



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
April 13, 2016, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 13, 2016, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Start with -- I am --

2 MS. FLORES: We have had more people.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're gonna -- the way
4 we're gonna do this is -- we're gonna start with Item 11,
5 Commissioner's report. And then we're gonna proceed out of
6 order for 14.06 and 14.08 because there are people who are -
7 -

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- here planning to
10 testify. So Mr. Crandall, if you want to start with the --

11 MR. CRANDALL: The PowerPoint. This is --
12 this is good too.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

14 MR. CRANDALL: They are pointing up now?
15 Please. Board Members, just let you know that -- whenever
16 we finish State Board Meeting, either immediately after or
17 the -- the next day, we have a quick debriefing. All of the
18 employees that had anything to do with the meeting, we went
19 upstairs in my office, we sit around make sure that -- and
20 okay, what information to this Board Member need? Who's --
21 who's responsibility is that? You've received in your
22 inbox, this little form right here. And it's the -- it's
23 from the last Board meeting simply says what -- what was the
24 Board Member's request? Who is it assignment to? And where
25 is it in that status? We're gonna see most of the things



1 from the last Board meeting that completed. Like for
2 example, listed above the school finance discussion on the
3 CDE website.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. (Inaudible).

5 MR. CRANDALL: They're gonna handle that, and
6 here's the link to it. So you'll -- you'll see that in your
7 inbox.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Folder, your email?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Email?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. You know, that
11 about an hour.

12 MR. CRANDALL: This is just a status report
13 from last Board meeting and all the things. Will create a
14 new one of these tomorrow at noon based on this Board
15 meeting.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. CRANDALL: Just to make you aware of
18 that.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Remind us of what we said.
20 That's an excellent idea, giving a short-term memory.

21 MR. CRANDALL: It may have seemed unfair.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Some things done there.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: What?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It seems unfair.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: I told her. Keep tape
2 back.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Just in case you're
5 thinking about.

6 MR. CRANDALL: Okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: I know.

8 MR. CRANDALL: I wanna share with you, I had
9 a -- I had a wonderful opportunity to visit with the Joint
10 House and Senate Education Committee and then the Joint
11 Budget Committee this morning to talk about just K-12
12 education in Colorado and where we want to go under ESSA. I
13 appreciate so much the big conversations we've had this
14 morning. We talked about accountability. We talked about
15 assessments. We talked about, you know, waivers that play
16 into that. That is -- it's important conversation, and so I
17 want to -- I wanna go through this kind of quickly, just so
18 you understand where I'm coming from, and hopefully, it
19 doesn't align with you as my boss also.

20 This last Tuesday, an opportunity to be in
21 the room with Lamar Alexander. Kitty you were there, yes.
22 Kitty was there with Gretchen. And he said guys, "The next
23 12 months we'll determine what your education system looks
24 like for the next 15 years." And we truly do as you've
25 heard a couple times here today. We have tremendous



1 flexibility under ESSA to do what fits Colorado's needs. We
2 have standards review coming up in 17-18. So I mean, we
3 have a new assessment system coming up, we'll talk more
4 about that, but we have a critical decision-maker.
5 Remember, this was being made to the lawmakers as well as us
6 here.

7 Number one, we wanna be a low-skill, low-wage
8 state. Believe it or not, there are states who whether on
9 purpose or not have this strategy. They wanted be the mecca
10 to call centers of low-cost, low-wage manufacturing, things
11 like that. I am after having lived here now for 90 days. I
12 do not think Colorado has any interest in being a low-skill,
13 low-wage state driving our economy. I appreciate that.
14 Because we want high-skill and high-wage. We truly want to
15 be the number one state for work, play, and life. But here
16 is what matters. That doesn't happen by accident. Low-
17 skill, low-wage does happen by accident, you do nothing.
18 And that's -- that's where you end up. To go the other
19 direction is -- the hard work, the hard lifting we were
20 talking about and doing today, tough decisions, best
21 interests of kids. And I even throw up the word humility up
22 there because I know I have some positions that I'm gonna
23 have to change, you know, maybe bills I passed, the things I
24 believed in passionately that I realize may not fit in a
25 long-term high achieving, high benchmark vision.



1 Real faster, most important thing, I want
2 lawmakers to understand is that education we -- we really
3 hit on that earlier today. It's a very slow process and
4 it's not till the end of ten years. When you look back and
5 you say, wow, look at all we've achieved or wow why did we
6 do something different ten years ago. And so we're
7 frustrated that we can't have new assessment next month. We
8 can have new accountability in the next two months. It
9 takes time and it's a very slow-moving ship. But if you do
10 it right, at the end of five, ten years, it's incredible. I
11 just want to show Colorado does many, many things very well
12 in the K-12 space. This is just one of them, this is 15
13 years data, the AP for five courses, so ten years ago, five
14 years ago last year. The blue is the test that was given,
15 let's say the computer science, come into --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Number of tests.

17 MR. CRANDALL: Number of tests, I'm sorry,
18 number of tests that were given and then the red is the
19 number who passed. Interesting because there are certain
20 ones we're doing well. It's fun that CALC-AP were so high.
21 High numbers. And just once again, congratulations to
22 Denver being the number one AP district in the world. That
23 was a huge accomplishment. Statistic something
24 interestingly. The rate of growth in the number of tests is



1 far outpacing the passing grade on these number of tests.

2 So interesting things there.

3 And then of course computer science such
4 potential. You may have seen my Thursday thought two weeks
5 ago. There's the brand new computer science principles AP
6 class. The computer science class right here -- there
7 reference is a very high-level and you're going to be a
8 programmer, that's who takes that class. They realize that
9 the rest of the world wants to take the class and teach us
10 about computers, the internet, and things like that and
11 they've come up with that new course. Important point here,
12 I love this. I use this quote all the time from Mackenzie.
13 This -- the greatest perks of Colorado is gonna be around
14 our teachers. In top performing countries, it's the highly
15 qualified teacher in front of all students.

16 I -- I truly believe this is the greatest
17 threat because all the things that we want to do around
18 apprenticeships, AP, IB -- anything without a great teacher
19 in classroom is just not gonna happen. This was the scary
20 chart, number of kids who are going into education. I'm
21 shuffling, I'm sure. You could have some conversations
22 about this. This is not a, not good sign for the future if
23 we really need high quality teachers in the classroom. So
24 teachers number one, here's our number two concern.



1 Okay, and this -- this is really where the
2 rubber meets the road. If I get straight A's, I have a 4.0,
3 I get a high school diploma and the school gets paid. I get
4 D's a 1.0, I get a high school diploma and the school gets
5 paid. Even worse -- actually, a little extra money. Until
6 this, I call this the perverse incentive until this is
7 fixed. We will never be the top performing state in the
8 country. Top performing in the world, when a school gets
9 paid regardless of the output of their product. It's very
10 hard to overcome that. In fact, it's almost impossible to
11 overcome that.

12 Another big issue we have here is zip codes
13 that determines way too much in Colorado. These two things
14 are not unique to Colorado. But if we want to be the number
15 one state in the country, we're gonna have to find solutions
16 to these long-term. It was -- it was tough to listen to
17 Kevin Shot. He and I had a long phone call last week. What
18 school district is he? About 60-70 miles out east on I-70.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kevin Shot.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kevin Shot.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Deer Park?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Deer Field.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it Deer Trail?

24 MR. CRANDALL: Deer Trail. Deer Trail. He
25 said, "I will offer free housing, utilities, \$3,000 signing



1 bonus, come into the salary schedule plus five, four-day
2 week, an hour and ten minutes from Denver, and I will not
3 find the single qualified math teacher to come to our
4 district. There's too few of them".

5 So even with that package, he cannot find
6 them. So it's -- it's a tough conversation when we consider
7 all the things that we're talking about. Things I've just
8 observed the first 90 days in Colorado, we are in a
9 fantastic situation to -- we have all the pieces in place to
10 be number one, really just kind of organize them a little
11 bit. And I did, I really do believe this. I love the State
12 Board's attitude toward innovation and waivers. The ability
13 to grant districts and schools, the freedom to do big
14 things. That's -- that's a very, very strong signal where
15 the opinion of the Board is.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are just having a
17 hard time hearing you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry. I just trying,
19 it's getting closer.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Okay, so it's a little
21 hard to hear.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Going closer. Closer,
23 right in front.

24 MR. CRANDALL: Moving forward here. What
25 will it take to be number one? This is the work we have



1 ahead of us for the next year. An education system based on
2 performance and mastery. As I just said, we can no longer
3 allow student to get a D minus in first grade, and move
4 forward. D minus second grade, D minus third. All the way
5 through high school. It doesn't work. Students need to be
6 able to try a task, retry it, retry it again until they
7 master that then they move on.

8 The good news is NCSL took 40 lawmakers over
9 the last two years. These are four right, four left. They
10 have been meeting once a quarter across the United States.
11 They will take different places, different experts come in.
12 In the August, they're rolling up their plan of what this
13 might look like, a performance-based mastery system. At
14 their national conference in Chicago, they're rolling that
15 out. Funding model right here that is focused on outcomes.
16 My vision of what I, what I kind of heard is that there'll
17 be a base level, then we've got some specific buckets for
18 ELL, special needs, minority, low income. Then you've got
19 incentives. Here's the big one. We've got to find a way --

20 MS. FLORES: Can just I stop you? For
21 specific categories then rewards for desired outcomes, do
22 schools who are already performing high, do they need
23 rewards?

24 MR. CRANDALL: Are they well -- I would say
25 yes because do we know if they're performing at their



1 highest potential. The phrase that I always use is -- it is
2 not enough for a district to be performing at the level of
3 its demographics. What I mean is if I have middle income
4 kids do I perform at the level I would expect to middle
5 income. That's not good enough.

6 MS. FLORES: It isn't. But you also have
7 high needs areas or high needs schools, that really do need
8 help, and they need to be incentivized to possibly even pay
9 teachers more. And --

10 MR. CRANDALL: That's up to --

11 MS. FLORES: The rewards for desired incomes
12 doesn't say --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Outcomes.

14 MS. FLORES: It doesn't say these are high-
15 achieving kids. That's usually how it is.

16 MR. CRANDALL: No, no, no. What that means
17 is incentivize the behavior we want. If we want kids who
18 can't read to learn to read for the great job with
19 incentivizing reading by third grade, and got some
20 incredible results out of that. I -- I hear what you're
21 saying now, not that we will incentivize at all different
22 levels.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I'm sorry.

24 MR. CRANDALL: An assessment system that
25 measures performance and mastery. There is not in the



1 United States currently, New Hampshire's toying with it.
2 There is not a good assessment system out there, right now.
3 All of them take months to get the results back. All of
4 them are at the end of the year. Far removed from the
5 classroom, the model that we want, we will develop during
6 the years as a pilot assessment. We will be one of the
7 seven states that gets to put together, the next generation
8 of assessments we're gonna or pilot those -- closer to the
9 instruction, some competency based, go the direction that
10 you talked about earlier this morning, Dr. Flores.

11 There's a -- there's a great book now 40
12 years old called the Game of Work, and it asks the question
13 why are you willing to go golfing in 110 degrees. Why are
14 you willing to go snow skiing in minus 20 degrees. Play
15 four hours of basketball and things like that. And the
16 point is, is because of how rapidly you get the feedback.
17 You know within four seconds, if you're a good golfer or a
18 bad golfer, you may even know faster than that. Our -- our
19 assessments system needs to give students that kind of
20 feedback to know if they're there, that's why video games
21 are so popular with a large number of kids, they know
22 instantly and then they get to try again. And that's not
23 how our system model works at all. Accountability model
24 that incentivizes desired outcomes.



1 And then finally, we call it Wicked Student
2 Engagement. Today's kids are not gonna sit there and face
3 the front of the classroom with a textbook and get much out
4 of it. There are so many things that we could, we could
5 work with the districts to build into this. Let's talk
6 timing for a minute. I -- I'm little disappointed at how
7 long it's gonna take but I understand why to get the rules
8 out. So as you know, they're negotiated rulemaking right
9 now. There are several areas where they're just not coming
10 to agreement. The U.S. Department of Ed is drafting rules
11 simultaneously. They'll be out for public comments, and I
12 think we're thinking July-August, could be as early as June.

13 Parts of it, but they'll be out for a 60-day
14 public comment period, that the department get them back.
15 We expect them to be out about November or December. Even
16 the rules for the pilot assessment, we will open those will
17 be out in July, and we can put in our application in
18 October. It will come out the same timeframe. One of the
19 things we'd like to do is as a department and very closely
20 with the Board is work on a state plan for education.

21 What is Colorado's vision for education?
22 We're required by law to go out and listen to every single
23 group out there, far right, far left, parents charters,
24 organizations, that you would normally even equate with --
25 with education. All of those groups need to have input into



1 our state plan that we will turn in April-May-June of 2017.
2 Here's our -- here's our plan. Right now, we're gonna do
3 some quick listening, May or June, all over the state and
4 not the CDE, there's multiple groups out there doing PD --
5 AFCD had one last week that they put together, kind of on
6 their own, PBC is doing some things, and then all your
7 different alphabet groups were doing.

8 Well, what we're gonna do is we're gonna take
9 all the comments we received for the first 60 days, put into
10 a document, we're calling it a working -- a working plan,
11 distribute that working plan across the state both via a
12 web, electronically, and hard copy, and say this is what
13 we're hearing, give us your specific individual feedback.
14 Is this -- do you think people are right for what we're
15 hearing wrong. What would you want to see in this plan? Do
16 that for all of -- we're doing for July and August, collect
17 those in September, then have a statewide summit around ESSA
18 in October, where we layout, have an almost like a finalized
19 draft that we would present in October. We then have it
20 open for comment for another couple of months because then
21 we would turn it into U.S. Department of Ed in March-April-
22 May.

23 The point we want to make to everyone -- I
24 want to make lots and lots of opportunity for comment for
25 everybody. All of your constituents, those you agree with



1 or those you don't will have lots of opportunities to know
2 what this plan looks like. And then it goes to, and correct
3 me if I say it wrong, it does come before the State Board
4 for their final approval. And the Governor's office also
5 has a chance to wait. Most important point I made at the
6 end is -- the reason I came to Colorado was because Colorado
7 is positioned to be the top performing state in the country.
8 Not a lot of the states have those pieces in place. So
9 let's aim for the top. Do that part. Mr. Chair I want to
10 take just a couple of quick comments about some things that
11 -- I got a call from a charter management group in Arizona,
12 the Phillip here last week. They happen to be the largest
13 group in Arizona, they have expanded in the Nevada, they're
14 trying to go to the Texas. They came out for some meetings
15 here that the department and the -- we don't call it the --
16 not the Bureau, not the Institute. The charter --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: CSI?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: League of Charters.

19 MR. CRANDALL: League -- the league. Thank
20 you, I was looking for the right word. The league charter
21 have put on a joint training. It's a two day boot camp for
22 anyone who wants to open up charges for Colorado. I want to
23 give a special shout out to Christine and Jean, (inaudible)
24 McMillan, and Kelly Rosensweig, who participated on behalf
25 of CDE. What made it cool is these folks from Arizona flew



1 back home. They called me that night, and said it was the
2 best one they ever been to -- the states they've been to.
3 As far as organized, they got the information they needed
4 that would help them, so positive news. Now, it is because
5 our laws are different. They said, you know, the problem is
6 you have to find a district. So it's not like Texas or
7 Nevada where you can go to an Authorizing Board to go
8 straight up. So they said we definitely want to be in
9 Colorado, but we need to figure out the -- the mechanics of
10 how that works when we partner with the district.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I ask you a
12 question?

13 MR. CRANDALL: Yeah, Val?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you (inaudible) with
15 parents who wanna start charters?

16 MR. CRANDALL: It was -- it was some parents
17 from Arizona who built their own charter management
18 organization. They have eight already. They just opened
19 one in Nevada. I -- I don't know for sure, but this boot
20 camp is open to anybody to attend who wants to open up a
21 charter. And they hold it how often? Any idea? Twice a
22 year.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So do companies come to
24 parents and say let's help you start a charter, or do



1 parents come to companies and say we want to help you manage
2 this school we envision?

3 MR. CRANDALL: That -- that's a -- that's a
4 very good point you bring up. My experience is a group
5 says, Hey, we see a -- we sense that there's dissatisfaction
6 in this area. And I was amazed at the amount of research
7 that already done in Colorado, these folks handed to me.
8 And they listen to comments from parents who are not
9 satisfied like no other options. Then they get into small
10 group that builds into a larger group. They won't do -- if
11 a parent demands not their company and they have taps for
12 all the parents.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've had that here.
14 We've had some appeals from the National Chartered
15 companies, which we call basically, a charter group looking
16 for a district -- which is one of the reasons we want to
17 make sure there are parents there as they want.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I just don't want
19 to see us flip the table on who's driving it.

20 MR. CRANDALL: And now -- I appreciate that
21 comment. One of the things that I've learned about charters
22 is -- it is -- there is the academic side, and then there --
23 it is a business. It is a true business with payroll and
24 things like that. And you have to have that expertise at
25 both. There is a critical mass number also in Arizona about



1 -- we need about 100 kids to really make it work. People
2 try and start up a charter with 35 kids, 40 kids, quickly,
3 nowadays especially since --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, commissioner,
5 what was the name of this?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Legacy -- Legacy Group.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Legacy Group.

8 MR. CRANDALL: Like I said, they -- they I
9 think they have about 14,000 kids in Arizona. They're for
10 school and about them. The whole -- the whole point I want
11 to make is, I liked that they were pleased with the training
12 that Colorado was providing. They may not be happy with all
13 the laws on the books but that's not -- that's a
14 conversation for another day for that piece. Mr. Chair, are
15 ESSA timing or ESSA work is going to just consume everything
16 over the next 12 month? As literally so much gets shifted
17 back from the feds to us. We're gonna be coming before the
18 Board constantly. We'll always have an ESSA component to
19 every Board meeting between now and June 2017. So it's a
20 little heads up I did -- we met with Pat last week to break
21 it up into bite size pieces. It can be very, very
22 overwhelming. What has to be accomplished that if we break
23 into bite size pieces work with our partners will be a very
24 positive move.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't want to
2 interrupt you. Can I ask you some questions?

3 MR. CRANDALL: Sure. By all means.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I -- I always get
5 concerned when we do these large tours and we have all these
6 entities that we're visiting with, and so forth, it's great
7 to get all this input. But there are really basic
8 underlying assumptions that probably Board Members would
9 like to weigh in on, as far as what direction Colorado goes.
10 And I get concerned that when we do these large tours,
11 because I've been a part of them, that the teachers and the
12 parents voices get drowned out by the entities that have
13 certain interests in the outcome. How shall we guard
14 against that? How shall we ensure that the focus of the
15 Board Members and the assumptions that they're using to
16 drive, how they might look at a proposed plan, how then to
17 ensure that that's driving it on the front end and not
18 commenting on the back -- commenting on it on the back?

19 MR. CRANDALL: Absolutely. I appreciate that
20 comment. We -- we're gonna have to have to put that
21 structure in place of where the seven Board Members what we
22 would -- we would love your feedback almost immediately on
23 it as we start to gather. We are holding meetings in both
24 the afternoon and the evening specifically for the purpose
25 of getting parents of the evening meetings, if a



1 communication strategy they put together to get word out in
2 those communities. The whole reason for the evening meeting
3 was prepare participation. We'll report back on what's
4 successful and what's not. And we will --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe each of us should
6 met with you and see the points in the PowerPoint. So we
7 can talk about -- do we embrace the direction so far --

8 MR. CRANDALL: Absolutely. We'd love that.
9 And at the same time as that hope -- we would love to have
10 Board Members at any of these meetings in May. We'll have
11 more in June, more in July, more in August. But any Board
12 Member who wants to attend any of the six, we would love to
13 have your participation in those. So --

14 MS. FLORES: I suggested that we videotape
15 them, when I sent out my -- my email to Board Members, and I
16 was just wondering if possibly that could be a conversation
17 all over the state. And I don't know if PBS or -- would be
18 interested in having these. We might need some sponsors,
19 you know, so that these could be aired, so that other
20 Members, all Members of the state could listen to what top
21 Grand Junction says or, you know, that part or District
22 three says, District one thinks. And I think that would be
23 a grand -- a really great conversation for -- for bringing
24 us together in -- in this endeavor. 'Cause I think it's
25 going to be -- it's -- it's a great challenge but at the



1 same time it's -- it's a great opportunity. And I think we
2 need to get as many people to buy in -- into it as possible.
3 And I think if people feel they're left out, and we need to
4 do as much as possible to get everybody to feel safe. Not
5 that, you know, I think we -- we just need to do our best to
6 include as many people as possible in -- in this endeavor.

7 MR. CRANDALL: Well, the big ideas that we're
8 -- we're talking about, we will move forward with this as we
9 figure out the logistics is inviting groups to host an ESSA
10 listening session. There's no way that any of us know every
11 single group out there who wants to weigh in on this. But
12 if we're very public, and I mean, very public if you would
13 like to have an ESSA listening session in your community, in
14 your group, we're all over that. We have, you know, we'll
15 make that happen. Coming up over the next six months.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder and Dr.
17 Scheffel.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So two things, one will
19 frustrate that we're calling it ESSA which makes it sound
20 like we're doing what the feds are asking us to do. And I
21 think we're doing what we're asking them to do.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the Colorado plan -
23 -.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Whatever -- I'm not naming
25 the name but, I'm encouraging us to think about it a little



1 bit differently. The second question is, when you do a
2 Listening Tour, you're asking what? It's important that --
3 that we know what the -- the framework is, what are the
4 questions that we're asking? Can they be -- how can we be
5 sure that they're specific enough that we really get
6 actionable feedback from folks rather than pie in the sky?

7 MR. CRANDALL: Absolutely. Thank you

8 MS. SCHROEDER: And -- and could we be part
9 of that? Could we be part of that discussion as we were
10 part of the discussion when we were looking for you? And we
11 came together and formulated those questions, and went out
12 into the field and asked those questions. Because in -- in
13 that, in what we did in finding the new commissioner, you,
14 we -- we tried to bring in as many people in the state as
15 possible. And we did go out into the various regions, and
16 we did ask questions about what, you know, the people wanted
17 in education and so --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I think it's a great
20 discussion as to how we get great input, and how we unpack
21 the details, and what I would say is just that the public I
22 think feels very much as though even though it's perhaps
23 attended Listening Tour at least the public eye to -- if
24 listen to the depend listening tours. But they've really
25 been out of the loop as far as what the eventual outcome is.



1 So for example Common Core got pushed through and the like
2 16 percent of the public had even heard about it, after it
3 was passed. And then all of a sudden parents saw Common
4 Core aligned on the textbooks, and two years later suddenly,
5 the issue becomes an issue. But they were late to the party
6 big time.

7 And you look at a document like this on
8 workforce readiness and all these laws coming current are
9 being considered, this Tom was on the website. In an
10 obscure location, four people looked at it or something, it
11 was changed, a few more or looked at it. But these
12 documents are what is driving a lot of what you're proposing
13 and the -- the public feels very much confused by it,
14 overwhelmed by it, like implication -- understanding
15 implications. So I just think we have to be very thoughtful
16 about. Is this really a tour to just expose the high level
17 points as opposed to what does this really mean for your
18 child and the data of your child, and how this is going to
19 influence this child's future and the future of our nation.
20 Or is this kind of a feel good, get around, and let everyone
21 feel heard, but in reality we already know the outcome.

22 And I just think that the latter has been
23 very characteristic of the way we've addressed reform
24 efforts in this state. And as you can see parents coming to
25 these meetings you know there -- you know, why is my child



1 taking a survey sponsored by ACT/SAT supposedly volunteering
2 to look at all these objectionable questions. Why does that
3 stop? I don't know. Can't stop it? What is in this
4 document?

5 MR. CRANDALL: I had not read that. So --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I've read it -- saying it's
7 great to see --

8 MR. CRANDALL: To suggest that the PowerPoint
9 that I put together out of my own mind based on some that
10 was driven by some dogma that never seen, it isn't quite
11 fair.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm not saying that. I'm just
13 saying that there are these white papers out there, that are
14 very extensive, that are outside Colorado, that move into
15 our state, influence legislation, and are indirectly
16 influencing our agenda. So I was just saying as we do this,
17 can we do it differently than we've done in the past.

18 MR. CRANDALL: Thank you. That's number one.
19 In fact I'm so glad you brought that up. Because when you
20 brought Common Core, every state out there, Wyoming was 14
21 listening stops, and they kept track of who attended. And
22 they do who attend -- I think they probably had video of who
23 attended. Arizona was 23 meetings. Exact same thing, you
24 know, we have 12 people over 14 meetings who attended that.
25 And so when we started out this Listening Tour, keep in mind



1 folks we're going to learn a ton about what's working and
2 what doesn't. I was very good with our people though it
3 could never be the way it was in the past. And not -- I'm
4 not just making that up because you said it also. We could
5 never go that route, and say, what do you mean, we went out
6 there just because you don't show up to the meeting was not
7 my fault? That could never be a response to -- to a parent
8 or anybody ever again. We will learn some things.

9 Now, everything is on the table. There is no
10 -- we have no predestined, "Here's what we want out of the
11 system, and let's -- we're going to guide you to our
12 answer." Not in the least is that. We truly are out there
13 and listening. It'll be about an hour, hour and a half of
14 education meeting and we're going to take the presentation
15 that we got -- he has to say the very -- some high level
16 points, accountability, assessment, the five percent here's
17 things that are required. What's important to you? That as
18 we do a listening session in June, we'll -- we'll probably
19 tweak the way we do, say okay, what we learned that didn't
20 work in our first one. And then also, you never need to ask
21 if you are invited to a listening session. The door is
22 always open to everything that we're doing. Complete
23 transparency as we go across the state.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: I agree and appreciate that very
2 much. I also have -- I have a real balance of feelings
3 about that, and I'd be interested to know what -- when we
4 say the word participate in it and -- and you think about
5 that in regards to the intention of these meetings, where is
6 the focus? If the focus is on the public and it's one of
7 the early checks is how aware are they. First of all, what
8 this -- what this brand new picture of our lives is going to
9 mean, that's impossible to predict a state of population,
10 the size we have, and the potential, for how many people
11 will be at these meetings. And we don't know what their
12 level of awareness is or how in touch they are. So I am
13 speaking for myself because I think it's -- it's -- this is
14 how I do better work, when it comes to constituency.

15 I just be -- I just be quiet, and I'll listen
16 to what they're asking and what they're worried about and
17 what they're happy about and kind of just keep my head open.
18 I do a lot of that at these meetings too. But I -- so when
19 we say, we're welcome to participate. What level of
20 activity does that mean on our part? My own -- my own
21 feeling right now, before we really started this round of it
22 after a few years ago of traveling the state doing that
23 other conversation, what do we want to do with this? I -- I
24 just believe I'm more comfortable it's better -- I operate



1 better if I hear any -- hear the big picture then I have
2 time to think about it.

3 I, of course, want to look forward to talking
4 with all of the rest of you, see what your impressions are.
5 I think we come to most of the time this work does pretty
6 well. We come to a spot where we find the common --
7 beginning point, unique common points of interest. But --
8 but I'm worried that if we jump in here too soon -- and it
9 won't take too long for people to figure out that we are the
10 body that does ultimately have the approval of this plan --
11 is that -- does that run the risk of squelching somebodies
12 open participation? Because we're in the room -- or a lot
13 of us are in the room or are not. So in a way, maybe the
14 ability to hear it remotely or whatever there is a that's --
15 that's kind of intriguing to me. But I'm just still not
16 quite there yet with all seven of us being in a room full of
17 people who are really entering this kind of public
18 engagement for the very first time. I don't know. That's -
19 - that's where I am.

20 MS. FLORES: I don't know about seven people,
21 but I think -- I think we have to understand that we have to
22 be part of that initial planning or think of these concepts
23 of plans that are out there or, you know, not creating them
24 but know that that's what our constituents are talking
25 about. Because they do talk to us, and we do kind of



1 understand. We don't want to stifle but we do want to hear.
2 So the other idea that I had was that they be videotaped and
3 that we could hear them, we could hear them. I mean, it's
4 something else to have written comments about what people
5 said. But another part which technology does allow us, and
6 that is to be there without being there.

7 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

8 MR. CRANDALL: Comments right there. Just
9 how we envision this happening. The first hour is that --
10 it's a three-hour meeting. First hour and a half is an
11 education because I think you're exactly right. The
12 majority of people across Colorado do not know what ESSA is,
13 don't know what's required of it. So somewhere between 60
14 and 90 minutes of that, as you go through different
15 sections. They're is just like state Board meeting. We
16 will probably do with this question. If we were to put
17 together a five to ten year plan for education as we review
18 the Department of State Board of Education for Colorado.
19 What would be important to you in that plan and then just
20 sit back and listen. You know like, Steve was into the
21 checking notes about everyone who spoke, and at the end that
22 kind of gave us a virtue based on those developments. We
23 will bring those comments back verbatim -- it's not a bad
24 idea, just to film it just for documentation in case we
25 reference something that.



1 MS. FLORES: Well known. I want to watch it.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You better.

3 MR. CRANDALL: Fast forward but -- but I
4 don't want -- and -- and I guess, so the only thing I can
5 say is hey, don't judge our future on the past yet. Now, if
6 we screw up and you don't like the way the first meeting
7 went or the second one, by all means we'll tweak it. We
8 have no hidden agenda. We have no -- we want what's best
9 for Colorado. And we need to hear from multiple groups.
10 And I think we're going to have to do at the end is we'll
11 have a log of every single group we've met with. And then
12 you're going to have a say, which you guys have met with
13 this group yet or this group and then will probably have to
14 call and reach out to them and say, hey, we can present you
15 to hear your perspective on this. If you like we've got six
16 to eight months to do this -- it's all -- it's not all going
17 to happen in the six meetings.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Doctor -- yes. Okay, Ms.
19 Mazanec and then you Dr. Scheffel.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. So I don't have the --
21 the email in front of me or the -- the news release but you
22 -- you're going to several different locations. Who do you
23 expect to be in the audience?

24 MR. CRANDALL: Absolutely --



1 MS. MAZANEC: Who are you going to be
2 listening to?

3 MR. CRANDALL: We are --

4 MS. MAZANEC: Are they going to be listening
5 to you?

6 MR. CRANDALL: We're publicizing in every
7 medium we can down there. Like I said, we'll -- we'll
8 present -- hey, here's why we're here. Here's what the new
9 law is. But this is only one reason why we're here. We
10 want to put together a statewide plan for education what
11 would be important. And then literally for the second hour
12 and a half we just sit down, we don't even speak. We'll
13 just take notes, we'll listen, people can come up make
14 comments. To be honest, there's not going to be 200 people
15 in the world, even though we advertise it for everybody to
16 come and talk about, you know, (inaudible) in education. I
17 would love it if there were.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Well, a couple of things. Did
19 -- did we decide to create a statewide plan or education?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We need, we have to.

21 MS. MAZANEC: We have to?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

23 MR. CRANDALL: We -- we have to turn one in
24 in March.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Two -- two for two one on the
2 fence?

3 MR. CRANDALL: Correct.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

5 MR. CRANDALL: But -- but here's the -- as I
6 met with Senator O'Keem (ph) last Thursday, I said, "We're
7 not turning in a statewide plan to comply with ESSA. We're
8 turning in the true plan of where we want to go over the
9 next ten years, and we'll tell you how ESSA supports that.
10 Not -- it's not like a waiver request, but we're asking
11 permission to do something.

12 MS. MAZANEC: And my next question is -- so
13 we have, CASE, CASB, CEA, going along --

14 MR. CRANDALL: At this first one.

15 MS. MAZANEC: They're going along for the
16 purpose of listening as well or are they --

17 MR. CRANDALL: They wanna listen as well.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. One other -- one final
19 thing I wanna say is that, and I think Jane mentioned this
20 was that, I think we all need to keep -- keep it in mind
21 that we can -- we can and we should listen. And we should
22 listen to as many -- what I would call stakeholders,
23 parents, and taxpayers about the best way to implement this.
24 But ultimately, we make the decision. We're elected to do



1 that. We're not elected to represent any one group. So I -
2 - I just think it is good for us to remember that.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess my thought would be,
5 and again, I appreciate the presentation. I -- I guess, I'd
6 like to see this Board do the heavy lifting on sketching out
7 direction and then listening. As opposed to listening
8 getting all this information that's a huge reports written,
9 we tweak the edges and basically, feel like, hey, they spent
10 months on this, and hundreds of people that's what we always
11 get. You know we've been to X number of schools, X number
12 of locations, rural, urban and so forth, these many
13 stakeholders, thousands of comments, and this is what they
14 suggested. We're gonna at that point say, well, we don't
15 think that's a good direction. Then in reality that pushes
16 us in a direction by default. So I would prefer that this
17 Board have the tough discussions about direction, then you
18 go out and get feedback, and of course listen and we're
19 always willing to tweak it based on our direction and then
20 all the other information that we gather.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Crandall.

22 MR. CRANDALL: No, I wasn't -- have any
23 comment on this. I --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: And also, I think that we do
2 have organizations and groups such as Colorado Succeeds,
3 Democrats for Education Reform, and all these other groups
4 that I think they need to be separate. I mean, we can have
5 one for those organizations that they can come to. But we
6 need to have -- we need to listen to people. I mean, I --
7 I'm over there at the legislature all the time. Who comes
8 most of the time? It's the same lobbying groups, the same
9 groups that we hear about. We need to hear what just
10 everyday people, you know, who have kids in school, who may
11 not have kids in school, in those communities, in those
12 areas, what they think about. And -- and not these lobbying
13 groups that we hear about all the time, and their reports
14 because we read the reports, and it has to be something
15 different then -- then from those people.

16 MR. CRANDALL: Point taken.

17 MS. FLORES: But I also agree with Dr.
18 Scheffel. That I think we need to craft -- we need to craft
19 that -- those questions and that -- those ideas.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: We do, and to the extent that
21 we have differences and opinions on the Board, we need to go
22 deep and figure out why, look at the underlying assumptions,
23 look at data, look at what works and look at what hasn't
24 worked for the past 30 years, and to pass this out. I think



1 beyond our purview and then comment on it later, I think
2 it's derelict of duty on the part of the Board.

3 MS. FLORES: Uh-huh.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions for Mr.
5 Crandall. Seeing none. Thank you very much Mr. Crandall.
6 We'll now proceed to out of order. If all are ready? I
7 presume, we are ready, Miss Burdsall for item 14.06 a waiver
8 request Lewis-Palmer Public School District 38. For a
9 waiver to CRS-22-7-104(2)(a) -- Early Childhood ratings.
10 Ms. Anthes are you gonna handle this?

11 MS. ANTHES: Sure, I can handle this. Thank
12 you Mr. Chair. Yes. This was school readiness assessment
13 waiver request that came from Lewis-Palmer School District.
14 We went through the normal staff review process, and you
15 have those materials in front of you. A few other potential
16 questions came up, and so we asked the district to be here.
17 If you would like to ask them any questions about the detail
18 of their replacement plan and school readiness. So with
19 that -- I'll let you decide if you would like to bring the
20 district up, ask any questions.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure, if they'd like to
22 make a quick presentation that will be fine.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good afternoon. We are
24 -- we're happy to be here and happy to answer any questions
25 about our waiver request. We appreciate the time that the



1 State Board has given us to answer any questions. One of
2 the things I wanted to highlight was we began this process
3 in September of last fall. It is actually a -- a thought,
4 an idea we've had for quite some time. We have a standards
5 based report card that we believe captures all the data we
6 need to determine school readiness. I know that some of the
7 comments we got back from our staff were around it being a
8 checklist, but I want to reiterate that TS Gold has a
9 checklist as well. So we feel that our teachers gather
10 comprehensive data. It stays out of the digital realm which
11 is a concern for our community and they have high quality
12 data. And I would say that our success in demonstrating
13 proficiency in our kids later on demonstrates that we do a
14 good job of identifying whether our students are ready for
15 the next level of learning. And I'd be happy to turn it
16 over to Sheila to add anything else.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good afternoon. Thank
18 you so much for allowing us to be here. Our teachers in
19 September as I was speaking with kindergarten teachers, they
20 certainly had overwhelming support for us to move forward
21 with this waiver, as well as parents during our public
22 hearing meeting we had three -- three parents comment and
23 they were absolutely supportive of that in their -- their
24 comments. Our parent comments, as well as our Board
25 comments were also overwhelmingly in support. They were a



1 fan of teachers having more time with students less tracking
2 paperwork and a dual system so we -- we just focus on a one
3 system based on standards.

4 Our -- our parents told us our teachers are
5 qualified and able to assess our -- our students well.
6 They're very talented, they are in favor of keeping the
7 assessments within the -- within this -- within the school
8 district. And as Karen indicated, we would be able to keep
9 our student data private meant for the audience that -- that
10 is most important to our parents. Additionally, we have
11 measurements -- measurement instruments, individual profiles
12 of -- of progress in reading, writing, Math, Art, Physical
13 education, Music, academic success, and behavior. Our Board
14 has given us permission to attempt to bring back level
15 control onto the Lewis-Palmer School District.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any questions from Members
17 of the Board? Let me start Ms. Anthes, if no one else has
18 any questions. We -- we spent a lot of time trying to drive
19 some change in reduction in TS Golds time consuming, and it
20 was limiting the data they collected, and then also things
21 like requiring positive often for video and pictures of
22 children which we accomplished after I think about a year of
23 -- of back and forth and -- and then we started receiving
24 requests for waivers from this after we had -- and actually
25 during that process. And -- and I'm not sure that --



1 Gretchen you can tell me does this waiver request contain
2 some of the same student protections that we have now in our
3 contract with TS Gold, for example, that they may not
4 photograph students or -- or take videos without permission
5 of the parent, is that part of policy? Do you know?

6 MS. ANTHES: I do not know that I'm not sure
7 if our staff (inaudible), Melissa Colzman, knows that she
8 reviewed all the documents in more detail but that might be
9 a question better asked of the superintendent.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perhaps you can answer is
11 there a specific prohibition in your waiver request for --
12 against the collection of videos and pictures of children.

13 MS. ANTHES: No, because it wasn't required -
14 - that was not one of the things we were required to report
15 on in the waiver request. But I can tell you that we've
16 made a commitment to not do that.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But it was not part of the
18 request, it's not part of the waiver.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not required to be
20 in the waiver request. There was no place to actually add
21 that information.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then in your proposal -
23 - in your waiver, do you propose to collect more data or
24 less data than is required -- than we now have in our
25 contract with TS Gold?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are around 55
2 objectives, I believe in the TS Gold and there are certain
3 checkpoints throughout the year. I would say, it's the same
4 data that our standards space report card is, they're very
5 much aligned on. And so it would be -- it would be similar.
6 However, it would be removing one of the systems, so we'd
7 only have one system for teachers, and reporting on our
8 students to our parents progress

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So the answer is yes, we
10 collect more data or no, we collect less data?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Similar.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Same data?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So I see your report card but
16 report cards come out quarterly. Or would it -- now, I'm
17 trying to figure out whether parents learn more or less
18 about the progress earlier or later by the progress of their
19 --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They come out by
21 trimesters three times a year.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And how is it work with TS
23 Gold? When -- when -- when do parents get the reports on?
24 Well, I think the initial valuation was like the first 30
25 days; is it not?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, for TS Gold.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. And then the
4 report card does not come back till the end of first
5 trimester.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: TS Gold does not report out?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. This standard space
8 report right. I'm sorry. However, standard measurement of
9 progress is an ongoing piece for them and the terms of
10 individual profiles. And that's under the measurements
11 found --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: So how do -- how do parents
13 to see that? I'm trying to figure out.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Parent-teacher
15 conferences, sending them home through different folders,
16 having those conversations. Teachers readily call on
17 parents, and inform them of their students' progress.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So if you have two systems
19 and they're extremely similar. Why do you have to have
20 yours? Other than that you --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We feel is a stronger
22 system, and we feel it's more specific to the standard's
23 based.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: And there's not a crosswalk
25 that shows me that?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's -- it's a very
2 similar crosswalk that you would have seen with district one
3 because it's a standard space report card.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One of the things that this
5 Board required to do -- department is required to do is
6 accumulate data from what is now becoming an increasing
7 number of sources to -- to then deliver a report to the
8 General Assembly on readiness. When we originally started
9 granting waivers, I had hoped that -- and I think presumed
10 and obviously inaccurately that we started with small school
11 districts who could demonstrate a variety of reasons that
12 the existing procedures were burdensome. We reduced that
13 burden and instead of quelling the requests for waivers
14 somehow we seem to have accelerated it, and can you tell me
15 if you're convinced that now -- how many ever waivers that
16 we have and if we keep granting them -- that the reports are
17 going to get are easily compatible, so we can give the
18 General Assembly, the information they requested?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, this Board
20 did make some decisions about how that data would be
21 collected and actually sort of cut, you know, change to the
22 way it would be collected. So I think districts can now --
23 would have to do that crosswalk with their systems in order
24 to make sure that it fits within the sections that you all
25 approved. That is one of the pieces we noted in the -- in



1 the last section of the staff response which is the more
2 different systems there are out there, but you know, there
3 are some comparability issues. Perfect compatibility issues
4 with those different systems. I will say that probably a
5 lot of the waivers we're receiving now have probably been in
6 the works for a little while. So I don't know if this is
7 some of the decisions that were made with TS Gold and such
8 will stem, you know, the tide later on some of these were
9 underway before that.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Any --
11 Dr. Schroeder.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: I just think we need to take
13 a time out on this, and figure out whether the changes that
14 were made by TS Gold made this a workable process for
15 kindergarten readiness. I just don't believe that the
16 legislature ask us to check kindergarten readiness, and then
17 have it ripped away and nicked away until there isn't
18 anything that we're actually providing for them in terms of
19 wanting to know whether the kids are ready, and whether
20 there are some improvements in whether the kids are ready.
21 So my inclination is for us to wait just a couple of years
22 and if there are some really good reasons for a district
23 especially the large district. The small districts where I
24 heard -- when they came from way (inaudible) is we're
25 already testing those kids in preschool, and we already have



1 all that data, and it's a redundancy for us to be doing it
2 again.

3 That's different from what were -- what we're
4 now getting. It's a completely different explanation, and I
5 think we were sympathetic to their limited resources, but
6 that's not what we're seeing here. We're seeing every
7 district going back to doing their own thing, and I'm really
8 worried about what we're going to be -- we're going to be
9 able to do to report appropriately and correctly, what's
10 really happening for our kiddos.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can I ask a question.
12 So tell me about the waivers you've already granted, and
13 then how does that fit with them saying, you won't be
14 granting any more waivers because you want to take a time
15 out when you have granted some waivers already to larger
16 districts, and then explain --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually larger.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Academy is larger, but I
20 think that's the only one.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Academy is larger. Yeah.
22 And I think that's our worry. I think we're -- we're just
23 seeing this snowball to the point where we know longer have
24 anything, right?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No longer have any -- any
2 uniformity.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I would say that, that in
5 part -- I mean, I'm not quite through with some of the
6 information raised but -- but in part the -- I look at least
7 two reasons for a waiver. One, you can do it better. That
8 might be true or two, it presents an undue hardship. And --
9 and I'm not sure you've done it, you know, you've certainly
10 identified an undue hardship issue. It doesn't sound like
11 you're going to be doing any less work. We have reporting
12 format issues that I think, I want to be dead confident that
13 every bite that we develop a reporting network requirement
14 that's solid, and then we'll have Ms. Mazanec, and then I'm
15 gonna ask a few more specific questions. Ms. Mazanec?

16 MS. MAZANEC: I'm unclear right now. Are you
17 currently using your own system for kindergarten readiness?
18 Have you been using that same system for some time?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have, yes. We've
20 been using this standards based report cards for the last
21 three years.

22 MS. MAZANEC: And when you say the standards
23 based report card, is that what you use for your checklist
24 as you -- for kindergarten readiness or is just report card?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Report cards, the
2 reporting system what the documents that follow behind that,
3 that actually gauge and measure the student's progress. We
4 have labeled or call them an individual -- individual
5 profiles such projects.

6 MS. MAZANEC: And we've been doing that how
7 long, sorry?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have been doing that
9 for -- for well, it's in the Bill 191 -- that's the other 50
10 percent for our teachers at kindergarten, and we started
11 with reading and writing this year, and we'll be
12 implementing the others over the rest of the next year.
13 Because the waivers first '16-'17 school year.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're welcome.

16 MS. MAZANEC: And how many -- one more thing.
17 How many students have we asked for --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just under -- just under
19 6,000, counting.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did that include our own
21 charter school?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that includes
24 our charter schools, by the way, did -- does have a waiver



1 for TS Gold because that process is so much different for
2 charter schools, yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're allowed to use
4 the --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: You know, I know that we try
7 to adjust the guidelines for the database for kindergarten
8 readiness to try to accommodate all the push back we had on
9 the data -- data privacy laws. The time it took to get TS
10 Gold and so forth. But as I look at your system, I think
11 it's very well aligned with best practice in early
12 childhood. Same categories are represented. Many of the
13 same questions are represented, and I think that you'll be
14 able to give very excellent information to the state based
15 on the kind of data we were requesting. So we can report to
16 the legislature for set of students ready or not ready by
17 category. I'll see any problem with what the -- what the
18 district has suggested. I think it's a great embracing of
19 love of control and a -- an incredible way with data and it
20 needs -- it will allow us to meet our obligation to the
21 legislature, and I guess I -- I appreciate you doing what's
22 best for your students in your district.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One of the requirements is
24 public participation -- a hearing on this topic; is that
25 correct?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And you stated, Ms.
3 Bevings, that the parents were supportive of this request
4 and -- is that correct?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'd like to read a few
7 letters to you. You don't mind me taking a few minutes from
8 parents I received in District 38. I'm writing to share my
9 experience with you in the public hearing held in our
10 district on the TS Gold waiver they were submitting to the
11 state. I found out to be meeting from Lewis-Palmer parents
12 Facebook page which they found out about just a couple of
13 hours before the public hearing.

14 I do understand the district followed the
15 letter of the law by posting a small public notice in the
16 newspaper in parenthesis. I was never even gonna find it,
17 even after the fact, and by putting some meeting notices on
18 the local post office doors, but really, if parents -- if
19 they wanted parents to attend and participate and provide
20 transparency, might have send an email through their
21 automated system or posted on the district school website.
22 Generally, parents receive information and everything
23 related to the school district or school Board meetings via
24 these methods of communication. Yet for some reason,
25 something is controversial as TS Gold -- they expected



1 parents to rely on the local newspaper and the Post Office.
2 Skip a couple of paragraphs. On such a hotly suggested
3 topic, it is what -- it was likely the result of not
4 communicating through the expected or normal channels.

5 A second letter, let's say -- I was told that
6 this entailed putting a piece of paper in the administration
7 building, the library, and Post Office, all the places that
8 few of us ever go. They also said it was properly
9 advertised in the paper for four weeks, and they claim they
10 have an affidavit to show that. Some -- some abutted look
11 through the papers and couldn't find anything else. Let me
12 see. They are deceitful and would rather -- we would just
13 go away. You should watch part two of the March school
14 Board meeting, and spare you some of those comments.

15 Mr. Durham, I'm a parent of a District 38
16 student is actively engaged with advocating for children
17 within our district. Describes a woman -- prescribes --
18 describes a background. She said, I'm shocked because I
19 active -- I've been actively involved in resisting TS Gold
20 by fighting -- by writing letters to the editor and making
21 public comments. The -- and then she goes on with the same
22 litany of complaints about the meeting not being properly
23 publicized or noticed.

24 Let's see. Here's another one, about --
25 towards lack of transparency. One example of the lack of



1 transparency applies the wherever you wanna entertain this
2 week. Again, an absence of -- of the attempt to ensure
3 public participation or encourage public participation. And
4 then the newspaper article from complete Colorado I guess,
5 concerning debate and dissent on the Board, which has been
6 characterized and would be -- appear to be fairly, so as an
7 attempt to stifle discussion of critical issues.

8 So I think I'm going to vote no on this, I
9 hope I'm not alone, because I don't believe that you
10 fulfilled your obligations at least relative to the intent
11 of the statute to encourage participation, and to adequately
12 inform parents, so that they can have the questions answered
13 for themselves, as to whether or not you're collecting or
14 proposed to collect more data or less data. And
15 additionally, I -- I think this Board should impose a
16 moratorium on these requests simply because until we can be
17 sure that we have a system of reporting that's compatible.

18 I think that there are serious -- serious
19 concerns, perhaps not all districts will have the same
20 concerns that were expressed to me by my constituents but --
21 but it's clear that -- that if you know the dissatisfaction
22 parents with this process you'd at least didn't disclose it
23 to the Board. If you didn't know, that's probably something
24 you should have known. So I will vote no. I hope there
25 will be others. And I think then -- I also hope that staff



1 will start taking a much harder look at these until we can
2 develop perhaps a little more coherent policy. Dr.
3 Scheffel.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: How would you respond to those
5 letters by those folks? How do you respond?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: First of all, I would
7 tell you that -- I do believe that you're here to decide
8 about our waiver request and our staff's preparation of the
9 documents. We've spent seven months working on this,
10 something that it takes charter schools -- simply very quick
11 fill up the form, and if we really do want to equalize
12 education in Colorado, I think we need to think about making
13 sure we have the same levels of local control everywhere we
14 are.

15 Secondly, I would say that yes, an error was
16 made and someone forgot to put it on the website. It
17 doesn't change the fact that if we followed everything that
18 we were required to do and -- in terms of advertising it.
19 Additionally, I don't believe that anyone -- everyone that
20 wanted to say something about that indicated although they
21 didn't realize it was there. They -- they made it, and I
22 don't think there is still any objection to what we were
23 doing. So I'm a little concerned that our -- our staff is
24 being tried for -- for an apparent political stance that we
25 have folks taking. You guys are Board of Elections, you



1 know, you're Board of Education, you know, you've been
2 elected, you can't always, there's always more information
3 to everything.

4 So I'm concerned that it sounds like, Mr.
5 Durham you want to punish our staff for a perceived way of
6 how our Board is currently being perceived by some folks.
7 That feels very not right to me, and I'm going to come right
8 out and say that. Certainly, it's your prerogative. You're
9 the Board of Education, you can do whatever you want to, but
10 I would hope you are evaluating our waiver requests based on
11 the waiver request itself, and whether it meets their
12 requirements. Not on -- some constituents quite honestly --
13 probably regardless of what we were to do today would have
14 something to say.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, let me -- let me
16 respond. There's no intent to punish the staff for Board
17 action. It would appear that not all that should have been
18 done to encourage public participation was done. Is that --
19 would you agree perhaps should have posted it on the
20 website?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. We do agree with
22 that --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you agree that you
24 should have perhaps sent an email through your ordinary
25 email chain?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So let me -- let me
2 speak to that Mr. Chairman. I received guidance from the
3 staff, CDE staff for waiver, and I followed that directly to
4 the point of -- of what they have suggested to do that we
5 needed to get that to the waiver. Additionally, parents had
6 another opportunity because we brought this forward to the
7 district accountability, and they unanimously supported our
8 direction in -- in requesting this waiver. So that was
9 another chance that had been advertised, posted, and parents
10 had it and it was on the agenda for that. And lastly, with
11 that piece of -- our Board unanimously supported the waiver
12 direction. The request for waiver, and their Board
13 resolution, and I have that in your -- in your supporting
14 documents. It was -- the motion was made by Sarah Sampayo,
15 it was seconded by Matt Claassen, and it was a vote of five-
16 zero, and we have five Board Members. So all were
17 unanimously supporting the direction.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We have a copy of that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Further discussion.

21 Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this still didn't
23 address my concern that we're just wandering off from what
24 was the original intent. And I really want the staff to
25 have some time to help us go through, when she'll be giving



1 you a waiver on this because it's really essential for the
2 school district. And when is it just we want to do our own
3 thing, and it really goes contrary to what the legislature
4 wanted. I feel I need to show respect to what our
5 legislators were thinking in a bipartisan manner of what was
6 needed in our schools. That's their responsibility -- it's
7 our responsibility to oversee and the -- the whole issue of
8 local control is always one of a real -- realistic tension,
9 and we just have to live with that but I'm -- I'm not
10 willing for the districts that can do the TS Gold after all
11 we've been through to make that more workable to just deceit
12 because they want to deceit which is what I hear from some
13 larger districts.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess, I would disagree in
16 the sense of this district is totally able to do what the
17 intent of a law request which is to give metrics regarding
18 numbers of students, or percentages of students ready for
19 transition into first grade.

20 DR. SCHROEDER: But there's more to school
21 than that.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: I know. That sounds like this
23 -- this district is able to answer that question and that's
24 the law requires -- that's to deny them -- the opportunity
25 to gather these data in ways that best meet their needs.



1 I'm not sure why we do that because they're able to do it
2 given this course. So I guess I appreciate the letters of
3 concern from parents, feeling they weren't fully in the
4 loop, but I don't think there are other letters that could
5 have been written that would suggest that there was a lot of
6 inputs. So, I mean, I, you know, these -- these individuals
7 apparently felt out of the loop and the school district
8 followed the specific requirements of CDE and submitting a
9 waiver. So I guess I -- I feel like they're doing what's
10 necessary to meet the unattainable.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is an odd debt,
12 because when there are people who are out of the loop,
13 you're their biggest champion. I'm just surprised to see
14 you have a completely different perspective in this
15 particular case.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, but I'm saying that if
17 people who want to speak spoke and so these letters they --

18 MS. FLORES: They weren't notified. They
19 weren't notified.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: They were notified, not maybe
21 they wanted -- the way the school had --

22 MS. FLORES: But -- and -- but if you really
23 think about it too, if you have a system, they have a system
24 that's working, that is not different, you don't know that.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I don't. You're right. I
2 don't.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You don't know that.
4 But it's working in their community and they're satisfied
5 with it. And we are --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But that's clearly not
7 true.

8 MS. FLORES: Well that's two, two letters, or
9 -- or were there more?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Four.

11 MS. FLORES: Four letters. Okay. So there
12 was --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: You guys had four letters of
14 support, so that's not the whole community. It means the
15 process didn't quite -- they didn't quite go through the
16 whole process of making sure that people were informed, and
17 they had the opportunity to provide input.

18 MS. FLORES: Okay. That's four people. But
19 I'm thinking of the basic process and the system that they
20 have. And I have been in schools where I thought that the
21 school system that we had was better than the District 1 in
22 such an area and kindergarten. So that happens. And
23 changing and training, and all that has to happen is -- is
24 just a lot of time and money, and if it -- if what they're
25 going to give the state is equal, I just don't see that --



1 if they can count to ten, and it's different in -- in TS
2 Gold or in their reporting. So some of these, you know,
3 we're just making too much hay out of -- out of this and if
4 we've given it before, I think districts deserve it just as
5 well as do charters. Charters how many? Some of them would
6 probably didn't even read. We just give them out. This is
7 a well thought out, it has the Board's blessing. I think we
8 should say -- we should give them the blessing. Say yes on
9 it.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion. Yes?
11 Ms. Mazanec.

12 MS. MAZANEC: You were talking about the lack
13 of notice to parents. Does this waiver require that public
14 meeting, right?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It does. It does and I did
16 -- I talked to a number of people and there was certainly a
17 consensus among those who I talked to that this meeting was
18 not appropriately, at least in their minds noticed because
19 it was not noticed through the normal channels. They met
20 the intent of the law but not the intent. I'm sorry. They
21 met -- they met the specifics of the law, but I'm not sure,
22 in fact I'm reasonably sure that they did not meet the
23 intent of the law which is to encourage public participation
24 in common, and failing that for this specific waiver is why
25 I fully intend to vote no.



1 I think -- I think transparency is a good
2 thing. I think open discussion and debate are good things.
3 I think things that stifle open discussion and debate
4 between parents, and administration, and between school
5 Board Members are good things. I mean, I can't imagine for
6 a minute that some of the things I've seen in Lewis-Palmer
7 that -- I tried to impose on these Board Members, they would
8 collectively hang me, and should collectively hang me. So -
9 - so I think you have a flaw in your request and that it
10 failed to meet the intent of the law in encouraging public
11 participation.

12 And I think we as a Board have a larger
13 problem in that we're -- if this continues, if these waivers
14 continue at the pace they're going for, we will soon have a
15 179 separate system by which -- by which the state Board
16 staff -- by the CDE staff is going to have to compile each
17 report to the legislature. I don't think we ever -- we
18 tried to pare down the original requirements for reasons, so
19 that we'd have a system that work, and yet protect your
20 privacy and did all those things. And I think we run the
21 serious risk of now having a system where we really cannot
22 meet our statutory obligations. So we're not considering at
23 the moment the moratorium question, we're simply considering
24 the waiver request at hand. And so is there further
25 discussion?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes? Dr. Scheffel.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you respond to -- I mean,
4 I think what the chair is saying is that you didn't have
5 much participation in the decision. Apart from the letters
6 that were read, what would you say to that? What
7 participation did you have? Is that a requirement of the
8 waiver?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is -- the only
10 requirement of the waiver is that the public notice is
11 placed in three public places within the district for at
12 least 30 days. We do have documentation of the public
13 notice that was required and -- and I can tell you we put --
14 we did put out a public notice on January 7th regarding the
15 public hearing stating that a quorum at the Members of the
16 school Board may be in attendance for the Monday afternoon
17 meeting at -- on January 11th for the public hearing
18 regarding public comment for the waiver. And we do have an
19 affidavit from the newspaper stating that it was placed the
20 newspaper per guidelines and per CDE waiver of guidance.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How many students do you
22 have in your district?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just under 6000.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How many parents came to
25 the meeting?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Parents.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The DAC (ph) meeting?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The public meeting. How
5 many people came to the public meeting?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Three parents spoke.
7 There were probably three Board Members and a handful --
8 quite a handful of teachers who are also parents within our
9 building. All right, being there -- our school district
10 probably --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Would you say, 20 --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably 20? All
13 together?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, the DAC meeting,
15 which we did advertise that they would be talking about the
16 waiver. I would say we probably about 50 people that attend
17 our DAC regularly, and those are open to anyone who wants to
18 come. And we actually had a few extra people show up that
19 night for that purpose to listen to what we're talking about
20 at the DAC meeting.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean, do we have guidelines
22 on how many people need to show up at these meetings if it's
23 -- I guess, I'm confused as to why we're saying that you
24 have to have a certain level of participation to submit the
25 waiver and --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder -- Dr.
2 Scheffel, I don't believe that there's any minimum required
3 participation. But I think there is a clear problem that's
4 demonstrated when you have roughly 12,000 parents, if you
5 have 6,000 people, on an issue that we all know based on
6 feedback is controversial, and you get fewer than 20 parents
7 who are not employees of the school district.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you anticipate if a lot of
9 -- a lot more people would have come that many of them
10 wouldn't like this waiver?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I believe that they
12 would have been positively responding for us to move forward
13 with the requested waiver. Additionally, prior to -- prior
14 to us having the public hearing, we had the opportunity for
15 public comment and Board meeting and this was one of the-
16 the -- the most -- for a while one of the best respond to
17 public comment during our Board meeting, and those parents
18 were absolutely in favor of us moving forward for seeking
19 the waiver.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess, my problem is that
21 the parents I speak to are not in Lewis-Palmer specifically,
22 but I'm say generally on this issue, I've never had a
23 parents say to me, if only we could give the TS Gold.
24 Never. I mean, I would find very odd if because of your



1 lack of posting it in some way that suddenly more parents
2 when surfacing -- please, don't go this direction.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some even commented that
4 they weren't going to bother to come because they supported
5 it. They felt like they would only be coming if they were
6 disagreeing with it.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion. Yes?
8 Ms. Rankin.

9 MS. RANKIN: What is our charge now? Is it
10 possible that they could go away and come back and present
11 again?

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

13 MS. RANKIN: So my question to you is would
14 you do that?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, if we knew what it
16 -- again, we operated under the parameters that were given
17 to us. So I guess, if there's more information in terms of
18 what is expected, we would need to know what that is, so
19 that we can come back and feel like we have -- that we've
20 been evaluated based on the criteria that's required versus
21 some unknown criteria that, you know, we don't -- we don't
22 know about.

23 MS. RANKIN: And Chairman Durham.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am.



1 MS. RANKIN: Do we have something in place
2 that if we do have a discussion about a waiver -- that if we
3 do grant it, we can check back -- I mean, is there like a
4 sunset on this? Can we put a sun set where we check back
5 and see results of what's going on and how it may have
6 affected?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think that's one of
8 things we've discussed that we should be granting permanent
9 waivers just as a general rule. And I think there's been,
10 kind of, a Board consensus or pretty close to consensus that
11 we thought that's probably the minimum we want to do. I
12 would suggest -- I would suggest at a minimum with this
13 instance that, if you want to go properly notice and really
14 try to turn out a crowd and listen to their concerns, and do
15 that come back and report and research, and we can lay this
16 over until the next meeting for consideration. If you want
17 to do that, if you don't that's up to you.

18 MS. RANKIN: Is that a motion?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. No -- not a motion on
20 the table yet. Just saying, if that's what they want to do
21 or --

22 MS. RANKIN: Can I --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- or perhaps willing to
24 do.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can do that. I guess
2 my question is, will there be a minimum -- if we get three
3 people that show up again will that be enough?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: If you do it properly and
5 do your normal -- what I would characterize and what has
6 been characterized to me is your normal method of
7 notification of these kinds of activities, and you get three
8 people, you get three people and it's less of an issue. I
9 think the complaint is that rightly or wrongly, I have no
10 idea but the complaint is that this question was
11 deliberately given a short shift in terms of notice because
12 you really didn't want a lot of public --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that is totally
14 inaccurate.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- which is what this
16 letter say, may be inaccurate, but it is the perception of
17 some of these parents and that perception is their reality.

18 MS. RANKIN: I understand that, but I do want
19 to caution us to assume that that was intentional because
20 certainly it was not.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't assume it was
22 intentional, the parents assume that it was intentional.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

24 MS. GOFF: Can I just --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: How would deferring this even for
2 a little while, does that impact timelines as far as kids
3 next year enrollment? How is it -- does it have anything to
4 do with now in relation to whenever you doubt it will be
5 needed?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'd like to have it in
7 place by next school year.

8 MS. GOFF: So we're not totally up against
9 back at the wall if -- if there is a recommendation to, you
10 know, come back?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are happy to come
12 back through, if that's what the Board wants. I just would
13 hate for us to do that and then come back and have the same,
14 kinds of --

15 MS. GOFF: I understand.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, we've been at
17 this for seven months and we've done a lot of work around
18 it. It's not just about the public meeting and about that.
19 It's about bringing groups of teachers together, it's about
20 providing substitutes, it's providing -- and we have worked
21 hard on this project. Under the assumption that what you
22 had done in the past, those were still the rules. So we're
23 willing to do it but if we come back in two months and it's
24 the same kind of thing, that's going to be -- that's going
25 to be disconcerting to us.



1 MS. GOFF: I wonder if I might -- had a loss
2 for memory as far as when we did the TS Gold decision
3 making, the last time that we dealt with TS Gold here, I
4 don't remember.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Showing how that -- it
6 wasn't that long ago.

7 MS. GOFF: It was just -- I think about a
8 month ago.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One final question, Ms.
10 Anthes. Do -- do you have any concerns that the data you
11 might get under their reporting system would be reliable and
12 consistent, and usable, and valid?

13 MS. ANTHES: I think given the reporting
14 structure that you all approved at the last Board meeting
15 which doesn't even require them to name the domains, this
16 would work.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

18 MS. GOFF: And if we change that? If we went
19 back to -- I mean, there's talking at the legislature about
20 fixing what we did last month because of great
21 disappointment.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we change that then
23 we would have to reevaluate based on whatever it was changed
24 to.



1 MS. GOFF: Because I think that's what folks
2 need to be aware of -- that that's probably coming forward
3 if not this year, next year. It was -- was a great
4 disappointment what we did.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there are others
6 that were disappointed and were very --

7 MS. GOFF: Well I know but --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Supportive.

9 MS. GOFF: There's -- there's a lot of talk
10 out there that that was not what the -- that the legislature
11 wanted to hear more than what we supported.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we would have to
13 evaluate based on, I mean, as we know we have a robust seven
14 month discussion about the data reporting system and we have
15 lots of different options there. So I wouldn't want to say
16 whether this system with me -- system we don't know yet.

17 MS. GOFF: No, but I want to know what
18 happens in that event?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh. Then I think we
20 would need to look at their reporting categories, and the
21 reporting categories that would be approved and see if it
22 would be comparable in the way that they could report to us
23 into whichever categories were selected, right?

24 Essentially, they would have to do a crosswalk to those



1 components that are outlined in the law and they've done
2 some of that work.

3 MS. GOFF: Okay

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

5 MS. MAZANEC: I think I'm worried about, you
6 know --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, you've been because
8 there -- is there a motion relative to the waiver?

9 MS. MAZANEC: I move to grant the waiver.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Ms. Mazanec moves to
11 grant the waiver.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been seconded. Would
14 you please call the roll?

15 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores.

16 MS. FLORES: Aye.

17 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

18 MS. GOFF: No.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

21 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.

22 MS. RANKIN: No.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

25 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

2 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. The motion is defeated
4 by a vote of four to three. Is there objection to the use
5 of the reverse roll call. If you'd like to make a motion.
6 We now need a motion to reject the waiver.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought that was --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, she made that up.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. I need
10 coffee.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Don't worry.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I like a motion to
13 reject the waiver request.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why do you have to
16 reject the waiver request?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The Board will second that.
18 We don't have --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We got to do it the
20 right way.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Probably should. Is there
22 objection to the reversal of the previous roll call for that
23 motion? Seeing no objection that motion is adopted by a
24 vote of four to three.

25 MS. FLORES: Can they come back?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Certainly -- they certainly
2 can but I think we're going to have some discussions with
3 staff about what we need going forward and perhaps putting
4 some parameters and perhaps additional guidance. So Dr.
5 Scheffel.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: When are we going to have
7 those discussions?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Soon, I hope.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because I really -- I just
10 want to say that I support flexibility for our school
11 districts. That's why I made this motion, and this is the
12 kindergarten readiness which statutorily just asks us to say
13 yes, ask us to tell the state, yes, they're ready, no,
14 they're not. So this is the most simple --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is more than that.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- thing we can do is say, you
17 guys have been evaluating kinder -- prekindergarten's for --
18 kindergarten for a long time. You know what you're doing.
19 Just let them do it. So I'm not sure I like the idea of a
20 moratorium -- moratorium on flexibility.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Dr. Scheffel.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think it's inappropriate --
23 inappropriate for us to contemplate future legislation by
24 those may have questioned this Boards action in previous
25 months as a way or lens of understanding the waiver.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean, we were asked to vote
3 the waiver based on statutory requirements and statutory
4 requirements, and I think that -- I'm not sure what the
5 school now does. What is their next request?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, I will simply -- I
7 was simply safe speaking only for myself that the -- this is
8 -- was my vote was based on my perception that they did not
9 meet the intent of the statute.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: What can they do to meet the
11 intent of the statute, so that our perception --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Notice to meet the intent,
13 they should give parents the notice that they ordinarily do
14 through ordinary channels of other high visibility, high
15 profilage.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So they do that and they come
17 back to this Board and have us merely look at the waiver and
18 not perceptions of intent of the law. I mean can they --
19 would that be a next step for them or are they just stuck
20 with TS Gold?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think they have to make
22 those decisions.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can we hear their waiver
24 intent if they --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- go advertise the meeting
2 and I would encourage you to do that.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Thank you very
4 much. We'll now proceed to -- so we take a five minute
5 break, if you like one of those? Thank you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 (Meeting adjourned)



1 C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25