it's getting harder and
17 we're getting further away from when we have a score for a
18 student necessarily.

19 MS. MAZANEC: And you're doing that by looking
20 at their --

21 MS. PEARSON: We're looking at their previous
22 CMAS score. If they had a previous CMAS score.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Through their student number?

24 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Yes. Through their
25 states and all internally. So -- so we -- so we know



1 statewide that's what it's looking like. It's not a huge
2 gap with students within -- like a greatly larger difference
3 between the state average, but they are on average higher
4 than the -- the scores of students that did test in the
5 current year.

6 Or that -- like, you know, the year that we
7 were looking at. That said, that's the state and individual
8 communities may look different than that. But for most
9 communities and what we've heard anecdotally is -- is the
10 students that are -- that tend to be higher performing that
11 are not taking the state assessment.

12 MS. MAZANEC: And so while -- while that may
13 tell us a lot about the students who are actually taking the
14 tests, it doesn't tell us -- it's not necessarily giving us
15 an accurate picture of the district as a whole.

16 MS. PEARSON: We do not have a complete
17 picture of districts where -- that's why we have those
18 descriptors on there, for meets participation or low
19 participation just as information item.

20 So, as a public taxpayer, as a parent wants
21 to look at the District Performance Framework, they can go
22 see just further down on the page. They'll have the actual
23 participation rates. So they can see what the -- the results
24 represent in terms of what percentage of students that are
25 represented there.



1 MS. MAZANEC: All right. Thank you.

2 MADAM CHAIR: So if I could continue just with
3 board member Mazanec's train of thought, and looking at page
4 21, the clock. Please remind me what's in legislation and
5 what's in our rules regarding five years.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What specifically? About
7 the five years in terms of the action?

8 MADAM CHAIR: Is it about five years that we
9 really don't -- we can't take action about changing the law
10 for less than five years?

11 MS. PEARSON: That's very helpful. So, what's
12 in legis -- which is within state statute is, a district
13 can't remain a priority improvement or turnaround for more
14 than five years. What it says -- it also says in statute
15 that if a district or a school is at a turnaround level and
16 not making progress, the board can take action sooner.

17 Right now we don't have any districts in
18 turnaround. But you do have that authority for districts or
19 schools if they're staying in turnaround and not making
20 progress and not waiting till five years are up. The other
21 thing we realized just the other day looking at things the
22 statute just says more than five years, state board rule
23 that defines when the- when the year starts.

24 So in a state board rule it says it's the
25 July 1 following the identification. So right now we're



1 identifying who's at year 1 right now? South Conejos or
2 Ignacio. They will enter year 1 July 1, 2018 per your board
3 rules but that's based on the results from '16, '17 school
4 year. So we're over a year out from those results when
5 they're entering year 1.

6 MADAM CHAIR: So, what I'm worrying about is
7 where we have blue and then we're back to orange. And we've
8 got a couple of them that were in year 5 and then had blue,
9 and then popped back in. And there are a number of things
10 that we probably need to be thinking about, but it'll be
11 helpful for us to know what our limitations are in terms of
12 rules.

13 We've had a- received a letter this week
14 regarding the AHEC (sic).

15 MS. MAZANEC: The what?

16 MS. PEARSON: The AECs.

17 MADAM CHAIR: AECs.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Oh. Okay.

19 MADAM CHAIR: I just made that up. And I just
20 think maybe it's time for us to look at this. We've got kids
21 that have been in some of these districts -- they're about
22 to get out of middle school if they were in kindergarten way
23 back when. And I don't know that this is the way we want to
24 keep doing things.

25 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Right now.



1 MADAM CHAIR: I really -- I really worry about
2 what I'm seeing with districts coming back on.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, that's a good
4 observation. Right now when they come back on, unless
5 they're on a turnaround, you all don't have the authority to
6 direct action based on what's in the statute.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: I mean, I just think about all
9 the people that are coming to Colorado that are -- I mean,
10 we've had a great influxion of people and I'm looking at
11 Westminster, which is where people go. They can't afford to
12 live in Denver. Many of them would love to live in Denver,
13 but then they go to the bedroom communities and that has
14 been kind of changing.

15 We've changed tests, they've gotten into
16 competency based education. They have a new program. And,
17 you know, there are so many factors. Are you asking that
18 you want to know about the factors, and why there is this
19 change? I know you're --

20 MADAM CHAIR: No, no. No.

21 MS. FLORES: I know you're saying that they're
22 staying and they're getting that way, but there are a lot of
23 factors that are, you know, that we could consider.

24 MADAM CHAIR: What I'm looking at is that kids
25 are not achieving. I don't care. I care what the reasons



1 are, but the reasons probably need to be changed, maybe. I
2 mean some of those- some of the strategies are not working.
3 And at some point, the question is when do folks really pay
4 attention and say "This isn't working, let's do something
5 different," except doing the same thing over and over again.

6 MS. FLORES: Could I --

7 MADAM CHAIR: Let's not go into the detail
8 though.

9 MS. FLORES: Well, okay. But I think that
10 mitigating factors are important. So maybe if we find out
11 that, you know, the kids that entered back when or maybe 50%
12 of the kids are not the same kids.

13 MADAM CHAIR: That's a good point. That's a
14 good point.

15 MS. FLORES: So, we have to look at those
16 factors and I know Westminster is one of those districts
17 that has had a lot of influx of people coming in from,
18 because they can't afford Denver.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of the question that
20 I -- this -- I really I shouldn't be flummoxed about, but in
21 terms of the high school measures of achievement --

22 MADAM CHAIR: I notice that the SAT is not in
23 there, because it's under the-

24 MS. PEARSON: Postsecondary Workforce
25 Readiness. Yes. So, we don't have much in the way of



1 measures for achievement for high school kids. Right now we
2 just have 10th grade, next year we'll have --

3 MADAM CHAIR: We'll have ninth and 10th.

4 MS. PEARSON: -- ninth and 10th grade. And we
5 have 11th grade Science is in there. For those students
6 that take the test.

7 MADAM CHAIR: So, we didn't put it in there
8 because it's double counting.

9 MS. PEARSON: Within the statute. Well, we
10 didn't put SAT in there, because if we kept it in PWR,
11 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness, it would be double
12 counting. I believe statute says that the college entrance
13 assessment is been part of the Postsecondary Workforce
14 Readiness indicator. But, I think that's something-

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Choice.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So, you guys can
17 talk about.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Because I don't remember having
19 conversion as to what it should.

20 MS. PEARSON: That's why we locked SAT there,
21 it's most similar to how we had the framework's in 2016 as
22 well when it was SAT and Postsecondary Workforce Readiness.
23 But I think looking at high school achievement and the data
24 that we have and how it makes sense is something we want to
25 talk about during this next year.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't get to measure
2 growth in 10th or 11th?

3 MS. PEARSON: Not next year we won't be. No,
4 no, no. We- We do measure growth from 10th to 11th. From
5 PAST, the SAT we way up, yeah. We did that this year, it's
6 included in the framework this year.

7 MADAM CHAIR: And you'll continue to do that?

8 MS. PEARSON: Yes. And then-.

9 MADAM CHAIR: And this is some- at least
10 there's some piece of the SAT that is in other than just-

11 MS. PEARSON: Just the achievement. Yeah. And
12 then once we have ninth graders that take the PAST, they'll
13 take it for the first time this year. Then next year they'll
14 have the 10th grade and they won't have growth between those
15 two.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Between ninth and tenth, and
17 tenth and eleventh?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yup and then we probably will be
19 able to do growth from eight to nine as well. We'll look
20 into that.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Okay. Other- Board
22 Member, Goff.

23 MS. GOFF: A review if possible for me would
24 be really helpful. The insufficient data category and the
25 participation are two different thought processes, right?



1 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

2 MS. GOFF: Would 0- I'm -- I'm really -- right
3 now I'm focused on the insufficient data. What about the
4 districts where the N number is low? Are they include- is
5 that encom- does, does that encompass those schools? And
6 what are we, what are we learning that we don't know or that
7 we know about accreditation or just accountability for these
8 in small in-number places.

9 I've a feeling, I don't have any hard proof
10 of it, but I have a feeling that's where people's curiosity
11 is. They may not have identified it yet about that we need
12 data revelation, this pressing data issue that keeps coming
13 up.

14 Is that part of that conversation and how,
15 how do we keep going on year after year with an insufficient
16 data cloud here? The desire of the public and parents to
17 actually, whether they know that they want to or not is get
18 all the information that they can. How do we get to where we
19 can talk about this?

20 And -- and I noticed on our next round there
21 are some districts that are a few, not many, but have a
22 distinguished rating or a credit, you know, rating and they
23 are labeled and described with low participation or
24 insufficient data.

25 And I'll tell you, I'm not looking forward to



1 try to explain that to all the districts I have that are
2 considerably larger. I don't know how to- how to get through
3 that. So, you're helped along. I've just always be there and
4 I appreciate that a lot. But do you see the- the problem
5 here --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

7 MS. GOFF: -- for us? And I would care more
8 about the problem that's going to be for our communities.

9 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

10 MS. GOFF: So, I don't know where, where we go
11 what, what we can do about the small N numbers. So, it's
12 becoming an issue.

13 MS. PEARSON: So, right now we- we only have
14 one district that has insufficient state data due to its
15 small end size. The other re- they're five that have
16 insufficient state data because of participation. Because
17 they don't have a high enough participation rate, either to
18 have any data that was reported of all, or it'd be
19 representative to give them a rating that they felt was
20 reflective of all their students in their district.

21 So, but we still know that the small end is a
22 challenge with accountability. You guys know when- whenever
23 you look at data, the smaller the end size the more volatile
24 the data is, the more extremes you see. And so that's been a
25 challenge. There are a group of districts you all heard from



1 back in 2015 called the student centered Accountability
2 Project, and they're real- mostly real small districts, that
3 are trying to think about how else we can get information
4 about how we're doing, and where we need to improve, and
5 whether the conditions that we have in place or needs to put
6 in place, so that we can see better outcomes for students.

7 They're going to come talk to you all in
8 December to kind of give you an update on the work they've
9 been doing, because they've really been trying to solve this
10 idea or figure out another way to get some good information
11 so they can have some public accountability with their local
12 boards. When the numbers are so small for many of them. So,
13 they're working on that piece of things.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

15 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
16 that just -- could we go back to the slide that gives the
17 percentages on which this rating's based?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. You mean the
19 weightings or the outcomes?

20 MR. DURHAM: The weightings, the weightings.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Direction going the
22 wrong way.

23 MR. DURHAM: There.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There we go.

25 MR. DURHAM: All right. It's right through it.



1 Now, have just to make sure we're comparing apples and
2 apples. It would appear or, have any of these weightings
3 changed in any way in the last few years?

4 MS. PEARSON: So, you all direct this in June
5 of 2016. Was it? Yes 2016. To use these weightings. So, for
6 the 2016 frameworks, and the 2017 frameworks, we use these.
7 We made those changes because at that time that adequate
8 growth measure, and we'll talk some more about it tomorrow,
9 but that kind of idea of; is the growth enough to get
10 students proficiency?

11 We weren't able to use with the new
12 assessments, because we didn't have enough years. So, as we
13 remove that data from, from the frameworks that we had had
14 from 2010 to 2014, it was important to look at the
15 weighting. Because that, that impacted how growth was
16 calculated.

17 MR. DURHAM: So, prior to 16 that --

18 MS. PEARSON: It was -- it was slightly
19 different and growth was weighed more. But growth included
20 that adequate growth component, which is very highly
21 correlated with achievement for a district. So, growth
22 previously was more of a hybrid growth achievement measure,
23 than it is now where it's pure growth, if I make any sense.

24 MR. DURHAM: Yes. And -- and that goes to the
25 heart of the question that -- that I have is; if we were



1 doing apples and apples and hadn't made that changes --
2 those changes, would we have the same level of improvements
3 in terms of districts moving up from one level to another?
4 In your opinion, I got you the time to calculate it.

5 MS. PEARSON: We can't, because we didn't
6 calculate adequate growth, so it's hard to say. But when we,
7 when we talk with you all, from that input that we received
8 to get those weighting recommendations to you all, it seemed
9 that this was about the adjustment needed to kind of take
10 into consideration the change and how growth was included in
11 the frameworks.

12 MR. DURHAM: So, so, for a district, let me
13 see if I can get this. The mean scale score is rated 30%?

14 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

15 MR. DURHAM: So, actual achievement is only
16 30% of the calculation?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

18 MR. DURHAM: So, it could -- one could make a
19 case that we're really not measuring results, because for
20 you- you place an equal amount on graduation and -- and I
21 presume those other items listed there are factored in that
22 30%. Is that correct?

23 MS. PEARSON: That's 30% because the
24 graduation, the drop out, the SAT means scale score and the
25 matriculation rate all of that and there's that eight



1 percent.

2 MR. DURHAM: Is there any change in that over
3 previous years in terms of that percentage?

4 MS. PEARSON: The percentage, again that was
5 the same from 16 to 17.

6 MR. DURHAM: Going back to the prior 16.

7 MS. PEARSON: I think you was- I think it was
8 35% before. You all made an adjustment there and-.

9 MR. DURHAM: It's a little, it's a little
10 less.

11 MS. PEARSON: Maybe a little bit different.
12 And also the matriculation rate was new in 2016. SAT clearly
13 was new this year.

14 MR. DURHAM: So we're at 30, 40, 30, and then
15 for district?

16 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

17 MR. DURHAM: So, in terms of hard performance
18 only 30% of the rating is based on what I would characterize
19 as hard results. That is, at the end of the day, students
20 perform at a particular level regardless of the reason they
21 may not be performing?

22 MS. PEARSON: That's true. I think that
23 historical conversation around growth is that that is such
24 an area where schools and districts have the greatest
25 impact, of whether students are moving or not. So, that's



1 why it's been, it's been something that's been more
2 prioritized in the state.

3 MR. DURHAM: Then, okay. We go back to the
4 slide then that shows where everybody was on the clock. Nice
5 colorful slide.

6 MR. DURHAM: That one. Thank you. Now, in this
7 one, it would appear we still have three districts on the
8 clock, but- but we took action. And so --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 MR. DURHAM: -- that that action relieve them
11 legally and expect more questions from Ms. Tolleson. Are we
12 now barred from taking action -- additional action now that
13 we're in year seven?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Board member
15 Durham. That's then a bit the sort of million dollar
16 question that's hung out is once the board has taken action
17 or directed action, does it sort of lose the ability to have
18 around two if there's no improvement? And you've heard I
19 think from at least one district that the belief that you
20 can't do anything further.

21 I'm skeptical about that interpretation, but
22 what we do know is for the orders that you all adopted last
23 summer, they gave most of the district, I think, at least
24 two years --

25 MR. DURHAM: Two.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- to make a move so you
2 wouldn't be, by your own order, in a position to take
3 further action, at least this year.

4 MR. DURHAM: So, they're on year eight. Next
5 year, we might revisit- or theoretically, be able to revisit
6 those- those districts?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd have to look at the
8 orders. Some of them say 2019, I think. But yes.

9 MR. DURHAM: Okay. All right. Well, I mean,
10 we're, at least if you take everything at face -- at face
11 value, which I'm not as inclined to do because only 30% of
12 the scores are hard -- as far as I'm concern, the really
13 hard number of how kids are performing. So, if we calculate
14 it and only that 30% just for the heck of it, which since
15 you have those numbers, where would we -- would we be in
16 terms of showing in -- in your -- you may not know the
17 answer --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 MR. DURHAM: -- but in your judgment, would we
20 be showing the level of improvement that we appear to be
21 showing using the 30-40-30 approach?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The level of improvement
23 in terms of movement of districts? Possibly.

24 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The overall performance



1 would probably look much lower.

2 MR. DURHAM: So, in terms of -- so our system
3 here is masking a result that is not -- I mean, if you took
4 the results and say value -- or face value, my initial
5 reaction was to suggest that our work here on Middle-earth
6 is done or nearly done.

7 If you were to take that 30%, my suspicion is
8 we're not quite done with our work here on Middle-earth and
9 might be stuck for another generation or two. Is it -- I
10 just want to make sure we're not -- we're not leading the
11 public to believe that at this point in time we're getting
12 significantly better results than we have achieved in the
13 last 10 years.

14 That -- that -- that it's somewhat illusory
15 based on the fact that we use a lot of other factors,
16 perhaps justifiably. But- but I think if you hone in on,
17 because we're talking, all this -- all this trauma started
18 because of the lack of competitiveness on a worldwide scale
19 when major against other countries.

20 And I think if you were to return strictly to
21 that major, we wouldn't have anything to celebrate here. Is
22 that a fair statement?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that we have made
24 progress as a state, but not as much as we want to or need
25 to.



1 MS. ANTHES: Yeah. And the different course,
2 which you say suggest-

3 MR. DURHAM: More progress than is -- than has
4 been made.

5 MS. ANTHES: I think -- I think you could look
6 to me --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Turn on your mic.

8 MS. ANTHES: How is it keep going off?

9 MR. DURHAM: You have assistance. I don't have
10 any assistance, I have to do it myself. I didn't say I did
11 need an assistance.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, well.

13 MADAM CHAIR: I think if we look to the NAPE,
14 Steve, we looked at some of the national tests, there we see
15 small incremental progress. I- I try to remember, though,
16 that our implementation of the different standard- of the
17 new standards has been painfully slow. Even though it was
18 passed in 2010, it wasn't official until 2014, but we still
19 hear of classrooms where we're not there. So, I don't know
20 that I want to start throwing things out at this point
21 simply because it takes a long time to turn this ship, but
22 you're absolutely right by using the different colors.

23 MR. DURHAM: Maybe you look at this chart,
24 you'd say --

25 MADAM CHAIR: Right.



1 MR. DURHAM: -- maybe our time here on Middle-
2 earth is about done.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Not so. And remember, we
4 talk about our worry that we're not even using high enough
5 expectations, period, but we were starting at a certain
6 point and we want to be- I mean, once we get kind of blue-
7 more bluish or maybe even now, it is probably time to look
8 at it differently. Board member Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Yes. That's one of the conv- the
10 conversations that's going on in Denver right now, and
11 especially concerning, you know, the- the jumping from one
12 great jumps from up and down for some of these schools. And
13 so, people are concerned and they would like to know whether
14 they're on a great level or not.

15 That's very important. Is there any way that
16 -- I know this is important and growth is important, I
17 understand that, and especially for our minority kids and
18 poor kids, but is there any way to give them an indication
19 of grade level?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, that's exactly what
21 the state assessment results do. They tell when the students
22 are meeting or exceeding expectations for grade level.

23 MS. FLORES: Because I knew that even from the
24 Teacher Union that they felt that the jump was- was, you
25 know, an explicable.



1 MS. ANTHES: But that's the message that we
2 have to give parents.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 MS. ANTHES: That if they want to know if
5 their child is on great- number 1, if the child is at grade
6 level. Number two, where did their kids need more help. And
7 with- if they opt their kids out, they're not going to get
8 that information, then they are subject to information from
9 other sources.

10 MS. FLORES: But Denver is a district that --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Students are
12 participating.

13 MS. FLORES: Students are taking the tests.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And those parent -- the
15 parent reports, this individual student report to the
16 parent, those are really helpful. Like, It's very clear to
17 see where my daughter is doing well, where she's struggling,
18 where she needs more attention and work, and it resonates
19 well with what I know about her, too.

20 MADAM CHAIR: I'd like to see one of those us.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I could give you.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Could you give -- provide
23 us with one, please?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comments or questions?



1 MR. DURHAM: Just --

2 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: Real quick ones. What's the
4 cutoff for an end-year percent score here for accredited
5 with distinction?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seventy-eight.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Seventy-eight.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 74%?

9 MS. PEARSON: 74% this year.

10 MADAM CHAIR: That's actually changed. Right?
11 It was higher.

12 MS. PEARSON: It was higher. You all, when we
13 were doing the work for that 2016 Lisa, you said to set the
14 cut scores because the framework is changing it, the data
15 behind it changed a bit, to set the cut scores so that it
16 aligned with the outcomes from 2014.

17 So, we- we looked at the distribution and we
18 carried- we set that cut scores at about the same place
19 where it was for 2014. So, when you look at-

20 MR. DURHAM: Since we change measures,-

21 MS. PEARSON: Since we change measures.

22 MR. DURHAM: -we changed- we changed the-

23 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

24 MR. DURHAM: - score the first year, to try

25 and-



1 MS. PEARSON: Yes. So, from --

2 MS. PEARSON: -- see if we make it as
3 consistent as possible.

4 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. So, the results from
5 2014- 2016 are- there not exact, but based on the
6 preliminary frameworks, we were trying to get the comparable
7 numbers and the percentages per your direction.

8 MR. DURHAM: So, anything above 74 is
9 accredited with distinction?

10 MADAM CHAIR: I have a question about-

11 MR. DURHAM: Then I- then I guess I do have a-
12 see here if I can.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Are you finished or?

14 MR. DURHAM: Well, here you get taking Cherry
15 Creek five. If I'm reading that correctly, they have 71.5,
16 are they accredited or accredited with distinction?

17 MS. PEARSON: Cherry Creek is accredited.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Credited.

19 MR. DURHAM: Credited? Okay. I'm sorry. So,-

20 MADAM CHAIR: The list of the schools of
21 distinction is in- is in this materials that --

22 MR. DURHAM: Right. I missed that. Yes. I- I-
23 I'm sorry. I- I have some reason and my packets disappeared.
24 But- so, what's the- what's in the cut off for accredited,
25 percentage-wise?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 56% of points.

2 MR. DURHAM: Fi- 56? Okay. All right. Thank
3 you very much.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Do we have expectation- I'm, I'm
6 think- I'm reflecting on the ESSA rules, and it identifies
7 subgroups that are wha- what we would call turnaround. And
8 calls for interventions, and makes them ESSA schools.

9 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Do we have that in our accredit-
11 accountability rating, so that if you have a- is it possible
12 for a school to be a accredited with distinction, but to
13 have a subgroup that is a turnaround?

14 MS. PEARSON: Yes. So, we could have a school
15 that receives a performance plan type, but then be
16 identified for a targeted support for our students with
17 disabilities for example on their ESSA.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

19 MS. PEARSON: That-

20 MADAM CHAIR: And might be something we ought
21 to look at also.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Because I think some of our-
24 particularly our highest performing school districts, to the
25 extent that they may have subgroups, and may or may not be



1 giving those students the attention whether they're- whether
2 they're Title I schools-

3 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

4 MADAM CHAIR: - or not, is really not my
5 biggest concern, but-

6 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

7 MADAM CHAIR: - is the district engaging in
8 efforts to improve their status? Because it's pretty easy to
9 match. Well,

10 MS. PEARSON: I guess.

11 MADAM CHAIR: - did that for years we've
12 masked subgroup achievement.

13 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. For 2018, that could
14 be a conversation we have about whether or not those ESSA
15 identifications get reported on the school performance
16 frameworks. So that's something that I think we need some
17 stakeholder, and buttons and conversation around that.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Great. Yes.

19 MS. PEARSON: We would like to talk to you all
20 about that too.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff?

22 MS. GOFF: Oh, well,-

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Board Member Mazanec?

24 MS. GOFF: No.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec to go



1 first, or what?

2 MS. GOFF: Well, I- fine. I just- the whole
3 discussion of this- what's being called the state report
4 card, the format, the look of it, you know, the- whether or
5 not it's consistent among districts, do we have a state
6 model for that?

7 I- I'd be interested in that. We heard some
8 more about that on the national view- from the National View
9 this past weekend. But the whole idea of what act- what is
10 the information that parents need, want, and can benefit
11 from, that-

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

13 MS. GOFF: -- that will actually give as full
14 a picture as possible, and answer the questions about their
15 own child's work. So, I'd like for us to continue that
16 conversation some time. And to see --

17 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

18 MS. GOFF: -- some of our examples.

19 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

20 MS. GOFF: Whether- are they the same in both
21 content areas? Language, Arts, and Math, does Science have
22 its own, are they integrated, I -- I just would like to see
23 some of that.

24 And the other real quick question is, as far
25 as the n numbers concerned, and we have- and we -- if we



1 continue to see that there are districts that are rated
2 distinguished low in number, with low participation.

3 MS. PEARSON: Distinguished in
4 (indiscernible), yes.

5 MS. GOFF: And I'm hoping we continue that
6 conversation. And if it needs to be in the context of
7 legislative propositional things, then so be it. But, I
8 think it's important.

9 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Yes. For right now, I
10 think that's a conversation that you all could have right
11 now, and we're taking your direction about not holding
12 schools and districts liable for parents that choose to not
13 have their students test, so, if they are not meeting with
14 distinction based on who test in, we're giving them the
15 rating. The distinction. But that's all- all based on you
16 all.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec, did you
18 have another question or comment?

19 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. Would you just repeat what
20 you just said though?

21 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: First?

23 MS. PEARSON: So, b- you all gave us the
24 direction not to hold schools or districts live based on
25 parents choosing to excuse their students from testing. As a



1 result, there is nothing that- like a school that may have,
2 or a district- sorry.

3 A district that has 50% participation, but
4 the students that- and I don't think there is one in that
5 list of distinction. But if a district had 50% of
6 participation, and the students that tested are in that
7 distinction rating, they would still get a distinction
8 rating. It's just distinction of participation. We're not
9 doing anything to keep anybody from getting that rating

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 MS. PEARSON: - based on their participation
12 rate.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, again, along those
14 lines though, of- of the- the evidence that CDE has about
15 students who do not test,-

16 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: - the evidence we have of
18 their achievement back from the CMAS, we only have the CMAS?

19 MS. PEARSON: It depends on when they last
20 tested, and where they were.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it might be something
22 it might be different type.

23 MS. PEARSON: It might have been to TCAP, or
24 may have been-

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It could be their last



1 test?

2 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The- the- the--

4 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: - the last state

6 assessment they took?

7 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, did we present
9 that information to the Federal Department of Education
10 concerning participation rates?

11 MS. PEARSON: About who the students are?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. But what we know
13 about those students.

14 MS. PEARSON: We talked that through with
15 them, but we didn't put it in the formal plan or anything
16 like that.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's not in the plan?
18 But I mean,--

19 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: - I'm trying to remember
21 what the- what the discussion was around their- their
22 insistence that they needed 95--

23 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: - percent participation.
25 And I'm just wondering if that was part of our argument.



1 MS. PEARSON: We did not. When we had one-on-
2 one with them to explain the context in Colorado, we
3 explained who the students were right now that are not
4 taking the test. To them, it doesn't matter who they are,
5 and who they aren't, because it's so clear, and s- and the
6 ESSA statue of what we have to do for those calculations.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, they don't care? Is
8 that what--

9 MS. PEARSON: I think it helps them understand
10 the context we're in, but the law says you will make this
11 cal- you will do this calculation, and so that's what
12 they're telling us to do.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: - but- all right. Thank
14 you.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you very much.

16 MS. PEARSON: Thank you all.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you Commissioner for your
18 role in this. Folks, I'm going to suggest that we take item
19 12.01, and postpone it. It's just a short item, however, we
20 need to go into the exact session. We will schedule for an
21 hour and a half, we are now down to one hour. So, our next
22 item is ---

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Lunch.

24 MADAM CHAIR: -- lunch, and exactly this
25 session, Ms. Cordial, would you please announce the



1 executive session please?

2 MS. CORDIAL: An executive session has been
3 noticed for today's state board meeting in conformance with
4 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific legal
5 questions, pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(ii) CRS, in matters
6 required to be kept confidential by federal law, or rules,
7 or state statute pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(iii) CRS.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Do I have a motion please to go
9 in the executive session?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So moved.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Anyone opposed?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

13 MADAM CHAIR: The motion passes, the board
14 will convene in executive session. The public is excused.
15 We are now an executive session, but folks, quickly please
16 get your lunch.

17 MR. DURHAM: Oh, for God's sake.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Yes.

20 (Executive session)

21

22

23

24

25



-
- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20



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