



Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

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

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



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And now we're behind  
2 schedule. We want to know, but usually we catch up. Just  
3 that we'd like to be behind the schedule. Item 13  
4 rulemaking amendments to the administration of the  
5 Exceptional Children's Act, and let's see, Colorado State  
6 Board of Education announces that the rulemaking hearing  
7 for the rules for the administration of the -- Exceptional  
8 Children Act, 1 CCR 3.01-8. State Board approve those  
9 rulemaking as of November 11, 2015 meeting. Hearing  
10 promulgated rules that make notice, that make known to  
11 publication or public notice on November 25, 2015. Through  
12 the power and register by the State Board notice on January  
13 6, 2016. State Board is authorized to promulgate these  
14 rules pursuant to 22-2-107(I)(c) Colorado revised statute.  
15 Commissioner, is the staff (inaudible)?

16                   MR. ASP: Yes we are, Mr. Chair. I want to  
17 turn this over to our Interim Executive Director of the  
18 Exceptional Student Services Unit, Toby King. He's also  
19 joined by Director Judy Stearman.

20                   MR. KING: Thank you, Dr. Asp, Chairman  
21 Durman -- Durham, sorry. I usually talk without a script  
22 but I've been forced to read the script here. Chairman  
23 Durham, State Board Members and Doctor Asp. I -- to -- to  
24 my left is Judy Stearman, Director of Facilities Schools.  
25 We are here today in order to align the rules for the



1 Administration of the Exceptional Children's Education Act  
2 with state statute and current practice. Recent amendments  
3 to the Public School Finance Act modified the formula for  
4 calculating revenue for approved facility schools. That  
5 calculation is now 173 percent of the state average per  
6 pupil revenue. This formula is also consistent with  
7 current practice in the state. However, as noted by the  
8 Office of Legislative Legal Services, the current ECEA  
9 rules do not reflect this formula.

10                   Accordingly, we request that the Board  
11 approve the proposed rule change to correctly align  
12 Sections 9.01, subsections 1A through 9.03, subsections 2A  
13 (ii)B of the rules for the Administration of the  
14 Exceptional Student -- Children's Education Act with the  
15 Colorado revised Statute Section 22-5-412(9)(c)(II). We  
16 would like to ask the State Board to conduct a formal  
17 rulemaking hearing to amend the rules for the  
18 administration of the Exceptional Children's Education Act.  
19 A formal hearing will allow the opportunity for the Board  
20 to vote, to approve the rules today with the unanimous  
21 vote, or would allow us to request a vote to approve the  
22 rules changes from the Board in a February meeting. Mr.  
23 Chair, are there any questions from the Board?

24                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Members, any questions?  
25 Any questions? Yes, Ms. Rankin.



1 MS. RANKIN: As I read all of this, it looks  
2 like it's defining more of the (inaudible) isn't it  
3 correct?

4 MR. KING: Ms. Rankin, I would like to turn  
5 that over to Ms. Stearman. Mr. Chair, please?

6 MS. STEARMAN: Yes. Money file -- it's just  
7 making sure that -- the -- the money does follow -- follow  
8 the child and it is -- it is in law -- law on what we're  
9 doing currently. We're just -- it's just more of a  
10 aligning, making sure a clean up of the rules.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions? Yes,  
12 Dr. Schroeder.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Is the -- is the  
14 practical implication that more funds would be available or  
15 is it -- what is the practical implications of it?

16 MS. STEARMAN: It's -- nothing will change.  
17 We're just cleaning up the rules.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Just the linguistic?

19 MS. STEARMAN: Uh-huh.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any other  
22 questions? Just one here is the one to -- 1.73 Statutory  
23 and -- or is it something we set by rule?

24 MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, I believe it's  
25 statutory. Let me just check with --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

2 MR. KING: Statutory. Mr. Chairman, it's  
3 statutory.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. So  
5 we're just reiterating it in the rule?

6 MR. KING: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Anything else?  
8 Going once, going twice. Is there a -- yes, Dr. Asp?

9 MR. ASP: We have one clarification that we  
10 need to make, if you'll indulge us for just a minute.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

12 MR. ASP: (Inaudible) , Associate  
13 Commissioner for School Finance and Operations has one  
14 clarification.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And I did forget to ask,  
16 is there anyone present who's -- that no one signed up to  
17 testify, is there any one present who would like to? Okay,  
18 thank you. Then, please proceed.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. One of the  
20 recommended changes from the OLLS that we're aligning to is  
21 that it's 173 percent of the statewide base per pupil  
22 revenues, which needs to also be reflected in 9.03 2A 2A  
23 and 2B, and right now it has average. So instead of  
24 average, those two words need to say base to align with --  
25 with the other one. So that's on your second page in the



1 red lined sections here. And the -- just the word average  
2 needs to also say base to align each one or we'll get --  
3 we'll get kicked back again.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

5 MS. FLORES: In what I'm reading it says  
6 base. Am I reading the wrong one? 9.01 1H.

7 MS. STEARMAN: Yes, that's correct. So that  
8 says base. Correct. And then on the second page, on 9.03  
9 2A 2A, those two paragraphs here, they have average still  
10 in there so those also need to align to base.

11 MS. FLORES: So that has to do with the  
12 (inaudible)?

13 MS. STEARMAN: No. This was -- this was  
14 statute -- base per pupil is what all of the factors and  
15 everything you've calculated on. And average is after  
16 everything is all -- all that. So -- so actually, the  
17 average would be higher than what base is. So we just need  
18 to align all of that to word base.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, further discussion.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: But so this doesn't -- this  
21 doesn't change the amount of funding at all?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no. It just this -  
23 - all this does is align the rules with current statutes  
24 and how it's being calculated.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.



1 MS. STEARMAN: So everything is aligned to  
2 statute. The rules were just out of sync with what statute  
3 was.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That concludes the  
6 hearing for the rules of the administration of Exceptional  
7 Children's Act. Is there further discussion? Say none, do  
8 we have a motion? Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the rules  
10 for the administration of the Exceptional Children's  
11 Education Act.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a sec? There is?  
13 Dr. Scheffel seconds. Is there objection to the adoption  
14 of that motion? If not, that motion is declared adopted by  
15 a vote of seven to zero. Thank you very much.

16 MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This continues. We will  
18 get back on schedule. All right. Now, we're going to  
19 proceed, yeah it's (inaudible). We're going to proceed to  
20 item 14.07 Educator Licensing. That's the big fat one, yes  
21 I'm -- I've seen that one. So let's see.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You were on track,  
23 right?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Pardon me?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We we're on track on  
2 time?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're close enough for  
4 government work.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So let's see, where are we  
7 here? Yeah. Okay. Let's see. Let's see -- let's -- why  
8 don't we -- we'll do the motion at the end of the  
9 discussion. So we'll do that a little different this time.  
10 So if -- Mr. Asp, we'd like -- your people would like to  
11 proceed, you can let us know how we're going to do this.

12 MR. ASP: Great. Thank you. We have Dr.  
13 Colleen O'Neill here, the Executive Director of our  
14 Educator Licensing, to take us through this item. Dr.  
15 O'Neill.

16 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Thank you Dr.  
17 Asp. Good afternoon, Chairman Durham and Members of the  
18 Board and Dr. Asp, our Commissioner. I appreciate the  
19 time. I think I've been before you a couple of times  
20 previous as well. So today, what I am presenting is  
21 another revision of the Educator Preparation and Licensing  
22 Rules for us. Specifically today, we are really sharing  
23 the current draft of the rules. This is actually the  
24 fourth vetted draft of these rules that you see in front of  
25 you. We are going to review the exception report feedback





1 at a very high level, and I'll explain a little bit more  
2 about what the exception report was for us. And then, it's  
3 -- it is up for a possible vote and adoption today. Just  
4 as a quick summary of where we've been.

5           This rulemaking process actually started  
6 with a call from our stakeholders to align our Educator  
7 Preparation and Licensing Rules to current statute and to  
8 current BEST practice. That began in May of 2014, so we  
9 are over a year, we're running about a year and a half now.  
10 The rule revision brings within alignment very  
11 specifically with the multiple pieces of legislation,  
12 specifically in our student standards in our Colorado  
13 Academic Achievement Standards as well as Senate Bill 191,  
14 Educator Effectiveness. The rulemaking process today, just  
15 yet again, very, very high level so that we are -- we kind  
16 of remember how that worked. The rural feedback and draft  
17 development began in the fall of 2014. We continued with  
18 that an initial stakeholder feedback in 2014 and into the  
19 spring of 2015. We started releasing different drafts of  
20 the rules beginning in June of 2015. Those drafts have  
21 been incrementally released over the course of the last  
22 several months, culminating in the rule draft hearing that  
23 occurred on November 12, 2015.

24           And then, one yet again, another revision,  
25 that is what you see in front of you today. At the last



1 meeting we were at, which was November of 2015, the Board  
2 asked us to take a look at those rules and create a  
3 document that kind of outlined what the rule was, what the  
4 statutory reference was, really what were the specific  
5 updates, what was the justification for those updates, and  
6 then what were the consequences of the change of those  
7 updates, specifically to our stakeholders or to our  
8 educator preparation entities and or our educators as a  
9 whole as they come to licensing. That document is in front  
10 of you and it's considered the exceptions document. At a  
11 very high level, I'll go back, that exceptions document  
12 really kind of helps us cite the rule citations.

13                   So why were we updating them, that statutory  
14 reference, and then really the justification is the new  
15 part that's been added to it. You did see this report back  
16 in November as well. But we added that final column really  
17 saying what are the consequences or what would be the  
18 unintended or specific intended consequences associated  
19 with it. There are three updates that I want to just take  
20 a note of between November and December when you saw this  
21 draft. Early Childhood Special Education. The Special  
22 Education Stakeholder Group had not been able to come  
23 together fully before November. That's a large group and  
24 very time intensive work, that they were working on. They  
25 did come forward right after our meeting. I would say



1 right in the December time frame with some additional  
2 updates.

3                   So you will see those included in this rule  
4 revision as well. You also see the Early Childhood Special  
5 Education Specialist included, and then the big difference  
6 again, is we've updated all of the rule numbers, we have  
7 updated all of the grammars, spelling, all of those things.  
8 It is a large document. It will take another iteration  
9 even if it was voted on today of the -- just the grammar  
10 pieces to make sure that it's in 100 percent shape before  
11 it goes to the Secretary of State for adoption. Okay. So  
12 with that, I'm going to go ahead and say that the -- the  
13 next steps that we really have is it is up for vote today  
14 of adoption. We are also here to answer any questions,  
15 collect feedback, help direct, it is a lot of information  
16 and we certainly understand that. So with that, Dr. Anthes  
17 and I are more than happy to help answer any questions or  
18 collect feedback or comments that you may have.

19                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions or comments?  
20 Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

21                   MS. SCHROEDER: So if you weren't  
22 overwhelmed by this, please allow me to admit that I am  
23 overwhelmed by this. And so I -- I appreciate all the  
24 additional information you've given us. And I haven't  
25 memorized a darn thing. It's just so humongous. I -- it



1 seems like every time a bill is passed, we just sort of add  
2 on to the bill and then we waited an awfully long time to  
3 clean this up. But thank you very -- I want to thank  
4 everybody very much. Not just all of you guys, but also  
5 the people who -- who stepped forward.

6 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm amazed that people spent  
8 time doing this. I was reading this last night and of  
9 course, I fell asleep every time that I try to even go  
10 through this document. Last -- I think the last time we  
11 were here, there were some folks who stepped forward  
12 because they had some concerns. And I thought I saw in  
13 here that for the time being, you've honored their request  
14 with the notion that they'll be -- there might be a time  
15 when in fact we do tighten up the expectations. Remind me  
16 exactly what that is because I know I read it last night  
17 right before I fall asleep. It was some very specific --  
18 some very specific special services person -- people and we  
19 were upping the requirements and there were concerns from  
20 CASB, CASE, those folks, whether we would be able to staff  
21 particularly in the rural school just because of the  
22 shortages. Would you just remind us again of that so that  
23 we --

24 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Thank you, Mr.  
25 Chair. Thank you Dr. Schroeder for the question. That was



1 specifically our Educational Interpreter Standards that  
2 were associated with it. And we did have -- we had kind of  
3 two differing opportunities there. One of which is really  
4 research-based along the fact that our educational  
5 interpreters are not necessarily being tested the highest  
6 level that they can, to ensure that we're providing our  
7 deaf and hard-to-hearing students educational interpreter  
8 services. That is an authorization, not a license, as it  
9 stands today. The problem with upping those standards was  
10 very much that for our rural school districts, we have a  
11 very difficult time hiring those individuals, even at the  
12 standards that they are today to be interpreters for our  
13 deaf students, and it is a straight interpreter program --  
14 program. I shouldn't use my hands to talk, I hit the  
15 microphone. I'll move that back a little bit.

16                   So really where we landed on that, and by  
17 agreement, is that later this month or beginning early in  
18 February, we will all come back to the table to potentially  
19 take a look at adding a separate endorsement for a teacher  
20 license that is around Educational Interpreter Teacher  
21 License, which is a step between an Educational Interpreter  
22 Authorization and an actual license to be able to teach  
23 using ASL, American Sign Language, in a content area. And  
24 that's something that we're kind of missing right now. So  
25 it has been stayed, essentially. It reflects very small



1 changes in more of specificity. But it has been stayed for  
2 the time being with the thought that we will come back to  
3 the table at the end of January or beginning of February,  
4 and potentially come back to the Board with a  
5 recommendation for an additional endorsement, months down  
6 the road.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So help me understand that a  
8 person who has these minimal qualifications that were  
9 accepting at this point, what we would like those  
10 individuals to have a higher level of skills. What's the  
11 take? What's it gonna take? What will it take to up the  
12 skills?

13 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Right now. I'm  
14 sorry, Mr. Chair. Right --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed. We're --  
16 we're using that new --

17 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you. Right now, I would  
18 say, what it really was -- is going to take is an increase  
19 in the pass rate of the EIPA which is the Educational  
20 Interpreter Performance Assessment, so that they're  
21 actually interpreting at a different level. So their sign  
22 is better. What that really means is that my sign language  
23 is better, as well as the pedagogical content that goes  
24 behind in understanding how to teach children and the  
25 content, the depth of content. Our educational



1 interpreters right now have a pretty preliminary  
2 understanding of education and pedagogy associated with it,  
3 and have a lower bar of their actual American Sign Language  
4 and the threshold for that. We believe and -- and after  
5 lots of conversation with folks like the University of  
6 Northern Colorado who specialize in a lot of the master's  
7 programs associated with ASL and Educational Interpreters,  
8 that we can raise that bar and it would be an increased  
9 proficiency level in the EIPA, and it would be increased  
10 courses, specifically, similar to those that an educator  
11 would take preparing to be a teacher rather than an  
12 interpreter.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Can that be done online?  
14 We're -- we're worried about our rural providers who are  
15 not sitting at UNC.

16 MS. O'NEILL: And I think that is a -- a  
17 huge conversation that still needs to happen. So if we  
18 want to change that today, no, we would definitely not have  
19 the kind of services that we want in place from an educator  
20 preparation standpoint to be able to serve those rural  
21 areas. But I think as we continue with that conversation  
22 and bring more of our institutes of higher education as  
23 well as our designated agencies into that conversation, we  
24 can absolutely meet that need.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So then I -- thank -- thank  
2 you for that. If I recall, that was the only push-back.  
3 Is that remain so or am I naive?

4 MS. O'NEILL: No -- no, I appreciate that  
5 question as well. That is actually the only push it back,  
6 was the only push-back really in the hearing. As it  
7 remains today, we have gotten very minimal feedback besides  
8 a couple of, "Hey, you've missed a grammar error here,"  
9 over the course. Except for those two things that I  
10 noticed with the Exceptional Student Services and our Early  
11 Childhood Specialist.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. Thanks  
13 so much for the hard work.

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

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Other questions from the  
16 Board? Yes, Dr. Scheffel. Excuse me.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I wonder if you've presented  
18 numerous times to the Colorado Council of Deans, got their  
19 input on this and if we have that input in writing.

20 MS. O'NEILL: Dr. Scheffel, thank you. The  
21 CCODE or the Colorado Council of Deans of Education have  
22 been involved in this process. We do not have that in  
23 writing and to the form of a letter or anything along that.  
24 We do have e-mails from the individuals associated with the  
25 CCODE supporting the revamp of this and we have presented





1 to them and garnered their feedback into this. So we have  
2 some verbal but we do not have anything in writing.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: So just -- this is just a  
4 very complex document when you look at the matrix. So just  
5 two questions that have lots of implications that, I guess  
6 I feel like I need to -- I think we could use a longer  
7 session to really delve into the implications. But if you  
8 look at for example 11.09, it prep entities that offer  
9 programs in school counseling will be required to be  
10 accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling  
11 or related education programs will be required to  
12 demonstrate proven coursework and so forth and so forth.  
13 What are the implications of that? Or have we heard from  
14 the counseling programs? Do they wanna be accredited by  
15 the Council for Accreditation of Counseling or related  
16 education programs? What is the oversight to ensure that,  
17 I mean, there's just, there's just one cell in this very  
18 extensive document and I would need to go ask people.

19 I don't know what they're thinking about  
20 this, and since we have no input from -- in writing from  
21 higher ed or the proxies of those administrative teams,  
22 it's hard for me to say, this looks great because there's a  
23 lot of implications. Another is 13.01. Entities offering  
24 induction programs will be required to code their induction  
25 plans and proposals to reference the Teachers Specialized



1 Service Professional. Principal quality standards as set  
2 forth by (inaudible) and so forth. I mean, again who's  
3 gonna oversee that? Who's gonna audit that? It seems that  
4 there's lots of implications nested in this very extensive  
5 document.

6                                   And I would want to just say, "It looks  
7 great, let's pass it." Certainly, the alignment pieces  
8 make sense and we don't want higher ed institutions trying  
9 to hit numerous targets that are not aligned, so that when  
10 they go for state approval they have multiple matrices that  
11 are seemingly not consistent. That's a problem just  
12 because it's hard to compare for. On the other hand,  
13 making this, the extensiveness of these changes without  
14 looking more deeply at the implications, I think makes me  
15 uncomfortable.

16                                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

17                                   MS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Dr. Scheffel. I  
18 would just briefly a couple of things. You asked about the  
19 oversight of these and I think it is important to say that  
20 we do an authorization visit to all of these institutes of  
21 higher education with regard to the implementation of the  
22 content specifically, and the programs that they are  
23 approved to be endorsed in. That it happens not more than  
24 once every five years. We do it in conjunction with the  
25 Department of Higher Education. And during those



1 authorization or reauthorization visits we do delve deeply  
2 into each of the content standards that they are endorsed  
3 in, in order to ensure that that is being implemented with  
4 their students in practice, as well as inform and function.  
5 As we approve them, we authorize them and move forward to  
6 offer that support. So there is oversight associated with  
7 that and I have definitely noted, you know, the questions  
8 around, you know, what kind of feedback have we garnered as  
9 well. And -- and that feedback has come more in the formal  
10 presentations, ensuring that these have been posted  
11 religiously for our individuals to be able to see and  
12 review. So thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please proceed.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So if you look at 3.01 E and  
15 5.00 and 6.00 dashed throughout on page two of the matrix,  
16 the bottom cell -- ed propensities will align their course  
17 curriculum with the most current law by which teachers will  
18 be reevaluated in their teaching career for effectiveness  
19 and prep entities have been. I mean, as we know we have  
20 the performance based standards for teachers, the licensure  
21 standards, then we have the -- the teacher effectiveness  
22 and principal effectiveness standards out of 191. So maybe  
23 you could direct me to the detailed language in the longer  
24 document that says, how are we adding two new sets to what  
25 we have, or what is the exact change that relates to the



1 TPS, the licensure, and the 191 effectiveness standards for  
2 teachers and principals?

3 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Specifically to  
4 answer that question, the performance based standards that  
5 existed prior previously had been removed and replaced with  
6 the Teacher Quality Standards and the Principal Quality  
7 Standards. So as our institutes of higher education and  
8 our designated alternative agencies look forward to their  
9 authorization and or re-authorization, they will be now  
10 coding to one single set of standards under Senate Bill 10-  
11 191, instead of two different where we used to have a  
12 crosswalk document literally, where these were their  
13 performance based standards that they needed to function  
14 under. And then these were actually the teacher and  
15 principal quality standards as well as our special service  
16 quality standards. So that was the crosswalk. As we go  
17 forward now, for authorization and re-authorization visits,  
18 they will be coding to only the teacher principal and  
19 special service quality standards, rather than also the  
20 performance based standards. So that actually has a  
21 streamline effect, or the intention of that is definitely a  
22 streamlined effect.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: What is the date of that?  
24 When does that take effect for whom, in terms of where they  
25 are in the cycle of approval?



1 MS. O'NEILL: Of authorization? For our  
2 institutes of higher education as well as our designated  
3 agencies, that's not once, more than once every five years.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Does it kick in today or in  
5 the month?

6 MS. O'NEILL: It kicks in when the rules are  
7 actually approved unless you're already identified into a  
8 cycle of re-authorization. So if you are in a cycle of re-  
9 authorization this year, it will not kick in because  
10 there'll be a grandfather that we have the opportunity to  
11 say, in conjunction with the Department of Higher  
12 Education, you know, we are still coding to these standards  
13 and we certainly understand that there is for our  
14 departments of or our institutes of higher education, there  
15 is definitely a very long lead time to be able to change  
16 courses, or to be able to change programs, or anything  
17 along that line. So by statutory rule, once those rules  
18 are in effect, and the secretary of state has said yeah,  
19 they're getting published, and moving forward, and the  
20 Board has agreed with that, they actually go into effect.  
21 But as we look at that re-authorization, we believe that we  
22 have the flexibility to say there is a period of time in  
23 which implementation is appropriate and would be very  
24 flexible with that implementation. That's a great  
25 question.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And are we required to strike  
2 for TPS and replace it with 191? Are we required to strike  
3 it? Take it out?

4 MS. O'NEILL: I don't -- I think that's a  
5 great question. I don't believe that there is a  
6 requirement that we're -- we have to strike the performance  
7 based standards in their entirety and replace them. I  
8 believe that was something that, well I know for a fact  
9 that was something that we heard from our educator  
10 preparation entities as well as from our districts, that we  
11 didn't want two different standards that were evaluating  
12 our teachers based off of, but the performance based  
13 standards are not in a 100 percent alignment. So it was  
14 definitely, I believe it was the will of stakeholders as we  
15 looked at that feedback to replace the performance based  
16 standards with the current initiatives that we have on the  
17 play, which are the teacher and principal quality  
18 standards.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: So where is that in this  
20 document, where we're striking TPS replacing it with  
21 effectiveness?

22 MS. O'NEILL: Say that to me one more time,  
23 because I think, I think we're -- we're looking at, if I  
24 have it correctly, what we're really looking at is where we



1 have the performance based standards, is that what you're -  
2 -

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Inaudible) the performance  
4 based standards for teachers.

5 MS. O'NEILL: For teachers. Okay. So those  
6 specific ones would be, let me go back. I'm not in the  
7 right one yet, 6.0 is actually our principals. Five point,  
8 so if you look at 2260.5 R 5, Teacher in Specialized  
9 Service Professionals Licensure Standards, Teacher Quality  
10 Standards. That is where we actually have struck the  
11 performance based teacher standards and we replaced it.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Under the -- where is it?

13 MS. O'NEILL: No, it's actually, if you, I  
14 don't know which version you're looking at. If you're  
15 looking at the non red-lined version, it's page 34 at the  
16 bottom.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't know if the Board has  
18 read these and looked at the difference between TPS and 191  
19 effectiveness, but it's an interesting cross one. I mean,  
20 I think, if we're really embracing that, we'd wanna know  
21 that.

22 MS. FLORES: That was the whole intent. I  
23 mean, yeah, that was the intent. That's been the  
24 discussion as to not have the old stuff.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Efficiency, yes. But  
2 content. I'm questioning where the content of the TPS  
3 shows up in the new iteration, which is the 191  
4 effectiveness.

5 MS. FLORES: I'm struggling to find it.

6 MS. O'NEILL: I think maybe ask me, and I'm  
7 happy to have more conversation as we go on as well. I  
8 think --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Inaudible) to take any  
10 additional time on this, but to me it's already a big issue  
11 because it has to do with the content that teachers are  
12 prepared based on. And it's a big shift. So if we're  
13 going to vote on this today then I'll continue, if we're  
14 not then I'll meet privately, you know, offline  
15 (inaudible).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think without a  
17 unanimous vote, this is delayed until February anyway. And  
18 so I would encourage you to work with Dr. Scheffel to see  
19 if we can resolve that issue. Any other? Yes, Dr.  
20 Schroeder.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I was gonna ask Deb. I  
22 thought you had already gone through the documents.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have but I -- I haven't met  
24 with Colleen.





1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So that I don't think  
2 we should -- we should try to approve it today but we do  
3 need to get it approved next time. It is huge.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's a big deal. Yeah. I  
5 mean, it'll affect curriculum exponentially and teacher  
6 prep. So I just want to make sure we've actually read the  
7 language, we understand implications for curriculum, and  
8 ultimately for effectiveness of teachers that it was  
9 designed to do.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: That's what it's supposed to  
11 do.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: My question is, will it do  
13 that? That's why the details (inaudible).

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anybody else? Ms. Rankin,  
15 no.

16 MS. RANKIN: I'd just like to be included on  
17 (inaudible).

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Okay, great. I do  
19 have a couple of quick questions. One, the private, the  
20 organization that Dr. Scheffel mentioned, the Private  
21 Counseling Organization. Whenever, and I -- I think I saw  
22 the same thing to the Nursing Board which is a private or  
23 not, I'm not sure it's private organization but it's close  
24 enough. I think whenever you reference standards or  
25 coursework set by a private organization, the very minimum



1 is that you should have a date certain of their rules  
2 because they can change. And while you, there are those  
3 who believe that those organizations exist to maintain high  
4 quality of performance, there are those of us who believe  
5 those organizations exist to create a shortage in the  
6 workforce and deliberately manipulate standards in order to  
7 sell continuing education opportunities.

8                   And so I think that they shouldn't be able  
9 to change or manipulate those standards if they're a  
10 private organization, or for that matter the State Board of  
11 Nursing. They shouldn't be able to -- they shouldn't be  
12 able to manipulate those standards without an affirmative  
13 vote of this Board. So I would encourage you to put in,  
14 you know, as of the -- the date of adoption for, for those,  
15 for those standards so that they are not subject to  
16 manipulation without approval of the Board to see whether  
17 or not those remain adequate. A couple of other questions;  
18 3.06, as I understand that change on professional license  
19 where it should be easier for principals to be able to use  
20 their alternative training. Did I interpret that  
21 correctly?

22                   MS. O'NEILL: That is correct.

23                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. And let me see  
24 here. The adjunct instructor, 4.01. That's an adjunct to



1 someone probably does have all the credentials, is that the  
2 correct definition?

3 MS. O'NEILL: Correct. The adjunct  
4 instructor generally has not completed an teacher  
5 educational preparation program in its entirety in many  
6 case.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they're -- they're at  
8 it but -- but you've made it a little simpler for the  
9 district to request the continuation of that, is that  
10 correct?

11 MS. O'NEILL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then, we're now  
13 conforming with House Bill 0-8-11-62, is this first time  
14 our rules have been brought into compliance with the  
15 military spouse? That's a fairly old change in the  
16 statute. That is 4.10.

17 MS. O'NEILL: Oh, page five.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Page five.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you. No, it is not the  
20 first time. It was just an update to a definition and  
21 clarification of it. It did fall underneath an interim  
22 authorization which we've been using and there was not a  
23 clear definition of military spouse, it just said that it  
24 was an interim authorization. So we wanted to extract that  
25 while we've been following all the rules. We just wanted



1 to extract it so that it was more clear for the rule  
2 process as well as for applicants when they applied.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, 5.0 at the bottom of  
4 page six, the top of page seven which is the READ Act  
5 certifications. I think we may be revisiting this sometime  
6 in the near future as well. Is it your opinion that this  
7 moves those standards forward or increases them and I  
8 wouldn't be surprised to see some attempts to- to get at  
9 these teacher certification standards at the -- at the  
10 higher ed level in the near future.

11 MS. O'NEILL: I think, you know, our -- our  
12 attempt there was really to again, we were talking about  
13 alignment in general. The READ Act is something that has  
14 been not necessarily referenced in our -- our educator  
15 preparation and licensing rules. We wanted to make sure  
16 that that was part of it and it is a reference to the READ  
17 Act instead of an inclusion in, so that if there was  
18 modification to the READ Act that we were able to use that  
19 reference out and ensure that there was alignment  
20 associated with anything that goes forward.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yeah. Here's the -  
22 - here's the reference to the Nurse Practice Act, which may  
23 contain a date certain- I'm not certain. It's on page 11 -  
24 - 11.05 as your reference.



1 MS. O'NEILL: And Mr. Chair if you will  
2 allow me just a moment of explanation around some of the  
3 additional or specialized service professional  
4 endorsements, those actually require us to work with the  
5 Department of Regulatory Authorities because they are duly  
6 certified in many ways. Nurse is actually one of them.  
7 Some of the revisions that came from DORA, and in the last  
8 year I have to be reflected in our roles as school nurses.  
9 So there's kind of that -- that balancing act would  
10 certainly have taken to heart your, your reference around  
11 dates and changes that makes a lot of sense. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. 11.07,  
13 education -- educator preparation for schools that offer  
14 social work programs. How significant is that change I  
15 would -- I would presume that this would have been -- that  
16 this is a new addition to this particular kind of  
17 certification.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The certification is  
19 not new. The addition was really about a functional  
20 behavior analysis and the requirement that our social  
21 school workers have more preparation around that in  
22 educator preparation. It's something that our functional  
23 behavior assessments simply have not been part of the  
24 school social worker review as we got to looking and  
25 talking to our stakeholders across the state who



1 specialized in social work, school social work. That's  
2 just one of the additions that they've requested. So it's  
3 not new. It's not a new endorsement area or anything like  
4 that. It's just simply a new addition to that one liner  
5 kind of you need to understand what functional behavior  
6 assessments are and how they work.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right and then  
8 finally on page 13, 12.04 this just strictly personal  
9 question. My license expired in 1974. Do I only have to  
10 take six hours or might have been under some other required  
11 for reinstatement?

12 MS. O'NEILL: In an interesting -- in an  
13 interesting way, I get that question I don't know how many  
14 times in a world but in a day. But it actually is under  
15 statute. You really do it within the last five years you  
16 have to take six hours of professional development, that is  
17 really the only requirement out of statute. So it is  
18 clarified enroll it has been a little bit muddy in the past  
19 because people have actually tried to use their  
20 professional development credit hours from 1980 and  
21 applying in 2016. So we did clarify that it has to be --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's wrong with that?

23 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely nothing, and we  
24 would welcome your application at any point.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we should move  
2 to make sure that Chairman Durham needs more.

3 MS. O'NEILL: Okay. Well, if you would like  
4 to talk more about that later, we can certainly do that.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Even though your license  
6 has been expired at significantly if you're tired if I were  
7 to enroll and take six hours in theory, I could get another  
8 certificate?

9 MS. O'NEILL: It actually yes, as long as  
10 you had it and --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not as long as we're on  
12 the board.

13 MS. O'NEILL: And then there's that answer  
14 to, and but it is actually in statute. And like you said,  
15 the clarification really comes around the five years  
16 because it has been somewhat muddy. But without the  
17 statutory change that is actually indeed the case.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. Yes.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So if in fact you had been a  
20 rocket scientist for example for the last 35 years, and had  
21 had a license and then renewed, I would guess there would  
22 be plenty of schools that would love to have you come and  
23 teach. Whereas if you'd been a lobbyist for the last  
24 (inaudible) year --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There's really no market.



1 MS. O'NEILL: That's not a scenario we have.  
2 But we can certainly look at it.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm going to take Ms.  
4 Mazanec's advice and not try it. Okay.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Would you like a motion,  
6 Sir?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Can we have a motion  
8 please?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I moved to delay the vote  
10 until February Board meeting.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there objection, is  
12 there second to that motion?

13 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. There is  
15 second to that motion. So if take care of trend -- work  
16 with Dr. Scheffel deal with the date certain issues and I  
17 think we'll be ready to go at the next meeting.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: And don't give us this big  
19 fat thing again, I will keep -- we will keep it.

20 MS. O'NEILL: I promise I won't.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Objection to the  
22 adoption of that motion? It's seems none we will take that  
23 up at the next board meeting in February. So now let's see  
24 where are we? Are we -- should we proceed with number 16?





1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about, Chairman --  
2 - what about 15.01, did we have that on the consent?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That was on the consent.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Those are both consent.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Those are both consent.

6 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry, 15-0-2.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: It's also on consent even  
8 though we got information on it. You are right.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Can we take that off or can we  
10 still discuss some 15.02?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's see. Tell me.  
12 Remind me quickly what the.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Hope Online's pilot multi-  
14 district.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: We did vote that.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, it's. Yeah, anybody  
17 who was on the prevailing side could make a motion to  
18 reconsider -- to reconsider that-

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you have a problem with  
20 the vote?

21 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I have a question about  
22 because.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So all right. Would you  
24 like to make a motion to reconsider the inclusion of that  
25 in that consent agenda, and if that motion passes and we'll



1 move this back to the regular agenda and probably proceed  
2 out of order but-

3 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's okay. So the motion  
5 to reconsider the consent to the inclusion of 15.02 on the  
6 consent agendas, who're Second? Second going ones, going  
7 twice. Yeah. Yes, Ms. Mazanec would like to discuss 15.02  
8 which was on the consent agenda. The only way we can do  
9 that is to -- Right, yeah. To vote reconsider. So second  
10 it's been moved and seconded that reconsider the inclusion  
11 of item 15.02 on the consent agenda. So objection to leave  
12 the adoption motion? It seems none. Okay. We'll put that  
13 back on the agenda. You want to move that to tomorrow, Ms.  
14 Mazanec will some sort -- why don't we -- can we --  
15 Elizabeth can you --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May we -- seems it is  
19 next on the agenda and part is available, would it be okay  
20 if we just take it up right now and then -- and then go  
21 following that go to 18.01 and -- and 19.01 and then back  
22 in the order of the agenda.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's fine with me. So  
24 that item is now before us 15.02, Ms Mazanec. See if I  
25 could find my papers.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair if I could --  
2 could have passed that their Executive Director of federal  
3 programs that answer the questions. Where is it?  
4 (Inaudible).

5 MS. MAZANEC: I think it prior be good if we  
6 had a short overview from Mr. Chapman about this pilot.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Chapman.

8 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you. It is in May of  
9 2014, the Board asked CDE to put together a pilot project  
10 to take a look at how the allocation of the methodology  
11 that were utilize to allocate Teller One funds to schools  
12 and districts. The reason being that in many cases that  
13 the school or district that's providing the Teller One  
14 services is not the district that receives the funds.  
15 Because funds are allocated to the state based on geography  
16 of a residence where the students live and not where they  
17 receive their instructional services. At the time we were  
18 asked to convene a two year pilot work coming into the  
19 close of that two year pilot and we will need to be making  
20 allocations, Teller One allocations to school districts  
21 within the next month or two. So we want to bring it  
22 before the board to ask whether you would like us to  
23 continue the project as is or discontinue the project or  
24 expand their project to include additional schools? We  
25 have given you information regarding some of the outcomes



1 that have resulted from the pilot project that the school  
2 that we ultimately chose to look at is Hope Online.

3                   So we looked at the place of residence of  
4 the students who attend Hope Online, and transferred funds  
5 from those districts of residence where the districts that  
6 received the Teller One funds and transfer those funds,  
7 allocated those funds to Douglas County which is the, well,  
8 the district of Hope Online. So in some cases school  
9 districts there's a fair amount of funds that were  
10 transferred, in other cases it was a small amount. The  
11 upshot is that Douglas County is able to provide Teller One  
12 services to two of its brick and mortar schools that it was  
13 unable to provide Teller One services and Prior and Hope  
14 Online has been able to expand their Teller One services  
15 from just an elementary level to include the middle and  
16 high school levels. We, based on that we will, we did have  
17 to get approval of this methodology from the U.S.  
18 Department of Education.

19                   So we will have to eventually loop back to  
20 the U.S. Department of Education and give them some  
21 information about how that- how the pilot has gone and  
22 whether or not we would like to continue. And so, when we  
23 -- we talked about the motion, the recommendation to  
24 continue the program for another year. And I think that  
25 was -- that was one of your concerns. You certainly have a



1 -- or entitled to have the right to say, "No, we would like  
2 this project to continue for one or more one or more  
3 years." We were just thinking that we'd sort of take it on  
4 a year by year basis and that we would want to loop around,  
5 loop back to the U.S. Department of Education sometime  
6 during the 16-17 school year to get that ongoing approval.  
7 Does that kind of address your concern?

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, I would just like to say  
9 that this is really an equity of fairness issue for  
10 students, students that are being educated in a district  
11 outside their geographical residence. So it seems to me  
12 that it's a very good idea and I would like to see  
13 expanded. And since we've been in this now two years, I  
14 would propose that we continue this indefinitely and it  
15 gives us good -- good information if we're going to try and  
16 expand that kind of portability of funding, title one  
17 funding to other -- other schools in other districts.

18 MR. CHAPMAN: And one of the things that is  
19 included in the handout that I didn't mention was that  
20 Leanne and I have talked about does the reauthorization of  
21 ESEA afforded the same opportunities that we didn't have  
22 under NCLB, I don't know that it does but I don't know for  
23 sure that it doesn't say we want to look a little bit more  
24 closely at that. We have had some discussions last year,  
25 we had some discussions with the U.S. Department of



1 Education to explore what flexibility we have in how we  
2 allocate the funds. And then also to talk about one of the  
3 limitations is just that it's done manually, and I don't --  
4 I've never had to do it myself but it's this iterative  
5 process that goes on for weeks just for this one school.  
6 So right now we currently don't necessarily have the  
7 systems in place or the people in place to -- to expand it,  
8 you know, to do it for long for the whole state.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Why -- I would propose that we  
10 expand that. I'm sorry, not expand it. We continue this  
11 pilot indefinitely with a definite eye towards expanding it  
12 to other districts. And I bet we can find a way to do the  
13 work easier.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So I may not have -- I may  
16 not remember my high -- higher Math but I think this is a  
17 Math programming problem. And I would wonder if we have  
18 reached out to Math department, one of our higher ed  
19 organizations to see if we can get a grad student to set  
20 this up. It's my inclination to say let's do this for one  
21 more year. I do want to follow -- partly because I want to  
22 follow up on how the kids are doing.

23 MS. MAZANEC: We can still do that, right?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Well but there's -- there's  
25 more opportunity for us to change things if we don't have



1 folks counting on continued -- the continued funding, if in  
2 fact that's not what's working. I don't expect that to be  
3 the case but I'm a little worried. And looking at the  
4 stats in the report that we got, that was not encouraging.  
5 But I do -- I would like to see us pursue the solution to  
6 the Math program theoretically. I think this is something  
7 that you, program is really complicated. Some out of here  
8 in and in there et cetera, et cetera with -- it'll require  
9 some formulas and that's where we -- we may or may not come  
10 in in terms of actually identifying a formula that's  
11 different than what we've picked at this point. So if we  
12 could work with a higher institution, Math institution to  
13 look at that and see if I'm -- if I'm right that that's all  
14 this is, it's a very complicated Math programming thing, we  
15 might be able to get better.

16 MR. CHAPMAN: I think it's not so much that  
17 the -- the Math, although it is complicated. But it's that  
18 it's how you have to do it. You have to -- there are  
19 certain requirements that you apply. You have to apply and  
20 creating the allocations. I mean, we have to kind of go  
21 back and do it for each kid that -- that --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Right, that's why you want  
23 this on a computer. But there are -- there are rules for  
24 each different step and they are very complicated. But I  
25 think there is theoretically you know, it's kind of like



1 programming, the red lights and the green lights and the  
2 traffic patterns, those kinds of things. It doesn't --

3 MS. MAZANEC: Can we do this for -- for CSI?

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. So -- so currently it's  
5 -- it's basically the same process that's used for CSI and  
6 CSDB.

7 MS. MAZANEC: So is it really hard to do it  
8 for CSI too?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Dr. Schroeder, I really like  
13 that idea of seeing if we could potentially get some free  
14 brain power and things to create systems that would do  
15 this. The other thing that -- that I think we have some  
16 opportunity with is looking at the whole allocation formula  
17 under the ESSA new statues and to see if there's other --  
18 other ways that we should be thinking about the allocation  
19 process to better reflect where students are served state  
20 wide, instead of just looking at those geographic  
21 boundaries that we know are very blurred. So I think we --  
22 we definitely have some opportunities there.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I -- I definitely agree it's  
24 an issue of fairness and -- but I'm not convinced it's fair  
25 to do something for just one district or one group of kids.





1 I'd like -- I'd like to see it happen across the Board. So  
2 I'm all for repeating it for another year and then  
3 hopefully just being a whole lot further down the line, so  
4 that if in fact there are decisions for us to make or for  
5 the legislature to make, we can be making them -- we're  
6 making them for all kids. Unless I'm totally off line here  
7 of what I'm thinking.

8 MS. MAZANEC: The -- the only caution I  
9 think at this point also that we'd really need to pay  
10 attention to is that by doing this for the one district, we  
11 pulled money from the others to send to this district. So  
12 the further we look at this --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: It's a lot -- it's a lot of  
14 money this year. It's a lot of money. There's push back.

15 MS. MAZANEC: The further we expand, the  
16 more impact we'll have on other districts potentially. But  
17 -- but that's where I think that also through the new laws  
18 we can take a look at that and see -- see if there's -- if  
19 there are other ways to maybe slice the pie without  
20 impacting students that are currently being served.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wait a -- wait a  
22 minute. It did -- I thought that it -- it looks to me like  
23 it's not a lot of money for these other districts.

24 MS. RANKIN: It depends.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, when you look  
2 at what --

3 MS. RANKIN: Denver I think was --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Things what Denver got  
5 before this pilot and what Denver is getting now. It's not  
6 --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's couple  
8 hundred thousand or something.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Eight hundred and fifty  
10 thousand dollars all total.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, 860.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean it's going up a lot -  
13 - my point is it's going -- it's going up but from last  
14 year to this year --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A lot, to 850,000  
16 thousand?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Total to other districts.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought it was the --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Is that the right -- that  
20 the wrong number?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Which one?

22 MS. MAZANEC: We'll see. So this year --  
23 this year there was a reallocation of 800 -- 890,000  
24 thousand. Last year it was 577,000 thousand. So it is --  
25 Denver was --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: It's 250 --

2 MS. MAZANEC: Two hundred and sixty seven  
3 this year, Aurora was at 253,000 thousand so -- so we just  
4 need to be cognizant.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that sound of 30  
6 million that Denver got.

7 MS. MAZANEC: And they have not reduced  
8 their services that we're aware of two others.

9 MR. CHAPMAN: And that was one of the things  
10 that we looked at is where the sending districts are able  
11 to continue to serve the schools that they have been  
12 serving. And I think there's just one school across all  
13 the districts that the one fewer school, and that -- that  
14 could be for a number of reasons, there are poverty rate  
15 change or the -- the school closed. But we did reach out  
16 and -- and try to ascertain the -- the impact on the  
17 sending districts and it really doesn't seem like there's a  
18 difference in the -- their ability to serve the schools  
19 that they had been serving prior to the pilot. One thing  
20 that we did kind of wanna mention is that if we do wanna  
21 expand the project to include other online schools, we have  
22 to revisit that criteria based on the criteria that the --  
23 the Board approved in 2014. Really hope was the school  
24 that -- that was- became eligible based on the criteria  
25 that was established. So we would review the pilot



1 criteria and -- and bring forward other criteria to you for  
2 your approval, if we expand it.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess my feeling is that  
5 this is a response to technology. Title 1 has been around  
6 a long time. It's a huge entitlement program. The  
7 outcomes of title 1 programs have been variously studied  
8 and impacts you know problematic and this represents an  
9 opportunity for us to let the money follow the kids. And  
10 it's like less than 0.01 percent or something of any  
11 district impact. It is a very small percentage of their  
12 total title one allotment. And so I'd like to see it  
13 continued. I'm -- I'm concerned if we only give it one  
14 more year, it might fall off the radar after that one year  
15 and I -- I think can -- let's -- let's just continue what's  
16 happening now, let's look at the outcomes and let's see how  
17 expand it to other online schools. That would be my  
18 thought.

19 MS. FLORES: Well that's what I'm afraid of  
20 actually is that it will fall off the radar because it  
21 won't come forward and we won't have- we won't have this  
22 conversation next year. And I don't -- I don't want it to  
23 fall off the radar because we are trying to be more fair --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: But we can --



1 MS. FLORES: -- but we're not -- we're not -  
2 -

3 MS. SCHROEDER: We could still have another  
4 review without -- we could -- we could certainly have  
5 another report. I -- I would like to see that. My -- my -  
6 - my concern is that suddenly we stop letting the money  
7 follow the child. I mean, I understand some of these other  
8 districts might be losing some money, but I don't think  
9 it's fair that that -- that say any district gets money to  
10 -- title 1 money to give services to children that aren't  
11 being educated by them. They aren't getting those services  
12 from them. So I would -- I would like to see a report  
13 again next year but --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin.

15 MS. RANKIN: Indefinitely scares me to  
16 death. But one year, I -- I just don't think that's  
17 enough. I don't think it's enough for a pilot program. I  
18 understand that -- that we're looking at a unique set of  
19 individuals, giving them an opportunity. I think  
20 technology is a great way for some students to learn.  
21 Others not -- not a lot but if -- if -- if we have this  
22 opportunity for some of these students that -- that haven't  
23 gotten in in the classroom, I -- I think that's excellent.  
24 I would say -- I would say at least two more years, I think  
25 we'll have better numbers. And I also through ESSA, so



1 many unknowns right now. I hate to see something get lost  
2 in the shuffle that -- that might -- might be good. So  
3 even if we revisit and -- and get a report back on how  
4 they're doing, I -- I would say two years and then after  
5 that I think we'll have a much better picture of a pilot.

6 MS. FLORES: And that would make it a three  
7 year program so that actually does make some sense. I  
8 would agree with that. Thank you.

9 MR. CHAPMAN: Jane, we're coming in to the  
10 end of the second year now.

11 MS. GOFF: We are now?

12 MR. CHAPMAN: So yeah, so this is -- so this  
13 -- we were -- we are two years in.

14 MS. GOFF: Two years worth of results, these  
15 students results?

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, and it's a little bit  
17 misleading because I think after -- it was after year one  
18 that -- that Hope expanded from just the elementary to  
19 middle and high school. So the -- the outcome that we --  
20 we pulled together what academic outcomes we could but we --  
21 - I don't know that we can necessarily attribute those to  
22 the --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: But in a couple of years --  
24 in a couple of years we have something more comprehensive  
25 because I -- I do care about that piece of it too. It's



1 not making a difference and we need to be having a much  
2 broader conversation about all this money that we are  
3 spending. So two years --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion from  
5 Members of the Board.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I can compromise on two  
7 years.

8 MS. FLORES: Make a motion.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, sure.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we make it more  
12 than two years. You're saying this it's really only been  
13 happening for one year. Because the first, they didn't  
14 expand.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: The first year was 14 15 and  
16 then we're coming into the end of the second year. So  
17 we're looking at allocations for 16-17.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which would be the  
19 second or third year?

20 MR. CHAPMAN: That -- that would be the  
21 third year 16-17.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Third year. Okay. So  
23 most initiatives take five years in my understanding of the  
24 research to show impact. So I guess I'd like to give them  
25 five years total and if they've had two --



1 MS. FLORES: She's gonna hear that.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- going on.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Three. I think we would like  
4 to come back every year and -- and -- and I think that we  
5 would -- we -- although we haven't had the U.S. Department  
6 of Education asking us. But I think they will eventually,  
7 we'll have to report back to them on whether we wanna  
8 continue this indefinitely or not.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there a -- may I  
10 --

11 MS. FLORES: I want to make a motion to Pam.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm moving motion.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

14 MS. MAZANEC: I would move that we continue  
15 this pilot project for three more years. And there is an  
16 even five, right?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to Ms.  
18 Rankin? Okay. Further discussion? Thank you. I would  
19 just observe that these -- we know that this a difficult  
20 student population to serve and I think results will always  
21 be difficult. One can -- one can hope however the -- the  
22 application of technology to this problem may be at least  
23 part of the solution. And so we'll see we'll give it  
24 motions for three years, is there -- you wanna call roll on  
25 that?





1 MS. GOFF: Can I quick --

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, I'm sorry. Ms. Goff.

3 MS. GOFF: Sorry that (inaudible) Is it --  
4 so for clarification, this assumes that our title one we  
5 will -- we will apply title one money to this work  
6 regardless of what title one looks like shapes up to be  
7 changes according to ESSA. So this is -- this -- in other  
8 words we are committing right now just saying that part of  
9 Colorado's title one allocation goes to this, regardless of  
10 what are the changes might occur in funding levels with  
11 title one whether it's at the Federal level or here.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think funding levels  
13 went up as I call and read the document.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It did.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, so --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And but you know --

17 MR. CHAPMAN: So these are just reviews in  
18 funds. So these -- these are funds that would flow to the  
19 school districts regardless. What this alters is inside  
20 the -- those districts that are sending students may get a  
21 little less and the districts that are serving those  
22 students may get a little bit more. The -- the -- the new  
23 law doesn't seem to you know, to change title one in any  
24 dramatic fashion. What we will be looking for is a little  
25 bit of a you know, some adjustments to the language around



1 how the funds have to be allocated. And we haven't been  
2 able to really dig into that deeply yet. It doesn't seem  
3 like there's anything significantly different. But there's  
4 also you know, a couple hundred pages of regulations that  
5 will be developed that we'll wanna look at as well to see  
6 to find some flexibility to find some opportunity.

7 MS. FLORES: Then why are we making it three  
8 years?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Because we -- because we're  
10 just coming in on a two years.

11 MS. FLORES: Pat just said kind of do it  
12 year to year because those weren't -- those results weren't  
13 the greatest.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, it's only been two  
15 years and -- and frankly as -- as we know, sometimes the  
16 results aren't good no matter what. We don't always get  
17 success when we have -- when we have more money.

18 MR. CHAPMAN: I feel a little -- I -- I  
19 don't know I -- maybe we should just -- should not have  
20 included --

21 MS. FLORES: We would ask you anyway. Yes  
22 you should have, sorry.

23 MR. CHAPMAN: Because I don't know that we  
24 can say that this -- that these outcomes are any -- are



1 result of this pilot either positive or negative because  
2 it's pretty early in the process.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One thing that a three-  
4 year commitment by the State Board would do is allow the  
5 both the sending districts and the receiving district to  
6 plan and have some stability as to that decision. And I  
7 guess if I were in a district I would appreciate that kind  
8 of stability with -- with this continuation.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

10 MS. FLORES: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, I'm sorry.

12 MS. FLORES: Bizy, do you have the actual  
13 motion? Do you have it -- have it in writing as we spoken?

14 MS. BURDSALL: I'm sorry. Say that last  
15 part.

16 MS. FLORES: The motion, do you have it as  
17 it was spoken?

18 MS. BURDSALL: Yes. Well I was gonna -- so  
19 I have approved the continuation of the Malta -- title one  
20 Malta District Online School Allocation Pilot Project using  
21 the established criteria for three -- for three years.

22 MS. FLORES: Well, does that mean that we  
23 are extending this pilot that we're currently in to a total  
24 of three years which means one more year or does it mean



1 that three more years starting now? We're adding on three  
2 more years.

3 MS. BURDSALL: Three additional years.  
4 Three additional years.

5 MS. FLORES: Yes.

6 MR. CHAPMAN: It would be end of 18-19  
7 school year.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Right. 18-19.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I would find it helpful if  
10 that was in there. If there's an endpoint on it and that's  
11 stated.

12 MS. MAZANEC: So this would take it through  
13 the 18-19 school year. And then we can reconsider.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: But hopefully by that time  
15 we figured something else out.

16 MS. GOFF: By then we know what to do.

17 MS. RANKIN: Wouldn't that be the 19 20?  
18 Because this is -- this is --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This would be the third  
20 year 16-17.

21 MS. MAZANEC: This would be what? 15-16 is  
22 the end of the second year.

23 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, so it's 16-17, 17-18,  
24 18-19.

25 MS. MAZANEC: 18-19 is the end.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: It would be the end of last  
2 year. And if we come up with some other solutions prior to  
3 that, we'll certainly let you know.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Well I -- I do think it's  
5 important to remember that most -- most of the time this is  
6 like less than one percent. A fact for most of these  
7 districts right?

8 MS. FLORES: Well, parents aren't going to  
9 say that.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: It's -- it's not -- I mean  
11 if you look -- if you look at the dollar amounts versus how  
12 much they actually got and it's a tiny piece.

13 MS. FLORES: -- district where those things  
14 don't matter. There's -- there are districts that are  
15 (inaudible).

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Well those things don't  
17 matter?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 18, yeah. We will do --  
19 We'll do that. Okay. Would you call a roll on that please  
20 Ms. Burdsall?

21 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

22 MS. FLORES: Aye.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

24 MS. GOFF: Aye.

25 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.



---

1 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

2 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

4 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

6 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

8 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Motion is adopted on

10 a vote of seven to zero.

11 (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