



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
September 15, 2016, AM

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on September 15, 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: Today, a quorum will come
2 in to order. Ms. Cordial, would you -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm
3 really not on tune here. Ms. Cordial, would you call the
4 roll, please?

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

6 MS. FLORES: Present.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

8 MS. GOFF: Here.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Present.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: Here.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel -- is on
14 her way.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Excused.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

18 MS. CORDIAL: And Chairman Durham.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Present.

20 Quorum is present. We'll start with the --
21 let's see where are we here? Legislative update.

22 Yes. Jennifer, do you like to -- Ms. Mello
23 will join us. Let us know what exciting things are going
24 on across the street.



1 MS. MELLO: Good morning. Is this on? Can
2 you all hear me?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We can.

5 MS. MELLO: Great. Well, as you know, there
6 not actually that many people cross the street right now on
7 a regular basis, so I can be relatively brief today. So
8 there are a couple of interim committees that are meeting
9 that I want to update you on.

10 The first that I know that you all are well
11 aware of, and in fact, I know several of you have been
12 attending the meetings is the Legislative Interim Committee
13 to look at the Every Student Succeeds Act also known as
14 ESSA. They had a second meeting on August 31st. The focus
15 of that meeting was to talk about accountability and
16 assessments. They had a very specific focus on learning
17 more about the non-academic accountability indicator that
18 is called for under ESSA. Alyssa Pearson and Joyce
19 Zurkowski from the department, both presented. They did a
20 great job.

21 This committee is not going to meet again
22 until after the election. And I guess what I would just
23 overall characterize their conversations so far, so they've
24 had two meetings, is I think they're really increasing the
25 knowledge of the Members of that committee on some of the



1 details around both accountability and assessment as it
2 relates to ESSA. The committee Members, I think, are
3 really diving in deep to how does this actually work in
4 Colorado, right? Because Colorado is different than many
5 other states and in the national context, and so I think
6 they're -- they're increasing their understanding of that.
7 They continue to think about opportunities for change to
8 our current statutes that are allowed under ESSA, not
9 necessarily required, because as we know, there's actually
10 relatively few areas of law that have to be changed. But I
11 think the question they're trying to answer is, what are
12 the opportunities that we have or don't have.

13 And I think that don't have part of it is
14 kind of important because I do think that many of them came
15 into it, thinking that there was more flexibility offered
16 under ESSA than -- than may be the case. So I think
17 they're starting to wrestle with -- with that. You know,
18 to me, they -- again, are, I think, doing a nice job in --
19 in staying grounded, and kind of how things work now in
20 Colorado, and thinking about how to make changes to that.
21 And have been very -- they really want the input from the
22 department, and the Board on that kind of baseline of what
23 does it really look like right now. Let's make sure we're
24 clear on that as we talk about how to change it going
25 forward. The second committee that's meeting that we



1 haven't really talked about has just started, it's actually
2 a continuation of the committee. It's not a new one, but
3 it's the school safety interim committee.

4 They did have their first meeting this week.
5 This is a committee that's comprised not just of
6 legislators, so there's also community Members, there's
7 parents, and a variety of folks that are on this committee.
8 When they met this week, they got an update on the Arapahoe
9 High School implementation of their new safety plan, and
10 they kind of reviewed for themselves, they had staff giving
11 a presentation on the status of existing law as it relates
12 to school safety. So it's kind of a, I would say
13 introductory, because this is a committee that's been going
14 on for a long time but a -- a first start at what's --
15 where are we right now. Let's really understand where we
16 are right now before we contemplate making changes to that.
17 Let me stop there real quick cause that's kind of concludes
18 my interim committee portion and see if we have questions
19 so just see we do.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I was fortunate enough to be
22 able to attend the morning session which was interesting.
23 I don't -- I'm not sure about that -- how the analysis
24 comparing Colorado to other states -- how strong that
25 really was. But I was not able to attend the afternoon.



1 I'm wondering if you could provide us with the link. I had
2 a number of people tell me that in terms of that additional
3 measure that Dr. Asp's presentation addressed some of the
4 right questions we should be asking. And even though I
5 know we -- or I think we have a Spoke committee for that.
6 Do we have a Spoke committee for that? I nevertheless
7 would like to inform myself of the questions. One of the
8 things that I liked in the morning portion was that
9 different folks pointed out some critical questions that we
10 need to be asking and I really think it help -- it will
11 help us -- it's sort of similar to the -- where the
12 decisions have to be made that occurred in the presentation
13 at the Hub meeting, but some of them are big pieces and
14 some of them are detail pieces. And I -- in my own mind,
15 it would help me a lot if I could figure out what are the
16 big ones decision wise, and then, what are some of the
17 detailed points that maybe there's a level of expertise
18 necessary to make those to be the best decisions. But if
19 you could give us a connection, would be great.

20 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chairman and Vice Chair, I'd
21 be happy to send that out.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anything else on that?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let the record show that
2 Dr. Scheffel is present. Good morning. Traffic is -- was
3 as usual, I would take it --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Inaudible).

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- that a lot lately.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's there.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Exactly, yes.

8 MS. MELLO: So just two more topics to touch
9 on briefly, and I don't need to tell you all that the issue
10 of schools and districts coming towards the end of the
11 five-year clock in certain categories is a present issue
12 for our state. And I know you all have really spent a lot
13 of time and energy on the details of that. I think there
14 are a number of legislators who either don't serve on the
15 education committee, who weren't around when the
16 legislation was adopted, and who were starting to hear from
17 their constituent's questions about this or concerns about
18 this.

19 So in response, I just wanted to let you
20 know that we have set up a couple of webinars for
21 legislators to just explain to them, you know, it's really
22 kind of a very factually-based presentation. I think much
23 more -- you all have gone into much more -- you have all
24 this information and -- and much, much more. But we just
25 want to give them the basic understanding around -- here's



1 what the law says, you know, and here's how this process
2 will unfold to the extent we know that. So those are
3 coming up. Those are scheduled for -- we have two of them
4 scheduled in the next couple of weeks.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Will you tell us when?

6 MS. MELLO: Of course, happy to distribute
7 that information.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible) available, I
9 should say.

10 MS. MELLO: And you know, I will tell you,
11 this was a little bit of an experiment. I hadn't,
12 personally, I haven't offered webinars to legislators
13 before. I didn't know if that would be something that they
14 would say, yes, we love that idea, or they would say,
15 that's a terrible idea. But we've had a pretty good
16 response. We have, I think, three or four scheduled for
17 each of them and I'm -- I'm encouraged by that. The final
18 thing I'll just touch on is, you know, obviously, it's an
19 election year, and I probably don't have to tell you all
20 that it's an election year. I don't have to tell anybody
21 in this country that it's an election year probably. But
22 you know, that limits some discussions that would normally
23 or wouldn't -- in a non-election year, would be taking
24 place in the fall about what's going to happen in 2017. So



1 I always say my crystal ball is pretty foggy. It's even
2 foggier at this point in election year.

3 That being said, I think just to give you
4 some preview of where I think -- so these -- these are not
5 specific pieces of legislation I'm talking about. This is
6 themes I think that we will see out of the legislature in
7 2017. We've already talked about one of them, ESSA, right?
8 And -- and opportunities for additional flexibility or
9 implementing that I think will be a continue topic of
10 conversation turnaround as these schools and districts
11 potentially near the end of that period of time where some
12 decisions are required. I think we'll see more
13 conversation about that than we have in recent years.

14 There is ongoing work around early childhood
15 discipline, so both at the preschool, and then
16 kindergarten, first, second, third grade level. There are
17 some advocates who feel very strongly that there's too much
18 suspension and expulsion happening for young kids. I think
19 districts -- there's a conversation happening. There's a
20 series of meetings going on right now to kind of see if
21 there's any meeting of the minds on that particular topic.

22 Marijuana money. I feel like that's another
23 topic we can't really avoid here in Colorado, right?
24 Marijuana. There has been an interim committee meeting on
25 marijuana all throughout the session as -- as frankly has



1 happened ever since our laws changed in that regard. A
2 couple of issues have come up that are specific to
3 education. There's a -- a group of -- of parents who I
4 think are pretty concerned about how our schools are
5 talking to kids about marijuana and -- and using it, not
6 using it, with the law, it's danger, all of that kind of
7 thing. So I -- I think that we will see some legislation
8 around ways to provide education to our kids on -- on
9 marijuana.

10 There's also -- I don't know if this bill
11 will go forward quite frankly, this is a specific bill
12 proposal the interim committee is considering. And the
13 issue is that, if you look at where that the tax revenue,
14 the marijuana tax revenue comes from, it -- it comes from
15 certain parts of the state more heavily than others.
16 Denver as an example, because Denver has more marijuana
17 retail locations. And there's a -- so 40 million of the --
18 of the tax money goes to the BEST program, the capital
19 construction program, and some legislators have expressed
20 their concern that there's a mismatch there between where
21 the money is coming from, and where it's being spent.
22 We'll see how that plays out. And then the final topic I
23 wanted to highlight, and I know it's one that --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)

25 MS. MELLO: Sure, I'm sorry.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's a common legislative
2 problem.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: With a -- with a --
4 with an example please.

5 MS. MELLO: Sure. So I think that -- that -
6 - and I wanted to be clear like this is -- this is not my
7 opinion, this is something legislators have said, right?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) just let us
9 know.

10 MS. MELLO: Legislators from Denver have
11 said, "Denver taxpayers are essentially contributing a lot
12 of it's money and yet the BEST program has not funded a lot
13 of capital construction needs in Denver public schools."
14 That most of them -- the money that -- and I think there
15 has been some money spent in the BEST program in Denver.
16 But because of the statutory criteria around that program,
17 because of the required way that -- that the department and
18 the BEST Board have to allocate those revenues, often
19 they've gone more toward rural areas of the state. And --
20 and these legislators are concerned, they're saying like
21 the money is coming from people in Denver and it's being
22 spent in other places.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So are they going to
24 differentiate the money from out of state purchasers? I
25 mean that --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The most common example is
2 gas tax. (Inaudible) I don't know if it's still true, 15
3 percent of revenue came from El Paso County, they got nine
4 percent of the spending. That raises issues at home, that
5 forces people to respond or let's say they respond. I
6 think, generally, those don't go any place and they are not
7 likely to be successful reallocating based on source of
8 income.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wasn't most of the case
10 that Denver didn't apply? There were -- there was a
11 charter school that applied for it. But I'm thinking they
12 applied for it and maybe they don't apply for it -- maybe
13 they don't apply for it because they think that -- that
14 they won't get it. The -- I think the -- the idea out
15 there is that it is for rural schools and not for urban
16 schools, so that maybe --

17 MS. MELLO: And -- and I wanted to clarify,
18 I was using that as an example to -- to make the point. I
19 don't actually have any information about what Denver has
20 been awarded or not awarded, whether they've applied or not
21 applied. So that was more just an example to try to
22 explain the issue.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is true, they have
24 not applied in recent years.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, cause I don't get
2 it.

3 MS. MELLO: So the other topic that I think
4 we will see continued discussion about, and again, I know
5 this is one that you all are interested in, and I've talked
6 about is concurrent enrollment. There was -- there were a
7 couple of legislative proposals that came forward on that
8 last year. The only thing that passed was a relatively
9 minor change, but the state in general, I think continues
10 to be interested in this issue of transition between high
11 school and career, be that trade, be that community
12 college, be that a four-year institution. Concurrent
13 enrollment is obviously one of those programs that has been
14 proven to be kind of a successful bridge. And so there is
15 a great deal of interest in the program, and how it works,
16 and how it could work better, and should there be
17 expansions, and should we run it differently. And I think
18 all of those questions will be things we'll see the
19 legislature take an interest in 2017.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And with concurrent
21 enrollment, at what point are you a Colorado high school
22 graduate? I think this is muddling up some of the
23 programs, P-Tech, for example, when do you walk as a high
24 school graduate if you're part of that (inaudible). So



1 that kind of needs to be part of those -- of those
2 discussions.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that too. And
4 also, there are other categories of kids, not a good word.
5 The -- I mean, I mention something because it relates to
6 this, the whole idea of off level testing in order to meet
7 certain qualifications for placement and or continuation in
8 high school, namely the gifted -- gifted students that
9 those that have been identified, but also, how does that
10 impact graduation, how are they counted in the graduation
11 rates? If a student graduates early, if it's able --
12 eligible to graduate early, how are they classified in
13 there? And then, my only other inquiry would be about
14 waivers in general or in particular whether we're going to
15 have a chance to talk about specific types of situations
16 pertaining to waivers, one being innovation schools, and
17 waivers in general. So the two bills that -- two or three
18 bills that kind of faded away at the end of the session but
19 are not necessarily dead issues.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further questions?
22 Did -- did you complete your --

23 MS. MELLO: I did. I was going to say I'm
24 done. And do you have any other questions, and you --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right.



1 MS. MELLO: (Inaudible).

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Great. Thank you very
3 much, Ms. Mello --

4 MS. MELLO: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- we appreciate it. We
6 now proceed to item 4.0, Colorado Culturally Linguistically
7 Diverse Action Plan. Dr. Anthes?

8 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm
9 going to turn this over to Dr. Colleen O'Neill to give us a
10 briefing on this. You heard little bit about this
11 yesterday.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. O'Neill?

13 MS. O'NEILL: Good morning. I'm Colleen
14 O'Neill, I'm the Executive Director of Educator
15 Preparation, Licensing in Educator Effectiveness. I'm
16 trying to figure out a shorter name. So if you have any
17 recommendations, I'm totally open to those.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Acronym.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Acronym.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what everybody
21 loves.

22 MS. O'NEILL: I'll work in on acronym. So
23 thank you. This morning, I'm here to talk a little bit
24 about the Colorado Culturally and Linguistically Diverse
25 Educator Development initiative. This initiative has



1 stemmed from many years of inquiry from the Department of
2 Justice, as well as the Office of Civil Rights, and this
3 dates back probably to about 2009 to 2011. Thank you. And
4 we have been talking about it internally for many years and
5 addressing it. So today, I wanted to give you just a
6 little bit of history around it. And then, we're going to
7 talk a little bit about the context around culturally and
8 linguistically diverse, our English learners in the State
9 of Colorado. And then, a little bit about a draft
10 development plan that we were talking about to kind of
11 address more aggressively our English Learner population.

12 This stems very specifically from the Equal
13 Educational Opportunities Act in which no state shall deny
14 equal educational opportunity to an individual on account
15 of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin by
16 ensuring that the failure -- by, I should say this again,
17 the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate
18 action to overcome language barriers that impede equal
19 participation by its students in its instructional
20 programs. The term state educational agency means the
21 agency primarily responsible for the state supervision of
22 public elementary schools and secondary schools, that is
23 also the Colorado Department of Education and the State
24 Board of Education.



1 A quick snapshot around English learners in
2 the state. Over the last 10 years, the number of English
3 learners in Colorado's public schools has grown by more
4 than double. The rate of growth in the total student
5 population. There are now approximately 126,000 English
6 learners in Colorado, comprising approximately 14 percent
7 of the total K-12 population in the state. Just under five
8 percent of the more than 100,000 teachers holding a
9 Colorado license have an endorsement in culturally and
10 linguistically diverse education. That is the main point
11 of concern around the Office of Civil Rights and the
12 Department of Justice inquiries. The fact that Colorado
13 educators do not hold clear endorsements, endorse
14 certifications around educating our culturally and
15 linguistically diverse students, again, less than five
16 percent in the state out of our 100,000.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: I was wondering if it might be
19 good to hear an explanation right now about what having a -
20 - kind of lost it, culturally and linguistically diverse
21 endorsement.

22 MS. O'NEILL: What does that mean?

23 MS. MAZANEC: What does that entail? What
24 does that mean? How does that help our ELLs?



1 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. The culturally
2 and linguistically diverse endorsement really helps
3 identify strategies for second language learners that is
4 very different than the strategies that we use for English
5 language learners. And when you receive a certification
6 and or professional learning and or endorsement in
7 culturally and linguistically diverse training, then you
8 receive strategies that really help ensure that you're
9 meeting the kids needs. My example has traditionally been,
10 we have a fairly large influx of Somalian refugees coming
11 to the United States. In many cases, those individuals
12 actually have not even held a pencil in their hand, much
13 less that in a formal school environment.

14 When we think about educating those folks at
15 a secondary level coming into freshman class versus a
16 Colleen O'Neill who has been here since she was in
17 preschool, it's a very different strategy to help support
18 those individuals. So culturally, we have a different
19 strategy and then linguistically there are different
20 strategies that go with that to help them understand the
21 English language. So those -- when we talk about
22 culturally and linguistically diverse, our general educator
23 preparation programs, we'll talk about differentiation for
24 students but we don't dig in very deeply into our
25 preliminary ed programs around how we really educate kids



1 that are coming to school that don't even know what a
2 pencil looks like, and or have no context around the social
3 and cultural aspects of being educated in the United States
4 school.

5 MS. MAZANEC: I think that's a great example
6 but I will follow up, please. I would like -- I would
7 really like to know more about what these strategies are,
8 just entrusted in what kind of strategies they use.

9 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. I can give -- I
10 can push some more of that information.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. Doesn't mean right now
12 but that'd be --

13 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely.

14 MS. MAZANEC: -- interesting.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you compare that
17 endorsement with the ESL endorsement.

18 MS. O'NEILL: I can give you -- I'll give
19 you a very high level description of it and I can certainly
20 give you a more point-to-point comparison of that as -- as
21 time goes on. Right now, the English second language is
22 really about teaching students who do not have native
23 English skills how to speak, write, and communicate. And
24 there is a difference between that and just helping others,



1 not just helping understand students culturally which is a
2 different -- a little bit different take on it.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Are there overlaps between
4 the two?

5 MS. O'NEILL: Yes.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So there is --

7 MS. O'NEILL: Yes.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: -- if you are ESL endorsed
9 teacher that the additional learnings are not as
10 significant as if you have neither of those?

11 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I would say that is
12 correct. Our -- our English as a second language
13 endorsement does definitely have overlap over our
14 culturally and linguistically diverse. Just for
15 clarification sake -- sake, the state of Colorado about
16 2010-2011, moved all of our endorsements off of English as
17 a second language and over into culturally and
18 linguistically diverse education endorsement which is --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So we don't have -- we don't
20 have the ESL endorsement here?

21 MS. O'NEILL: Correct. We have a -- we have
22 a legacy endorsement that we do still grant, of course,
23 because folks were -- were endorsed under that and they
24 have a due process for that. However, we have moved
25 everything over to a culturally and linguistically diverse



1 added endorsement by program only, which also means that
2 there is no test option today to allow for culturally and
3 linguistically diverse endorsements. Does that help a
4 little bit clarify that?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: It does, because I think
6 when we're talking about the -- the percentage of the
7 teaching population, don't we have a lot of ESL endorsed
8 teachers?

9 MS. O'NEILL: If I -- sure, if I go back --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So that she -- my
11 (inaudible) only thought is that the shift for them to be -
12 - to how this endorsement is not as great. I mean, I
13 remember schools in my community where every teacher was
14 ESL endorsed. This is when that was the endorsement
15 because of the population.

16 MS. O'NEILL: Correct. Absolutely, and --
17 and each district has the opportunity to hire in the way
18 that they see best fit to meet the needs of their student
19 population. And in many cases, they have already hired ESL
20 teachers and or culturally and linguistically diverse.
21 This particular slide kind of helps identify the five
22 percent in -- when we talked about the five percent of more
23 than 100,000 teachers holding a culturally and
24 linguistically diverse endorsement, those are actually
25 collapsed in there. So this slide talks a little bit about



1 our active CLD or Culturally and Linguistically Diverse is
2 768 as of the time of this slide, they change every day.
3 And then actively, linguistically diverse education, which
4 is a different endorsement, similar in nature, we're
5 talking nuances or linguistically diverse education
6 bilingual, which is now subsumed into our ESL is right
7 around 4,100 folks. So -- and those are the folks that --
8 that are often in our pullout programs, very specifically
9 oriented towards title and or pull out programs. When
10 we're talking about --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, what's a
12 pullout program?

13 MS. O'NEILL: A pullout, meaning, I have a
14 specific hours set aside as an EL learner, that all I do is
15 I work on my language development, so I'm not in a regular
16 -- a mainstream English language arts class, something
17 along that line.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.

20 MS. FLORES: But we do have tests. I mean,
21 if they passed, we do have tests to pass on.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Microphone.

23 MS. O'NEILL: But currently we do not have
24 an approved --

25 MS. FLORES: Not in the state?



1 MS. O'NEILL: -- not in the state anymore.
2 As of 2010-2011, the decision was made with a large group
3 of stakeholders that they would not be -- it would be added
4 endorsement only. There is no standalone endorsement,
5 added endorsement only for culturally and linguistically
6 diverse educators. Without -- without a content test
7 because it was not required.

8 MS. FLORES: Well, why not have a content
9 test --

10 MS. O'NEILL: And at the time --

11 MS. FLORES: -- and -- and a language test
12 as well. I mean, that -- that could do it. We could have
13 a lot more teachers if they could pass the content test,
14 and I think they would, I think a lot of people might do
15 that.

16 MS. O'NEILL: And as we talk about the plan
17 that we're looking on in front of us, a potential plan
18 today that is certainly a conversation that we're having
19 around bringing back an assessment and multiple pathways
20 again. For educators who already have an endorsement in
21 another area, like Colleen has an endorsement in English
22 Language Arts for her to be able to go down a different
23 path, by either professional learning competency, because
24 there are chances that I may have been involved in a lot of
25 the ESL strategies and or professional learning, and I'm



1 demonstrating those competencies already in my class, and
2 or I can take it by assessment and or that competency-based
3 assessment.

4 MS. FLORES: And then another option would
5 be for -- for the state to require a -- a class that all
6 teachers and -- that are going to be certificated in the
7 state of Colorado have a -- a course in methodology and in
8 -- in the area. I think -- I think that would help a lot.

9 MS. O'NEILL: I think -- I think we're --
10 we're on that trajectory. I'll jump ahead just a little
11 bit in our presentation to kind of get us there, because I
12 think what we're going to be recommending someone of is --
13 is in alignment with your thinking, Dr. Flores. So I'm
14 going to go ahead and jump along. We -- we have a few
15 statistics and I'm going to roll through them pretty
16 quickly, just so that you -- it helps give context to the
17 number of educators that -- or number of students that
18 we're talking about when we talk about our English
19 language. This particular slide talks about the total
20 number of English learners in grades K-12 in Colorado. I
21 think the important piece of this slide is actually in fine
22 print at the bottom, which it says the numbers do not
23 include parent refusals. But if it was included, the total
24 number in '14-'15 of a EL population would be 126,000
25 students in the state of Colorado.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Could you -- could you let
2 us know what parent refusals are?

3 MS. O'NEILL: Parent --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, I had the same
6 question.

7 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Thank you.
8 Parent refusals are really around, I don't want my kids
9 tested or in any programs that support English language
10 acquisition. Meaning, I don't want them to enter into an
11 English language program at all. I want them to be
12 completely mainstreamed with no support. And those parents
13 do have choices for that.

14 MS. FLORES: What number is that? What
15 column is that?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. How many are
17 these?

18 MS. O'NEILL: There is not a column on here
19 on this particular one. I'm happy to get you some of those
20 data.

21 MS. FLORES: Just 126,000 compared to --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: A hundred and one.
23 Shouldn't the asterisk be at 101,439?

24 MS. O'NEILL: That's what I -- what I'm
25 saying is that -- that in the graph itself --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right.

2 MS. O'NEILL: -- the number of parent
3 refusals are not included. But if we were to say to add to
4 parent --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Until you have an asterisk
6 and the asterisk doesn't show up any place, it should
7 probably be behind 101,439.

8 MS. FLORES: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct?

10 MS. O'NEILL: Correct.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

12 MS. O'NEILL: Correct.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And so these are -- these
14 are just to make -- or these are parents who want their
15 kids mainstreamed in English.

16 MS. O'NEILL: Do not want any support.
17 Actually, it's not necessarily English, it's just they want
18 no support for English language acquisition.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But they're just
20 mainstreamed.

21 MS. FLORES: The thing is that I think we
22 have to listen to parents -- I'm sorry, Katy. I think we
23 have to listen to parents whether they're going to take the
24 responsibility of teaching them in their language at home
25 and want the school to teach them in English. And I think



1 that's -- that's what needs -- we have to listen to them.
2 And if -- if parents want bilingual classrooms or dual
3 language classrooms, I think we have to provide those dual
4 language programs for them, and not say, "Hey, wait a
5 minute. We're going to put you only in a Spanish-dominant
6 classroom, and then when we find that we have more room,
7 we'll place you there."

8 Because I know many parents speak to me and
9 they say, this is in Denver, and they say to me, "Well, I
10 would like my child in a dual language classroom, but he
11 ends up only in Spanish for five or six years, and you
12 know, that's not what we signed up for. We signed up for a
13 dual language that was promised but he never got to dual
14 language, and it's only in Spanish." And I think we -- we
15 have to listen. Yes, and in fact, I just -- I went to a
16 homeless meeting of homeless parents, and these parents
17 were -- were -- were telling me that nobody in their
18 family spoke Spanish. But just because they had a Spanish
19 last name, they were being placed in classrooms where only
20 Spanish was spoken, and they didn't understand. They were
21 not doing well because they didn't know Spanish. So you
22 know, we have a lot of these issues where I don't think
23 school districts and schools listen to -- to parents. So -
24 -



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think, Dr. Flores, I
2 don't think that fits this presentation --

3 MS. FLORES: Well, --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- at the moment, so --

5 MS. FLORES: -- I'm just giving you the
6 broad reason why we have the issues that we do.

7 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I certainly appreciate
8 that. Thank you. I will move us along just a little bit
9 with some more data so that we can have a little bit more
10 time talking about a plan of action for our educators, to
11 have a little bit more background knowledge in culturally
12 and linguistically diverse. This particular slide points
13 out that the K-12 English Learner growth rate in Colorado,
14 which we have already mentioned some but the Colorado
15 English Learner population enrollment growth rate over the
16 last seven years between 2008 and 2014 has increased by
17 23.6 percent.

18 Again, I -- I want to highlight just kind of
19 what situation we are sitting in with our English Learner
20 population. The next slide talks a little bit about the
21 growth rate in -- in individual grade areas. And this
22 particular slide highlights that our early -- early grades
23 are where we are seeing some of the largest growth rates,
24 and our later grades are not the largest growth rate. So a
25 little bit about where -- if we were to start to really



1 help support our educators, and a -- a more specific or
2 prioritized way around culturally and linguistically
3 diverse professional learning, where would we want to tap
4 in the most? As you can see, it's on the earlier learning
5 grades around there.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

7 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Again, this may not
8 be totally pertinent to this part of the presentation, but
9 the growth factor, is that based purely on what our growth
10 -- what kind of our growth goes into that. And then a
11 follow up to that would be, how many of English -- how many
12 English language learners, if we have an estimate, also
13 study a second or third language in addition? So they come
14 in with a dominant language, whatever that may be. They
15 are in English learning situations but they also are either
16 studying or have access to another or more languages. And
17 how that all plays into the growth? I'm not sure that's a
18 question for you specifically, Colleen, but I thought about
19 this -- that particular last slide, the growth factor.

20 MS. O'NEILL: Great. I will -- I'll take
21 that. How many second or third languages off of the plate
22 for now, but do some research to follow up on that for
23 sure. And that the growth rate that we're talking about
24 here is the population growth rate, just to clarify what
25 that slide also means for us.



1 MS. GOFF: Okay. So our -- our population
2 growth has increased 27 percent.

3 MS. O'NEILL: In the EL population.

4 MS. GOFF: Quick memory, is that over the --
5 over the last few years, our English Learners growth,
6 academic growth has been consistently high, and in some
7 cases, higher in parts of the state than the regular
8 population; is that right?

9 MS. O'NEILL: You are right. You are right.
10 So I think this is -- and what you don't see in here is an
11 academic growth. We're really talking about population
12 wise, and in just a couple of slides, I'll get to the point
13 around that. Our population that we have been measuring
14 around EL has been academically growing over the course of
15 the last several years, and I'll talk a little bit about
16 why we're still having this conversation even though we
17 have a population that's growing.

18 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

19 MS. O'NEILL: This particular slide points
20 out the number of English learners and K-12 schools all the
21 way across the Board. We think that it is important to
22 highlight that we also have a very large percentage age of
23 ELs, of our English learners in charter schools as well.
24 And so statewide, 15.3 percent of students in charter
25 schools are English Learners compared to 14.2 percent of



1 students in non-charter schools. There are some important
2 factors to that because when we are talking about English -
3 - culturally and linguistically diverse educators in the
4 state of Colorado, we have opportunity to really influence
5 the professional learning and growth around educators that
6 are in public schools.

7 Charter schools can seek waivers out of any
8 of the opportunities that we may talk about with
9 professional learning and or any requirements that we may
10 make around entry level professional learning for
11 culturally and linguistically diverse for our educators.
12 It is important to make that distinguishing note, because
13 we are talking very much around what is it that we're
14 helping our educators learn and be able to do on behalf of
15 students. The next slide talks about the top 10 districts
16 by numbers of English learners. This is the slide that
17 I'll start to get into a little bit of conversation around
18 the Department of Justice inquiry in the Office of Civil
19 Rights. The context of this conversation is we have a
20 significant number of English language students in the
21 state. We are the sixth largest in the nation with our
22 English language learner population.

23 With given that -- given the fact that we
24 only have five percent of our educators that haven't
25 culturally or linguistically diverse background to help



1 support our -- support our English language learners, there
2 is a deviation between those numbers, and that is what the
3 inquiry right today is about. Do we have a number of
4 educators trained to provide services to the amount of
5 English language learners that we have in the state? And
6 that answer to date, if you look at the numbers
7 statistically, is no. The top 10 districts that we have
8 listed on our slide right now are the districts that either
9 have an Office of Civil Rights agreement that says they are
10 going to train their educators more aggressively around
11 culturally and linguistically diverse education to meet
12 their population needs and or they have an actual
13 Department of Justice consent decree that says they will do
14 more additional professional development training for their
15 educators so that they can meet the needs of their English
16 Learner population.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me. Chairman Durham?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Please, Ms. Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: I'm wondering how does
21 Colorado compare to other states as far as having teachers
22 trained?

23 MS. O'NEILL: So the other states that at
24 least sit above us on that six, so as number six, they all
25 have a requirement to ensure that their educators have



1 either a certificate or a full fledged endorsement or have
2 passed the content assessment in culturally and
3 linguistically diverse in order to be educated or in order
4 to be an educator in their state. That includes like
5 California, Arizona -- I can give the laundry list of those
6 folks. The reason that we're having this conversation is
7 because many of the other folks that we compare to already
8 have requirements in place in their state from a States
9 Department of Education level and the State Board of
10 Education to ensure that those educators have a culturally
11 and linguistically diverse background that meets the needs
12 of their students.

13 MS. MAZANEC: What does that mean -- what
14 does that mean functionally, though they may have the
15 requirements but considering the teacher shortage across
16 the nation, are those states also struggling with finding,
17 you know, getting --

18 MS. O'NEILL: I would say based on my
19 knowledge, everybody is struggling finding enough teachers.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Everybody?

21 MS. O'NEILL: So this is really about the
22 conversation of how do we get it into pre-service, and
23 that's as we talk about the plan going forward in the next
24 couple of slides. We really are talking about the pre-
25 service teachers, we're talking about in-service teachers,



1 we're talking about out-of-state teachers that don't come
2 to us with some of this work, and how do we kind of lift
3 the entire boat across, not just the state, but the nation
4 as a whole, too.

5 MS. MAZANEC: Apologies, I keep interrupting
6 --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That's fine.

8 MS. MAZANEC: -- while you try to get to the
9 point.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: Well, you know, it was
12 interesting to me that many of the other states kind of
13 surrounding us have an undergraduate program to train ESL
14 teachers. But yet here in this state, the first time I
15 heard about it was last year when Boulder brought in their
16 program, when Metro brought in their program, and where
17 several other universities brought in their program. So
18 that tells me that while other states have been training
19 teachers at the undergraduate level, we have only had
20 programs in the master's level for years, where others have
21 overtaken us for 25, 30 years. So I mean, I can see why.
22 And then when you take away that testing so that teachers
23 can take tests and be able to, you know, say, "Well, I
24 tested out," we took those away too. Can you understand



1 why we're in the problems that -- that we have the problems
2 that we do?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Dr. Flores.
4 I do wanna make note of a couple of things. One, we have -
5 - we have actually a significant number of (inaudible) of
6 Higher Education that have dual endorsement programs and or
7 standalone culturally and linguistically diverse programs
8 and have worked on them for a number of years. We have
9 quite a few opportunities around that. All of our educator
10 preparation programs have at least a course or embedded
11 coursework in culturally and linguistically diverse. What
12 we are recognizing is it's not quite enough yet. And so we
13 do absolutely have those braided in, but we think the needs
14 of the population as it is growing, we have not managed to
15 keep quite up with all of our entry level. But we do have
16 quite a few programs who now have dual endorsements.
17 Meaning, I'm coming out of that elementary with an
18 elementary endorsement, and I'm coming out with a
19 culturally and linguistically diverse and or special
20 education endorsement. So there are plenty of
21 opportunities around that. What we're -- what we're going
22 to be proposing is that we actually raise that even more to
23 be more specific around it, not just for our pre-service
24 teachers, but also our in-service teachers as that mix up
25 the vast population who are serving our EL kids today.



1 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

2 MS. O'NEILL: You're welcome.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just a quick math. That
4 would appear about 80 percent of the English language
5 learners are in these 10 districts?

6 MS. O'NEILL: I would say --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I have got about 80,000.
8 I didn't benefit from higher learning skills.

9 MS. O'NEILL: You are correct. A large
10 portion of our students are in these 10 districts. I will
11 also say that a significant amount of money in cost is
12 incurred by these large districts to educate their teachers
13 even further than what we have done in order to serve the
14 population. The other interesting thing that many of these
15 districts have talked to us about is the fact that they're
16 educating these -- there are teachers in their system to
17 meet the needs of their EL students, and then those
18 teachers are lured away by other districts and take their
19 skills with them.

20 And so the context around this is really
21 what is the Colorado Department of Education and the
22 state's role in ensuring that all educators have this
23 versus individual districts role in the Office of Civil
24 Rights to come in and actually make a decree and or an
25 agreement or a requirement for that district. Is there a



1 role? The Department of Justice right now believes that
2 there is a role that the Colorado Department of Education
3 should be taking and ensuring that all of our educators
4 have this foundation in order to support the sixth largest
5 EL population in the nation. So I think that's the context
6 in which they're coming to us with and it's -- could be
7 debated a lot.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The districts -- the
9 districts that are dealing with this, what is the
10 difference between whatever extra they're doing? And
11 ultimately, I read through the proposal, ultimately, what
12 you're going to suggest? Are they already doing it?

13 MS. O'NEILL: Many of the districts are
14 already doing it. Many of the districts are not doing it
15 at the extent that we would be looking at it. And many of
16 the districts have already --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm talking of these 10?

18 MS. O'NEILL: Of the 10? Yeah. Of the 10
19 that we're talking about. They are doing it, they are
20 finding ways to do it. They're also spending a significant
21 amount of time and money and energy to do that, when they
22 felt like it could be something that potentially our
23 educator preparation could be providing and supporting. So
24 there's a -- so you're right.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they have 80 percent of
2 the students and they're already, in your own words, doing
3 a good part of this?

4 MS. O'NEILL: Some of it, yes. At that
5 initial level --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Some of it or --

7 MS. O'NEILL: I will say at the -- at the
8 six -- we can do this a couple of different ways. I can --
9 I can go through and actually talk about what the programs
10 are and then kind of backtrack and say --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: When you do that, then
12 talk about the deficiencies of these programs. Okay.

13 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead (inaudible).

15 MS. O'NEILL: How about we do that because
16 then it'll give us the context of what layers we're talking
17 about.

18 MS. FLORES: And may I just say that some of
19 these districts, like Jefferson teaches ESL, is that
20 correct? Isn't that correct, Jane? Denver, if you have a
21 last name of Flores or Garza, your placed -- and then you
22 say that a parent in your family speaks Spanish, you're
23 placed in the Spanish-speaking classroom as opposed to an
24 ESL classroom. Adams 12 is the same way. I don't know
25 about St. Vrain. But I can say that, you know, that Adams



1 12, and I think Adams-Arapahoe and Denver do that, and they
2 do it only for kids who have a Spanish last name.

3 And then when they ask for to be placed in
4 an English classroom or without any of the frills, which is
5 what my parents did. Then -- and a lot of parents want
6 this. They'll take care of the native language at home,
7 but they want the school to take care of English. They're
8 not allowed to. They're giving promises such as, "Well,
9 we'll place you in a dual language," but we don't have that
10 class right now. Maybe they only have two schools that
11 provide that, and then they get to sixth grade and they
12 really haven't had any English. So that's very difficult
13 for the development when we know -- what we know about the
14 brain and how it develops and when you're learning two
15 languages.

16 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you. I -- I do think
17 that there's more conversation for us to have around the
18 district level placement. Our -- our focus right now is
19 really been on educating all educators, so making sure all
20 educators are equipped regardless of how the districts is
21 choosing to use them today. But I do definitely hear you
22 and that there's more conversation to how they think about
23 how we're placing them.

24 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

25 MS. O'NEILL: So I do want to be just --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Really --

2 MS. O'NEILL: Oh, I'm sorry.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I'm sorry. I can't get
4 recognized, so I'll just go ahead. You may have said this
5 and I apologize or so, how did this get initiated? Did
6 districts initiate the conversation with the Office of
7 Civil Rights or was it vice versa? Yeah. And well --

8 MS. O'NEILL: I think it's actually done
9 both ways.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: If the interest on the part
11 of districts, in general, is teacher preparation, teacher
12 capacity, and so forth to address this many kids, that's
13 one thing, that would be -- I mean, I would find it logical
14 that some -- some, if not all, of these districts would
15 start the conversation. And when it pertains to the
16 state's role in that, I just find it even more likely. But
17 if it came from -- from the Office of Civil Rights to begin
18 with, considering the numbers of the growth in the
19 population, I can understand that. I would find it helpful
20 to be clear about where that started and how it's
21 progressing as I go about finding out more about this in
22 the districts that are on there, and I have several. So I
23 want to -- I want to find out more about how it came about
24 before I pursue further with them.



1 MS. O'NEILL: I'll give you a very high
2 level analysis of what we know today, and then we can dig
3 in a little bit more and then push that forward. What we
4 know is that the inquiries around the larger district
5 started first, and then it became pretty apparent from the
6 districts that the state was not doing anything to support
7 them and help get those educators in. And that information
8 kind of has gone back to the Department of Justice, so then
9 the inquiry started there. So I would say it was actually
10 twofold. Is the Department of Justice, really the Office
11 of Civil Rights, was looking into it? Working with the
12 districts, as they were talking to the districts, it became
13 very clear that we had not, as the department had not gone
14 in and made very clear requirements for all educators to
15 come forward with this level of learning to help with our
16 culturally and linguistically diverse.

17 So I think it was a little bit of both. We
18 have definitely in the last year had these larger districts
19 at the table having conversations about it, and it is a
20 very, very clear message from these districts to the
21 department to say we believe you need to do something about
22 this. So it is -- it's definitely from the field as well
23 saying, "We are asking you to help us." And because of the
24 time, the effort, the money, the loss, the return on
25 investment when our teachers leave us at the district



1 level. So it's definitely coming from both ways and I
2 think that's very important to know.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you very much.

4 MS. O'NEILL: Okay. I'm going to just very
5 briefly hit on this and I'm gonna probably skip a couple of
6 slides so that we can get to the meat of the conversation.
7 Again, highlighting a few things. We're the sixth largest
8 EL population in the nation. There is a leveling off of
9 educators receiving an endorsement and or any other
10 certification and culturally and linguistically diverse.
11 The Department of Justice is in agreement with two
12 districts and investigating an additional districts. That
13 means there's a consent decree in two districts right now
14 from the Department of Justice. Meaning they will not sue
15 that district for Office of Civil Rights violations as long
16 as they continue down this pathway. The Office of Civil
17 Rights is in agreement with 13 other districts regarding
18 appropriate adequate services for English language
19 learners.

20 So again, there's -- they have made an
21 agreement with those districts to say, as long as you
22 continue to do this level of professional learning for your
23 educators to educate your kids, we will not make any
24 further inquiry, and we'll continue to monitor instead of
25 potentially launch an investigation into a lawsuit against



1 that. The Department of Justice inquiry to Colorado
2 Department of Education really regards the accountability
3 to support an educator endorsements. So when we go to the
4 original and back a little bit into your question, when we
5 go to the original timeline around this, it was initially
6 initiated -- let's try that again, initiated in 2009 with
7 the Department of Justice contacted the Department of
8 Education. At that time, they were really inquiring about
9 a few things. One, what's our accountability measures for
10 making sure that our English language learners are educated
11 at the level they need to be educated out? How do we know
12 that that's happening? And then also, how many teachers
13 are endorsed in that process?

14 We've collected a bunch of responses and we
15 sent that back to them and then they held for a few years.
16 And then in 2011, they made another contact. This one was
17 very clearly really around educator endorsements and the
18 number of educators that are qualified to do this work on
19 behalf of students. And we responded back and then we had
20 very limited conversation with them until 2015. The fall
21 of 2015, they got back in touch with us again around this,
22 and that's when we really initiated very heavy conversation
23 around educator endorsements and the data that went with
24 that. That really leads us up to today and from last year,
25 we started a stakeholder group meeting to start having



1 conversations around from a district perspective. It's one
2 thing for the Department of Justice to tell us, "Hey, we
3 think there's a discrepancy." There's another thing for us
4 to go out to the stakeholders and say, "Where is that
5 discrepancy? Do you see that discrepancy?"

6 And that's where we went as we went to the
7 stakeholders and we amassed a stakeholder team meeting to
8 really talk about that. And so I'm going to skip a couple
9 of slides in the absence of time. And so during that
10 conversation, what we really were looking out with our
11 stakeholders, which included some of our largest districts,
12 Aurora, Denver, many of our educator preparation agencies
13 that were also involved in it and some of our -- our local
14 human resource officers around the state, the issue that
15 really was there is, do our English language students have
16 an opportunity to receive the equitable education based on
17 teacher qualifications? And that was the question that we
18 started posing to our current stakeholder group. From an
19 educator endorsement perspective, the inquiry around that
20 really was, that came back from the stakeholder group, the
21 stakeholder group said actually, "No, we don't think that
22 we're providing enough support for all of our English
23 language learners in the state of Colorado."

24 So we went ahead and had a conversation
25 around that and said, "So if we were going to do that what



1 would it look like?' The answer really was to develop and
2 implement somewhat of a tiered and fully aligned approach
3 to ensuring that all of our teachers have a level of
4 competency around cultural and linguistically diverse
5 education. So that's what you see on the slide that's
6 presented in front of you. The recommendation -- very
7 draft recommendation that's coming for Board -- before the
8 Board today is exactly that kind of tiered model. It has
9 not been fleshed out in great detail. It is right now,
10 it's coming to the Board for some initial response and
11 reaction to see if this is a pathway that you would like us
12 to continue to pursue or to not pursue. Right now, what we
13 have is we have a level one certificate that would be
14 implemented for all teachers. So the requirements, again
15 kind of going back to you, I think, Dr. Flores, you had
16 brought up, you know, how do we make sure all teachers have
17 this in educator preparation. It's really around a level
18 one certificate that outlines very clearly the high-level
19 needs. That certificate is right now identified as a six-
20 hour component that focuses very much on competency.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can I interrupt?

22 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you have -- you have 14
24 percent of the students that have this need. They appear
25 to be clustered in a relatively small number of districts.



1 And yet I don't know what the cost per semester hour is,
2 but how many teachers do we have in the state?

3 MS. O'NEILL: Currently in the state, active
4 teachers, we have approximately 52,000.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you're going to have
6 52,000 people take six hours, that's, I don't know how, at
7 a cost for what per hour?

8 MS. O'NEILL: I think it completely depends.
9 Some are free depending on how we approach it, and that's I
10 think a huge conversation for us to have. Some are free.
11 Other states have implemented something similar in nature
12 for free, and it depends on your district. Some teachers
13 actually get paid for their professional development. So
14 I'll speak about Greeley-Evans, where I was the Chief Human
15 Resource Officer. Our teachers got paid \$25 an hour for
16 their professional development over the course of the
17 summer. So it is -- it varies greatly in small rural
18 districts, no, they're not getting paid to do this work.
19 So it varies greatly between but in some cases, they --
20 they do actually get paid for it.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So -- so as many attempt
22 to slice this in the way where, you know, you're -- you're
23 in districts where you don't have at least students, and
24 you can't make any other case, so that's a waste of
25 resources. That's not something that is required or



1 needed, and yet you're going to -- you're going to
2 substitute this six semester for professional development
3 perhaps strengthening the academic knowledge in the -- in
4 the area of, you know, physics or chemistry or whatever it
5 is you're taking. So you're going -- you're going to be --
6 there's no way to describe this other than you're applying
7 more resources to the problem and does not necessarily
8 resolved. Is there a way to -- is there a way to cut that
9 in some fashion, so that we -- we don't -- we don't
10 misappropriated scarce resources.

11 MS. O'NEILL: I think, Mr. Chair, there are
12 other states and this is, and again, an ongoing discussion
13 because this is very drafty at this moment. An ongoing
14 discussion, other states have prioritized based off with
15 the percentage of ELs, of English learners, sorry, English
16 learners in their, in their district and have prioritized
17 it as to when they would be able to obtain the kind of a
18 certificate or a level certificate around that. So I think
19 there are definitely ways that we can look at prioritizing
20 state -- state resources in a way that meets the district
21 needs.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, but you know,
23 certificate level one required of all pre-service
24 educators.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pre-service, that's not
2 the total number of --

3 MS. O'NEILL: Pre-service would be -- so in
4 this particular bullet, our pre-service educators that
5 would be pushed into our educator preparation programs --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So that's six hours of
7 something they're not going to take.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It could be or it could
9 be blended. So the other conversation that we're having is
10 that, it's actually blended into many of the classes, so
11 that you're learning the strategies in conjunction with
12 teaching science. You're learning the strategies in
13 conjunction with teaching literacy. And there are, we
14 already have a couple of institutes of higher education
15 that have done that in order to have a dual endorsement
16 into their elementary program. So we have some examples of
17 that -- of that work. So again, it's -- it's a
18 conversation if it's applicable for sure.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

20 MS. RANKIN: As, as a representative of
21 Rural Colorado, we have a hard time getting teachers
22 anyway. The last thing I want to do is have them educated
23 whether they'll be hired away. So this is of great concern
24 to me.



1 MS. FLORES: But -- but the thing is that,
2 if -- because of -- of how the state, the migration within
3 the state of teachers, not only of students, we have that
4 too, but we have enough teachers. We need to think about
5 all teachers taking this, and they're going to need six
6 hours in order to be recertificated again. So in order to
7 get their certificate, these would be wonderful hours a day
8 if we can provide them either free or with some
9 compensation.

10 MS. RANKIN: Not if there are no English, or
11 I'm sorry what was that word?

12 MS. O'NEILL: English ---

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: English learners.

14 MS. RANKIN: English learners in their
15 district. There's not a need there. I -- I just don't see
16 that. I understand that in some districts. I understand
17 that near district --

18 MS. FLORES: Maybe -- maybe in some
19 districts, you provided for two people that maybe need
20 recertification, and who need the hours to be recertified,
21 and they want to take six hours in this area. So I mean,
22 teachers are always wanting to learn.

23 MS. RANKIN: That's a whole different --
24 that's a different discussion.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's voluntary
2 (inaudible) -- that's requiring all teachers to be
3 certified --

4 MS. FLORES: But it would be easy to ---

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- in an area that they
6 may not ever required.

7 MS. RANKIN: And what's the (inaudible)
8 required would be?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, are you -- Dr.
10 Schroeder.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: How many districts have no
12 English learners?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I was actually
14 just looking behind me to see if somebody have the data. I
15 do not have info in my hand. I don't actually know that we
16 have -- there are, are you looking --

17 MR. CHAPMAN: (Inaudible) and then there are
18 others with small numbers.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah, and then -- and then,
20 there's a percentage. So we'll give -- we'll have Mr.
21 Chapman give us an update on that. But there's also a
22 percentage conversation to have, is that while there may
23 only be four, there may only be 15 in the district or 20 in
24 the district where -- however that look. So we've been
25 trying to look at it from a percentage. We'll take a look



1 at it. And I -- I do think it's also important to note
2 that this is not -- the Department of Justice -- I want to
3 go back to a question that you kind of noted a little bit
4 earlier. The Department of Justice is asking that we
5 ensure that contents specific teachers who serve the vast
6 majority of our English language learners have a very clear
7 understanding and support strategies for English language
8 learner and culturally linguistically development context
9 and strategies.

10 And I think, as we've had our stakeholder
11 conversations, we have had a lot of conversation around.
12 Is it all teachers? Is it only some teachers? What's the
13 fairness level of that? Are there strategies that make a
14 lot of sense for all teachers? So -- and I think that's
15 the other important thing to note, is that as we're talking
16 about culturally and linguistically diverse strategies,
17 we're actually talking about differentiation strategies as
18 well that are strong -- strong across the continuum for all
19 educators, whether that is, you know, our special education
20 students to English language learner students. I think
21 that is for us to define and -- and for you as the State
22 Board to kind of give us more direction around that, where
23 we right now, is a stakeholder group had gone down the path
24 of saying, we say it's for all.



1 We definitely say it's embedded into pre-
2 service so that we have this. We don't see a trend going
3 downward in our English learners population. We have
4 continued to see an upward trend. And so we're thinking
5 about today and we're trying to think about moving forward
6 in the Colorado context. The other thing I guess, just
7 very high level, I wanted to say is that, when the
8 Department of Justice started talking to us about this, we
9 were very clear in saying, we appreciate what other states
10 have done. We want to do what's right for the state of
11 Colorado and for our learners here and for our teachers
12 here. So while these are some preliminary conversations
13 that we're having by no means is -- is this where we need
14 to land? So we will take every ounce of feedback that you
15 have around and the concerns and go back and go, okay, this
16 is where we are today. Now, what -- what do we want to
17 talk about next and bring that back to us.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Let's see,
19 where were we? You want to go ahead and finish up and --

20 MS. O'NEILL: I will.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- we'll -- we'll hold the
22 rest of questions to get done.

23 MS. O'NEILL: Okay. I will do my best. In
24 support of trying to make sure that we actually have
25 something that meets the -- the entire state needs



1 including our rural conversation that we've had pretty --
2 pretty aggressively -- the level one certificate is for all
3 pre-service educators, that means that it gets embedded
4 into all of our educator preparation programs and our
5 designated agencies are alternative as well. How that
6 embeds is very much up for discussion. And then, it would
7 also be required as a renewal criteria for all educators
8 over the course of their renewals cycles. We actually have
9 talked with the -- the folks about having two renewal
10 cycles to be able to do this, which is essentially 10 years
11 to be able to identify where this requirement comes in.
12 And multiple ways to be able to do that by endorsements, if
13 you already have it by competency based, by content
14 assessment in a multitude of ways to make it easy
15 (inaudible) possible.

16 MS. RANKIN: Did you eat some chocolate?

17 MS. O'NEILL: I think so. I'm -- I'm sick,
18 so that has not helped anything. I'm sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's all right.

20 MS. O'NEILL: I'll take a drink of tea and
21 my voice will be better.

22 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Chair, in fact maybe Dr.
23 Scheffel can tell me something or perhaps some Ms. Goff but
24 I am really -- I'm really wanting to understand what these
25 strategies are that apparently, the Department of Justice



1 thinks would make a big difference and how these students
2 succeed.

3 MS. O'NEILL: I'm -- I'm looking around the
4 room to see if there's somebody --

5 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. You don't need to --

6 MS. O'NEILL: -- who's smarter than I am
7 (inaudible) --

8 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. You don't need to -- I'm
9 just, you know, I'm looking at these, you know, you have
10 the six hours for the level one. Six hours, what -- what
11 kind of course are we talking about? What -- I'm saying
12 with the six additional, you know, and then, 24 --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think --

14 MS. RANKIN: -- I'm wondering what kind of
15 course is this.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Hold on a second there.

17 MS. O'NEILL: I actually -- we have Dr.
18 Carla Essar who is here, who actually has a second -- she's
19 one of our stakeholder Members and could give us --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. O'Neill, I think part
21 of problem is were running late and we'll do have some --
22 we do have some guests here that we need to present some
23 awards to. So I'd rather not run any later. I think -- I
24 think that the presentation has been a good one but I think
25 when you get into the specifics of what these classes are,



1 probably better for another day with a different set of
2 expertise. And -- and I think the summary is -- is fairly
3 self-evident that you got level one and I guess there would
4 be a timeframe for that. Level two, and then, you have the
5 standard endorsement which some may choose to get and which
6 -- it's one way or the other, and I would guess that would
7 be the -- the approach. But I think we're -- we're
8 obviously going to spend a long time on in the future. So
9 I think it's been a good -- a good summary and a good start
10 and the -- the presentation is pretty clear, I think so.

11 MS. O'NEILL: And -- and I will take away
12 some of the things that you have given us to think about
13 and come back with a little bit more clear information for
14 us around what are those courses. I will direct you to
15 right around page eight or nine of the actual working
16 product discussion plan, because that outlines all of the
17 standards and strategies that may help a little bit on that
18 end of explaining what are some of those strategies,
19 because those are the culturally and linguistically diverse
20 roles that are adopted by the Board. So from there I will
21 go ahead and take any additional request.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think we'll hold the
23 rest of the questions.

24 MS. O'NEILL: Okay.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And Dr. Scheffel, you
2 didn't ask any questions. You want to take one?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I would just say thanks
4 for the presentation, great questions from the Board. My
5 sense is that people just want to take a deep dive into
6 what would likely make a difference. Because I think that
7 there are standards in the teacher preparation in the
8 licensure standards right now. There are standards within
9 that that do address linguistically diverse students and
10 English learners. The question is, what kinds of
11 coursework and experiences link to those in teacher prep
12 programs that have a high likelihood of making a difference
13 to close achievement gaps for these kids? And now, if we
14 had six additional hours or however many hours or whatever
15 types of experiences, I think there's a great interest in
16 ensuring that they actually work and that they make a
17 difference, and that they're, you know, I -- I think words
18 like culturally sensitive or responsive strategies, they
19 don't mean anything to people, many folks.

20 So the question is, what does that language
21 mean? And what are districts already doing in that realm
22 that actually work? How could that be folded into
23 exemplary teacher ed programs? And so that's a great mixed
24 up for this conversation but the framing is excellent.
25 There's a huge need and teacher preparation firms want to



1 address it. The public wants to address. The Justice
2 Department is surfacing the issue. What has a high
3 likelihood of actually making a difference, and that's the
4 next discussion. So thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Thanks very
6 much, Dr. O'Neill. We're now going to proceed into the
7 recognition of the 2016 National Spelling Bee finalist. We
8 have recognitions of Colorado of outstanding students and
9 educators. The first of our two recognitions is the
10 Scripps Howard National Spelling Bee finalist.
11 Commissioner, if you would take over please.

12 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you. We are really
13 pleased to be honoring a 2016 Scripps National Bee finalist
14 today. And I'm going to turn it over to our Associate
15 Commissioner for Quality Instruction and Leadership,
16 Barbara Hickman, to present the award.

17 MS. HICKMAN: Thank you very much. We --
18 it's my pleasure, we have two honorees today. And one of
19 them is not here and one of them is, so we'll just spend a
20 minute talking about Mr. Cameron Keith who isn't here
21 today. He's a fourth grader at the Friends School in
22 Boulder but he was on -- he's on a family vacation. He
23 wasn't able to join us. But just a quick word about him,
24 he was the Barnes and Noble Boulder Regional Spelling Bee
25 in February, he won that to secure his second straight trip



1 to Washington. He didn't make the finals last year but at
2 the age of 10, advanced this year to the finals. But again
3 he is on a vacation and wasn't -- wasn't able to be here.
4 However, we do have Ms. Sylvie Lamontagne who is here,
5 right? Come on up. You want to bring your mom, too? Come
6 on up, mom. So we're going -- we're going to talk about
7 you a little bit.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible).

9 MS. HICKMAN: So we're going to talk about
10 Ms. Lamontagne for a minute. I'm going -- I'm going to
11 tell you the three words that -- that came up for her so
12 that we can be suitably impressed with that. Scripps
13 National Spelling Bee is the nation's largest and longest
14 running educational promotion administered by the Scripps
15 Company. The purpose is to help students improve their
16 spelling, increase their vocabulary, learn concepts, and
17 develop correct English usage that will help them through
18 their lives. Each year, tens of thousands of schools
19 enroll in Scripps local spelling bee. During the fall and
20 winter, schools conduct programs in the classroom, spend
21 their champions, and send their champions to continuing
22 levels of competition. The champion of each local spelling
23 bee qualifies for participation in the National Spelling
24 Bee near Washington, D.C., and that is by the way broadcast
25 live and you can still find it on YouTube. If you'd like



1 to watch it, it's on ESPN too. And this year, it was May
2 26, 2016.

3 Colorado was well represented, as I noted,
4 both with Cameron Keith and with Sylvie Lamontagne who's
5 sitting right next to me, right now. For the second year
6 in a row, Ms. Lamontagne was in the finals. Last year, she
7 finished ninth in the competition. This year, she advanced
8 and finished fourth in the national competition as one of
9 285 initial contestants. She advanced through the
10 competition, once again, to the live finals and she
11 conquered words by correctly spelling Shubunkin, which is a
12 kind of gold fish. (Inaudible) which is a kind of Japanese
13 poetry, and I did have to look these up. And she made it
14 to the final four before she was given the word,
15 (inaudible) which is a type of net, and that brought the
16 competition to an end.

17 She's an avid speller. She studies
18 extremely hard to get to the National Spelling Bee. She
19 works on this up to five hours a day and longer on
20 weekends. She does schedule time for some of her favorite
21 activities which include dance, hiking, hanging out with
22 friends, and Harry Potter books and movies. This will be
23 her final competition but in the future she would like to
24 coach other spellers. So please help me recognize Ms.
25 Sylvie Lamontagne from Crayton Middle School, and then,



1 we're going to let her say a couple of words.

2 Congratulations. And it's your turn to talk and we're just
3 going to move the mic down for you a little bit. You don't
4 have to talk, but if you want to, it would be great.

5 MS. LAMONTAGNE: I was told that I was --

6 MS. HICKMAN: Perfect.

7 MS. LAMONTAGNE: -- (inaudible) these talks
8 so I have stuffs I'm going to say. So -- I forgot --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's okay. I was using
10 notes --

11 ALL: I use notes.

12 MS. LAMONTAGNE: Yeah, I know. I just
13 forgot.

14 MS. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

15 MS. LAMONTAGNE: Okay. Mr. Chair, Members
16 of the Board. First, I want to say --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can't hear you.

18 (Inaudible).

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There you go.

20 MS. LAMONTAGNE: First, I want to say thank
21 you for inviting me here today. It was good to be able to
22 go back to nationals for a second time and it was also
23 great to be able to place higher than I had the previous
24 year. It was also an amazing experience outside of the Bee
25 itself. I was able to gain knowledge of language when



1 studying, and that was fascinating to me. I think I've
2 realized that etymology is much more interesting than it
3 might seem at first that sometimes -- people say, "Oh well,
4 it's just like, oh this word is German and that's Latin.
5 Move on." But there's actually pieces of roots and pattern
6 and things like that, that you can use to help piece
7 together a word and I think I realized that that was really
8 important this year. That it's not just memorization, that
9 you actually have to understand etymology to put words
10 together.

11 I also was able to meet and make friends
12 with many different kinds of people and I think I'll stay
13 friends with lots of those people for a long time. And
14 there was the Bee itself as well. Just being able to stand
15 up on stage in front of all those people and pick apart
16 words was thrilling I guess, and I did eventually fail the
17 spell word as she said, which is obviously why I didn't
18 win. But that ended up not mattering to me so much as that
19 I tried my best and learned a lot along the way. This has
20 also opened other doors for me as well such as coaching
21 other spellers and also participating in events with the
22 Spelling Bee of China. In July, I went to California to
23 participate in a Spelling Bee between some students in the
24 US and also some students in China, and I won that. And
25 then I was -- because of that, I was able to go to Beijing



1 just six weeks ago, which was a great experience and I
2 participated in the Spelling Bee of China's conference to
3 begin their spelling season. I was very appreciative of
4 how many people were following Spelling Bee and following
5 me as well. And thank you again for having me here today.
6 I appreciate it.

7 MS. HICKMAN: Congratulations.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you and on behalf of
9 the State Board, we'd like to commend you for your
10 exceptional achievement and for being a student role model.
11 So if you want to, we'll present a certificate with the
12 Commissioner and Ms. Goff.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jefferson County, Ms.
14 Goff, I think -- yeah.

15 MS. GOFF: Can I make a quick comment?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Do you want to make
17 a statement?

18 MS. GOFF: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

20 MS. GOFF: Hello, again. And always, I have
21 known Sylvie and her family for several years. This is a
22 family celebration in so many ways. For the people of
23 Jefferson County, the school district and the entire
24 county, and I think as time has gone by it's become a
25 statewide brother and sisterhood of goodwill about this



1 young woman and her family and just taking it to the limits
2 where dedication, hard work, commitment to a good cause is
3 extremely important and appreciated by so many people.
4 Sylvie, you've become quite a role model. I'm sure you're
5 picking up on that. But at the same time, you are having
6 fun and you're enjoying being a young person now in high
7 school at the best high school in this state. And I just
8 want to say thank you for all of us in Colorado schools,
9 and you didn't mention what you did last weekend to carry
10 on the great calling that a lot of young people have for
11 spelling and the Arvada Harvest Festival. Sylvie was a
12 color for the bee's, is that what you're called when you
13 take that job on? And presented several words to fourth
14 graders? Fourth and fifth graders?

15 MS. HICKMAN: Four through six, yeah.

16 MS. GOFF: As part of the Arvada Harvest
17 Festival and a winner was determined and prizes were
18 awarded and she was also one of the parade participants.
19 So we had our home -- my hometown, Arvada, had a chance to
20 celebrate in that way as well. So thank you. Good luck
21 this school year. Continued fun with words. We really
22 appreciate your efforts and congratulate you.

23 MS. LAMONTAGNE: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. So

25 (inaudible).



1 MS. HICKMAN: Follow up (inaudible).

2 (Overlapping)

3 MS. HICKMAN: Congratulations.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, now we'll proceed to
5 -- the rest of the group will be returning shortly. Let's
6 see. The recognition of Colorado's International Teachers
7 Exchange League Program. Commissioner?

8 MS. ANTHES: Yes. I'm going to turn it back
9 over to Barbara Hickman to present our next award. We're
10 pleased to be honoring three teachers from the CITEL
11 Foreign Exchange Program. And so Ms. Hickman.

12 MS. HICKMAN: Thank you. I've moved up here
13 because these are adults and there are I think three
14 teachers and each brought your principals too, didn't you?
15 And so we'll take up a little more space so we may do this
16 part standing up. It is my pleasure today to honor Ms.
17 Glynis Wilson, Ms. Helen Nemeth, and Ms. Lauren Kirk, and
18 tell you about which I think you say, "CITEL" if you
19 pronounce this as a CITEL is a word. The Colorado
20 International Teachers Exchange League was formed in 1985
21 by a group of exchange educators returning to Colorado from
22 Australia and the United Kingdom. Since then, it has
23 evolved into a well organized network of educators
24 dedicated to sharing, supporting, and promoting the concept
25 of international teacher exchange. This exchange program



1 provides opportunities for a Colorado educator and a
2 foreign educator from Australia or Canada, to trade jobs
3 and homes for a full year and then return back to their
4 home classrooms.

5 Foreign exchanges teach for that full year
6 in a Colorado classroom. The Colorado International
7 Teachers Exchange League and the Colorado Education
8 Association, facilitate exchanges with most states and
9 territories in Australia and many Canadian provinces.
10 There are many benefits to this exchange, gain access to
11 new ideas and teaching methods, and educators in Australia
12 or Canada gaining insights into curriculum and methodology
13 for their assignment in another country, and students
14 certainly gain from working with a visiting international
15 educator, who can bring new ideas and cultural experiences
16 to this school. Three Australian exchange teachers are in
17 Colorado for the 2016's calendar year, which does coincide
18 with the Australian school year. So Glynis Wilson, if
19 you'd like to come up, and do you have people with you?

20 MS. WILSON: No.

21 MS. HICKMAN: Okay. Glynis Wilson is from
22 Melbourne Victoria, Australia. She's a primary special
23 education teacher currently working at Skyview Elementary
24 in Thornton, Adams 12, Five Star Schools. Helen Nemeth is
25 from Hunter Hill. Do you stay here? Is from New South



1 Wales, Australia. She is working at Mortensen Elementary
2 in Jefferson County Public Schools. And Lauren Kirk is
3 from Bordertown. Come on over. Lauren Kirk is from
4 Bordertown, South Australia. She is teaching Secondary
5 Science at the Discovery Canyon Campus in Colorado Springs
6 Academy 20. Please help me recognize each of these
7 exchange teachers and they will come forward and say a few
8 words. And first we have Ms. Glynis Wilson.

9 MS. WILSON: Mr. Chair and Members of the
10 Board. It's a great pleasure to be invited today and to be
11 honored by the State Board of Education. It's been my
12 great pleasure to travel all the way from The Land Down
13 Under to the Mile High City, and I certainly consider
14 myself very lucky to be here in Colorado. It's a beautiful
15 state and I feel very lucky to have the Rocky Mountains on
16 my doorstep. I pinch myself each morning as I drive to
17 work at that beautiful site. I've enjoyed my teaching
18 experience at Skyview Elementary very much and as a Special
19 Education teacher, I had the opportunity to work with a
20 wide range of students and teachers. My impressions of
21 Skyview Elementary add that it's a very well-managed and
22 well-run school with an excellent principal.

23 My first impression when I entered the
24 school was that it was a very happy place. The teachers
25 greet the students individually with great enthusiasm each



1 morning and the students arrive with an air of anticipation
2 about what the day would bring. The staff are dedicated
3 and professional and saw high standard for these students
4 and they teach a rigorous curriculum. My particular area
5 of interest and note is the positive behavior support
6 program. This is an area of my personal research project,
7 and it has close links with the positive behavior support
8 program in my home school.

9 It's a very positive atmosphere at Skyview
10 and the impact of positive behavior in student engagement
11 and learning is evident. The students are proud to call
12 themselves the Skyview homage and follow the Skyview rule
13 each day and this has enormous implications for engagement
14 and well-being and connection for all Members of the school
15 community. So thank you for the opportunity to be here
16 today and the recognition. And it's been a pleasure to
17 teach here in the Adams 12 district. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Wilson.

19 MS. NEMETH: Good morning Mr. Chair and
20 Members of the Board. Thank you for the opportunity to
21 express my gratitude in being able to participate in the
22 exchange program. I would especially like to acknowledge
23 the Colorado Exchange League who largely voluntarily
24 organized these exchanges, because they feel so strongly
25 about the positive experiences they encountered when they



1 did their own exchange. I'm currently teaching at a
2 marvelous school, Mortensen in Littleton Jefferson County.
3 Each year -- school year, there is a theme to create a
4 common goal and focus promoting in a positive way. In the
5 2015-'16 school year, that theme was Mortensen: Where
6 learning takes flight. I could well relate to these theme
7 because not only has my learning taken flight, it's having
8 trouble landing.

9 A hot air balloon was launched to kick off
10 last year and if I could relate this to the Colorado
11 Springs Hot Air Balloon Festival that I attended over the
12 Labor Day weekend, whenever I feel like my learning balloon
13 is circling or starting to drift, another shot of gas is
14 pumped and there I go again on that steep learning curve.
15 The 2016-'17 theme for Mortensen is where learning is
16 magical. This was reflected last Friday in the emergency
17 fire drill that took place. So the PC alarm rang out and
18 like magic, the schoolchildren and staff vacated the
19 building in silence. That would certainly never happen in
20 Australia, that silent part. Lastly, I would like to
21 express my gratitude to the Colorado Board of Education for
22 their open mindedness in welcoming exchanges from the other
23 side of the world. So on behalf of my exchange partner,
24 Carla Hankinson and myself, I thank you for this wonderful



1 experience and opportunity to learn and enhance our careers
2 and undergo such positive personal growth. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Nemeth.

4 MS. KIRK: Dear Mr. Chair and Board Members.
5 I'd like to take this opportunity to thank all parties
6 involved in the exchange partnership. In particular, CITEL
7 Members who coordinate the program voluntarily and a
8 special thank you to Jim Bailey and The Discovery Canyon
9 Campus Community for accepting me into the school and
10 making me feel welcome. The saying, "Time flies by when
11 you're having fun," is certainly true in this case. The
12 opportunities and experience that this exchange provides
13 are unforgettable. Students will be the same wherever you
14 teach in the world and you will always be challenged. That
15 school culture is something that takes time and effort to
16 build.

17 My experiences at DCC have shown me ways to
18 implement positive school culture at Bordertown High School
19 and I'm grateful to be involved in the new strategies that
20 DCC are trialing currently. An exchange is not an easy
21 experience. It takes a lot of persistence and courage.
22 However, when you're provided with support system such as
23 mine at DCC, the experience is less daunting. I'm proud to
24 be part of a team that shares a clear vision and work
25 exquisitely with smiles on their faces. They have also



1 become like family which is important to an exchange
2 teacher as they need that person to vent to, those who
3 encourage them, and those to make a tough week better with
4 a beer. There are few areas of interest that I've noted
5 during my exchange today. For instance, the importance of
6 teaching is a vocation, not just as a job, which has
7 dwindled over the years in Australia.

8 In addition, the debate around traditional
9 grading versus standard based, which is also a current
10 issue in the Australian National Curriculum. Also, the
11 International Baccalaureate Program has been a new
12 adventure and certainly shown me strategies that I can
13 share with my colleagues. Finally, as a faculty head at
14 Bordertown High School, I've also been interested in
15 encouraging others to follow your lead and I've had a
16 chance to see that in action and prepare myself with
17 strategies on my return. Thank you for supporting this
18 exchange program. The learning that occurs is invaluable
19 and I hope to see it continue in the future so that more
20 students and teachers can benefit from this experience.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. On
22 behalf of the State Board, I'd like to commend all of you
23 for your dedication on helping students achieve and for --
24 by inspiring students in both Colorado and your home
25 schools to attain high levels of academic performance.



1 Congratulations. And if you would come up, we'll get some
2 pictures and certificates up here.

3 (Overlapping)

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are going to take
5 about five minute recess. Okay. Thank you. The State
6 Board will come back to order and we are all set. It looks
7 like -- I'd like to just find the right page and then we
8 are going to start with -- the next item is the briefing on
9 the Every Student Succeeds Act state plan. Commissioner.

10 MS. ANTHES: Yes. This is part of our
11 ongoing many series on the ESSA plan. I'm not sure if it's
12 as good as Downtown Abbey or whatever many series you are
13 into. But we are committed to bringing this to every --
14 every Board meeting. So we have the --

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Some people will die.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, Downtown Abbey
17 rocks.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nobody dies.

19 MS. ANTHES: Okay. So this is not as good
20 as that. It's not as good as that. But I will turn it
21 over to Barbara Hickman to kick it off. And then we have a
22 panel of esteemed colleagues, Pat Chapman, Lisa Medler,
23 Brad Billsmer and Peter Sherman to talk a little bit about
24 their specific Spoke Committee. So Barbara.



1 MS. HICKMAN: Thank you Commissioner and
2 Chairman Durham, Vice Chair Schroeder and the Board. I do
3 -- just -- just like the title page, I just want to note
4 that since every --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it on?

6 MS. HICKMAN: There we go. Five of seven of
7 you were either present or listening online, I believe, for
8 the Hub. So although, we did promise you that we would
9 give you an update on Hub meetings each time, we'll make
10 that pretty brief. Because I think many of you were aware
11 of what happened. The Hub meeting had almost -- everyone
12 was present and we covered two different areas. Alissa
13 lead a conversation on accountability that focused on
14 expectations of the Hub for long term accountability
15 pieces. And also some on -- some -- some conversation
16 about what indicators might be used.

17 And so that was a healthy conversation that
18 took about an hour or so. And then the School Improvement
19 and Support team, who is here today, also presented to the
20 Hub with some of the issues in ESSA around their work to
21 get some information back from the Hub and bring it back to
22 you. And so this is the first time we've tried to kind of
23 get ourselves in this rhythm. So we'll be interested in
24 hearing your comments about whether or not that was
25 successful. Mr. Chapman, you're up.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. I just wanted to
2 give you a couple of quick updates of activities that have
3 happened since last we met. Particularly, wanted to point
4 you to the direction of the link that's up there that
5 includes information. We've had a lot of questions about
6 Hub membership, Spoke membership, activities, and focus
7 areas of the various Spoke Committees. And so we've
8 created a website that -- the link is right there and that
9 includes meeting minutes, the purpose of the Spoke
10 Committee, the meeting schedules, agendas and -- and so
11 forth and membership information. And it's attached to
12 another sort of a larger ESSA webpage that includes a lot
13 of information that might be helpful to you in
14 understanding what's happening as we move forward with our
15 State Plan Development.

16 We will not cover the Legislative Committee
17 meeting as Jennifer Mello covered that meeting. The only
18 other thing we really wanted to talk about a little bit was
19 the -- the rulemaking process. We're being sort of
20 barraged with rules to review and -- and comment on. Since
21 we met the last time, Carla did submit comments related to
22 the proposed rules, related to assessment and then the
23 assessment pilot. I think those were submitted on -- on
24 the due dates from September 9th. It was interesting to
25 note that there already are caught Colorado comments were



1 in the Fed Register already on, I think it was last
2 Tuesday, just two days ago. So they're really moving
3 pretty quickly on getting those rules published.

4 There are -- there are two other rules
5 packages that we're analyzing and developing a response to.
6 One is related to the ED Facts Information Collection
7 package. It's a fairly massive package that we submit
8 annually given the new -- the new law. They're revisiting
9 some of the -- the current rules and some of the current
10 expectations with regard to data submission. And we hope
11 that they will eliminate a number of data items, but
12 because there are a large number of new data items that are
13 being added to the package. And so we have a team of folks
14 who are really familiar with our reporting and where we get
15 sources of, you know, the sources of data and what we have
16 to report. And they're reviewing those rules.

17 The -- the proposed rules were released on
18 August 24th and comments are due by October 24th. The
19 other rules that were proposed released the invitation to
20 comment, was released on September 6th. The due date for
21 those comments is- it's actually not November 6th, it's
22 November 7th. And those rules apply to us, the supplement,
23 not supplant provision, which is really a pretty big deal
24 in the world of Federal programs. If any of you have been
25 -- been tracking that there's been a lot of discussion



1 about it and a lot of push back with regard to those rules,
2 some of the Members of Congress who were instrumental in
3 drafting the legislation, are arguing that they
4 intentionally left comparability alone so that there would
5 be no rules, new rules proposed related to comparability.

6 And instead, just modified the supplement,
7 not supplant language. And the only modification to that
8 was to suggest that school districts do not have to make a
9 case for individual expenditures at the individual level.
10 Instead, they just need to make a case for comparability
11 that they are not supplanting at the school and the
12 district level. And so the rules that they proposed look a
13 lot like the comparability rules that are already in place,
14 already what we're doing for comparability. So we test
15 annually for that in two ways. We test for comparability
16 and we test for maintenance of effort. The rules that are
17 proposed sort of seemed to add another layer that's very
18 similar to what we do for comparability already, but enough
19 different that it could create problems for school
20 districts and -- and -- and schools.

21 So were feeling pretty good about what we've
22 had in place. I also think that it's a really good
23 development that -- that school districts and schools don't
24 have to make a case for individual expenditures as being
25 supplemental. And that it would be very nice to just test



1 for this once and be done with it. The problem is -- is
2 with the nature of the rules and this sort of a
3 prescriptive nature for how we -- how we document that
4 expenditures are supplemental and not supplanting. There's
5 a lot of reporting requirements. But we have folks who've
6 -- I've read them and participated in a couple of webinars
7 are very brief. They are posted on our website and we have
8 put out a notice to the field inviting the field and some
9 of our professional organizations to comment on them as
10 well. And we'll come back to you in October with a very
11 detailed response to those rules and -- and you know, any
12 concerns that we might have. And with that, any questions
13 on -- on that stuff before we move into the next section?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So how many sets of rules are
16 associated with ESSA?

17 MR. CHAPMAN: Well, I think -- so we have --
18 the -- the rules that have been released include the
19 accountability data reporting and state planning rules,
20 assessment, assessment pilot rules, the information
21 collection package rules, the supplement, not supplant
22 rules. I think there are five.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Five or six steps, right?

24 Okay.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: Five or six, yeah.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And we've turned in comments
2 on the first set; is that right? They were due by --

3 MR. CHAPMAN: So we've commented on the
4 state plan, the accountability, and data reporting rules,
5 then we submitted comments on related to the assessment
6 rules. And then we have two -- I think we've commented on
7 everything. Right?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to clarify, it's
9 the assessment pilot rules, right?

10 MR. CHAPMAN: Well, it's assessment and
11 assessment pilot.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So have we seen what the
14 state submitted? I saw the first -- the first set of
15 comments from the state but I don't think I saw on here --

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. So in preparation for
17 this meeting, I do have a -- a copy and we can get a copy
18 to you. Interesting way, the -- the quickest way for us to
19 get our assessment response was through the Fed Register.
20 So I have the copy that's in the Fed Register, but I have
21 not received the copy directly from Joyce, but we will post
22 those. There are very good comments and she did it in a
23 really crisp and concise way with helpful recommendations.
24 And as expanding the non-double testing way to include
25 seventh grade. The one percent that had -- that had not,



1 we are not focused on the one percent, instead focus on
2 guidelines for eligibility for alternate assessments.

3 There are five or six comments including --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So do you think you could e-
5 mail summatively what the state has -- because I get
6 questions like that, what is the state saying to the Feds
7 as they're rolling out the ESSA? We are commenting that --

8 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. And I can -- certainly.
9 And at the break I can hand you the direct -- the copy, but
10 we'll get that to you electronically by the end of the day.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. That'll be great. And
12 then the other question is on these data rules that are due
13 -- comments are due by October, so we haven't commented on
14 that yet?

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Correct. And we will take
16 that -- we'll bring both supplement, not supplant response
17 and the data package rules response to you.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

19 MR. CHAPMAN: We'll bring that to you at the
20 October meeting prior to submitting to the USDE.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so are there data privacy
22 implications with that, or what are the issues that we
23 should be looking at? And also, some of us I think
24 submitted individual comments and so if we're going to do
25 that I'd love to know what the State is saying before I



1 would say something that might bolster what we're saying to
2 the Feds, or not. So maybe we could begin on what -- what
3 are we thinking in terms of issues related to that data
4 aspect.

5 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. And so we can get --
6 we'll make sure that you have the notice, inviting comment
7 and sort of a sketcher of what the major issues seem to be.
8 We'll certainly come back to you in October with a forward
9 discussion prior to submitting anything to the US
10 Department of Education.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: And in time so that we might
12 be able to ask, of course.

13 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: If there are no other
16 question, we'll --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Quickly. In relation
20 to each set of rules, which Spoke Committee is -- can you
21 do that or not?

22 MR. CHAPMAN: So with -- with the
23 supplement, not supplant, it's -- it's largely an issue for
24 the Title programs.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: Particularly Title I, because
2 the -- the supplement, not supplant provision applies only
3 to Title I. It does not apply to Titles II and III. So
4 we're working with the folks in the Title Committee, but
5 we're also working with folks internal to CDE who have had
6 our fiscal folks who've had to test for maintenance of
7 effort. And that we have somebody who's been doing
8 comparability with school districts. So we're bringing
9 those into the supplement, not supplant discussion as they
10 are most familiar with it.

11 But also working it through our Title
12 Program Spoke Committee, that the data package, one sort of
13 cuts across these Spokes, so it's not one particular Spoke
14 that's dealing with that issue. Currently, it's all of our
15 -- the IMS folks and our data folks and our stats folks who
16 are pulling together the -- the proposed rules themselves
17 and comparing to what's currently in place, and -- and
18 identifying areas where there seems to be an expansion of
19 data collection, or where there are data privacy issues.
20 So those are the ones who are most close to -- to that
21 particular proposed rule set.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks. Yeah, it helps
23 -- it just helps to have a way to explain the tangential
24 operations. So thanks. I appreciate it.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you. So with that, I
2 will turn it over to Lisa, Brad, and Peter.

3 MS. MEDLER: Okay. So thank you for this
4 opportunity to give you an update on where the supplement
5 and support Spoke Committee is. Some of you got to hear
6 this earlier in the week. The theme may be to entice you a
7 little bit more. I don't have a British accent or -- and
8 I'm not New Zealand, that's so much more delightful to
9 listen to, I realize. But I at least have my colleagues
10 this time. It was just me on Monday. So I'm going to keep
11 the -- the opening portion and brief and then I'm going to
12 hand it over to my colleagues here and then they'll be able
13 to give you a much more in depth information as well. So -
14 - oops, can I grab that?

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah.

16 MS. MEDLER: Thanks. So we're going to just
17 talk about the school improvement Spoke work. I think
18 you've already heard quite a bit from the accountability
19 group as well. They're obviously tied together pretty
20 well. Before we get into the details, just you know, I
21 want to remind you we are in the very beginning stages of
22 this work. This is just where we are to date. Pretty much
23 it's been focused on gathering membership and wrapping our
24 arms around what are we really need to be doing. So while
25 we've been working furiously, there's still a ton of work



1 ahead of us. So if it doesn't seem like we're as far along
2 as you would expect, give us some time and we will knock
3 your socks off at the next presentation. And then you'll
4 also hear us be referring to some of the other Spoke
5 Committee work as well because it's so integrated. Okay?

6 So I'm going to just give you a quick
7 overview so that you have a sense of what it is we are
8 supposed to be doing. So just to remind you, we are one of
9 several Spokes. So we're that one there in the corner
10 there, the School Improvement Committee. And then the
11 Spoke Committees have some pretty specific expectations.
12 We are mainly in charge of pulling together folks from the
13 field, really getting ideas out there, and then coming up
14 with some options to run past you and PEP Committee and
15 other folks that are making the final decisions. But
16 certainly doing a lot of the draft writing and --- and --
17 and what have -- what have you. So that's pretty much our
18 charge.

19 This you should have seen before, the
20 decision points, when you heard general presentations on
21 what we need to be doing. So we've just lifted this out
22 and highlighted it for you. Really, this is our main focus
23 area on those schools that are struggling most. Okay? So
24 we'll get into a little bit more detail on that, but that's
25 our focus. So what are -- what is the State doing to



1 support those identified schools? How can we help
2 districts to support those identified schools? How do we
3 ensure that there's evidence based strategies being
4 selected and implemented? And then how are we ensuring
5 that resources and Brad's going to talk more about
6 resources, because we know people get really excited about
7 that part. Very limited resources, how do we use them as
8 effectively as possible. Okay?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Schroeder.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: While I listen to folks and
11 read about ESSA and I'm also worried about the work that we
12 have ahead of us. Can you align for us the kinds of
13 conversations we're having about our turnaround efforts,
14 options, what we think we can do, and also, what the State
15 has been doing for those districts and what's in ESSA? In
16 other words, is this aligned with the kind of support we
17 have been giving districts? Is it different? How is it
18 different? I think I heard you say this was an -- somebody
19 say on Monday, this was an opportunity for us to look at
20 doing some different things. Is that my imagination?

21 MS. MEDLER: So let me kick it off and then
22 Peter --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I just think we ought to
24 bring these things together so that we don't go off January



1 through June in a direction that might be -- that's not
2 going to be enhanced by implementation --

3 MS. MEDLER: Sure.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- of ESSA, the following
5 August.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And Peter's
7 going to definitely talk about this more as the
8 presentation goes on. But we are bouncing a very tight
9 line here. This is what we currently have, we have our
10 current accountability system where we're identifying
11 schools and districts, those are on that accountability
12 clock, I know you've got some big discussions this year
13 around them in particular. With the waiver a few years
14 ago, through ESCA, we really took pains to trying a lot,
15 make some of those policy alignments come into play as well
16 as we could. It wasn't 100 percent but really try to wind
17 them up, so -- and mainly so that schools and districts
18 didn't have to be confused. I'm a Title I school so I have
19 to do the special thing, I'm identifying the special ways
20 versus the state system.

21 So we want it to work together so that it's
22 really about really identifying those schools and -- and
23 districts that are struggling the most so that we can
24 identify, again our limited resources going toward them.
25 So this is, I think, a continuation of that same discussion



1 we've been having for the last two years. That being said,
2 we also want to be really cognizant of it's not just we're
3 going to do the same old thing we've been doing, this as an
4 opportunity to kind of break it open and say, "Here's where
5 you are -- where we are, do we have some opportunities to
6 make it even more effective?' So that's -- that's the
7 tight balance of build on what we have and innovate even
8 more. So with that, I'm going to hand it over to Peter.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: And then what legislation,
10 if any?

11 MS. MEDLER: Right.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Or work changes? Okay. Go
13 ahead.

14 MR. SHERMAN: Good afternoon. I was -- or
15 good morning. I was going to say the same thing and Lisa
16 just said, so --

17 MS. MEDLER: Oh, I'm sorry.

18 MR. SHERMAN: -- I mean, I -- just to
19 reiterate. I mean, I think we are using this -- this --
20 the -- the ESSA plan process and this Spoke Committee in
21 particular as an opportunity to really look at what we're
22 currently doing, what we think needs to be adapted, and if
23 there are practices that we need to change entirely. I
24 think is -- we -- we can certainly speak more specifically



1 but I'm not quite sure -- that sure, if that's what you
2 want me to -- has to go right now, we'll get there.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I just want to know if
4 that's what you are thinking about.

5 MR. SHERMAN: Yes?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So when you come to us as
7 later in the day with recommendations, there's not a
8 misalignment between what we can anticipate coming down
9 when -- when we -- when ESSA actually is implemented.

10 MR. SHERMAN: Yes. Absolutely, that's our
11 goal. And I think also just to point out, as you -- if you
12 look at the list of committee Members that we've invited or
13 that have expressed interest in being on this committee,
14 there's quite a -- quite a range of folks that are in the
15 field from higher performing and lower performing schools
16 and districts, as well as folks from different types of
17 organizations. So we're really relying on their input and
18 their -- in many cases, their critical feedback to us about
19 supports that they find effective.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you.

21 MS. MEDLER: Okay. So thank you. This is -
22 - this weighs heavily on our minds, too. There's a lot to
23 balance here. So kind of glad to hear that your -- it is
24 on your mind as well. Okay. So that's -- that's
25 essentially our task, we're gonna go into a little bit more



1 detail on each of those pieces. The definitions are
2 probably pretty key. I'm gonna also point you in the
3 direction of another resource that we added into your
4 pockets. It's a one pager that lays out the comprehensive
5 and targeted schools. So that if you had a chance to take
6 a look at that, this essentially just breaks down the law
7 and lines them up side by side. Does this look like
8 familiar?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mine doesn't have
10 color, so this start with definition, identification,
11 notification.

12 MS. MEDLER: Uh-huh. So comprehensive
13 schools and targeted support and improvement.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yup, yup, yup.

15 MS. MEDLER: Yeah.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Are just -- are
17 just as -- are just right there.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just not in color,
19 unfortunately.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's right on
21 top. Might be.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It should be.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good.

4 MS. MEDLER: So don't worry I'm not going to
5 quiz you on this. But I think this is kind of -- couldn't
6 be helpful because we're going to be introducing some
7 language mainly around comprehensive support and targeted
8 support. Comprehensive support being -- and this is where
9 we're overlapping with the accountability group quite a bit
10 when we are -- sorry. I mean, I know people are still
11 struggling to find this. Comprehensive support are really
12 those that they're saying or the law is saying, at least
13 the bottom five percent of schools, and when we say schools
14 we're talking Title I schools in this instance. So we are
15 really cognizant of our accountability system when we're
16 talking about prior improvement turnarounds and making sure
17 that -- that, you know, we're looking at that at the same
18 time.

19 So we're working with the accountability
20 group in the identification process. But this is a way to
21 identify those -- those folks. We'll get into resources in
22 a minute and then there are some pretty specific
23 requirements around that. The expectation is that the
24 state is involved, the district is involved. There's
25 planning expectations, there's an expectation around



1 selecting these evidence based strategies to support them.
2 So when we talk about supports, and Peter will get into
3 that little bit later. That's where, I think, about our
4 lowest -- lowest performing schools, and what do they need
5 in place to help -- to help get them off of our
6 accountability block. On the other side, the targeted
7 support are any schools that are consistently under
8 performing for one or more of those disaggregated groups.
9 So it could be special ed students, it could be our English
10 language learners, it could be girls.

11 I mean there's -- there's a variety of ways
12 of disaggregating data. So again, I'm working very closely
13 with the accountability group because we could identify a
14 lot of folks there, right? So some of this also has to do
15 with whether states have the capacity to even track. This
16 one's a little bit more focused on districts. So the state
17 identifies them then the districts are really in charge of
18 working with them, and at least for those first few years
19 and trying to address some of those -- those -- those
20 groups that have been identified. So -- so that you have
21 this little cheat sheet here for you so they don't need to
22 go stumbling through the law as well, but it does at least
23 lay out some of the specifics. Okay, any questions on
24 that? Because that when we're talking school improvement



1 that these are the kinds of schools that we're talking
2 about, okay?

3 And -- and then the other definition I want
4 to get into you've heard me say several times evidence
5 based strategies. This is a very short summary of what's
6 in the law, it goes on for I think a full page but
7 essentially looking at research promising practices,
8 there's a few things that need to be considered, things
9 like are there actually efforts going on to assess whether
10 these strategies are working. So this is the kind of
11 definition that we need to be very cognizant of as we are
12 selecting and putting things out in front of schools and
13 districts to choose from. So with that being said, that's
14 at least a quick introduction to what we're talking about.
15 (Inaudible) those are the types of schools that we're gonna
16 be looking at. There's our -- now there's the resource
17 connection and I'm going to hand over to Brad.

18 MR. BILLSMER: Yeah. So we wanted to take
19 this opportunity to answer some questions that kind of
20 arose during the listening tour. There's a bit of
21 confusion about the funds that we have available through
22 Title I to support these low performing schools. So this
23 the next -- the next few slides are -- there we go -- an
24 attempt to do that. So for this conversation, we're really
25 focusing on the yellow and the green pie piece. The



1 overall pie obviously is Title I funds as a whole that the
2 state administers for all the districts throughout the
3 state. And I know that our eyes go immediately to the big
4 blue part of the pie piece, and just want you to know that
5 we will be addressing that as part of the Title I -- the
6 Title Programs Spoke Committee will be addressing that big
7 blue portion. But for our conversation, we're taking a
8 look at the -- the yellow and the green.

9 So under ESSA, states are required to set
10 seven percent of our Title I allocation aside to support
11 these schools. So as you can see that -- pie piece is
12 broken out and those -- that set aside has to go to support
13 again, LEA districts with a large number of those under
14 performing schools whether it's the lowest five percent or
15 those schools that are missing those -- have those under
16 performing subgroups of students, so those targeted
17 supportive students. We're looking at, again I want to --
18 I also reiterate that these are estimates only, Colorado
19 receives or administers approximately \$150 million a year
20 for Title I and so that's an estimate, a nice round number
21 for us to kind of work through but please do know that
22 these are estimates.

23 So that seven percent estimated would be
24 around \$10.5 million that we would be using to help support
25 LEA with those lower performing groups -- lower performing



1 schools. Ninety-five percent of that seven percent has to
2 go to those LEAs. Five percent can be retained in order to
3 administer those programs and support the LEAs with those
4 programs. Again they have to -- we have to prioritize
5 those districts with large numbers of those identified
6 schools. We also -- the law asked us to take into account
7 the geographic diversity of the state which is something
8 that was not in NCLB, and is a -- a response -- in response
9 basically to the way programs were administered under --
10 under NCLB. So as we award those funds we do have to take
11 into account the larger urban districts as well as those
12 small rurals.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: For the seven percent, it
15 goes to Title I schools that are in the bottom five
16 percent, or goes per student to the Title I schools?

17 MR. BILLSMER: It goes to -- LDAs they have
18 -- the districts that house those Title I schools that are
19 in the lowest five percent. It also includes high schools
20 that have a low --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: High school graduation.

22 MR. BILLSMER: -- the low graduation rate
23 and then depending on how much money we have left of that
24 \$10.5 million. So if we're looking at five percent of
25 Title I schools, it's about 33 schools, 33 to 36, somewhere



1 in the -- in the -- the mid 30's that we would have funds
2 to support those programs and to support those improvement
3 activities. So if we want to get those funds down to those
4 targeted schools as well, we'll have to take into
5 consideration the amount -- the amount of funds that we're
6 able to award and how we best distribute those funds, so --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: And then do we hear from the
8 listening tour that they want them just -- forgot what the
9 terminology was --

10 MR. BILLSMER: Yes. So one of the questions
11 is whether we will award them by formula --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Formula, thank you.

13 MR. BILLSMER: -- or competitively. Under
14 NCLB, we didn't not have the option of awarding them on a
15 formula basis. So it was, we did award them competitively
16 and then that rose -- rose the issue with those small
17 rurals who didn't have the capacity in some cases to -- to
18 apply for those funds.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm just trying -- I have
20 -- sometimes I have to get in the weeds in order to
21 understand. So we've got 33 schools --

22 MR. BILLSMER: 33, mid -- mid 30's.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: -- of formula basis. You
24 going -- you going to take the \$10 million and divide it by
25 the number of kidlets there in those 33 schools?



1 MR. BILLSMER: That would be one of the
2 options so that would be --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Allocated that way and then
4 what the heck is with the geographical representation?

5 MR. BILLSMER: Right. So that would be one
6 of the considerations that this committee is going to be
7 working through, is how to -- how best to distribute those
8 funds whether it's by formula, whether it's 75 percent by
9 formula, 25 percent competitively. What kind of a balance
10 might there be? But as we distribute those by formula it
11 would -- we'd have to again take -- take into account the
12 districts that have large numbers of the schools. Where
13 they -- where they sit around the state and that's the
14 whole geographically diversity question and what's the best
15 way to distribute them? So the amount of funds that we
16 might want to allocate for each school is -- is it a per
17 pupil amount, is it based on the size of the school, size
18 of the district, and their capacity so --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So it actually gonna matter
20 which of the criteria that they're giving you comes first?
21 Is the first criteria geographical representations? Then,
22 based on that you've got extra dollars left and you could
23 do by formula per student? I mean, I -- trying -- head
24 around --



1 MS. MEDLER: Can I -- yeah. Can I jump into
2 'cause I wanna also point out that it's not just those
3 comprehensive support and improvement schools. It's also
4 the targeted support and improvements. So we're -- we're
5 seeing certain populations of students not being adequately
6 serves. So we're actually talking about potentially a much
7 larger number of eligible schools and while \$10.5 Million
8 sounds like a lot in a lump sum, it's actually not. And
9 when we start getting into -- well what are some of those
10 evidence based strategies that need to be employed, used in
11 these schools, some of them are quite expensive. It takes
12 time. And quite a bit of concerted effort over time --
13 sustainable effort. So there's the balancing act of you
14 need to give enough money to actually have an impact. But
15 you need to be fair about it as well, and so it's not an
16 easy matter always, formula versus competitive that might
17 be maybe a combination of both. So I think this is -- this
18 is not going to be an easy thing to solve. And we really
19 want to emphasize that we wanna meet -- we even tried to
20 talk about what is it that we want to do. Because in that
21 should then be determining how we are providing
22 recommendations on how to use those resources.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Remind me what a SIG grant -
24 - how much money was in a SIG grant to school district?



1 MR. BILLSMER: So that's the 1003 fund.
2 1003 G funds so --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I just wanna get a sense
4 between the 10 million and --

5 MR. BILLSMER: It was about -- it was about
6 six million. So in previously --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Per -- per district?

8 MR. BILLSMER: No, \$6 million as a whole.
9 So --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So what did a district get
11 back when we were getting --

12 MR. BILLSMER: And it -- it would vary.
13 There is words from up to a million dollars per school down
14 to \$250,000 per school --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Over three years?

16 MR. BILLSMER: -- over three years.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. I just want to
18 get a perspective of what we have now compared to what we
19 were doing.

20 MR. BILLSMER: Right.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

22 MR. BILLSMER: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores and then Dr.
24 Scheffel.



1 MS. FLORES: I have a couple of questions.
2 So are we bound to the 10 million 500 could we up that --
3 could we up that percentage to higher? Because I mean,
4 we're dealing with these schools that may not be around and
5 they really do need a lot of help. And two, shouldn't they
6 get a much larger, well, a much larger, and why would they
7 have to -- why would they have to apply? I mean, some of
8 these rural districts don't have a federal district
9 director and it takes time to write a proposal and such.
10 So why don't -- why aren't we more democratic about it and
11 spread out the money, spread more of the money so that they
12 do get a sizable amount of money to do some good?

13 MR. BILLSMER: Right. Regardless of the way
14 that we distribute them, formula or competitively, the
15 district and the school are going to have to write a plan
16 on how they're going to use those funds. So the
17 application itself could look very much like the plan that
18 they have to develop as well.

19 MS. FLORES: Right.

20 MR. BILLSMER: So they're going to need to
21 develop a plan that we could held them accountable to.

22 MS. FLORES: Right. But -- but the thing is
23 that they write a plan it's competitive and the others
24 don't get the money. So I'm thinking more democratically
25 that everybody writes a plan and then those who are in more



1 need can. And I also think that we, as a state, need to
2 take, I know I've said it before, a more proactive stance
3 where we do provide mentors for these superintendents
4 where, you know, we provide the monies for -- for them.
5 They can take it or not take it. You know, we don't have
6 to force it down their throat. But here are some people
7 that, you know, have been successful, either they're
8 retired or you know, they want to do the work. And I think
9 it would be incredible work. You know, just for self --

10 MR. BILLSMER: Right.

11 MS. FLORES: -- to -- to help these kids to
12 help these -- these communities so I -- I can see that
13 there would be some people that would like to take
14 something like this on.

15 MR. BILLSMER: Appreciate that.

16 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Dr. Scheffel.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Has there been any analysis
19 of the impact of using a competitive system under NCLB? I
20 mean, is there a sense that that was more effective or
21 really wouldn't have mattered or did it kind of a meta
22 analysis of --

23 MR. BILLSMER: We did do some analysis and
24 we did find that the rurals were not disproportionately
25 harmed but competitively although, you know, the things



1 that we heard it sounded like they were. And I think there
2 are instances when perhaps they didn't have the capacity to
3 -- to compete for some of the opportunities. But as we did
4 our study we did notice that a large number of rurals that
5 were able to participate should the competitor --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think CDE did a good job of
7 reaching out to those districts and helping them, assisting
8 them with the grant writing process.

9 MR. BILLSMER: Right. And that's --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't -- I don't know if
11 you think that resulted in a higher quality of plan where
12 people were thinking more deeply about their -- what they
13 were proposing or if your sense is that they would have
14 proposed the same thing if it would have been distributed
15 by formula.

16 MR. BILLSMER: I think it definitely did.
17 We did see the positive effects over the years that we
18 began to almost kind of force that support into -- into the
19 systems. But it is also something that we've heard from
20 the districts, during our listening tours, that they
21 appreciate that type of support to help them develop a plan
22 and that leads us to another question as far as whether we
23 should retain a portion of that seven percent to continue
24 to provide that support to those districts that might not
25 have the capacity.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean my sense is that we
2 don't want to be awarding money based on sleek presentation
3 of -- of a plan. That's not a good way of doing it. On
4 the other hand, if some version of a competitive process
5 nested within the whole can create the conditions for
6 deeper thinking about really needing these funds and how
7 we're actually going to use them, and our linking them to
8 practices that have a high likelihood of success, and that
9 could be beneficial for the district primarily as well as
10 the state.

11 MR. BILLSMER: I was just going to add to
12 your point about sort of those conditions and the
13 readiness, I think -- we think that either in formula or
14 competitive funds or in both that there are ways to really
15 be clear about conditions, and criteria that we want to see
16 both on the front end during a grant process or funding
17 process, and of the tail end as well.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

19 MS. GOFF: Quickly.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, Ms.
21 Goff.

22 MS. GOFF: A little clarity that I -- I've
23 been going back and forth on my own clarity on this. The
24 seven percent -- I'll go the other way. Is the three
25 percent a completely separate pot of money? Recently, I



1 heard someone explaining it as, not -- not from here,
2 someone had the impression it was the whole seven percent
3 out of the blue circle, the seven percent, was then
4 subdivided by the three percent.

5 MR. BILLSMER: No --

6 MS. GOFF: I don't think so --

7 MR. BILLSMER: You're right.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: But the optional part of that
9 kind of puts some people back in to scratch head and --

10 MR. BILLSMER: Right. That's why we --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I understand and I'm
12 assuming every -- does but maybe not. So it's like, how do
13 we -- we just have to know the two cents line to say, "Yes,
14 this is." "No, this isn't, this is how it works"

15 MR. BILLSMER: Right. And that's what --
16 that's what this graphic hopes to demonstrate is that the
17 yellow is the seven percent and the green is that optional
18 three percent. So I'm glad you -- that's a great segue
19 into the next slide which does talk about that additional
20 three percent. So it would -- it would be a total of ten
21 percent of the Title I allocation that could be taken off
22 the top. The seven percent must be taken, the three
23 percent is an optional set aside that the district may --
24 or the state may take after consulting with -- with
25 stakeholders. And that would be estimated at about 4.5



1 million. Ninety-nine percent -- 99 percent of that has to
2 go to LEAs. Again with a large number of these low
3 performing schools.

4 There is some flexibility in that three
5 percent that it -- that it may fund opportunities at a high
6 school level. Since most of the districts in the state --
7 (inaudible) their Title I funds down to the elementary
8 level. There's often populations in high schools that --
9 that don't have the opportunity to access those funds. So
10 this additional three percent does provide some of that
11 flexibility. However, if you take a look at that big blue
12 part, they can use those funds for -- for those activities,
13 in many cases as well. So -- but they can go for some of
14 the activities that were described on that sheet. That
15 three percent also can be used to support that after-school
16 tutoring that used to be required for low performing
17 schools under NCLB. So the SES programs you might have
18 heard about.

19 Supplemental Educational Services. This
20 provides an opportunity for the state to continue that
21 system with -- with LEAs who might want to continue to
22 provide that after-school tutoring to their low performing
23 schools. However again they may use their regular Title I
24 funds to support those activities as well. And then also
25 exercise those Title I school choice options where in the



1 past districts had to -- had to -- required to offer school
2 choice to students in those low performing schools so that
3 they could choice into a higher performing school. This
4 would provide some funds to support that (inaudible)
5 transportation costs to continue those efforts. Again
6 those funds could be used -- Title I funds can be used for
7 those activities as well.

8 MS. FLORES: You know may I just --

9 MR. BILLSMER: So if we don't -- if we don't
10 take that -- that green pie slice it gets wrapped into the
11 blue slice. So that 4.5 million would increase the amount
12 of funds that would be allocated to the LEAs --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

14 MR. BILLSMER: -- under regular Title I.

15 MS. FLORES: Thank you. You know, I see the
16 -- the list, I just honed in on those lists there where it
17 says after-school tutoring. Couldn't there be summer
18 school? I mean. Summer school --

19 MR. BILLSMER: Absolutely. Yeah and that's
20 -- that's kind of, in the general -- the general
21 description of after-school tutoring so --

22 MS. FLORES: What about early childhood? If
23 it was English education in early childhood?



1 MR. BILLSMER: Title I funds can certainly
2 support early childhood education and there's actually a --
3 an emphasis on early childhood education throughout ESSA.

4 MS. GOFF: Yeah, but --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: We're having a good conversation.
7 Does that -- but do we still need to keep in mind that it's
8 only Title I kids or programs?

9 MR. BILLSMER: So --

10 MS. GOFF: If you have a Title I school and
11 maybe -- maybe even that current thinking about where at
12 all is definition wise it's going to be a little bit
13 different.

14 MR. BILLSMER: Right.

15 MS. GOFF: But if -- if part of the three
16 percent -- there's the list, I'm thinking I have another
17 kind of complicated question about how this might relate to
18 the READ Act. Because part of the interventions, READ Act
19 is also tutoring where (inaudible) and which how -- how
20 limited is the law, the statute with both our school
21 finance law or our READ Act law when it comes to funding
22 the various parts of all that stuff. But as far as Val's
23 question, I appreciate that, because here again, I do think
24 locals and I'm talking below the level of administrators
25 who deal with this in districts. The general community and



1 the faculty, and staffs knowing how to talk about this, and
2 when we talk blue pot and here we talk Title I and this is
3 Title I money and what do you have to be in order to get
4 that money regardless of whether it's a state decision,
5 competitive, formula, whatever. Where does that money have
6 to go to and where's it -- where's it more flexible now?
7 So that's -- I just, I don't know.

8 MR. BILLSMER: You know, I think as we move
9 -- as we move forward with this conversation, we'll be
10 (inaudible) to get some more specific breakdown (inaudible)
11 on where that's all going to be going -- could possibly be
12 going.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I want to go back to basics.
15 Title I kids self-identify or not? How do we know who's
16 the Title I kid?

17 MR. BILLSMER: It depends on the program.
18 So in the school wide program, every child in that school
19 wide school is a Title I -- Title I student so that the
20 funds that go into that school benefit the program as a
21 whole. So every child in that school.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: But how do you start? How
23 do you become a Title I school?



1 MR. BILLSMER: So that's a district level
2 decision. The districts are allocated, you know, anywhere
3 from \$6,000 to \$30 million across the state.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No. I'm trying to figure --
5 I'm trying to identify who is -- who decides? Is it self
6 identification that you're a Title I?

7 MR. BILLSMER: No, it's based on free --
8 free and (inaudible).

9 MS. SCHROEDER: And that self-identified or
10 not?

11 MR. BILLSMER: It's by reporting the numbers
12 of students who are --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And how do you know -- I'm
14 trying to figure out. Is this by self --

15 MR. BILLSMER: (Inaudible) forms so they --
16 they are -- they fill out the forms, and they're eligible.
17 So it's done at the school and that's (inaudible) --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So parents fill out a form.
19 And so it is self-identified?

20 MR. BILLSMER: Right. Well, but the
21 students who are free and reduced lunch students are not
22 necessarily the Title I students. So Title I students,
23 it's based -- are the students who are at risk of non
24 proficiency. So they're currently not proficient or they
25 don't -- they're not meeting standards. And so the free



1 and reduced lunch students generate the funds for the
2 school. But the students who receive the services are not
3 necessarily they're free introduced lunch students. As
4 Brad was saying in a school wide, all students enrolled in
5 that school are considered Title I students but none of
6 them are necessarily identified as Title I students but in
7 their targeted support school students are identified and
8 they receive services based on their proficiency.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Just a second. So I'm
10 trying to -- I'm trying to get -- I'm trying to get to the
11 dilemma that we experienced which was that at the high
12 school level there just wasn't that self identification.
13 And so the schools identifying who are at risk kids but the
14 money is based on kids who don't request --

15 MR. BILLSMER: Yeah. Well, that --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm trying to figure out how
17 you get -- that's what I'm saying --

18 MR. BILLSMER: Just so we will be going into
19 it. So this is like that part of the Title Program. So we
20 will be going into this in depth when we bring the Title
21 Programs -- how Title I works and so forth. But just
22 quickly, school districts only receive so much funds and so
23 they -- as they allocate funding to schools oftentimes they
24 make the decision at the district level whether it'll serve
25 elementary, elementary and middle or elementary and middle



1 and high school. And the reality is that they don't
2 receive enough funding to serve in many cases to serve all
3 three levels of school, so -- so Title I schools, we only
4 have very few Title I high schools in the state that are
5 Title I schools, and we have more middle schools, but the
6 majority of the Title I funds are at the elementary level.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. So you're taking me
8 exactly where I want to go which is to figure out when you
9 have below a 67 percent graduation rate, and you're not a
10 Title I high school what's the story?

11 MS. BILLMER: Then -- there sort of that
12 came with the school improvement grants those (inaudible)
13 grants that we're talking about were wanting to ensure,
14 because they're high school. A lot of students in those
15 schools who might be graduating were not college or career
16 ready. So they opened up the school improvement funds to
17 include Title I eligible high schools. And now that --
18 that -- that manifests itself an ESSA as any school with a
19 graduation rate under 67 percent. We need to identify
20 those in addition to the bottom five percent of Title I
21 schools as eligible to receive these school improvement
22 grant funds.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Sorry, I just
24 needed that clarity.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, you asked the
2 questions --

3 MS. MEDLER: No. These are good questions.
4 I think the other thing to point out is those targets
5 support schools, the ones where you got that segregated
6 groups that are not performing that can be any school as
7 well. So we're -- we're, yes, that Title I piece is that
8 apportioned. The schools that are eligible for this but
9 there are going to be schools identified and not
10 necessarily Title I, that are getting identified through
11 the system and will be eligible potentially for these funds
12 depending on how they're set up.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you guys make us
14 a cheat sheet on that?

15 MS. MEDLER: You bet.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This really get -- this
17 really gets hard to --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're in the process of
19 doing that right now in preparation for next (inaudible).
20 We'll start talking about (inaudible) --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So just sort of break
22 it down.

23 MR. BILLMER: And I think -- I think ESSA
24 does provide -- actually is pretty explicit about providing



1 the type of flexibility that you're seeking. So I think
2 there is -- there is an opportunity here to --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: We get a lot of flexibility,
4 no money. That's --

5 MR. BILLSMER: That's the thing -- that's
6 the thing so you know, with the amount of funds we might
7 have to do some prioritization on our own in order to make
8 sure that works.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So Title I schools, are they
10 all schools -- all schools could be? They have to have a
11 large number of free and reduced lunch. They have to have
12 kids who are not performing well. What's the other
13 criteria?

14 MR. BILLSMER: It's not that they -- the
15 funds flow based strictly on the percentage of free or free
16 and reduced lunch students. And that's up to districts
17 level whether they use free and reduced lunch or just free
18 lunch counts. Schools that are at or above the district
19 average for free and reduced lunch are the ones that are
20 served. So they have -- and then schools that have 75
21 percent or higher free and reduced lunch have to be served.
22 But the district receives a certain amount of funds and
23 they award those funds. And when they run out of funds,
24 they can no longer serve any more schools. About a third



1 of the schools, I think it's like 600, 650 schools in the
2 state are Title I schools out of the 1,900 or so schools.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: So basically you could have a
4 school that would have 70 percent kids that are not free
5 and reduced lunch and be served and yet another school
6 could have --

7 MR. BILLSMER: It's based on the district's
8 average poverty rate -- free reduced lunch. So a school in
9 one district may have -- that served in one district may
10 have 20 percent and whereas a district with a lot of high
11 poverty schools might be not serving a school that has 16
12 percent.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: That doesn't seem --

14 MS. MEDLER: So your questions are very
15 good. I think this helps us to understand maybe where we
16 can come up with some tools that will help you. We're
17 going to --

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Bring us down to the --

19 MS. MEDLER: We're going to -- yup. No.

20 This is really helpful for us to hear where you're
21 struggling. We only have 20 minutes left though and I
22 really want to make sure that Peter has enough time to go
23 through his section. So I'm going to turn it over to you.

24 MR. SHERMAN: I'll go through just a couple
25 of points quickly which may not necessarily align to these



1 -- but as we are using this process as an opportunity to
2 really think about consider assess the current supports,
3 supports that we think need to be adapted, and other
4 supports that we might offer with as we've all come to the
5 conclusion, and with fairly limited resources, not just
6 financial but in terms of our staff as well. We are
7 identifying sort of what are our theories of action, and
8 our goals around supports, and what ways that we know that
9 we can have impact with districts and with schools. And
10 then we're also working with our committee to identify some
11 of those criteria for what should supports from the state
12 look like.

13 What should supports from districts to their
14 schools look like. So the purpose of today was not to give
15 you a comprehensive view of all of the supports that we
16 offer. I think you've heard some of that before, and we'll
17 be glad to share that with you if you'd like in the future.
18 But I think to give you just a quick sense of that, some of
19 the goals that we have are really about building district
20 capacity. We want districts to have greater leadership,
21 greater capacity to be able to support their schools and
22 differentiate their -- their support for their schools. We
23 would like to be able to provide autonomy and flexibility
24 for schools as -- as they're -- as they're capable of
25 utilizing that.



1 We're really interested in having really
2 focus on outcomes and results on what's on the tail end.
3 Leadership, as a number of you bring up often is a critical
4 factor in all of this work that we have, and we really seek
5 to differentiate our support. So we work -- we have a
6 number of support structures that work with districts. At
7 the district level, we have some support structures that
8 work at the school level. We have a number of grants that
9 work at -- target a lot of things and we have very specific
10 leadership focused topics as well. It would be that the
11 heat would get hotter right --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is hot.

13 MR. SHERMAN: All of a sudden it's warm. We
14 also, of course there are a lot of really various content
15 specific supports that come from CDE and literacy and TSS
16 secondary, postsecondary. So there's quite a lot of
17 different content supports that are offered out in the
18 field as well. So again this process will be for us to
19 analyze and evaluate some of the supports that we're --
20 that we're offering. Thanks. Yeah, I'm going through
21 these really fast (inaudible).

22 So just, so you know you have a list of the
23 folks that are on our committee, so that you understand we
24 have sort of concentric circles. Brad and Lisa and I are
25 the leads for this particular Spoke committee. We have a



1 working group which is another five or six CDE staff. We
2 have what we call an Internal Advisory Group which includes
3 another circle of some of those content directors and
4 executive directors. And then we have this external
5 advisory group, the larger group. Though the committee are
6 smaller, tighter circle, we meet regularly every week at
7 this point. That External Advisory Group met once on
8 August 11th and they're meeting again next Friday and we
9 anticipate there to be two or three more meetings in the
10 future.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So if we just take the big
13 picture for a minute and look back on 50 years of
14 implementation of Title I and we look at return on
15 investment in different models, I don't think there's been
16 a lot of innovation in terms of Title I, how the funds have
17 been used and how we adjusted or tried to look expansively
18 about how we might rethink this program. Is this an
19 opportunity to do that, to step back and say I mean I think
20 NCLB was unique in saying well let's at least make some of
21 the funds competitive so that schools have an incentive to
22 sit down and really ask, "Is this likely to work?" Hoping
23 that the state would, you know, give more funds or more
24 support to schools that really have thought deeply about
25 how to ensure that the funds made a difference? Is there



1 any appetite in your committees that you're working with to
2 really take a more -- take a long look at really how we
3 could completely rethink this and is that even possible in
4 the context of ESSA?

5 MR. BILLSMER: There -- there weren't some
6 of the hope for changes and with regard to the rules for
7 how funds are allocated and -- to states and/or school
8 districts, but I do think there -- there's an opportunity
9 to revisit how we make those funds available to districts
10 and their schools and be clear about the allowable uses and
11 how you can, you know, if -- if you have a solid
12 comprehensive needs assessment as your basis, you can use
13 these funds more flexibly than -- than a lot of people
14 think. But that's -- that's some of the discussion we're
15 engaging with.

16 So we do, as I mentioned we have a Title
17 Program Spoke Committee and that's the work that we're
18 doing with that -- that committee, to look at the
19 applications for those funds, the allowable uses, how we
20 help those who are applying for those funds be informed
21 consumers so they really are aware of all their
22 opportunities that these -- these funds are for them in
23 providing services to students. So again that's one of
24 those things that we will want to bring back to you



1 beginning in October but more of -- for deeper dive in
2 November as to that thinking of that committee.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Are any states doing anything
4 unique in this area that we could learn from? And you
5 know, as I talk to teachers, many teachers know what they
6 need to really enhance instructional quality in their
7 classrooms and yet you look at a program like this that's
8 just -- I heard there's a lot of money associated with it -
9 - with whether there's enough of it or not, there never is,
10 but there is a lot of money in Title I when you look at the
11 summative effect of 50 years of implementation. You know,
12 is there a way to streamline how the money flows?

13 We're just looking for leverage points
14 because again when you look close to the side of change
15 ,student achievement, a lot of teachers will say, "If I
16 only had this or that or -- or more time for this or a
17 certain type of program or additional something." A lot of
18 times they know what they need. And yet when you look at
19 this program, there are so many layers before it gets to
20 that that a lot of times their voice isn't heard. Is there
21 -- is anybody streamlining the process of how the money
22 flows and get teachers to -- to request what they need and
23 have it -- have those decisions closer to the classroom as
24 opposed to in a plan that's 10 layers up?



1 MR. BILLSMER: There's the -- the school-
2 based plan for Title I and then there is a district-based
3 plan. I think in some cases, a fair amount of the Title I
4 funds are -- are reserved at the district level. In some
5 cases, that's a -- that's a really good thing. In some
6 cases it may not be. But the idea is to have -- to kind of
7 look at school wide planning plans versus targeted plans
8 and to ensure that those school wide plans where all of the
9 students in the school are considered Title I students that
10 -- that there really is an impact. That there's some bang
11 for that buck and it's not just another teacher in the
12 building. So I think that's the work of that Title Spoke
13 Committee is to -- to really home in on -- on the school
14 plan that will have an impact and that they have a firm or
15 a good understanding of how they can -- can coordinate all
16 these federal resources together so that they get a greater
17 bang for the buck. But that they also are really fully
18 aware of the flexibility and the opportunities that -- and
19 how they can use these funds. But the decisions for how
20 the funds are used are made at the -- the local level.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: And -- and my final question.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's all right.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you've been doing this
24 work how long in Title I path?

25 MR. BILLSMER: For a couple of months.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean your career --

2 MR. BILLSMER: I'm new --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just seems a long way.

4 MR. BILLSMER: -- I'm still on my honey moon
5 period but I do think that we -- we have, I mean we've
6 tried to -- we've done some pretty large evaluations and
7 looking at really trying to home in on is the school wide
8 program more effective than a targeted program. And -- and
9 it's hard to know how -- how -- what student outcomes would
10 be where there are no funds. I mean, we can't withhold
11 funds to -- to create a control group. But I do think that
12 -- that your -- your concern is exactly the right concern
13 about there's a lot of money that flows through this
14 consolidated application and through Title I, on an annual
15 basis, what can we do to ensure that that's money well
16 spent?

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I mean, I'm asking an
18 honest question which is you've been doing this work
19 several decades. In your conversations, are any new ideas
20 emerging? I mean --

21 MR. BILLSMER: That's the first time maybe
22 ever said several decades to me.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I mean really it's
24 because you've been --



1 MR. BILLSMER: It's really -- it's two and a
2 half decades.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- you've been in the
4 conversations and -- and so have I and I keep thinking is
5 there any new concept that's surfacing as you're looking
6 across, you know?

7 MR. BILLSMER: Yes. Let's look.

8 MR. SHERMAN: Yes. I mean, I'm not as --
9 Pat has certainly a better command of the history of Title
10 funds than I do.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because he's been doing
12 this.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because he is all doing
14 this.

15 MR. SHERMAN: He's far -- he's far wiser and
16 more learned than most of us put together on this topic. I
17 mean, I would say -- I would say yes to both of your
18 questions, Dr. Scheffel. I mean, I think absolutely we're
19 using this as an opportunity to assess the flow of funds
20 and the use and the impact of funds. And we -- I think,
21 when you do look at the gamut of grants and supports that
22 we offer through CDE, we -- we have some that offer a lot
23 of money to a few places. We have some that distribute
24 smaller amounts to -- to wider places.



1 We have ways, we have grants where -- where
2 funding is, you know, is really essentially given to folks
3 and then they're let be and some support structures where
4 funding is -- is very much sort of meted out with very
5 specific activities along the way. And I think each of
6 those have different ways that they're -- that they're
7 showing results, and so I think that's absolutely part of
8 our work and our conversation and these are -- these are
9 exactly the kinds of questions that have emerged from our
10 External Advisory Committee as well. So they're very much
11 on our agenda.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I appreciate and I'm
13 not being fictitious. I'm serious in the sense that I know
14 you've been committed to this work for a long time and I
15 know in some of the conversations I have in education I say
16 to myself, "I think I could have had the same dialogue 15
17 years ago." It's like if anything new coming up and that's
18 why I'm asking. You know, I know you have a lot of
19 national connections on this too and I -- I would hope that
20 there'd be some new thinking hopefully and how can we make
21 this program work better. So thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

23 MS. RANKIN: I'd like to go back to the
24 original question you had and it was this has been going on
25 for 50 years. I did teach 50 years ago in a Title I school



1 and I -- I know I was very young at the time. But let's
2 look more what the evidence based is. Are we making any
3 gains on this or do we keep hoping for something different?
4 There should be enough research along the way that says,
5 we're just not -- we're trying a bunch of different things
6 hoping that something different comes out.

7 And I understand our local control and I
8 think it's great to put things down at the teacher level
9 but there should be some backing for 50 years as you say,
10 Dr. Scheffel, of -- of experience there and it may not be
11 in the state of Colorado. You know, wherever Colorado
12 started, maybe we need to start from that and -- and see
13 what kind of students we're dealing with. But -- but I
14 think you raised a very interesting question. Do we just
15 continue to throw money at a problem or do we have some
16 evidence-based results that say this is the way to do it
17 and should we be focused more on that area?

18 MR. SHERMAN: I think, Ms. Rankin, I think
19 that's a great question and I -- I know some of the support
20 structures that we have that we've been trying to drill
21 down more into progress monitoring more frequently with --
22 with how folks are, what sorts of results we're seeing, not
23 necessarily just waiting for the performance frameworks.
24 Of course we're all holding our breath for the -- for the
25 coming weeks and months as this new data is released and we



1 are -- we are hopeful and we're hopeful that -- that we'll
2 see results and that are -- that -- that we can point to
3 from that. But we also do have more incremental data that
4 we track with some of the districts and schools that we
5 work with specifically in turn around much more closely and
6 I think, you know, in some cases we're seeing some really
7 positive trends and we're -- we are hoping and expecting in
8 some cases that the -- the performance frameworks will try
9 will follow that.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel? Schroeder.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Schroeder today.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Whatever. Must be
13 lunchtime.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So in relationship to your
15 question, Deb. My limited experience with Title I
16 decisions which are made sometimes at the district level,
17 sometimes at the school level. Very often the teacher
18 said, "I need smaller class size." We don't do controlled
19 studies. We don't have first grade teacher A for the
20 different class sizes. So it's very, very hard to answer
21 your question. Big time studies have suggested that there
22 are limitations on reducing class sizes in terms of being
23 effective. But under Title I, I don't think -- I think
24 it's very, very difficult to do the kind of analysis, the
25 bang for the buck, et cetera. Because we can't line the



1 kids up and put them in group A and group B and give them a
2 placebo and the whole -- the kinds of research structures
3 that we'd like to see.

4 But -- but just listening to the teacher,
5 may or may not provide better results for the kids. It
6 just may provide better results for the teacher being able
7 to master class but achievement may not actually end up
8 being different. I mean, that's what we've learned with
9 class size. It hasn't necessarily, on its own, made that
10 big a difference except in very limited circumstances.
11 Whereas, class size along with other efforts do make a
12 difference. So this is a really -- I appreciate that you
13 wanna know the results and I don't know that we've figured
14 out a good way to -- to test it to see what works.

15 MS. MEDLER: So can I -- can I inject
16 something too? I -- I wanna remind you guys that Title I
17 and all these Title Programs, they're supplemental, right?
18 This is -- this is -- in the scheme of things, this is not
19 a lot of money, this is supplementing what's coming from
20 the state. So this is -- while there's, you know, there's
21 a lot of discussion here, this is also about getting clear
22 about we're talking about our lowest performing schools and
23 there's several different funding sources that are at play
24 here. And while we're -- this is an opportunity to focus
25 on the supplemental funds, there is -- you're getting into



1 some broader issues. And I think sometimes people lose
2 sight of the fact that we're actually talking about a small
3 part of money that is supplementing the state's money.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

5 MR. BILLSMER: I would say five to ten
6 percent.

7 MS. FLORES: But if we have --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Five to ten percent, what
9 are you saying?

10 MR. BILLSMER: Five to ten percent of their
11 Title I -- Title I's funds or probably five to seven
12 percent -- five to ten percent of what that school has --
13 has operating budgets.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you.

15 MS. FLORES: But if we hone in I -- I
16 disagree with Dr. Scheffel, Dr. Schroeder, I disagree with
17 her.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You give me enough time,
19 I'll confuse everyone.

20 MS. FLORES: Because there is -- there is a
21 lot of research that says that smaller classes -- smaller
22 classes and that seven to 12 and even up to 16, which is
23 would be the max would really serve kids and you do get
24 results for how to serve kids. So if --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's not what -- that's not
2 what is happening.

3 MS. FLORES: So if -- but if -- if the
4 monies are spent on those hard to serve schools, there's
5 also early childhood. I mean, there's research that shows
6 that early childhood -- and we have that research from
7 Georgia and we have that research from Oklahoma, where kids
8 are going into early childhood and they are getting
9 results. Everybody goes or who wants to go gets into it.
10 We do know that year round schools, you know, for -- for
11 some of our kids, some of our poor kids would do much
12 better if they went to year round schools.

13 And we tried it here in Denver, it worked
14 very well. Administrators were the only ones who didn't
15 like it. Kids did well, parents liked it, teachers liked
16 it but administrators didn't like it. So I mean, there are
17 many ways that I think we could help high school. We could
18 help them with summer schools. So to say that there's not
19 any ways or techniques or strategies that we could help
20 them. I mean there are a lot of strategies out there where
21 if the monies were targeted to those individuals, it would
22 work. But I think we need to get -- need to get that out
23 too. So that there are strategies that help poor kids.

24 MR. SHERMAN: I know we're just about out of
25 time. We'll -- we'll just leave you these -- some of these



1 questions are fairly simplified questions but this is --
2 this -- I would say sort of synthesizes the -- the
3 questions at hand for our committee and what we're working
4 with on our -- with our extended committee Members. It's
5 just really thinking about their supports and the
6 strategies that these funds and all of our personnel
7 efforts will be directed toward.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anything else for the good
9 of the order today? Thank you. Appreciate it. I think it
10 was a good discussion. I think really, at some point we
11 all keep hoping that somebody will find the magic sauce,
12 then we can sprinkle it all over the schools and see if we
13 can get the right result. That's your job.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Challenge taken
15 (inaudible).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pixie Dust.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. All right. Let's
19 see, I think we're now ready for recess for a luncheon for
20 executive session. Ms. Burdsall, would you care to read
21 the magic words.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Happy to. The executive
23 session has been noticed for today's state Board meeting in
24 conformance with 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice
25 on specific legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II)



1 CRS in matters required to be kept confidential by Federal
2 Law or rules or State statutes pursuant to 24-6-
3 402(3)(a)(III) CRS and pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(b)(I)
4 concerning the evaluation of the State Board of Education
5 employee who requested that the matter be addressed in
6 executive session.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Cordial.

8 MS. CORDIAL: My pleasure.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just want to know we're
10 evaluating the right person.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Motion.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There is -- is there a
15 motion to -- it has been moved (inaudible) executive
16 sessions. Is there a second? I see Dr. Flores wanting a
17 second to that motion.

18 MS. FLORES: Yes. Yes, seconded.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, good. Is there
20 an objection to the adaption of that motion? Takes five
21 votes. Seeing no objection, that motion is cleared up.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I lost it.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You didn't wanna object?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I did not intend to
2 judge.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Good. Good. All right,
4 so we'll go ahead and get situated for the executive
5 session and we'll go from there.

6 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

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

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