



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
APRIL 8, 2015, Part 6

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 8, 2015, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Marcia Neal (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MADAM CHAIR: The group will come back to
2 order and we will take up item number 17.01, which Steve
3 Durham would like to address.

4 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair, and
5 members of the Committee, or the Board.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Whoever we are.

7 MR. DURHAM: Whoever we are. At the last
8 meeting we rejected the cut scores for social studies and
9 science, at the end of that meeting, and gave notice of
10 intent to reconsider. I voted against accepting the cut
11 scores because it was -- I just cannot support a scoring
12 system or mechanism that shows the vast majority of
13 Colorado students failing without at least a lot of
14 analysis to demonstrate that's the case. We discussed
15 the matter at length over at the Capitol, and it is
16 something they actually care about and may be willing to
17 try and help us with a little bit. Unfortunately, that
18 has not yet occurred. I also met with staff on the issue
19 to see if there was any possibility of compromise or some
20 other approaches we might take. But I'd like to wait
21 until the legislature has an opportunity to address the
22 whole testing issue, which they will have done by the
23 next meeting, so I would move to lay this over until the
24 May meeting of the Board.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Second? Deb. Any discussion?



1 Any objection?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I have
3 discussion.

4 So there are a couple of things that I'd
5 like to point out. Not surprisingly, the scores that we
6 have in Colorado mirror the last test results from NAEP
7 in U.S. history, which I found pretty surprising. I
8 think for years Colorado has looked at their, for
9 example, CSAP scores, and then looked at the NAEP scores
10 and said, "Woo, these are really different." And the
11 expectation is that when we get our PARCC scores we're
12 going to see the same thing.

13 The National Assessment of Educational
14 Progress, those frameworks are based on the higher
15 standards that we have adopted now in Colorado. And, by
16 the way, this is not about PARCC, and this is not about
17 Common Core. These are Colorado standards and this was a
18 Colorado test, and this is what we keep hearing that what
19 we really want in Colorado.

20 The results are almost -- actually they're a
21 little bit better than the national test that was given
22 in 2010. That's the last time they did the national test
23 of 12th-graders in U.S. history.

24 So the reality is that this is truth-
25 telling. This is where our kids are. And I thought that



1 Mr. Daly, last month, was very --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who's Mr. Daly?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- the teacher who
4 spoke -- was very honest and was willing to bear the
5 responsibility for the fact that we've not been teaching
6 social studies in our schools. Therefore, we're going to
7 have these results, and apparently it's a nationwide
8 issue. It's not just a Colorado issue. So I think we
9 need to be careful about saying that this is somehow
10 unfair. It is unfair that we've not been teaching our
11 children well, which is why we came up with new standards
12 anyway.

13 That does not mean that accepting these cut
14 scores, that that somehow is going to go into an
15 accountability system that's going to hurt teachers or
16 hurt schools. Other states, for example, that have
17 received cut scores from the Smarter Balance have
18 recalibrated those scores for their own state in how they
19 are used either for graduation, which is the situation in
20 Washington State, or any other kind of accountability
21 measures.

22 So the fact that we're not accepting these
23 doesn't mean that this is the only thing that we can do.
24 There are other options that we have of what to do with
25 these scores when we apply them to something else. But



1 these scores, the fact that they mirror what's going on
2 everywhere else, tells me that this is actually the truth
3 and this is what's happened. One percent of the kids
4 were advanced in social studies, 9 percent were what's
5 called strong command, 46 percent was moderate command.
6 On the PARCC that would be -- I mean, on the NAEP that
7 would be considered basic, and that number is actually
8 higher than the NAEP was. So I would say that's actually
9 a good indication for our Colorado students, compared to
10 the national averages.

11 My second point, which bothers me even more,
12 is the fact that over 80 percent of our seniors took
13 these tests in science and social studies. They are
14 graduating next month and we are not going to give them
15 results. Now I've got to tell you that if I took a test
16 and the teacher said, "No, I'm throwing it out," I would
17 not be happy. I think that's extremely unfair to the
18 kids and extremely unfair to the teachers. They also
19 don't have the information to start thinking about, well,
20 what is it that I've got to do next year? How can I
21 analyze this information?

22 So I object to what you're suggesting, not
23 because I'm not concerned, as you are, about the results,
24 but the fact that we are pretty much not doing our due
25 diligence. This is our job. The Department has the job



1 of responding back to the districts and the teachers and
2 the students, and we're just not doing it. The
3 legislature can do what it wants to do. We do not have
4 to sit on our -- we don't have to sit here and wait and
5 wait and wait for them to do our job.

6 DR. FLORES: Madam Chair.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

8 DR. FLORES: May I speak?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

10 DR. FLORES: I think we have NAEP. NAEP has
11 done -- I mean, you're comparing NAEP and you're saying
12 NAEP is a -- NAEP is the score that we should believe,
13 and I agree with you. I think NAEP is a much better -- a
14 much better test, and we have a test that's a national
15 test, and it's NAEP. And we have wasted so much time on
16 this whole testocracy that really is not going to give us
17 any better information than does NAEP. And, you know,
18 it's good for the feds, it's good for the state, it's
19 good for the district, and I think we need to get back to
20 teaching and learning, which is what education is about.
21 And that's -- and you're -- you're seconding me on that
22 issue. Thank you.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Deb.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: And my thought is -- my
25 concern with the nature of these tests is how easy they



1 are to manipulate outcomes. When you look at the
2 performance level descriptors and look at those
3 distinguished command, strong command, analyze economic
4 goals and predict how scarcity of resources affects
5 choices made by individuals, businesses, and governments,
6 how many assumptions are nested within those --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- within those bullet
9 points, and who drafted that language, and how are items
10 on the test aligned with these performance level
11 descriptors, and what are the rubrics like that are
12 superimposed on the answers the kids give that can create
13 a condition where every kid can pass or every kid can
14 fail these items? Even the person from Pearson this
15 morning that talked about the Chinese test said a very
16 high number of individuals passed the Chinese test, and
17 yet we move to this approach, which is the bookmarking
18 approach, which Pearson is using on these CMAS tests in
19 addition to PARCC, because they're the same vendor, is
20 creating an artifact of failure based on the way the test
21 is written.

22 And, you know, I think that the comment on
23 truth-telling, it's truth-telling only if you agree with
24 all the assumptions sitting underneath how these scores
25 are derived, and there are massive assumptions built into



1 this.

2 So I think letting the legislature act, as
3 this Board has asked them to act in the area of
4 assessment, makes some sense.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Letting the legislature --
6 repeat that last sentence again, Deb. Letting the
7 legislature --

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: We're laying this over
9 because we are waiting -- we are hoping -- we have asked
10 the legislature to do that.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Waiting for the legislature,
12 is what you said?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To do what?

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: We are asking them to relook
16 at the assessment issue based on the burdensome nature of
17 the assessments, and based on the way these assessments
18 are developed we create a narrative of failure as an
19 artifact of the way the items are written, the way
20 they're scored, and the way the cut scores are created,
21 even disparate with the Pearson person here earlier who
22 talked about the Mandarin test. I mean, that was --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that was completely
24 different.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: I know that, but I'm just



1 saying --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those were natives
3 taking the test. You would expect them to be 95 percent.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: These are natives taking a
5 social studies and science test. The point is the nature
6 of the way the items are written and scored is vastly
7 different. My question is, why? The assumptions built
8 into this narrative of failure are problematic.

9 MADAM CHAIR: I would ask, as long as we're
10 all adding comments, to add a comment here. I'm not
11 necessarily disagreeing with what Steve has to say, but,
12 number one, one of the unintended consequences of the
13 whole argument has been around the fact that CMAS was a
14 Colorado assessment and was basically -- we bragged that
15 up because we had, you know, PARCC, and it's federal
16 assessment, or federally drawn. So when we talk about
17 CMAS, Colorado assessments, and we put a lot of pride in
18 those because we're going to have Colorado assessments
19 instead of national ones.

20 Well -- and good efforts, as far as I'm
21 concerned. The Department made good efforts and, you
22 know, we put these forward. And then -- and talk about
23 asking the legislature, I mean, it's not, maybe -- we've
24 got these two groups, you know, and they're kind of
25 heading down the road and we never seem to get in that



1 direction. And, I mean, I have great respect for most of
2 the legislators, but they don't know what to do. They're
3 putting up new bills every three or four days and
4 shooting them down, let's do this, let's do that, and
5 going back and forth on -- basically on these same
6 questions as you're talking about, about PARCC, what are
7 we going to do about PARCC. And so we have CMAS, but no,
8 we don't like CMAS. We're going to shoot it down too.

9 I'm not blaming anybody. It's just
10 unintended consequences. Only I would say we have NAEP.
11 That's a national test and Colorado has always sort of
12 resisted, you know, falling into the national test score.
13 I know it's had its good.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But they take the data
15 --

16 MADAM CHAIR: It is quite a mess. No matter
17 how you look at it, it's quite a mess right now, and I
18 don't know if we're going to get it solved or not,
19 because I always have to remind people, we, on this
20 Board, have very little ability to do anything about it,
21 and we're waiting for the legislature. And I think they
22 are trying but, you know, Democrats put up a bill and the
23 Republicans shoot it down, and the Republicans put up a
24 bill and the Democrats shoot it down. And they're like
25 taking pot shots at these various tests. Well, we won't



1 test seventh-grade social studies. You know, we won't
2 test 11th grade.

3 So it's really been very distracting for me
4 and I think a lot of good effort and good intentions --
5 you know, the road to wherever is paved with good
6 intentions. Well, we have a lot of good intentions, a
7 lot of good, hard work, but it just seems to be shot
8 down all over the place, including by us. I mean, we're
9 not blameless either. So I just think -- I appreciate
10 what you said, Steve. You know, I totally agree, and we
11 do have a motion on the floor.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Jane wants to say something
14 and then we'll call roll, since we have so much
15 discussion.

16 Yes, Jane.

17 MS. GOFF: The motion itself was to what?

18 MADAM CHAIR: To put it off until next
19 month.

20 MS. GOFF: I'm sorry. What was the original
21 action, to just not tell anybody how they did?

22 MR. DURHAM: We rejected the standards.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Rejected the cut scores.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Rejected the cut
25 scores.



1 MS. GOFF: Not the standards.

2 MADAM CHAIR: The cut scores.

3 MR. DURHAM: Cut scores.

4 MS. GOFF: But rejecting the cut -- the
5 setting of those cut scores means what? There is no cut
6 score, and therefore, no districts will be informed, no
7 schools will find out.

8 DR. FLORES: Well, we could give them the
9 raw score.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Well, let --

11 MS. GOFF: Hang on. Thank you.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Stay in order.

13 MS. GOFF: It's a matter of what are -- how
14 are -- whatever we decide, any time, how is that
15 impacting schools?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And kids.

17 MS. GOFF: And so far today we have produced
18 zero. Everything that's been proposed today has been put
19 off, pushed down the road, and we have accomplished
20 nothing to move us forward or backwards today. So I'm
21 just -- I'm kind of like ready to implore. Is there ever
22 going to be something that comes out of this Board that
23 moves us in some direction?

24 Now the motion today is to deny, or whatever
25 the word is you used, reject the cut scores, that's one



1 thing. But I tell you, I can't not be compelled to say,
2 then what? What is the impact of doing this?

3 DR. FLORES: Give them the raw scores.

4 MS. GOFF: We're going to have 78 school
5 districts' worth of social studies and science teachers
6 and schools having no clue how they did. That is not
7 meant to be a judgment question or a value question or do
8 we care. It's just they won't know. There's no news.

9 We have spent, well, going on five years as
10 a state, working on incorporating, and that happened
11 across the street too, by the way. The whole existence
12 of (indiscernible) Pearson standards, all of that work is
13 incorporated into both our math and social studies
14 standards (indiscernible). There we are, not to mention
15 all the conversations we've had all the time about the
16 seemingly very important block in social studies
17 (indiscernible).

18 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, and don't forget the
19 social studies group.

20 MS. GOFF: Put them over there. Put them
21 over here, and never will we quite figure out what it is
22 we're ready to do with them.

23 So I'm just saying, I honestly am not clear
24 what my thought on this motion is --

25 MADAM CHAIR: We're all a little frustrated.



1 MS. GOFF: -- but I'm concerned about this -

2 -

3 MADAM CHAIR: I think we all are.

4 MS. GOFF: -- four times in a row we have
5 done nothing.

6 MADAM CHAIR: And there's nobody to blame it
7 on. It's your fault, Keith. I know that.

8 It is very frustrating and I think we're all
9 very frustrated now and we all understand that. I would
10 just move that we go ahead and vote on Steve's motion.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pam, did you want to
12 speak?

13 MS. MAZANEC: I was just going to say that I
14 think that depicting the nature of this work as confusion
15 is very misguided. There's a huge chasm between saying
16 we should be teaching science and social studies, we want
17 our students to be well versed in basic concepts and
18 great content in these important subject areas and the
19 nature of this test and the way it's scored and the
20 performance descriptors. There is a huge chasm. So when
21 we look at the detail, which is always the case -- every
22 discussion we have we all agree on the broad outlines.
23 When we see the details they're shoveled at us, largely,
24 and when we look at how they're actually going to be used
25 and the details behind it, then we have issues. And I



1 think that --

2 MADAM CHAIR: Deb, do you have an idea of
3 how we could solve that?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I do.

5 MADAM CHAIR: What?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: And right now we can't solve
7 it.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I mean, we --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: But by delaying and by
10 surfacing issues --

11 MADAM CHAIR: -- if we had the power, how
12 can we solve it?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- and by getting the public
14 engaged, and by looking at the details we'd begin to have
15 a deep discussion as opposed to an abstract discussion
16 about how important science and social studies are. We
17 all agree. But when you look at the details, then we
18 have issues. And we should be looking at the details on
19 the front end, not the back end and then wringing our
20 hands saying that somehow our work is dragging us down.
21 It isn't. It's actually the detail that we need to be
22 looking at, and sooner in the process.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. I'm going to make a
24 judgment and ask Carey to call roll, and we're voting on
25 Steve's motion, which has a second.



1 MS. MARKEL: Steve Durham.

2 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

3 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Flores.

4 DR. FLORES: Aye.

5 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: No.

7 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

9 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Aye.

11 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

13 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Do we have anything

16 else to do today. I totally lost my -- oh, yes. How

17 could we have forgotten all of that.

18 MR. DURHAM: Apparently the person to blame

19 for everything.

20 MADAM CHAIR: District and school

21 accountability, including Turnaround, for 30 minutes.

22 Commissioner?

23 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. We wanted to bring

24 you up to date on some of the questions you had in regard

25 to this specific topic. Secondly, Mr. Durham had raised



1 some questions as it relates to the Turnaround schools,
2 kind of what's happening, contracts, et cetera. So we
3 will kind of bring that together, and if you have other
4 questions we'll be glad to address those.

5 This is particularly important since
6 tomorrow -- and it will be a long day tomorrow -- when
7 you will get a report from different school districts.
8 So we just wanted to give you kind of a heads-up and
9 understanding.

10 MR. OWEN: Sure. Good afternoon. Madam
11 Chair?

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

13 MR. OWEN: So we -- wow, I feel like I've
14 got an echo going on. We will do our best to move this
15 along, and one of the things that we're going to go
16 through, just kind of a quick overview, is talk a little
17 bit about the role of the State Board of Education when
18 it comes to Priority Improvement schools and districts.
19 We're going to talk a little bit more about the State
20 Review Panel and their role in informing you about those
21 schools and districts. Then we're also going to talk
22 about some of the supports specific to Priority
23 Improvement, Turnaround schools and districts. And then
24 at the very end Peter Sherman, who is our Executive
25 Director for School District Support, will briefly



1 outline the role that you have tomorrow with the school
2 districts that will be coming. You will have four school
3 districts coming to you tomorrow, and the purpose, again,
4 for those visits and some additional information and
5 answer any questions you might have about the visits that
6 are upcoming. Okay?

7 So with that, Madam Chair, I'm going to go
8 ahead and get started.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Go right ahead.

10 MR. OWEN: Okay. So if you could move on to
11 the next slide, Peter.

12 I know some of you have heard these pieces
13 before but because there are new members I thought it
14 might be helpful to kind of go through the role of the
15 State Board of Education specific to districts and
16 schools. While there are a lot of similarities between
17 the two there are some differences, and I want to make
18 sure I point those out.

19 So districts are accredited by the state,
20 and the State Board must remove a district's
21 accreditation if a district reaches the end of the clock,
22 which is essentially six years, and we can talk about
23 that when you lay it all out, or they may remove
24 accreditation early for a district that's in Turnaround.

25 When it comes to schools, schools are



1 accredited by a local school board, so there is no
2 accreditation by the State Board for schools. You do
3 finalize school plan types and then districts use those
4 plan types to do their own accreditations of their
5 schools, but you do not have an accreditation role
6 specific to schools. Okay?

7 So when you see that there's a required
8 action, that's specific to reinstating accreditation, and
9 the State Board of Education shall require actions of
10 local school districts, of the local board, when they
11 either reach the end of the clock or you act early on a
12 Turnaround district. You also direct action to local
13 school boards through schools, and again, that's when
14 they reach the end of the five-year clock or if it's a
15 school that's in Turnaround.

16 So the recommendations, how do you get to
17 the point where you're making decisions about schools and
18 districts that either reach the end of the clock or are
19 in a Turnaround situation? That comes from information
20 that will be provided to you by -- and it states it like
21 this -- "The State Board must consider recommendations
22 from the Commissioner and the State Review Panel." So
23 we're going to talk a little bit about how you're going
24 to be getting recommendations from the Commissioner and
25 then the role of the State Review Panel on how you'll be



1 getting recommendations from the State Review Panel.

2 So what's the actual impact on the district
3 and in the schools? If you lay out actions for districts
4 specific to reinstating accreditation, once you've agreed
5 on those conditions or those actions then you are to
6 reinstate their accreditation. So that is kind of the
7 trigger, the lever that you have in getting school
8 districts to go along with decisions that you make, is
9 you can put conditions in front of the school districts,
10 you can put expectations, and if they meet those then you
11 are to reinstate their accreditation. If they refuse
12 then they will essentially be without accreditation as a
13 school district in Colorado.

14 So for schools it's a little bit different.
15 If a school actually does not take it -- so let's say you
16 give a directive to a local school board specific to a
17 school -- the impact, the consequence of a district not
18 doing what you're asking, a local school board not doing
19 what you're asking is that the state can then -- the
20 district's rating overall can be lowered by one or more
21 accreditation ratings.

22 So let's say you see a Turnaround school in
23 a local school district, you say you want to close that
24 school and you direct the local school board to close it.
25 If they don't adhere to that recommendation then the



1 consequence that you can impose on that school district
2 is to lower their accreditation rating. Okay?

3 DR. FLORES: So --

4 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair -- I mean, sorry.

5 DR. FLORES: Madam Chair?

6 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

7 DR. FLORES: So what is -- what are the
8 alternatives when closing a school? Is it just
9 chartering?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Let's let him continue.

11 DR. FLORES: Oh, okay.

12 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, we will hit the
13 different levels of consequences.

14 DR. FLORES: Thank you.

15 MR. OWEN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, can you go
16 on to the next one?

17 So just to refresh your memory as well there
18 are five different accreditation ratings that we use in
19 the state of Colorado. There's Accredited with
20 Distinction, Accredited, Accredited with Improvement,
21 Accredited with Priority Improvement, and Accredited with
22 Turnaround. The bottom two categories are what trigger
23 what's called the clock in Colorado, the accountability
24 clock. So Accredited with Priority Improvement and
25 Accredited with Turnaround are those two categories where



1 the clock action starts for a school district when they
2 fall into those two categories.

3 There are four school plan types in
4 Colorado. There is the Performance Plan, Improvement
5 Plan, Priority Improvement Plan, and a Turnaround Plan.
6 Again, it's the two bottom ones that trigger a clock
7 action in the state. Okay?

8 Go ahead and move on to the next one.

9 Just a quick picture of performance and
10 where we're currently at on the clock in Colorado,
11 specific to schools and districts. This chart shows, at
12 the top, the number of schools and the number of years,
13 and it gives you an idea of the number of schools that
14 are going into Year 5. Right now, just to quickly
15 highlight that, there are 30.

16 The bottom chart is for school districts,
17 and you can see that there are eight school districts
18 that will be going into Year 5, and again, that's prior
19 to looking at any performance indicators and additions
20 that they might do as far as a request for
21 reconsideration process that will happen in the fall that
22 could pull a school or a district out of that category.
23 Okay? Go ahead.

24 So the process for the accountability clock
25 is for any district or school that's on the clock for the



1 five years, or again, a school or district that is in
2 Turnaround, the lowest category, the Commissioner can
3 make recommendations to the State Board about specific
4 types of actions to take, and we'll go through what those
5 actions are. The State Review Panel also is called out.
6 Specifically it's statute to give you guidance as well.
7 And so based on the recommendation from the Commissioner,
8 based on recommendations from the State Review Panel, and
9 we're also throwing in the addition of districts.

10 As you've seen, districts are coming to you,
11 talking about the things that they're doing, and so we
12 would include that you'll hear from the district, you'll
13 hear from the State Review Panel, you'll hear from the
14 Commissioner, and then you will make some determinations
15 about actions that you would like to see at the district
16 level or at the school level. Okay. Go ahead.

17 I'm going to have Lisa Medler, who oversees
18 the unified improvement planning for the state but also
19 oversees the State Review Panel process to briefly
20 outline the State Review Panel, their work, and how
21 that's going to be coming to you in the near future.
22 Okay?

23 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

25 MS. MEDLER: Thanks.



1 So as Keith mentioned, I have been
2 overseeing the State Review Panel process, so I'm just
3 going to walk you through what's outlined in the law and
4 then kind of point out, in practice, what we've been
5 doing over especially the last year, because things are
6 really ramping up as we've got some school districts
7 nearing the end of that accountability clock.

8 So as you'll see on the slide, it does lay
9 out -- the law does lay out some requirements for who
10 would be a panelist. Just to be clear, it is an
11 independent body from the Department, and I'll get into a
12 little bit about how we're finessing that, since we are
13 the Department, that are, you know, charged with
14 overseeing that work. They -- we have recruited a number
15 of folks meeting these different criteria, also
16 considering locations around states. So we've got people
17 that are from all around, in rural areas, urban areas,
18 different -- a wide variety of folks, because we want
19 experts that can go into the various schools and
20 districts and actually kind of know what they're looking
21 for.

22 So they -- that is a part of the recruitment
23 process. You can also see that the purpose of the Review
24 Panel is aimed at providing a critical evaluation of the
25 improvement plans, but then also provide, ultimately, a



1 recommendation to you, as the Board, and to the
2 Commissioner, for consideration, before those actions are
3 decided upon, which is, you know, hard work, and so we've
4 been working with the panelists and with the field to set
5 up a process that will actually result in meaningful
6 recommendations to you and to the Commissioner.

7 And I also want to point out that because
8 they're an independent body we want to take that
9 seriously, and if they have to be making recommendations
10 to you we don't want to get that -- at least a perception
11 that because the Commissioner is making a recommendation
12 that the independent body is being overseen by CDE. So,
13 as a result, we did put out an RFP to have an independent
14 group oversee the work of the panel. So we still have
15 Colorado experts being recruited as panelists but we
16 wanted an outside organization to oversee their work.

17 So that RFP went out. The vendor that was
18 selected was SchoolWorks. They do have experience in
19 other parts of the country providing site visits, and so
20 that was a big benefit is that they could actually help
21 folks come up with protocols, go in efficiently and
22 conduct interviews with staff and get a sense of the
23 school pretty quickly. But they are -- this outside
24 group is not making the recommendations. That is solely
25 the panelists, okay. They're just overseeing their work.



1 If you look at this slide, those panelists
2 are using two things to gather evidence as they go, and
3 that is, one, they're doing a document review. So that's
4 where the Unified Improvement Plan comes in as well as
5 anything else that's publicly available, such as the
6 performance frameworks, any data -- so data available
7 through SchoolView, things like turnover, leadership
8 turnover, things like that, that really give some -- at
9 least some clues as to what's going on, at least
10 historically.

11 But they also are conducting site visits,
12 and this was not originally laid out in the law. But as
13 we consulted with advisory groups and with the field, and
14 the panelists themselves, I think it was agreed that
15 folks really needed to get in and step foot into some of
16 these buildings before they could make a recommendation
17 that had some legs under it.

18 So we were able to get a decision item a few
19 years ago passed to fund the site visits, because they
20 are costly, and so they are now in the process of
21 conducting those site visits. And again, this is being
22 done in partnership with SchoolWorks.

23 As they do this, as they do the document
24 reviews and the site visits, they do have a set of
25 criteria that they're considering for their evidence



1 gathering, and that's laid out here on the slide. So
2 those are the kinds of questions that they are asking.
3 This is laid out in the law, okay. So as you can tell
4 it's about getting at the infrastructure of a school, of
5 a district, to support rapid improvements. Can they pull
6 it off? What's been done historically? Also taking into
7 consideration things like does that school need to remain
8 in operation, so things like location do matter if that's
9 an isolated area, right? So taking the context into
10 consideration.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me. Do they ever --
12 conditions of the building, something like that, would
13 that be a part of it? If they're in a really old
14 building, is that taken into consideration?

15 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair, you mean -- you're
16 talking about the --

17 MADAM CHAIR: -- the physical condition.

18 MS. MEDLER: -- the physical building? That
19 is not necessarily called out specifically but that's
20 certainly --

21 MADAM CHAIR: It may be a part.

22 MS. MEDLER: -- you know, there is -- as
23 they are doing the site visits they are interviewing
24 leadership, staff, and if that's coming up that would
25 certainly be a part of what they can do consider.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

2 MS. MEDLER: Absolutely.

3 So to the next slide, this, again, was what
4 was laid out in law as options to guide the
5 recommendations of the panelists to you, the Board, and
6 to the Commissioner. So you'll see that there is a
7 separate set for district actions and for school actions.
8 They're pretty similar. The color-coding should
9 hopefully help you see that, the ones that are related.
10 So, for example, the orange ones have to do with
11 management structures and alterations in that, depending
12 on whether it's a school or district or a charter school.

13 So the panel is constrained by the law to
14 pick from this list. So when they are making a
15 recommendation, when you see that coming from them, it
16 will be at least one of these from the list. Okay? And
17 I think Peter has spent some time with the Board in the
18 past going over what exactly these all entail, and will
19 continue to do so, so I won't spend time there. But I
20 just want to let you know that the panel is really
21 constrained to this list.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could I ask a question or
23 should I wait until the end?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Well, if it's just a detail
25 question.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just a detail question on the
2 list. So there was another statute passed, and I don't
3 recall the exact number, HB-something, that said -- they
4 added another option which is like other options as
5 suggested. Why is that not on there, or was that just
6 for the State Board, or where does that fit?

7 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

9 MS. MEDLER: Great question, and actually
10 that's a great segue into the next slide, if I might.
11 And to answer your question, though, specifically, yes,
12 that was made available to the Board. That was not --
13 that did not open up the possibilities to the panel.
14 They're still constrained to that list of actions.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: But the Board is not.

16 MS. MEDLER: But the Board is not --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

18 MS. MEDLER: -- for the schools in
19 particular.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

21 MS. MEDLER: Yep. And that was actually a
22 big basis for this slide, is saying -- and I think this
23 gets actually back to Dr. Flores' question, and that is,
24 well, so what are the options? So while the panel is
25 going to provide a recommendation based on this list,



1 both at the district and now at the school, with that
2 change in legislation last year, you are, at the Board,
3 expected to consider the recommendations and to consider
4 the recommendations of the Commissioner, but then you are
5 not restrained by that particular list, right? So a
6 hybrid of that or something else completely different.
7 The law does not specify that necessarily.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Okay. Go ahead.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're going to have
10 school districts bring forward recommendations. Are they
11 going to be analyzed/evaluated by the panel with some
12 feedback as to why they do or do not, even though they're
13 not free to recommend that, because it might not be in
14 their list? Do they get a pass at evaluating the
15 evaluations that the districts themselves suggest?

16 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair, I will say that
17 they will absolutely pick from the list, as is required
18 by the law. You will also -- I want you to really see
19 that we're finalizing that process so what you will
20 actually get, the template for that. But it's been
21 important for us for them to be able to explain why they
22 chose what they did and what goes into that, and if maybe
23 there's some alterations or other suggestions that you
24 might want to consider, then that would be included as
25 well.



1 So to be really direct on your question, we
2 are trying to set up a template so that that is possible,
3 but that is up to the panelists to decide, and really, we
4 will hold them to what's required in the law.

5 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

7 MR. OWEN: I would also add to that that
8 some districts have been more active in trying to engage
9 in that, and some are less. So I think there are two
10 ways. They could certainly talk with the State Review
11 Panel when they're out doing the visit and try to give
12 them information about what they're doing, or what they'd
13 like to do. They also will have the opportunity to tell
14 you their recommendations, what they would like to see
15 when they come -- have the conversation with you when
16 you're deliberating about what the State Review Panel has
17 suggested and what the Commissioner has suggested. We
18 think it's only fair that you have an opportunity to hear
19 what the district thinks of that as well. So there will
20 be an opportunity to hear all three of those pieces of
21 information and then make a decision.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Val.

23 DR. FLORES: I guess I'll --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me just follow up.

25 So the district has the choice, and what I see is that if



1 the district has a recommendation and they just come to
2 us, they're coming to a citizen group, without having
3 gone through any kind of evaluation from the expertise
4 that has been created by this Board. And I find that
5 problematic, simply because it's sort of a runaround.
6 It's sort of a move of going around that board rather
7 than having some kind of input from them.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

9 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

11 MS. MEDLER: Can I -- let me -- I do want to
12 clarify, in the protocol, like you said, the panelists
13 are out doing site visits right now and as a part of that
14 protocol they are meeting with district leadership and
15 with local boards, and are specifically asking them which
16 of those options work for them and which don't. So they
17 are taking into consideration, as they are making their
18 recommendations, what is the desire of that particular
19 entity. So that -- so as they are providing their
20 recommendation to you they are considering it. Even
21 knowing that the district may take you up on the offer of
22 having their own conversation, the panel is also
23 considering that. So that is embedded in there.

24 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, the difference,
25 though, there is the State Review Panel is bound by



1 statute. So if the district doesn't want to have one of
2 the selections recommended then there's opportunities for
3 them to express that to you, but they have a very clear
4 purpose that's outlined in the statute. Does that make
5 sense?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It makes sense. It
7 just -- I just feel like there's a way to avoid having
8 their recommendations evaluated by a set of experts.
9 It'll just be us. And I find that a little bit
10 challenging.

11 DR. FLORES: There's a few experts on this
12 table.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's not our job,
14 however. We're a citizen board, and so it's not our job
15 to be experts in how to turn around schools. And so
16 that's why you have this Board, and I just want to make
17 sure that you can't have an end-around where it's not
18 going to -- they're not going to get the input.

19 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, specifically to that
20 question, there's nothing that would stop the district
21 too, though, from having the Department, through its
22 process, evaluate their plans and see if those could be
23 incorporated at the Commissioner's recommendations to the
24 State Board.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 MR. OWEN: So there is an opportunity, I
2 think, to capture that, a couple of ways --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MR. OWEN: -- and then also be presented to
5 you. So I do think there is a pathway for districts to
6 get that information to the State Board, and for it to be
7 evaluated either by the State Review Panel or by the
8 Department.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: And, Val, I didn't mean to
11 keep you short here.

12 DR. FLORES: Okay.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Because this is a -- well, no,
14 let me. This is a five-year plan. We've been working on
15 it for five years. So it's not a time to question what
16 they're doing.

17 DR. FLORES: I'm not questioning.

18 MADAM CHAIR: It's just a time --

19 DR. FLORES: I'm just adding.

20 MADAM CHAIR: -- just to ask them details
21 and that sort of thing. And so I kind of wanted you to
22 get a feeling of what the whole plan was before we really
23 dug into attacking their work. Okay?

24 DR. FLORES: Right. Well, I think, you
25 know, you're -- I think you're right in going to and



1 talking to administrators and policymakers. We need to
2 look at the curricula, of course, that they're using,
3 given where they are, and also I think you need to do an
4 audit of the books.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Well --

6 DR. FLORES: I mean, we're looking about --
7 we're talking about --

8 MADAM CHAIR: -- five years.

9 DR. FLORES: -- we're talking about teachers
10 and teacher training. They may need teacher training. I
11 think an audit, looking at their -- how they're spending
12 their money. I think all of that has to go in --

13 MADAM CHAIR: Well --

14 DR. FLORES: -- to see if whether they're
15 spending their money well.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Val, again, and I don't mean
17 to, but it's a five-year project. We've been working on
18 this five years --

19 DR. FLORES: Right.

20 MADAM CHAIR: -- for you to come in today
21 and say --

22 DR. FLORES: Oh, but I --

23 MADAM CHAIR: -- why don't you do an audit?
24 Maybe they're doing an audit. I don't -- let's get their
25 -- let's get their report and then we can ask them



1 questions. Okay? If you want details of what they're
2 doing, but not to question what they're doing --

3 DR. FLORES: I'm getting --

4 MADAM CHAIR: -- at this point. I would
5 just --

6 DR. FLORES: I -- I --

7 MADAM CHAIR: -- I would hope that you would
8 --

9 DR. FLORES: -- well, I have done -- I have
10 done these audits before.

11 MS. MAZANEC: May I --

12 MADAM CHAIR: Pam.

13 DR. FLORES: And --

14 MADAM CHAIR: I'm sorry. Let's move on. I
15 don't -- I didn't mean to hold it up.

16 DR. FLORES: May I finish? May I finish? I
17 just wanted to say that I have done these audits before
18 in schools.

19 MADAM CHAIR: I know. We've all done this,
20 but I'm talking about this particular plan.

21 DR. FLORES: No.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. I'm sorry.

23 DR. FLORES: And I've looked at many plans.

24 MADAM CHAIR: I apologize.

25 DR. FLORES: Sorry.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Pam.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Are they not -- are you not
3 done yet?

4 MADAM CHAIR: I thought they weren't done.

5 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair. No, we've got about
6 three or four more slides to go through real quick.

7 MADAM CHAIR: If we can get through them
8 then we can --

9 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. I can wait.

10 MR. OWEN: Okay.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

12 MR. OWEN: So I think with that, let's turn
13 it over to Mr. Sherman to talk a little bit about some of
14 the supports and then talk about tomorrow, and then we're
15 happy to take any questions.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

17 MR. OWEN: Just one note that I think was
18 brought up, though, was specific to next year, about Dr.
19 Scheffel's question, and if you'll go back one slide,
20 there was some flexibility given to the State Board, to
21 you, to give actions that are of comparable significance
22 and effect, that give you a little bit more discretion
23 next year around these decisions, okay. So for schools,
24 and so just know that that was added into that
25 accountability push that happened in -- I can't remember



1 the bill number but it was a year ago. Okay?

2 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

3 MR. OWEN: 1182? Okay.

4 MR. SHERMAN: Madam Chair.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MR. SHERMAN: I recognize I'm the last
7 speaker, I think, that you have today, and it's been a
8 long day, I'm sure.

9 I just wanted to speak for a few minutes
10 about some of the supports that we, as a Department,
11 provide to the field for both districts and schools that
12 are rated in the Turnaround or Priority Improvement, in
13 particular.

14 We -- as required in statute, across many
15 different offices here in the Department, we provide a
16 lot of technical assistance and support in a variety of
17 different ways. Of course, the goal of that -- the
18 purpose of all of that support is to improve learning for
19 kids as quickly as possible, so to create the conditions
20 in schools and districts where all of our students can
21 learn and can really progress.

22 We coordinate that support across the
23 Department, which is not always -- which is sometimes
24 challenging, but we have a number of mechanisms that we
25 use internally to really try to coordinate so that we



1 know that we have aligned strategies and efforts towards
2 schools and districts.

3 This slide just very quickly talks through a
4 couple of sort of some big pockets of kinds of support
5 that we provide. There are diagnostic reviews and grants
6 to support those. There is an improvement planning
7 process, which you know, through the Unified Improvement
8 Plan. There are implementation supports and grants which
9 might lead to a whole variety of strategies, of
10 professional development, of consultation. Those are
11 selected by local districts and schools.

12 And then we have some specific turnaround
13 support mechanisms and strategies that we've implemented
14 over the last two years, specifically a turnaround
15 network of schools, which I've spoken to you a little bit
16 about in the past. There is a turnaround leader
17 development grant, which we're in the process of
18 implementing for the very first time, and the next couple
19 of slides will give a little bit more detail.

20 So again, another way to parse this out is
21 that we've got some universal supports in the field where
22 we have staff that are working with superintendents and
23 BOCES leaders that are sort of serving as brokers, if you
24 will, or liaisons for a lot of different initiatives
25 coming from the Department, and that these serve as point



1 people for folks in the field.

2 We have Priority Improvement and Turnaround
3 district support, so really working on -- there are
4 diagnostic reviews and evaluations and improvement
5 planning that occurs. There are a variety of different
6 strategies where we bring districts together to provide
7 technical assistance. And a lot of that is focused on
8 building district capacity. We know that at the State we
9 have very specific roles and it's not to go in and sort
10 of lead professional development for teachers or evaluate
11 teachers or do some of that nitty-gritty work that's
12 needed in a lot of the schools. That's the principal's
13 job. That's the district job. So our goal is very much
14 so to create the capacity and build those system within
15 the districts.

16 In our turnaround network and in some of our
17 other more intensive supports we practice a performance
18 measurement, where we are, again, really trying to help
19 folks learn how to look at data, whatever that data may
20 be. It's still varies across the state. But how do they
21 look at that data and really use that to help drive their
22 instruction and their improvement? So we work with
23 districts and schools closely on that.

24 Just a big overview, particularly from my
25 office. Since I've got the mic I get to tell you about



1 what my office is doing. But we, again, have a
2 turnaround network where we're working with nine schools
3 in five different districts this year, very intensively.
4 That's going to expand next year to probably 20 or 22
5 different schools next year.

6 The -- excuse me -- we want to expand that,
7 so that, sort of, have people be able to come on deck, if
8 you will, and be able to expose them to some of the
9 learning that we've done in the network. So we're
10 creating what we're calling a Turnaround Learning
11 Academy, which will expand some of that learning to a
12 wider circle of other folks.

13 And then, as you know, the Turnaround
14 Leadership Development Grant, which both establishes --
15 it's a state-funded initiative which has established
16 funding to develop turnaround leadership providers, and
17 then also to support participants, districts, and charter
18 schools to be able to send both teacher leaders,
19 principals, and district folks to such programs to
20 support their learning, and to build their capacity.

21 And then, finally, just some more specifics
22 on these. I won't walk through them, just in the
23 interest of time. But I wanted to lay out some more
24 specifics. I believe you have this slide on that.

25 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, before Peter talks



1 about tomorrow, one of the quick things I wanted to
2 remind the Board is one of the philosophies underlying
3 the support that the Department provides the schools and
4 districts that are falling into these two lower
5 categories, in alignment with Commissioner Hammond, is
6 that we've tried to really be open about working with
7 people that are willing and want to help. And so some
8 districts absolutely, early on, say, "Hey, listen. Our
9 school fell into this lower category and we would love
10 some support from the Department." They reach out,
11 they're active, and then we try to pull in and see what
12 kind of supports we can provide.

13 There are other districts that say, "We
14 appreciate what you have but right now we're doing this
15 work ourselves and we think we're going to work our way
16 off of this situation." So you have the extremes, I
17 think, in the state of very intensive work and support
18 with school districts, to very little support to school
19 districts, based on what they, locally, want to do
20 specifically to their schools.

21 So I just want to give you that context.
22 It's not like all of these things are happening in every
23 one of the districts, or schools that fall into that
24 category. It's happening where the schools -- the
25 districts want that type of support.



1 And, Madam Chair, here's Peter if you want
2 to have him finish up for tomorrow.

3 MADAM CHAIR: That will be good.

4 MR. SHERMAN: Great. Madam Chair.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MR. SHERMAN: So finally, tomorrow,
7 continuing from what we did last month, there will be
8 four different districts that are coming to present to
9 you, and we just wanted to reiterate the purpose of that.
10 The purpose is really to give the districts an
11 opportunity to share their story, some of their
12 strategies, some of their efforts that they're making, as
13 well as some of their challenges with you, and really an
14 opportunity for all of you to understand better what's
15 happening out in the field.

16 So I see it as an opportunity for you to
17 listen and an opportunity for you to pose challenging
18 questions, if need be, but to really understand what are
19 those districts and schools grappling with and what are
20 their real challenges? Because they wouldn't have been
21 invited had they not had some of those challenges.

22 Some -- per the earlier conversation, some
23 of the districts that come and present will be proactive,
24 I think to one of the questions. Some will come really
25 saying, "Look, we want to be -- we want to get ahead of



1 this, and we are ahead of this, so these are some of the
2 ideas that we have around the pathways." And so I think
3 you'll hear that a little bit tomorrow.

4 Specifically, for the four districts, Aurora
5 Public Schools will start the morning, Greeley-Evans will
6 follow, I think there's a lunch break, and then Pueblo
7 60, and then Denver Public Schools. Some of the
8 questions we might encourage you, and I think you may
9 have copies of these in the packets that we provided, but
10 some highlighted questions I would say are really to ask,
11 "How are your students performing?" "What data do you
12 have to rely on that and to inform you of that?" rather
13 than, you know, "Well, we just know." "How do you know?
14 What is that evidence that folks can share?"

15 "What are some of the root causes of the
16 challenges that you have?" "What are some improvement
17 strategies that you've tried? What's worked? What
18 hasn't worked?" "What are your next steps?" What is
19 your district's capacity to be able to support the low-
20 performing schools you may have or those that may arise
21 or whose performance may drop in coming years? So what
22 is the capacity to be able to manage that, and, if
23 needed, to differentiate support across your schools?"

24 And then "Which of the accountability
25 pathways," that we've outlined here, "are the right ones



1 -- are maybe the right solutions?" And districts may or
2 may not know the answers to that, and some have thought
3 more than others, but I think it would be a fair
4 question.

5 You also have information and presentation
6 materials from each of those districts. I think they've
7 all submitted data and PowerPoint slides that I believe
8 you have. That's all.

9 DR. FLORES: Okay. May I?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Val. I'm sorry. Pam.

11 MS. MAZANEC: (Indiscernible.)

12 DR. FLORES: Thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Oh Pam -- I'm sorry. Pam says
14 I've ignored her.

15 DR. FLORES: No.

16 MS. MAZANEC: I never got to ask my
17 question. Remember? I said I would wait.

18 DR. FLORES: Oh, okay.

19 MADAM CHAIR: See, now I've got a fight.

20 DR. FLORES: And then I'll sum it up.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Pam, go ahead.

23 MS. MAZANEC: And I actually have two
24 questions. The first one is this SchoolWorks, tell me
25 about their role and their expertise, and actually, I'd



1 like to get whatever information we can get, you know, by
2 email or whatever too, on them.

3 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

5 MR. OWEN: I'll let Lisa answer that
6 question. She works closely with SchoolWorks. They're a
7 provider that went through the RFP process to be
8 selected.

9 But what I wanted to just briefly comment on
10 is we thought it might be helpful to pass out the
11 pathways document that Peter's office created with the
12 AG's office, that shows what the options are for schools
13 and districts. It's very handy, I think, and really
14 tries to take this complex law and break it down in a
15 clear -- as clear as we can manner. And he was going to
16 bring his big charts but I don't think he brought it
17 today.

18 And the second document is a document that
19 Lisa put together, that's about the State Review Panel,
20 and talks about their role, what's required in statute,
21 and the composition of the State Review Panel, and would,
22 I think, be helpful to answer some of those questions as
23 well.

24 But, Lisa, would you quickly answer the
25 question about -- specific to SchoolWorks?



1

2 MS. MEDLER: Sure. Madam Chair.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, please.

4 MS. MEDLER: Okay. So SchoolWorks, their
5 role, the role that asked this vendor to come on to do is
6 to -- essentially to recruit and manage the panelists
7 themselves, so that CDE was not being seen as cherry-
8 picking or selecting these folks.9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, Lisa. I'm
10 sorry. Recruit?

11 MS. MEDLER: They're recruiting --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: State panelists?

13 MS. MEDLER: Mm-hmm.

14 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, to help clarify --

15 MS. MEDLER: So, and I can --

16 MR. OWEN: -- that, I just would add that
17 there are specific -- and I don't know if it's on your
18 sheet -- there are specific requirements that they have
19 to look at to try to -- to get broad expertise across the
20 state of Colorado. But keep in mind, the State Review
21 Panel passed was volunteers that just -- a lot of arm-
22 twisting to get people that would be willing to even do
23 the work, because there was -- there's no compensation
24 for the individuals that were doing this work.

25 So an example, like an academic officer in a



1 school district, a superintendent would say, "Can you
2 spare somebody to be a part of this?" and then they would
3 say, "Sure," and then would bring that list of people to
4 you every year to get approved. I think there's a small
5 amount of compensation, honorarium, now that's available,
6 because of legislation that was passed, that allows us to
7 at least, I think, honor some of the time that the State
8 Review panelists put into this work. But you want to --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Keith, and I should
10 know this, but do they have a different panel for each
11 school or is it one big panel?

12 MS. MEDLER: So I -- I'll answer -- I'll
13 start with your question and then I'll go back --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, I'm sorry.

15 MS. MEDLER: No, that's okay. There's -- I
16 realize we haven't really had a lot of time to date to
17 talk about the panel, so I'm sure you guys have a lot of
18 questions.

19 The panel is about 50 individuals at this
20 point. When they are assigned to a school or a district
21 it's usually about a team of two, depending on the size
22 of the school or the district. And that's for the
23 document review and that is for the site visit as well.
24 When a site visit is occurring, somebody from SchoolWorks
25 or from CDE will go just to answer questions and make



1 sure the process is going smoothly but not to actually
2 conduct the interviews or collect information.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Pam.

4 MS. MEDLER: To answer your question, so for
5 the recruiting process, you know, SchoolWorks came on
6 this past year, so we started with the returning
7 panelists and see who -- you know, wanted to see who was
8 interesting in still continuing, but then also put out
9 information in professional publications to say, "Hey,
10 here's this opportunity. Here's what's needed." So it
11 really was a recruiting process, and like you said, we do
12 have at least a small amount of compensation and can pay
13 for their travel.

14 So the -- SchoolWorks is in charge of
15 recruiting them, training them, in partnership with CDE,
16 about the process and about the protocols that have been
17 designed. We have worked in partnership with the
18 organization to design those protocols in advance, so
19 that we have consistency when reviews are happening,
20 whether it's on paper or in person during those site
21 visits. They have a set of questions that they're
22 working from, again, based on that criteria that was laid
23 out in the law. So that is really the organizing
24 framework for any of the protocols.

25 MS. MAZANEC: So does SchoolWorks have



1 experience in doing this exact kind of thing, exact kind
2 of work in other states?

3 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

5 MS. MEDLER: I will say yes, to some extent,
6 and no, to some extent. No because the State Review
7 Panel and this accountability system is unique to
8 Colorado, honestly, and so we -- when we put out the RFP
9 we were looking for expertise in designing state
10 accountability systems, as well as getting in and doing
11 site visits, diagnostic review type work in schools,
12 specifically. And so SchoolWorks met both of those
13 criteria. There were a few other organizations that
14 applied that had similar background, but in the end
15 SchoolWorks really was able to put together the most
16 efficient plan to get up to speed quickly and get in and
17 do the work.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Just one more quick question.
19 It's kind of different. But I know that we have closed
20 schools, right. There's been schools that have been
21 closed in the past -- not under this system. But have we
22 ever tracked -- do we track the performance of students
23 that come out of those closed schools when they move to
24 another school? Do we track that performance at all, or
25 is it just -- do we know what happens to those kids?



1 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

3 MR. OWEN: I don't know if Lisa has a little
4 bit more context, and this is something that we can
5 certainly have Alisa talk to if we wanted to do a little
6 bit of follow-up. We get an indication when schools are
7 being closed through the school code process, so they'll
8 submit a closure, but that's a local decision. And then
9 sometimes it's because of a facility, a physical plant.
10 Other times they're consolidating schools or they're
11 having to -- having a declining enrollment so they'll
12 make some decisions. Some of them for performance, in
13 some school districts.

14 The CDE take a look at all of the school
15 codes that come in as closure and then do an analysis of
16 where those kids went. To track their performance? I
17 don't think so. I'd have to double-check. I think Alisa
18 did do a study about some of these schools and the impact
19 of school closures, so I could talk with her some more
20 and get back with you about that. But I don't think it's
21 a thing that we do statewide.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Sometimes districts do it.

23 MR. OWEN: Yeah, sure. I would imagine that
24 a district would certainly track that.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Val.



1 DR. FLORES: Yes. Thank you. I just wanted
2 to say that, you know, you should -- I think the state
3 should do it. I don't know why the state isn't doing it.
4 I mean, the state should do it.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Do what?

6 DR. FLORES: Have teams of people that go
7 out into the schools --

8 MADAM CHAIR: They do.

9 DR. FLORES: -- to -- no, they don't. They
10 hire out. And what has happened -- I don't know -- is
11 something happened that they don't trust the Department,
12 these --

13 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Owen.

15 MR. OWEN: We absolutely do have staff that
16 are in schools every day. So we do have teams that go
17 out, do diagnostic reviews, they do unified recruitment
18 planning processes. So we do have a lot of our staff in
19 schools, throughout all the units, almost every day.

20 DR. FLORES: Well, I know you do -- you
21 know, you do the data thing, which is, I think, you know,
22 I think the Department, everybody's been doing data, big
23 data, for 20 years. And I go back --

24 MADAM CHAIR: But we're talking about this
25 specific program.



1 DR. FLORES: No, we are. We are. I'm
2 getting to it.

3 MADAM CHAIR: So don't --

4 DR. FLORES: You never let me finish my
5 thoughts.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Well, why are you talking
7 about 20 years of, you know.

8 DR. FLORES: We are talking about --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Stick with this program.

10 DR. FLORES: I am sticking with it.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. I'm sorry.

12 DR. FLORES: And I'm saying that it's based
13 on structural, you know, structural --

14 MADAM CHAIR: So you're saying we should
15 change the program?

16 DR. FLORES: -- and big data. I'm saying
17 that that's what it's been based on and that's why you
18 have not been -- that's where we are. I mean -- and it's
19 not a failure, and I think it should be from here, from
20 here, meaning from the Department. And we know that
21 reform, these 20-some-odd years, have been a failure, or
22 else we wouldn't have what we have right now. The
23 philosophy of reform is out. It's structuralist. It's
24 based on data, and not that data, cannot give us
25 information, but when it's based just on data, we need to



1 start working with a culture of those schools, and
2 they're not the same. They're all different. And I
3 think that's what's missing.

4 When we go in, when a team goes in, really,
5 it should be somebody who knows about the money, somebody
6 who knows about -- who really knows about the policy, and
7 by policy I mean the administration, a supervisor who
8 knows about teachers, training, what needs to be in their
9 like tools that they're missing or may not be using,
10 awareness of curriculum that can change, or different
11 curricula that can be used, you know, for different
12 children. Because I'm sure they don't have the same
13 children --

14 MADAM CHAIR: We really need to move on.

15 DR. FLORES: -- within a culture. I'm just
16 saying that --

17 MADAM CHAIR: No. We need to move on.

18 DR. FLORES: -- I'm giving you -- this costs
19 a lot of money, what I'm telling you, and what I'm
20 telling you. This is a lot of money.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

22 DR. FLORES: And I'm giving it to you for
23 free.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

25 DR. FLORES: So --



1 MADAM CHAIR: Let's move on.

2 DR. FLORES: I'm telling you what -- if you

3 --

4 MADAM CHAIR: Deb.

5 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, just --

6 DR. FLORES: I needed to say that.

7 MR. OWEN: -- could I do a quick response?

8 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

9 MR. OWEN: Just that maybe we need to spend
10 a little bit more time with you, Dr. Flores, and really
11 outline the supports and the involvement, because all the
12 things you mentioned we are involved with, and we do have
13 staff out in schools doing all those things that you
14 brought up.

15 MADAM CHAIR: And I know you've spent a lot
16 of time with Peter.

17 DR. FLORES: I spent just an hour with
18 Peter. I'm going to spend more time.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

20 MR. OWEN: And we can certainly go through
21 that in more depth with you.

22 DR. FLORES: I think --

23 MADAM CHAIR: But you're asking him to
24 change their whole program they've been working on five
25 years.



1 DR. FLORES: That's right.

2 MADAM CHAIR: And you're basically telling
3 them they did it wrong.

4 DR. FLORES: Because it isn't working.

5 MADAM CHAIR: But anyway --

6 DR. FLORES: And they need some addition --

7 MADAM CHAIR: -- well, that's beside the
8 point. I'm sorry.

9 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, just quick, to the
10 point of the State Review Panel, is that the purpose that
11 we interpret it, from statute, and I think it was fairly
12 laid out in statute, is it's independent of the
13 Department for a reason. The Department will give you
14 recommendations that will go through the Commissioner to
15 you, but the State Review Panel is supposed to be
16 specifically outside of the Department, to give you kind
17 of third-party, independent evaluation of the performance
18 of a school and a district, that will help inform you.

19 Sometimes I would imagine that the
20 recommendations out of that panel and the state will be
21 the same, but I could imagine there would be times when
22 they're different. And so the purpose that was written
23 into that statute was really that third-party piece.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Anybody else?

25 DR. FLORES: And one last comment. I think



1 you guys are very skilled, just very -- there's great
2 capacity in this Department, and I think it can be done.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Deb.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: All right. Thank you. Can
5 you just answer a couple of questions? The State Review
6 Panel visit, is that in Year 5, or is it -- when is it?

7 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

9 MS. MEDLER: Yeah, the way we've designed it
10 at this point, because of limited funds we are scheduling
11 the visits now just as schools and districts are about to
12 enter Year 5 on the clock.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how long are they in the
14 schools, to have a sense of what -- how they might create
15 recommendations?

16 MS. MEDLER: Madam Chair.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

18 MS. MEDLER: So we -- they are in schools
19 and districts for approximately a day and a half, to
20 carry out all the protocols. Now that does include site
21 visits into the classrooms but then also interviews and
22 focus groups with staff, local board leadership.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so if you can envision a
24 school or district that had a recent State Review Panel
25 visit -- I saw the language that you put up, Peter,



1 about, you know, what are the kinds of supports -- but if
2 you were to track, let's say -- I mean, is there a
3 district or school that had a recent State Review Panel
4 visit that you could envision? What would it look like
5 if you made a list of, for the past four years, we did
6 this, this, this? I mean, I saw the language but I don't
7 know what it means, you know, when there's like a
8 development of principal supervision. Like what does
9 that look like? Screening and vetting turnaround
10 leadership -- what does that look like?

11 So, I mean, you know, is there a district or
12 school that just had a recent visit? Would it be
13 possible to come up with a list and say, "They're in Year
14 5, they just had a one-and-a-half-day State Review Panel
15 visit. These are all the things we actually did. We
16 called them. We went out there. We did a webinar. We
17 sent five people to this training." I mean, how does it
18 really look?

19 And why am I asking the question? Because
20 I'd like to know that they would feel they really had
21 substantive help and not just in Year 5 when the State
22 Review Panel came, you know, because that's a little
23 late, right? And so what does it really look like?

24 MS. MEDLER: So, Madam Chair --

25 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.



1 MS. MEDLER: -- can I respond and then I'd
2 like to hand it over to Peter. And I think this is
3 confusing because it's been confusing for us and it's
4 been confusing for the field. That State Review Panel is
5 solely in there to provide -- to gather information and
6 provide a recommendation to you. Their job is not to
7 provide technical assistance. They are not in there to
8 provide support. So while we're recruiting experts that
9 understand this, their job is not to fix it. It's just
10 to say, "You've been given these supports and you've had
11 this amount of time. This has worked. This hasn't
12 worked. This is what we think are next steps. This is
13 our recommendation."

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when we receive that body
15 of information we'll receive their recommendation, based
16 on one-and-a-half days, and then we would have a list of
17 the 25 things you've done for four years. Is that right?

18 MR. HAMMOND: Madam Chair.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

20 MR. HAMMOND: Dr. Scheffel, yes, we have
21 ways that we're documenting the supports that we're
22 providing to districts and to schools. What I didn't
23 show you today is, you know, we don't have a slide that
24 says, you know, on day one this is exactly what you get,
25 all the way up for the five-year continuum, because it



1 varies, and it varies, as Dr. Owen said earlier, by the
2 district's willingness and interest in working with us,
3 and it also, of course, varies by the context and the
4 size, et cetera.

5 We -- there are about 180 schools that are
6 on the accountability clock. We don't have the capacity
7 to work with each of those individually. That's sort of
8 the theory of action of our turnaround network is to work
9 with a very small group but much more intensively, where
10 we believe that we can really impact the way that the
11 district supports those schools.

12 Do we want to work with more schools? Of
13 course, but we -- yes, we can and we do track the kinds
14 of supports that we provide to folks over that period of
15 time. And I think that that includes, Dr. Flores, to
16 some of your questions, it includes formal diagnostics,
17 informal diagnostics and visits, and giving feedback. It
18 includes some data analysis and interpretation, because
19 we know the frameworks are challenging, and it includes
20 classroom walkthroughs, it includes feedback about school
21 culture and climate, about sort of all of the academic
22 systems around talent management, about hiring and
23 supervision and evaluation, and it also includes things
24 like operations of schools and district support for
25 schools, which involve finances and human resources and a



1 whole slew of different kinds of systems.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Jane.

4 MS. GOFF: I think it's connected to that,
5 to go back towards the beginning (indiscernible). Tell
6 me -- help me again. When the Review Panel makes a
7 recommendation to the Board, is that the point, just the
8 making of the recommendation then triggers
9 reaccreditation? It's at that moment or does something
10 have to happen first to put -- to create the
11 qualifications for meeting the criteria of whatever
12 category we settle on? Because that was a little
13 unclear. I think -- is there a cross-path of
14 requirements or are we acting more on kind of a pre-
15 incentive, you know, this will get better and you will be
16 at that point? I just lost that in my head.

17 MR. OWEN: Yeah, sure. Madam Chair, so I
18 think the way that we've set this up is that you're going
19 to get information from districts early, like you've been
20 doing, so getting context about what they -- the things
21 they're working on. That was purposeful, so that when
22 you are faced with making these final decisions you at
23 least, I think, have some exposure to the work, the
24 people, and the context of where they're at.

25 The State Review Panel recommendations and



1 the Commissioner's recommendations, we see those coming
2 to you simultaneously, before the State Board meeting,
3 where you would take action on those school districts, so
4 that you can read them, review them, and you might want
5 to meet with them and then deliberate and then make a
6 decision the next month. And so we'll lay that process
7 out for you, our recommendation on what the process would
8 look like.

9 Part of what's, I think, a little bit of a
10 challenge right now is because of the assessment switch
11 and, you know, what's going on with accountability and
12 how we're going to utilize those -- that data to run
13 frameworks, there is some delay that's going to happen
14 because of the switch to the new assessment and our
15 ability to utilize that information and make frameworks
16 is going to be a challenge over the next year. So we
17 hope to have a new school performance framework for the
18 State Board 2016, but before that's ready, though, some
19 of these questions will be coming to you, and you're
20 going to have to use the information that's been there
21 before and where the district's currently at.

22 So July 1 is the trigger in each year for
23 action to have happened, and what we're envisioning is
24 that we start those discussion January, February, leading
25 up to July 1, so that by July 1 you've made your



1 decision, the district's had an opportunity to reflect on
2 the conditions you've placed, make their own actions,
3 back to you, and then agreement to form so that you could
4 reinstate accreditation immediately so the district would
5 never lose it, if you had agreement. Does that make
6 sense?

7 So the timing is all leading up to July 1 of
8 each year. We envision that this would be more of a
9 conversation that takes place in the winter, early spring
10 of each calendar year.

11 MS. GOFF: Well, under the ideal situation
12 there would be fewer and fewer districts and/or school
13 conversations to be had, firstly, if the people across
14 the street would cut their lists down of things they want
15 to do, and we would have an opportunity to really focus
16 on that. But it is, it's tricky right now. It's very
17 transition-y, all over the place. But thank you for the
18 answer. It helps me center my head.

19 MR. OWEN: Sure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, guys. I
21 have one quick request. I think what I'd love to see is
22 I'm always thinking about the human nature factor, right.
23 We're trying to drive reform, top down, right, looking at
24 some pretty negative consequences for these schools.

25 Question -- if we had a list of these



1 schools or districts, or I guess and districts, would
2 some have not received hardly any visits or supports
3 prior to this State Review Panel and others have gotten
4 ten things on the list that was done? And probably it
5 would be like that, right? So, I mean, human nature
6 suggests that if you know somebody, you've been to their
7 school, and you want to help them, you'd be -- I mean,
8 that creates kind of a have-and-have-not situation, not,
9 you know, implicitly, probably not on purpose, but just
10 because you don't have the resources to go help all these
11 schools. Probably some have a real window on what do we
12 need to do to fix this problem. Others haven't had a
13 visit, haven't had much support. And so, you know, the
14 indirect outcome is that, hey, we're really not getting
15 much help until the fifth year, and we're not going to
16 make it.

17 And so I'm just wondering, you know, at some
18 point to have a list of who got visited before that
19 fifth-year State Review Panel, how much help is it, how
20 dissociated is it -- not to, you know, create negativity
21 but just to -- that's human nature. When you know a
22 school and a culture you're likely to give them the clues
23 to come out of their current situation. Others may be
24 floundering and they might say, "Hey, we haven't heard
25 from CDE. We're in Year 5 and we don't know what to do."



1 So anyway, it'd just be good to see that
2 dissonance.

3 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Owen.

5 MR. OWEN: You -- I think you would -- Dr.
6 Scheffel, I think you would absolutely hear that from
7 schools.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's kind of what I'm
9 hearing from the field.

10 MR. OWEN: And I think that's part of being
11 in a local control state. You've got some school
12 districts that feel like this is their responsibility,
13 they don't want any support from the Department. Every
14 year we send out a notice to all the districts that fall
15 into this category, that have schools in these
16 categories, outlining the opportunities for support, and
17 then we also follow up with visits to the lowest-
18 performing schools and districts in the state and sit
19 down with them and explain the supports. We do have
20 schools and districts that have chosen not to partake in
21 that.

22 Now the challenging part, I think, is going
23 to be is you're going to have some schools coming to you
24 saying we've never had the Department or we've never had
25 support, and they don't even know that that was available



1 to them through their district. You've got a
2 superintendent or a school board that's made a decision
3 not to have that kind of support, while I school might be
4 saying "I would love that." And we've found that through
5 Peter's Turnaround Network, which is going down into
6 schools, is that they're getting some access to
7 information that they've never been able to get through
8 their district.

9 So you will get that spectrum, without a
10 doubt, in my opinion, and I think you'll hear a lot of
11 schools and districts talking about things that the
12 Department should have done, that they should have got,
13 and I think you're going to have to go back and look at
14 the evidence of what was provided to you, the
15 opportunities for you to engage, and then I think local
16 school boards and superintendents are going to have to be
17 accountable for decisions they've made. And some have
18 made decisions to absolutely say "we've got this" and
19 others have really engaged.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Good point. Thank you.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Peter.

22 MR. SHERMAN: Madam Chair, just to follow
23 up, also, Dr. Scheffel. I'd be happy to share with you
24 more information about the kinds of supports across the
25 Department that are provided, and we can try to pull that



1 together.

2 But I also wanted to just point out the
3 comment about, you know, some of these pathways that you
4 see up here, to some out in the field may feel punitive
5 and may seem like, okay, this is something that's
6 happening to us. I want you to know that the language
7 that we use very consistently over the last several years
8 has been out to the field that, sure, if you want to --
9 if you -- if you see it that way, that that is the way
10 that it may come, but these are also opportunities. I
11 think if you were to look at any of the supports that my
12 office or other offices in the Department provide out to
13 the field, they're linked to some of those pathways.

14 And, you know, so some of those may be parts
15 of the solutions to those districts or some of the
16 components of what districts or schools need to improve
17 on can be found within those, and I think that's part of
18 the challenge that you all have is to be able to sort of
19 home in on what that might be.

20 Certainly there -- you know, to some there's
21 a very consequential punitive tone to it, but I think
22 there also -- there's also an opportunistic tone. Thank
23 you.

24 DR. FLORES: May --

25 MADAM CHAIR: If we -- just a moment -- if



1 someone were to say that to us tomorrow, like, you know,
2 gee, nobody's ever been to visit us, would you correct
3 that or would you just let them --

4 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MR. OWEN: We've tried not to interject
7 ourselves into the presentations that you're getting. I
8 think there will be a time and opportunity when you're
9 faced with these tough decisions to get that factual
10 information from the Department about what has and hasn't
11 happened. But we've really tried to let that be your
12 conversation with the school districts and not be fact-
13 finders and try to really, you know --

14 MADAM CHAIR: And I totally agree, but I
15 also think what you said about them -- some of them not
16 knowing that you had offered, or, you know, that someone
17 else turned you down and said, "No, we don't need you,"
18 it would be kind of an awkward situation. I just
19 wondered if we'd have a chance to get that clear -- not
20 that it matters. I just was curious about that.

21 MR. OWEN: Sure.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate.

23 DR. FLORES: Madam Chair.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

25 DR. FLORES: I just wanted to say that



1 engagement -- I know I've said that word a lot, but it
2 means so many different things. I mean, I know that in
3 my culture we have -- I -- it's very important to
4 personalize interpersonal relationships, and I really
5 don't know if that's part of being -- having grown up in
6 a rural area or part of my Mexican heritage, or being
7 brought up in South Texas. But it's very important to my
8 family, to how I grew up, to personalize those personal
9 relationships. And I think that's kind of a tricky
10 thing.

11 I know that there are -- you have these
12 meetings with these administrators when they come in, and
13 I know that that's a very positive, probably for all of
14 you, in order to personalize, you know, these
15 interpersonal relationships. And I think if you went at
16 it kind of in that way, I don't know, it's the same with
17 children. I mean, I think that administrators and
18 teachers have to engage those kids, and the research
19 shows that those cultures, those schools and districts
20 where there is engagement by -- where people care that
21 you didn't come to school, and they tell you, and they
22 become, you know, these personal relationships, that that
23 has to be.

24 And then there's also all that research from
25 -- I'm trying to think of the psychiatrist in Harvard --



1 anyway, where he talks about that all schools, even the
2 janitor, has to personalize interpersonal relationships
3 with teacher and students and such, so that all kids feel
4 that somebody there at that school cares about them. And
5 I think that's so much more important. I know data is
6 important, of course, but these other, the culture part
7 of it is so important as well. My two cents.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Anybody else?

9 Thank you very much. Very informative.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 (Meeting adjourned)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of January, 2019.

/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