



Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

**March 8, 2017 Meeting Transcript - Prt. 2**

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

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



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's on but it's not  
2 right direct. For the rules for the determination of inden  
3 -- indigency and establishing policy on school feel -- fees,  
4 1 CCR 301-4. The State Board voted to approve the notice of  
5 rule-making at its January 11th, 2017 Board meeting. A  
6 hearing to promulgate these rules was made known through  
7 publication of a public notice on February 10th, 2017  
8 through the Colorado Register and by State Board notice on  
9 March 1, 2017. The State Board is authorized to promulgate  
10 these rules pursuant to 22-2-107 (1)(c) C.R.S.  
11 Commissioner, is staff prepared to provide an overview?

12 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.  
13 I'll turn this over to Leanne Emm, Deputy Commissioner for  
14 School Finance and Operations.

15 MS. EMM: Thank you. Leanne Emm. And these  
16 ru -- these particular rules were noticed back in January in  
17 order for your consideration for adoption. As the  
18 Department went through this review, there is no statute  
19 that requires the State Board to promulgate these rules.  
20 And that there's statutes that do require districts to set  
21 policies around these but not -- we have to have rules. So,  
22 we would recommend that we just abolish these rules and get  
23 rid of one page.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Is there anyone  
25 here to testify? I have no one on this sign-up sheet going,



1 going gone. Thank you. So, that does conclude the rule-  
2 making hearing. I'm open to a motion, please. Board Member  
3 Ma -- Mazanec. Is that my turn around my eye to.

4 MS. MAZANEC: I move to approve the rules for  
5 determination of indigency and establishing the policy of  
6 school(indiscernible), 1 CCR 301-4.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Does anyone object  
9 to this?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I want to make a comment  
11 at a time when we have so many kids that are needy, that are  
12 poor, and we're going to get rid of this? I mean, are you  
13 sure we're not going to know --

14 MS. MAZANEC: They're not necessary, Evelyn  
15 (ph).

16 MADAM CHAIR: The rules are not necessary.  
17 School districts are addressing this.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you're not hurting  
21 the (indiscernible)?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anybody opposed?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Didn't I ask is anybody opposed  
24 and nobody said anything?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE (Indiscernible).



1 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, all right. Are we fine?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that --

3 MR. DURHAM: Motion's adopted.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Hot diggety. Motion's adopted.

5 Next item.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Ma -- Madam Chair, I'm  
7 wondering if -- do you just want to take the next few rule-  
8 making hearing items?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Would you like to change it?

10 MS. CORDIAL: And then go ahead -- and then  
11 we can go back to this.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Are we fine on the schedule in  
13 terms of the way they were--

14 MS. CORDIAL: We are.

15 MADAM CHAIR: We are? Okay.

16 MS. CORDIAL: We just have -- the only one  
17 you won't be able to take -- actually, yeah, you can ta --  
18 the only one you won't be able to take is the 2:30 rule-  
19 making hearings. So, we could do the 1:30, the 2:00  
20 o'clock, and then go back to the standards review and  
21 revision process update.

22 MADAM CHAIR: So, let's go to item 15. You  
23 can just stop me when I'm messing up --

24 MS. CORDIAL: Yup. Yes, ma'am.

25 MS. ANTHES: And Leanne is doing all of them



1 so you can just keep --

2 MADAM CHAIR: So you can just stay there.

3 Thank you. The Colorado State Board of Education will now  
4 conduct a public rule-making hearing for the rules for the  
5 administration of the Second Chance Pilot Program, 1 CCR  
6 301-30. The State Board voted to approve the notice of  
7 rule-making at its January 11th, 2017 Board meeting. A  
8 hearing to promulgate these rules was made known through  
9 publication of a public notice on February 10th, 2017  
10 through the Colorado Register and by State Board notice on  
11 March 1, 2017. The State Board is authorized to promulgate  
12 these rules pursuant to 22-2-107 (1)(c) C.R.S.

13 Commissioner, is staff prepared to provide an overview?

14 MS. ANTHES: Yes, it's -- Deputy Commissioner  
15 Leanne Emm.

16 MS. EMM: Thank you. This rule can be  
17 repealed. We do not have any Second Chance students in this  
18 Pilot Program. And if we did, those students would be  
19 covered under the rules within the School Finance Act.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Great. Thank you.

21 MS. EMM: Six pages of rules gone.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Awesome. And we do not have  
23 anyone here to testify. So, this concludes rule-making  
24 hearing for the Rules for the Administration of the Second  
25 Chance Pilot Program, 1 CCR 301-30. Is there any further



1 discussion? May I have a motion please? Board Member  
2 McClellan.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to approve the Rules  
4 for the Administration of the Second Chance Pilot Program, 1  
5 CCR 301-30.

6 MADAM CHAIR: That's a proper motion. Is  
7 there a second?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Are there any objections to  
10 these rules? Passed. Done. Sixteen. Am I -- that's still  
11 us --

12 MS. CORDIAL: Still good.

13 MADAM CHAIR: -- all right.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Uh-huh.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Colorado State Board of  
16 Education will now conduct a public rule-making hearing for  
17 the rules for the Implementation and Financing of Regional  
18 Education and Support Services, 1 CCR 301-55. The State  
19 Board voted to approve the notice of rule-making at its  
20 January 11th, 2017 Board meeting. A hearing to promulgate  
21 these rules was made known through the publication of a  
22 public notice on February 10, 2017 through the Colorado  
23 Register and by State Board notice on March 1, 2017. The  
24 State Board is authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant  
25 to 20 -- 22-2-107 (1)(c) C.R.S. Commissioner, is staff



1 prepared to provide an overview?

2 MS. ANTHES: Yes, they are. And back to  
3 Leanne Emm.

4 MS. EMM: Yes, thank you. These rules were  
5 developed in 2002. However, the funding no longer exists.  
6 And therefore, we feel like these rules could probably go  
7 away and give you an additional three pages of rules to  
8 eliminate.

9 MADAM CHAIR: It's kind of hard to argue with  
10 that.

11 MS. MAZANEC: (Indiscernible - away from  
12 microphone).

13 MADAM CHAIR: It's my understanding there's  
14 no one here to testify to this. All right. This concludes  
15 the rule-making hearing for the Rules for the Implementation  
16 and Financing of Regional Education and Support Services.  
17 Is there any further discussion. Is there a motion, Board  
18 Member Pam Mazanec?

19 MS. MAZANEC: I move to approve the rules for  
20 the Implementation and financing of Regional Education and  
21 Support Sys -- Services; 1CCR301-55.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is your microphone on?

23 MADAM CHAIR: That's a proper motion.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just a second is your  
25 microphone on.



1 MS. RANKIN: Is your microphone on?

2 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. RANKIN: But that's okay.

5 MS. ANTHES: You want her to do it again?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does she have to do it

7 again?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could she? Please.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I will do it right this time.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Just really quick.

11 MS. MAZANEC: I move to approve the rules for

12 the implementation and financing of regional education and

13 support services. 1CCR301-55.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, that's a proper

15 motion. Is there a second?

16 MS. GOFF: Second.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Goff seconded. Any

18 objections to the rules? Thank you. Now Board -- Board

19 Member Durham.

20 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, I move to -- as

21 having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider,

22 the item 5.01; he Board vote on the consent agenda.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

25 MR. DURHAM: I would just ask for a yes vote





1 and if that -- if the motion is to reconsider.

2 MADAM CHAIR: This is item 5.01.

3 MR. DURHAM: 5.01 and if that's readopted  
4 then -- if that's adopted --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Reconsider,  
6 (indiscernible - simultaneous speech).

7 MR. DURHAM: -- then I will ask for that --  
8 then I will move that we -- that we delete item 19.06 from  
9 the consent agenda. We need to adopt the reconsideration  
10 first.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Was there an objections to  
12 that? So that passed.

13 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Proceed.

15 MR. DURHAM: I move we -- I move that or I  
16 think I don't -- I don't think we need motion. I will  
17 object to the inclusion of item 19.06 in the consent agenda,  
18 so it should be deleted from the motion to approve the  
19 consent agenda. Then I would move the adoption of the  
20 consent agenda as amended

21 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, any objection to the  
22 con

23 --

24 MR. DURHAM: Your's is still off.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Your's is still -- your's is



1 still off.

2 MR. DURHAM: Your's is still off.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I -- I would like to  
4 take some --

5 MS.CORDIAL: You'd like to put some back --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like to put some  
7 back on-

8 MS. CORDIAL: -- on the consent agenda.

9 MR. DURHAM: So, you want to move, which one  
10 is it.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So I want to move  
12 the Douglas County --

13 MR. DURHAM: 24 -- 20.4.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 24.04 a waiver request  
15 from state statutes by Douglas County School District on  
16 behalf of Milestone Academy.

17 MADAM CHAIR Okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then the other one,  
19 there's two more. 20.06 a waiver --

20 MR. DURHAM: That was already off.

21 MS. RANKIN: That one was always on consent.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh yes, yes, yes, okay  
23 and then 20.07 request for from Greeley-Evans School  
24 District 6 to approve its innovation application on behalf  
25 of Fred Tjardes School.



1 MR. DURHAM: I consider those friendly  
2 amendments, and if there is a second to -- to that motion.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Looking into that --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, those are basket  
5 consents.

6 MADAM CHAIR: No ask that. Go ahead and ask  
7 that before we vote on this.

8 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Durham, I just want a  
9 clarification. You said 19.06 is that correct.

10 MR. DURHAM: That's I believe the one that --

11 MS. RANKIN: I think you believe -- I think  
12 it should be 19.05.

13 MR. DURHAM: I'm sorry, I have it. It is 19.

14 MS. CORDIAL: It is 19.06.

15 MS. RANKIN: Is it because 155 was 05 okay,  
16 just making sure.

17 MR. DURHAM: So, to clari -- oh, I'm sorry.

18 MS. CORDIAL: You might have an older version  
19 of the agenda, Board Member-

20 MS. RANKIN: Just wondering.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin. You may  
22 have an older version of the agenda --

23 MS. RANKIN: Oh.

24 MS. CORDIAL: -- so now the current agenda  
25 19.06 concerns disciplinary --



1 MS. RANKIN: 155.

2 MS. CORDIAL: 155.

3 MS. RANKIN: I do have an old agenda.

4 MR. DURHAM: So, then -- so, I would consider  
5 those friendly amendments and would ask for a second.

6 MS. RANKIN: Second.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Anyone object?

11 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, I now move that  
12 item 19.06 be scheduled for inclusion in the -- at the April  
13 meeting of the Board.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Second?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Any objections?

17 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you folks. Are we at the  
19 right time now to get to the last.

20 MS. CORDIAL: No, not till 2:30.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So, let's go back to --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are not on schedule.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, thanks for that.

24 MADAM CHAIR: But I appreciate the thought,  
25 it would be a lovely time. I think we're at 14.00.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Standards review and  
3 revision.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Number 14. -- 14.01

5 MADAM CHAIR: What did I just say? 14.01.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Commissioner.

7 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you Madam Chair, I'm  
8 going to turn this over to Dr. Colsman associate  
9 commissioner for student learning. This will be a similar  
10 regular update, you're going to get as we embark on the  
11 standards revision process. But Dr. Colsman has said that  
12 she's going to keep it quick. She's going to shorten, you  
13 know, shorten it a little bit try to make up some time.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Although are  
15 we voting?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

17 MADAM CHAIR: No. Are we giving -- giving  
18 direction?

19 MS. COLSMAN: Asking for some feedback.

20 MADAM CHAIR: There's a question here, right?

21 MS. COLSMAN: Correct.

22 MADAM CHAIR: So, will we be voting on that  
23 or what direction would be adequate?

24 MS. COLSMAN: I'm just asking, yeah, asking  
25 for some direction.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay thanks, great.

2 MS. COLSMAN: So, thank you Dr. Anthes and  
3 Madam Chair members of the Board as Dr. Anthes noted, our  
4 attention is to bring to you regular updates on the  
5 standards review and revision process. Today, I'd like to  
6 be able to cover the necessary information but do so in an  
7 expedited way to help you get back on track with your agenda  
8 for today. So there are two main points that I'd like to  
9 update the Board on today. The first is a brief update on  
10 the Standards Review Committee application process and  
11 secondly to update you on a new addition to the Colorado  
12 Academic Standards, which is for computer science. So, just  
13 as a brief reminder, we are following these principles to  
14 guide the work for the standards review and revision  
15 process, that this be a transparent process, that it be  
16 inclusive research informed, consistent with statutory  
17 requirements, substantive meaning we focus on the substance  
18 of the standards and improvement oriented. So, these are  
19 guiding our decisions as we move forward with each aspect of  
20 the standards review and revision process. The first piece  
21 of this update today is on the committee application  
22 process, which is the inclusive principle meaning that we  
23 are asking members of the education community, parents,  
24 business, higher education, early childhood education to be  
25 a part of this process. So, we are engaging committees for



1 each of the content areas within the Colorado Academic  
2 Standards, that's 10 different content areas. We'll also  
3 have a committee focused on computer science, which is in  
4 addition. Personal Financial Literacy, which actually spans  
5 across two content areas in English language proficiency.

6 Our committees will include educators across  
7 all grade bands, business leaders, representatives from  
8 higher education and parents of community members. We are  
9 submitting -- we're soliciting applications through an  
10 online application process and we're really looking to make  
11 sure we have geographic diversity on the committees, as well  
12 as representation for students with disabilities, English  
13 learners, and gifted and talented students. We will be  
14 reviewing the applications using a blind review process,  
15 meaning we will remove the names from the applications as we  
16 review them so that we're looking at the applicants'  
17 qualifications apart from any person that we might know.  
18 And the intention is that the review committees are going to  
19 be using the feedback from stakeholders and research to  
20 inform any recommendations that they would bring to you for  
21 -- for consideration during the review process.

22 You'll recall that we have an online  
23 standards feedback system, which is collecting that input.  
24 All of that input will be given directly to our committees.  
25 The application process opened on February 15th, is closing



1 on March 15th, and we intend to announce our committee  
2 members at the beginning of April. So far, we have close to  
3 300 applications for the committee. We'll have close --  
4 somewhere between 175 and 200 positions across the 13  
5 committees just depending on making sure that we have that  
6 representation of all grade bands. So far 65 percent of  
7 those applicants are educators, classroom teachers, 21  
8 percent are district leaders, presumably curriculum  
9 directors, seven percent from institutions of higher  
10 education, four percent business, and two percent parent.  
11 We're really working at bolstering the parent application  
12 process as well as business representation.

13                   So, the piece that we are bringing forward to  
14 -- today, that we would like some direction from the Board  
15 on is in relation to computer science standards. So, in the  
16 2016 Legislative Session House Bill 16-1198 pass which  
17 required the adoption of computer science standards along  
18 the same timeline as the Standard to Review and Revision  
19 process to conclude by July, 2018. What's interesting about  
20 this particular statute is that it -- these standards would  
21 be optional for districts. So, these would be the only set  
22 of optional standards, and these standards are to be written  
23 only for secondary. So, those are unique features of this  
24 particular set of standards. There are some requirements  
25 that the standards have, one that they would identify the --





1 the knowledge and skills that students would need in  
2 computer science, but they call out specifically computer  
3 coding as some of those skills. And the standards are to be  
4 articulated into one or more courses the districts could  
5 then choose to use as graduation credit, should they so  
6 desire, in either math or science. So, these are kind of  
7 some unique features of the computer science standards.  
8 And, again, these are completely optional standards.

9           Because these are new standards for the  
10 State, over the fall we conducted a series of standards  
11 input meetings to get some general input on the front-end  
12 around the standards process to ask questions about what --  
13 what should the committee membership look like? What should  
14 be some of the principles that this committee follows?  
15 Because statute didn't define computer science, we asked a  
16 question about what should we be considering as computer  
17 science? Because computer science, in some people's minds,  
18 can be something as simple as learning how to operate  
19 different technologies to what a computer scientist would  
20 indicate as computer science, which is a much more technical  
21 perspective. So, we conducted this -- this series of -- of  
22 regional meetings. We had about 170 registrants. We had  
23 approximately 40 percent of the participants were K-12  
24 educators, 11 percent were technology librarians. We had  
25 representation from business at six percent, career and



1 technical education at six percent, and institutions of  
2 higher education at five percent.

3                   From these meetings, these were some of the  
4 general themes that emerged. By the way you do -- you  
5 should have as part of your packet, a summary report of  
6 these regional meetings. We were very grateful that  
7 Education Commission of the State was able to facilitate  
8 this for us and actually take notes for us and summarize, as  
9 part of their service to the -- to Colorado, and to that we  
10 are very grateful. So, these themes emerged from these  
11 meetings. The first is that these standards really need to  
12 be very adaptable because of the rapid change in technology  
13 that occurs. That the standard should require not just  
14 mastery of knowledge, but also the ability to apply that  
15 knowledge such that students would perhaps emerge with a  
16 portfolio of actual projects that show that they not only  
17 understand, but can actually apply the knowledge that  
18 they've learned through the computer science courses that  
19 they've taken. There was a request to integrate these  
20 skills into other subjects and have it not necessarily only  
21 be a standalone set of standards, that we would, through  
22 this process raise student awareness of computer science job  
23 opportunities; that we would increase business partnerships,  
24 including work based learning opportunities, and perhaps  
25 apprenticeships; and that, ultimately, we would increase the



1 number of -- of Colorado students pursuing computer science  
2 careers. But one that I skipped as I was reading through  
3 here is actually pertains to what we're bringing forward for  
4 you today to get some feedback on. One of the themes that  
5 we heard throughout this was, if we wait until secondary to  
6 start to support students in computer science, there was  
7 this feeling that that felt a bit late, and it seemed that  
8 there was a request to consider looking at inclusion of  
9 elementary computer science expectations in some shape or  
10 form. So, that is what we wanted to get your feedback on  
11 today. Because as we are getting applications for the  
12 committees, committee applicants indicate which committee  
13 they would like to apply to. They indicate which level that  
14 they are interested in applying for. And so, right now they  
15 can apply for any level, any content area.

16           And so, what we need to know is what -- what  
17 do we do with folks who might be interested in elementary  
18 computer science? And so, we -- we've thought about some  
19 different ideas here. We thought of -- of kind of three  
20 scenarios. I'm sure that there are others. So, one option  
21 that we could do is -- is actually -- because these are  
22 optional standards anyway, the -- we could have elementary  
23 standards also part of this process such that we actually  
24 have a P-12 set of computer science standards. In --  
25 between option could be that we follow the letter of the



1 statute and develop secondary science computer -- secondary  
2 computer science standards, and identify at least some  
3 optional resources for elementary so that those districts  
4 that want to support a computer science program at least  
5 have some high quality materials or resources to draw from.  
6 And then, our third option would just be to go -- to simply  
7 follow the letter of the law and develop secondary computer  
8 science standards. So, we wanted to get some direction from  
9 you because, as you can see, as we are forming these  
10 committees, this question is becoming a little more pressing  
11 in our thinking.

12 MADAM CHAIR: I have some questions, just to  
13 understand this a little bit better. Secondary, is that 6-  
14 12 or 9-12?

15 MS. COLSMAN: That's a -- that is a good  
16 question because we've -- we actually spent some time  
17 looking in -- in statute around that. And -- and our Policy  
18 Advisor, Melissa Bloom (ph), helped us think about that  
19 because in some cases it  
20 -- it does look like we can consider six through 12 as  
21 secondary, and others nine through 12. So --

22 MADAM CHAIR: That wasn't a very good answer.

23 MS. COLSMAN: I --

24 MADAM CHAIR: I mean, a very helpful answer.

25 MS. COLSMAN: I --



1 MADAM CHAIR: I know it's the best answer  
2 maybe --

3 MS. COLSMAN: Right.

4 MADAM CHAIR: -- you can give me but --

5 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you.

6 MADAM CHAIR: That's not particularly helpful  
7 for us.

8 MS. COLSMAN: Right. Right.

9 MADAM CHAIR: And the other question I have,  
10 in terms of their recommendations, it says be integrated  
11 into other disciplines. And I think they're talking about  
12 in the standards. And if they're talking about in the  
13 standards, then it ceases to be voluntary. So, I'm look --  
14 I mean, I'm all for integrated -- integrating it into the  
15 curriculum that a school district or teacher chooses. But  
16 I'm a little worried about how it's going to work if we  
17 integrate that into the standards and then those are our  
18 standards that we expect all kids to meet and then we say  
19 but -- but part of this is voluntary, don't you think that  
20 might confuse people?

21 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. You raise a very good  
22 point on that and the pieces that, you know, we shared with  
23 you here what the themes were, we -- because of the exact  
24 point that you bring up, that does feel like a  
25 recommendation that would be problematic for us to be able



1 to act on. We do know though that within -- within the --  
2 within cap for K, there is a provision of skills that need  
3 to be a part of all of the standards. In the past, we  
4 called them 21st century skills which is really getting old  
5 calling them 21st century skills. But there is --  
6 information technology application skills is meant to be  
7 integrated in all standards. So there -- I think there's a  
8 possibility of perhaps at least meeting some of what our  
9 stakeholders would want. But -- but I think that if we were  
10 to integrate the actual computer science standards across  
11 all of the standards, we would face a problem that you've  
12 noted.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Colleagues; comments,  
14 questions? Board Member Flores.

15 MS. FLORES: Well, I mean, it's -- it would  
16 be cruel not to have young children, you know, be on  
17 computers although, I see the other side where I hear from  
18 some moms, I can't get my kid off the computer. But we have  
19 a large number of kids who don't have computers at home and  
20 certainly, I mean, that's a lar -- large chunk of money I  
21 think for families to be, to have a computer at home. I  
22 just am looking at, you know, my own personal -- how much I  
23 pay for my computer at home. And -- but it's so necessary.  
24 And I'm wondering if, with the 21st century skills, whether  
25 they could be embedded within courses such as writing, such



1 as investigation in science, in the elementary school where,  
2 you know, you'd have to be able to do that. But I guess  
3 that goes into what a school district might -- we don't  
4 want to say so that everything is done. I mean, I go into -  
5 - I just remember going into this particular school. Every  
6 classroom had their computer out and I spent a few hours  
7 there and it just seemed like they were on computers, that  
8 seemed to be too much. And the teacher was kind of hovering  
9 over, but I don't know, and -- and it was not just one  
10 class, it was predominantly all over the school.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Other comments. I'm sorry.

12 MS. COLSMAN: I was just going to respond.  
13 So in the -- exactly what you said was so -- something that  
14 came up in our public meetings which was distinguishing  
15 between information technology application skills, which is  
16 what you were talking about seeing that across the  
17 curriculum and more about a specific focus on computer  
18 science skills, which is why the definition of computer  
19 science is really important. I was able to go to a coding,  
20 a day of code at an elementary school which was really  
21 exciting because you could see kindergarten and first grade  
22 students being able to use icons and understand the  
23 iterative process of, of coding and about how it requires a  
24 lot of, what is the -- a lot of the kind of procedural kind  
25 of thinking to actually code and make a little animal move



1 across the screen. So that would be definitely a skill that  
2 wouldn't be a part of a typical curriculum, but it would  
3 really be leading to -- in to computer science skills and  
4 thinking in the future. But you're right, those are, those  
5 are kind of two distinct sets of skills.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Board McClellan.

7 MS. MCCLELLAN: I just want to make sure that  
8 I'm understanding the input that you're seeking. Are you  
9 looking for guidance with respect to how we might like to  
10 see the committee weighted in terms of what kinds of  
11 individuals you're looking for? And forgive me if I'm  
12 playing catch up here. Do we already have some examples of  
13 -- are we looking at maybe a mix of individuals representing  
14 parent groups or advocacy groups or maybe someone from  
15 higher ed who can say this is what we're going to be looking  
16 for once they're done with their K through 12 education --  
17 that kind of balancing?

18 MS. COLSMAN: Right. So, we're asking  
19 specifically around when we -- when we look at the committee  
20 composition, do we actually engage elementary teachers and  
21 have them develop some elementary standards for computer  
22 science or not? Because the statute doesn't require that,  
23 but that's what our stakeholders have said is -- it feels  
24 like they need an on-ramp to get to secondary standards.

25 MS. MCCLELLAN: Well, I went to elementary





1 school in Silicon Valley and we began learning about basic  
2 coding. Now we were just down the street from Apple  
3 Computer and we learned about basic coding, I think  
4 beginning in fifth grade. So, and we were fortunate enough  
5 to have Apple give us computers for, when we would go into  
6 that lab we each had our own. So, we had a little bit of an  
7 advantage there but certainly not inappropriate. So, if  
8 that's the input that we're getting from the elementary  
9 level, I think that within the committee having that voice  
10 included seems appropriate. And I also wanted to ask, are  
11 we keeping the process open enough so that advocacy groups  
12 and other interested parties can be giving kind of ongoing  
13 feedback and reflecting on the process as it evolves? Is it,  
14 we'll have a committee but is it still a relatively open  
15 process?

16 MS. COLSMAN: That, that is a good question.  
17 So as the committees convene and have an initial set of  
18 recommended revisions, just like we have right now, which is  
19 this online standards feedback system where anyone can go in  
20 and respond to what's in the standards; they'll be able to  
21 do that same thing and respond to any of the recommended  
22 changes. So, we've -- our  
23 -- our web-based team has done a great job of setting up a  
24 system that will allow us to adapt to that so that we'll be  
25 able to have that feedback in a very robust way and we'll be



1 looking for that sometime in the fall.

2 MS. MCCLELLAN: That's great. Thank you.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec.

4 MS. MAZANEC: So, people can still provide  
5 input on sta -- on just these standards or the other -- is  
6 the ability to provide input on standards period, generally  
7 over?

8 MS. COLSMAN: No. The online standards  
9 feedback system is open until April 30th. So there's still  
10 plenty of time.

11 MS. MAZANEC: So anybody can access that now.

12 MS. COLSMAN: Right. Right.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Anybody, thank you. So, I've  
14 heard some people were unable to -- or weren't invited. I  
15 was like I think anybody can.

16 MS. COLSMAN: Absolutely. And we can send  
17 the information about how to -- how to get logged in and  
18 provide feedback so we can send that to Bizy to distribute  
19 to all of you. That's right.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

22 MS. RANKIN: So, if I read this correctly,  
23 1198 says that we are required at the secondary level; is  
24 that correct?

25 MS. COLSMAN: Required to adopt at the



1 secondary level.

2 MS. MAZANEC: But we don't defi -- but we  
3 don't define secondary, yeah.

4 MS. RANKIN: Right. Right. I, I kind of, so  
5 this is a new area and it's the only one we have of  
6 standards that can permeate all the other standards and all  
7 the other curriculum that we teach. I would want to start  
8 with what the minimum that we have to do and then build from  
9 there. And I don't -- I think the -- the lower grades could  
10 come up, and for a couple reasons. First of all, I know  
11 students, even at junior high and higher elementary level do  
12 some of their homework online anyway, they have some  
13 familiarity. I also know that through the BOCES and other  
14 avenues, there's some blended learning opportunities. I  
15 think students are going to be coming into the secondary  
16 school level with a variety of backgrounds. But if they  
17 hear that computer science is something they are interested  
18 in, this is a typical thing because of the vehicle and  
19 computers. They're going to get a lot of it online on their  
20 own. So -- and I'm not saying a kindergartner would. I  
21 think that's wonderful to have it. But again, it's all  
22 optional. I think it might be directed more from within the  
23 beast. And do we have anybody that, I mean, would -- would  
24 there be any reason for a Board Member to be in that  
25 computer science thing?



1 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. There's, there's no  
2 prohibition for Board members to be a part of that work.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Go for it. I think you should.  
4 Go for it. Yeah.

5 MS. RANKIN: If I can figure out how to get  
6 online and sign up. Find a kindergartner..

7 MADAM CHAIR: So, I guess my position is a  
8 little bit different, since it is all voluntary on the part,  
9 it would be my inclination to build a system. And I'm not  
10 suggesting this to a kindergartner, but at the elementary  
11 level, so that you've actually got a -- as -- as -- a  
12 platform that really ratchets its -- ratchet -- ratchets it  
13 up. And then, schools can decide if they want to have the  
14 kids -- have that integrated into their elementary  
15 curriculum or not. And then, we don't have to figure out  
16 whether it's grade six or grade nine, but it's there. That  
17 would be my inclination, just, just to have -- have that --  
18 the other thing is that for some kids and probably in some  
19 communities, that is such an item of engagement. It's just  
20 a reality that this is what floats some little people's boat  
21 and to the extent that a district can provide that, I think  
22 it could be very, very helpful, but I'm just disagreeing  
23 with my colleague here. Go ahead. Board Member Rankin?  
24 Oh, I'm sorry. Board Member Goff?

25 MS. GOFF: Thank you. STEM. STEM programs,



1 are they primarily at the middle high -- middle level? Are  
2 there's any -- are there growing number of them at the  
3 elementary level or not?

4 MS. COLSMAN: Yes, yes. There-

5 MS. GOFF: Elementary like-

6 MS. COLSMAN: -- yeah.

7 MS. GOFF: -- age four, five, and six's of  
8 them.

9 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. There, there is a gr --  
10 kind of more of a trend to thinking about STEM education,  
11 science, technology, engineering, mathematics having not  
12 just be a secondary piece, but really thinking about that as  
13 that whole continuum of learning from young children upward.  
14 So, there is more, more of a push for that if we can get  
15 some more information for you about the prevalence here in  
16 Colorado, if you would like.

17 MS. GOFF: Well, it's -- it's -- right now,  
18 just thank you. But right now, it seems like that's a sort  
19 of a good spread possibility area. So, if we want to -- if  
20 there was a central place to start with on that and it would  
21 still be -- it  
22 -- it's still secondary, it's looking at that middle level  
23 whether -- whether we want to tur -- turn or include  
24 literally the middle, the intermediary grades along with  
25 that middle level. Although, high school, pretty logical



1 too. I'm sure that the current STEM programs if nothing  
2 else, not to mention all the robotics. Or even a lot  
3 opportunities are out. So, it's up pretty well for  
4 standards. Just curious about that though, I thought it  
5 maybe -- that could be -- that is an idea or a program area  
6 that does encompass a range where we could call it  
7 secondary.

8 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: So, let me go back to the chair  
11 -- chairperson's opinion on having throughout the grades.  
12 We're representing a lot of very small school districts in  
13 rural Colorado that are starved for teachers. I'm very  
14 concerned about having enough teach -- we may have the  
15 interest on -- of the children, but I'm not quite sure what  
16 the capability is of the teachers to be teaching this at the  
17 elementary level. I can see it fitting in more to the  
18 secondary level because of math and science. And I think  
19 STEM itself is -- is a great program to promote this, but I  
20 feel we would be really biting off more than we can chew if  
21 we -- we try to do it all at once through all the grades.

22 MS. COLSMAN: So, middle ground could be that  
23 middle option, then which would be to -- to go ahead and  
24 develop these for the secondary level. But then, perhaps  
25 develop just some res -- optional additional resources for



1 the elementary grades that districts can pull on should they  
2 would like to or  
3 -- and -- and if there was any change in the future to  
4 statute, we could -- we would actually have a base then to  
5 pull from.

6 MS. RANKIN: I really like that.

7 MS. GOFF: Yeah, that's a pragmatic, but we  
8 still need to, to find secondary.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Let's do it. I can't wait to  
10 find --

11 MS. COLSMAN: So, for the purposes of this, I  
12 mean, I -- I -- I do think that we would have kind of leeway  
13 in, in whichever definition that we would like to give. I  
14 think that they -- it could be justified it at -- you know,  
15 by a different statute. So, if that's something that you  
16 would like to say that secondary starts at sixth grade or  
17 ninth grade.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Six through 12.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just 12.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Feeling a little feisty,  
21 are we? How do you all feel about that? Sixth through --  
22 secondary is six through 12th?

23 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham.

25 MR. DURHAM: What -- Quite clearly, it's not



1 elemen -- I mean, elementary school's one through six. So,  
2 I -- I think --

3 MADAM CHAIR: What?

4 MR. DURHAM: -- the common standard of  
5 secondary is high school, which is ninth grade and up.

6 MS. RANKIN: I agree. Now, remember -- and  
7 we could always --

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff.

9 MS. GOFF: Where did they put the middle  
10 schools then?

11 MADAM CHAIR: Well, we've been arguing about  
12 many schools for the last 25 years frankly. Board Member  
13 Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: I taught seven through 12, I  
15 always considered it just secondary -- it's hard for me --  
16 My thought was, and I'm not sure -- I won't feel badly if  
17 you tell me this is not related, but the idea of, of  
18 shortage of teachers that are on their way or al -- already  
19 are qualified to do something like this -- I'm just thinking  
20 about the future needs, and what we know the realities are,  
21 how many truly secondary; in other words, nine through 12,  
22 kids or even juniors and seniors in high school who are on  
23 the verge of or very near having -- having a pretty close  
24 touch on being certified or having a certificate; an  
25 industry stre -- certificate.





1                               So, that part of the high -- high school  
2 credit or something incentive placement quality credit for  
3 taking a role in the actual instruction of not full blown  
4 responsibility as a classroom that a licensed person would  
5 have, but using all of this stuff as some pathways for  
6 kids, whether it's on the -- on the learning end or on the  
7 distributing end of the knowledge and, you know, maybe down  
8 -- you know, out there it's a bigger picture. But a -- a  
9 partnership, a community partnership idea being or something  
10 like that where kids could really be involved in this too --  
11 or grow into it even as they progressed through, through  
12 school. It's standards. It's, you know, they're still  
13 exercising standards and being evaluated on it. But looking  
14 ahead, I'm just -- I think this is exciting I'm glad we're  
15 doing it. I just hope it's -- it's done as quickly as it  
16 seems like it's possible to because we have so many young  
17 people that are already down the road. Just -- just keep  
18 them going, so.

19                               MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Colsman, did we answer your  
20 question?

21                               MS. COLSMAN: I believe I understand that we  
22 should consider these as nine through 12th grade standards.  
23 And there seems to be support for going ahead and for grades  
24 prior to that perhaps engaging some educators to help at  
25 least identify some resources that districts may choose



1 from. Does that summarize? Okay.

2                   MADAM CHAIR: So, let me just ask one thing.  
3 In the -- if in the process of setting the standards for  
4 ninth grade, we're assuming that the kids don't know  
5 anything about computer science. And that's where we start  
6 -- that's probably pretty -- I mean, that's what worries me  
7 about just looking at secondary. What's the assumption that  
8 you're going to make by just starting at ninth grade  
9 standards? That -- that has me pretty worried because I  
10 think it's going to -- not really align with where the  
11 students are. Board Member Flores.

12                   MS. FLORES: Wouldn't it be possible to just  
13 have those, I guess, standards for pre-K through sixth grade  
14 or whatever, that -- that is available for districts to be  
15 able to  
16 --

17                   MADAM CHAIR: Well, that's kind of what we're  
18 deciding and it's a -- it's --

19                   MS. FLORES: And that we shouldn't. I mean I  
20 don't think it should be a yes or a no. It should be that  
21 the State should be able to help in -- in the development of  
22 those standards. So, that they be available to school  
23 districts if they want to -- to use it. I bet most of them  
24 would want to have an -- a guide, a guide for those.

25                   MADAM CHAIR: So yeah, I -- I mean, I don't



1 know how you address that.

2 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. So I think we can, you  
3 know, if the direction that I'm hearing is that we can go  
4 ahead and develop -- help these committees develop some of  
5 those resources for prior to ninth grade for districts. And  
6 -- and actually, Madam Chair, the point that you've made  
7 about the assumption for ninth grade is something that would  
8 have to be built into the standards in terms of assuming --  
9 assuming kind of, you know, like what is it that a typical  
10 ninth grader might have had in their background and kind of  
11 starting from there. So -- so that actually is an important  
12 thing because if -- if we've assumed that they've had some  
13 computer science and that's different than using technology  
14 -- the actual computer science kind of thinking in  
15 activities. I think that, you know, that gives us a  
16 different starting point.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Right. And I think, for  
18 example, in the Saint Brain School District the odds are  
19 very high, that they've had some computer science from  
20 elementary school on --

21 MS. COLSMAN: Right.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Real Computer Science just  
23 because of the --

24 MS. COLSMAN: Right.

25 MADAM CHAIR: -- focus in that school



1 district. Well, then the standards at the secondary level I  
2 would think would be different.

3 MS. COLSMAN: Well, they might as -- they  
4 might -- they might look at them and say, well, we've  
5 already accomplished these. You know, we've already  
6 accomplished some of these, so we can just focus on the  
7 areas of -- that the students haven't done, because they're  
8 entirely optional anyway.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

10 MS. COLSMAN: There's a lot of discretion  
11 about how districts would use these.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin?

13 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Coleman (sic), is there a  
14 fiscal note on 1198?

15 MS. COLSMAN: There was not a fiscal note on  
16 that.

17 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

18 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

19 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

20 MR. DURHAM: So, there's no fiscal note, no  
21 appropriation?

22 MS. COLSMAN: No, this was assumed to be  
23 fitting in with the Standards review and revision process.

24 MADAM CHAIR: And so with the standard --

25 MS. COLSMAN: And actually goes in with --



1 MR. DURHAM: But did we have an opportunity  
2 to provide a fiscal note?

3 MS. COLSMAN: Yes, we did.

4 MR. DURHAM: And we did not, or did we  
5 recommend one, and it was rejected by OSPB?

6 MS. COLSMAN: I would have to look back at my  
7 records on that piece, but I do believe that there was a  
8 sense that this could be accomplished within the actual  
9 budget requests that we have forward before the legislature  
10 this year to incorporate this -- incorporate this within  
11 that process.

12 MADAM CHAIR: The budget request for  
13 standards?

14 MS. COLSMAN: Right.

15 MR. DURHAM: Is it, have we incorporated --

16 MS. COLSMAN: It is.

17 MR. DURHAM: -- into the budget request?

18 MS. COLSMAN: Yes, it is in there.

19 MR. DURHAM: Okay. I -- I just think, I  
20 always get a little cynical because that which we want to do  
21 is free. That's what we don't want to do is unaffordable,  
22 and it's government by fiscal note, and I don't think we  
23 probably did our job appropriately if we didn't have a  
24 fiscal note attached to this bill, because it's not free.  
25 So, not a big deal either, but it just -- it just feeds the



1 cynicism that people have about government bureaucracies  
2 sometimes. So, I do think -- is the statute in your  
3 judgment pretty clear about secondary standards?

4 MS. COLSMAN: Yes. Yes, it is.

5 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Colzman. Ms.  
7 Cordial, where am I?

8 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair you are now on item  
9 --

10 MADAM CHAIR: 17?

11 MS. CORDIAL: If you wouldn't mind, maybe we  
12 could just quickly do 18.01, the last rulemaking hearing.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, We're there, excellent.  
14 Welcome back.

15 MS. RANKIN: We've got the scissors out,  
16 cutting the red tape.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Alrighty, except that's 15,  
19 that's not going to help me very much. Try it -- did you  
20 say 18?

21 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, ma'am. 18.01.

22 MADAM CHAIR: 18.01, Colorado State Board of  
23 Education will now conduct a public rulemaking hearing for  
24 the rules, for the administration of the Post-secondary and  
25 Workforce Readiness Assessment Pilot, 1CCR 301-77. The



1 State Board voted to approve the notice of rulemaking at its  
2 January 11, 2017 Board meeting. A hearing to promulgate  
3 these rules was made known through publication, with a  
4 public notice on February 10, 2017, through the Colorado  
5 Register and by State Board notice on March 1, 2017. State  
6 Board is authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant to  
7 22-2-1071CCRS. Commissioner, is staff prepared to provide  
8 an overview?

9 MS. ANTHERS: We are. Thank you, Madam Chair.  
10 Back to Leanne Emm, Deputy Commissioner for School Finance  
11 and Operations.

12 MS. EMM: Thank you. These rules are no  
13 longer necessary. The pilot is done and the statute was  
14 repealed in April 2010.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. I believe there is  
16 --Board Member, no, just let me, let me jabber for a minute.  
17 I'm assuming there's no one here to testify? Great. So,  
18 this concludes the rulemaking hearing for the rules for the  
19 administration of the Post-secondary and Workforce Readiness  
20 Assessment Pilot 1CCR301-77. Is there any further  
21 discussion, and is there a motion? Board Member McClellan?

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to approve the rules  
23 for the administration of the Post-secondary and Workforce  
24 Readiness Assessments Pilot 1CCR301-77.

25 MADAM CHAIR: That's a proper motion. Is



1 there a second?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any  
4 objections, colleagues? That motion passes. So now we're  
5 going to go through the, I believe 19.09

6 MS. CORDIAL: 17.01, 17.01

7 MADAM CHAIR: 17.01? Wait a minute, that's  
8 bass ackwards. Yes

9 MS. CORDIAL: Well -- yes, but.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry. Stacey, Marcia I'm  
11 really sorry. I really am. The next item on the agenda is  
12 an update on the student data transparency and security act.  
13 Commissioner, I'll turn this over to you and I will warn you  
14 that it may occur, that we might ask you to interrupt your  
15 presentation at 3:00 if you're still at it, because we have  
16 something coming up at 3:00. I hope that's okay.

17 MS. ANTHES: Yep, we're good.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Even after asking you to wait  
19 all this time.

20 MS. ANTHES: Thank you Madam Chair. I'll  
21 turn it over to Marcia Bohannon, our Chief Information  
22 Officer.

23 MS. BOHANNON: Hello members of the Board --

24 MS. ANTHES: Can you use your mic --

25 MS. BOHANNON: -- Madam Chair and





1 Commissioner Anthes, and let me pull this over; there we go.  
2 We were here, you might remember, we were here last August  
3 after the -- the new data privacy bill passed across the  
4 street. We came with an implementation plan and kind of  
5 walked you through what activities we were going to  
6 undertake and -- and sort of what the deadlines were and  
7 that sort of thing and we're here now to just give you an  
8 update on where we are with that. So it's really we're kind  
9 of going back to those particular items that we shared with  
10 you then, we're just going to let you know how we are  
11 progressing. We can make this short and sweet especially  
12 since you're running late, but also feel free to ask  
13 questions if -- if you have any. Got the agenda up there  
14 and we'll -- we'll -- it's fairly straight forward so we'll  
15 move on to the next -- next slide which is sort of the top  
16 level.

17                   This is -- this is it in a nutshell and then  
18 following this we have some additional information on each  
19 of these items. But the slide you're looking at now lays  
20 out first on the left side, it's what's called prior to law,  
21 that -- those are the items that were included in the 2014  
22 privacy law that passed and there was -- it was not really  
23 extensive but it kind of gave us a head start on the various  
24 data privacy challenges that we're starting to encounter, so  
25 that -- this lists the -- the types of things that we



1 already had done. On the slide you'll see some blue check  
2 marks and some green ones. The blue ones are just  
3 indicating that we've completed the items. The green check  
4 marks are ones that we have also completed, but those are  
5 ones that are specified in the new data privacy law that  
6 actually had dates associated with them. So, I'll say a  
7 little bit more about that when we go through it.

8                   So the -- the arrow on the left is, is prior  
9 to the new law and those particular items were already in  
10 place and I don't think we need to probably go through  
11 those, but just as a reminder that we did have those  
12 requirements earlier. The new data privacy law which I -- I  
13 call it the data privacy law but it's actually the student  
14 data transparency and Security Act. But data privacy law is  
15 easier to say so -- so that's what I'm referring to when I,  
16 when I talk about that. In August of 2016, that was -- that  
17 was actually our first -- first time requirement with the  
18 new law. It passed in, I think it was late June that it was  
19 actually signed by the governor. So we had until -- about  
20 two months to create the contracts and contract verbiage and  
21 the various agreements that we go into. So what it said was  
22 we needed to have the verbiage in place to be able to, as we  
23 renew contracts or go into new contracts with vendors that  
24 handle personally identifiable information, we had to have  
25 that language ready and start incorporating that -- that



1 language into new contracts. So we got tho -- that ready  
2 and since then have been as contracts come up for renewal,  
3 we've been renegotiating those and so far have been  
4 successful, some of them have been a little long and drawn  
5 out but we've been able to -- to get them done. The next  
6 four boxes actually are items contained in the bill that  
7 we're required to complete without a timeline. So that the  
8 bill just said you need to do it. So with -- this was part  
9 of our implementation plan that we laid out for you -- sort  
10 of the sequence. So we created a research process. The  
11 bill did say that we needed a research process approved by  
12 the State Board so we created that, brought that to you last  
13 fall and you guys approved that. So we're following that  
14 process now. The LEP contract language -- that's basically  
15 saying that we are providing some verbiage and some con --  
16 like sample contract language for the LEPs to use for their  
17 vendors that use PII or that that deal with PII. So we-

18 MADAM CHAIR: Could you please --

19 MS. BOHANNON: Sorry.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Could you please say for the  
21 benefit of the audience what an LEP is?

22 MS. BOHANNON: I will. Sorry. You think I  
23 know that.

24 MADAM CHAIR: You know me; I'm anti acronym.

25 MS. BOHANNON: I know you are, and I should



1 know that. I should know that

2 MADAM CHAIR: I'm allergic to them. Thank  
3 you.

4 MS. BOHANNON: Local Education Providers.

5 MADAM CHAIR: School Districts.

6 MS. BOHANNON: School districts, BOCES, any  
7 of -- yeah. Essentially school districts. Sometimes known  
8 as local education agencies so that kind of -- yeah this  
9 bill calls them LEPs, so. But -- but consider them school  
10 districts. So we got the language -- some sample language  
11 out there for them to use in their contracts. We've  
12 actually been working with various districts and various  
13 groups around the state to do that. And there's a couple of  
14 different options for them. There's some legal groups that  
15 put together some language on this too. So -- districts  
16 aren't required to use what we -- you know, what we give  
17 them, but it's an option for them so they can -- they can  
18 use it if they want. January of 2017, our website was  
19 prepared and it's ready so that we can put information out  
20 there. It just complies with the transparency rules so that  
21 if we need to be communicating something out there, that's  
22 the place where people can go and then the last the most  
23 recent one is March of 2017. The LEP policies and what that  
24 is is their -- their sample sort of template policies that  
25 the districts can use if they want to



1 -- ones that have to do with either information technology  
2 security or data privacy specifically. We ended up with 45  
3 policies that we put out there. So it's a pretty good chunk  
4 of policies that they can use as a starting point or they  
5 can ignore. It's -- it's strictly for their benefit if they  
6 want them. They now have until -- the large ones have until  
7 December to complete their policies, and the smaller roles  
8 have until July of next year. So those are, this is  
9 basically the bulk of the work that we've completed,

10                   Going forward, we're still working in the  
11 second blue ar -- arrow. You'll see the vendor breach  
12 process, the resources training and guidance internal  
13 processes and basically us kind of checking ourselves and  
14 then updating policies. So those are all the areas that  
15 we're still working on, especially the training one is going  
16 to be a lot of work. So we're hoping to get some out --  
17 some training available for the districts in the fall, but  
18 we'll see. But these are the things that we're working on  
19 going forward. So I am going to hand it over to Jill. She  
20 can kind of walk through with a little more detail. But if  
21 -- does anybody have any questions before we do that or --  
22 or do you want more detail?

23                   MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, looks good.

24                   MS. BOHANNON: Okay. I'll give it to Jill.

25                   MS. STACEY: All right. As Marcia mentioned



1 we had several requirements from the 2014 version. This  
2 just goes over what those were and what we did to comply  
3 with them. So you can just use that as a reference if you  
4 are interested, but I don't think we need to touch too much  
5 on that, since it's prior to this law. So I broke this out  
6 into specific buckets in terms of sort of categories of the  
7 interest. So for the first area of research we were  
8 required to put in place the process as Marcia mentioned.  
9 We got that process approved by you. We have posted it on  
10 our website to make it -- researchers and other parties  
11 aware of what that process is. We're currently running  
12 through that process for a number of research requests and  
13 so we're complying with that process as of now. We were  
14 also required to update our research agreements to have  
15 specific requirements. We used our -- the standard language  
16 that we're using with pretty much every vendor that complies  
17 with the requirements of the law. We have yet -- not yet  
18 signed a research agreement since it's still running through  
19 our evaluation process but we will use that agreement  
20 template when we get to that point.

21 MS. BOHANNON: And we may have a research  
22 request to bring to you at the next Board meeting. We're  
23 not sure yet. It's still going through our internal  
24 process, but we just want to let you know that there may be  
25 more fun to come.



1 MS. STACEY: So one of the major areas was  
2 the requirements in the law for vendors, and what we needed  
3 to do to engage with our vendors. As mentioned we needed to  
4 have specific language in our contracts with them. We had  
5 developed that template as of August and have been putting  
6 that in place with all our vendor contracts that we have  
7 signed since then.

8 As Marcia mentioned it has been rather successful, but there  
9 have been lengthy negotiations to do so. We -- we are  
10 required to provide the LEPs with sample contract language,  
11 we provided that and we have posted it on our website, we  
12 have included both the plain template language, also  
13 provided an annotated version that ties specific sections of  
14 the contract to specific requirements in the law, and we  
15 also have provided additional guidance on how to use the  
16 template and -- a little light instructions on how to  
17 negotiate it or to revise that language if they choose to.

18 As Marcia mentioned we have a number of  
19 transparency requirements in the law. One of them is  
20 specifically related to what is called the school service  
21 contract or On-Demand provider, which is what you would  
22 consider your click through agreements and your apps. As  
23 required by the law, if the district ceases using one of  
24 these On-Demand providers, they have to post notice on their  
25 website and then they also need to inform us and we will



1 post that information on our we -- our website. So we have  
2 a page dedicated to this, we have instructions on how  
3 districts can submit that information to us and a  
4 placeholder for when we receive one of these notifications.  
5 We were required to provide a sample information policy and  
6 protectio -- privacy and protection policy. We -- it had --  
7 the last -- spec -- specified -- specific topics that were  
8 required to be contained in this policy. We also understood  
9 that there were a number of key critical IT processes that  
10 weren't covered in the law and we wanted to provide the  
11 districts with a good robust suite of possible policies that  
12 they can use. So we included policies that cover the areas  
13 of the law and then a couple of other areas that are  
14 necessary. As Marcia mentioned there are 45 different ones,  
15 some of them are very short, some of them are longer, and we  
16 have posted those on our website and they're available to --  
17 to be used by any district if they so choose.

18 So as Marcia mentioned there is still a  
19 number of -- there's a lot of work ahead of us as well. So  
20 these additional areas are discussing what we have currently  
21 in front of us. We are required to provide a lot of  
22 training guidance to the LEPs. We have been updating our  
23 website to include guidance that we've been able to either  
24 create or find so that we're not waiting until the end to  
25 provide all the information that we can. We're continuing





1 to work on new guidance as matters come up and we will post  
2 it all there, and then we will work on a more robust  
3 training program that as Marcia mentioned we're hoping to  
4 start off -- introduce in the fall. The law had very  
5 specific requirements around what we could and could not  
6 collect and what we could and could not transfer. So we  
7 have been working with our staff and other members to  
8 determine if we are collecting any of this information and  
9 just double checking ourselves. We have not been aware --  
10 made aware of any data that has been collected outside of  
11 the requirements of the law, but we continue to inquire  
12 throughout the agency and document what we do find. We are  
13 working on providing you with a process that we will take in  
14 the case of a vendor breach. If a br -- a vendor breaches  
15 the contract and that results in the misuse or unauthorized  
16 access of PII, we are required to hold a public hearing and  
17 present that information to you and then you can make a  
18 deter -- determination if we will terminate that contract.  
19 This is an indication of what that process will likely look  
20 like but we will de -- be developing a full process for you  
21 to approve at a later date.

22 We just want to provide a re -- really high  
23 level information on the fact that we're working extensively  
24 with districts to provide them with materials that they can  
25 use. So we're considering their input when we're working on



1 things and trying to direct it to things that they can use  
2 in their daily efforts. We're also -- because we are short  
3 of resources, we're working hard to leverage as much as we  
4 can from other parties. So if somebody has a very good  
5 training out there we'll use it if it's appropriate.

6 MS. BOHANNON: One thing I want to add to  
7 this is that there's been some confusion about CASB's role  
8 in the policies versus our role because of CASB's generally  
9 the -- the one that provides policies to districts. So we  
10 have been working with them and talking with them and  
11 they've really focused on the higher level, sort of the  
12 Board level policy, and the policies that we put out there  
13 are more the working policies at the district level. So but  
14 -- because of the confusion with the word policy we talked  
15 with them and decided to distinguish between there is a  
16 Board level policies and then district level policies and  
17 we'll put that on our website just so that people aren't  
18 confused. A lot of the very small districts -- you know  
19 they only have a few policies but everything does get  
20 approved by their board cause there's not -- you know not  
21 too many people there, so. But we have been trying to work  
22 through that so that people are clear on that cause that's  
23 caused some confusions.

24 MADAM CHAIR: But some have regulations and  
25 that's the articulation of the policy --



1 MS. BOHANNON: Yeah --

2 MADAM CHAIR: -- with the specifics?

3 MS. BOHANNON: -- yeah, that was another  
4 suggestion to call them re -- regulations but even that  
5 sounded a bit more prescriptive, you know, more than what we  
6 -- so and they're not as detailed as procedures. So, we  
7 just decided to sort of separate between the higher level  
8 and the lower level and if there's still a lot of confusion  
9 we'll work on that some more and see how we can clarify.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Great, thank you. Board Member  
11 Durham.

12 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I know we're about  
13 out of time and I just would like to make a comment to --  
14 things are remarkably better than two years ago when I first  
15 started dealing with this issue and I think you guys have  
16 really worked hard to get us to a much better place. I  
17 think the biggest problem I've been able to observe is we  
18 still have some districts that simply don't obey the law for  
19 whatever set of reasons and I don't know that we're in a  
20 position to do a lot about that. But I would encourage you  
21 to take a further look at Naviance and their relationship  
22 with districts, the kinds of questions they're asking and --  
23 and how that data is being protected and if you find that  
24 there's a problem maybe turn that over the to -- to our  
25 attorney general see if there's any possible course of



1 action and then, we do have a specific request on the PARCC  
2 test to see if it might be possible to have -- since those  
3 are coming up soon to just have the Proctor announce that  
4 children are not obligated to answer any personal questions  
5 that might appear. So just those two things and otherwise,  
6 thank you very much.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any other questions  
8 quickly or comments. Thank you very much Miss Bohan -- Miss  
9 Stacey. I appreciate it. I believe we have a guest who's  
10 going to explain to me and us all about mill levies, Mr.  
11 Harper, or did you change your mind already?

12 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair, since DPS folks  
13 are here, we're wondering if we could just take those, that  
14 it -- those three items really quick.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Are you sure Mr. Harper?

16 MR. HARPER: That's fine.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Great. Thank you. So those  
18 were items 20 --

19 MS. CORDIAL: Those were items 20.01 through  
20 20.03.

21 MADAM CHAIR: And Ms. Flores, as fast as you  
22 can do this. We have a guest that we need, so we just want  
23 to get through this.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair?

25 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Kelly Rosensweet's going to  
2 first try to answer the questions and then if there are any  
3 details, we'll have --

4 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Ms. Rosensweet?

5 MS. ROSENSWEET: Hi.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Hi. Welcome.

7 MS. ROSENSWEET: Thanks.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores, what's  
9 your question, please?

10 MS. FLORES: It's questions.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Questions.

12 MS. FLORES: And maybe I'm just reacquainting  
13 myself with -- with all these automatic waivers, but I never  
14 thought that they were no -- non-automatic waivers. So is  
15 that a new term, non-automatic?

16 MS. ROSENSWEET: No. There's two types of  
17 waivers, automatic and non-automatic. Automatic waivers are  
18 not a waiver that the State Board gets to approve. They are  
19 automatically granted to a charter school when they sign a  
20 charter contract. A non-automatic waiver are the only ones  
21 that come before you. But it is common practice that a  
22 charter school lists the automatic waivers they're invoking  
23 in their waiver addendum of their charter contract, which is  
24 how waivers of all types are requested by the -- of the  
25 State Board. That's why you are seeing both.



1 MS. FLORES: Okay. So I guess my first  
2 question is -- well, it has to do with the evaluation of --  
3 of teachers and how do you evaluate your teachers as opposed  
4 to what happens with -- with teachers in public schools,  
5 charters versus charter -- public school versus charters.

6 MS. ROSENSWEET: So there are three charter  
7 school networks that are in front of you asking for a  
8 waiver. All three of them have different systems that they  
9 use in order to evaluate their teachers. They all do have  
10 to be in compliance with Senate Bill 191 though, with their  
11 evaluation tool.

12 MS. FLORES: Okay. And so they are all the  
13 same. I mean, as I looked at them, they're the same. And  
14 I'm concerned about -- for instance, that an administrator  
15 would evaluate them, will evaluate these teachers who do not  
16 have a D license. So is that just something, an  
17 administrative D license. So does that just happen?

18 MS. ROSENSWEET: So one of the automatic  
19 waivers that's granted to a charter school actually gives  
20 the authority for a principal in a charter school not to  
21 have a license, an administrator license. And which is why  
22 when in a charter school evaluations are done, it doesn't  
23 have to be by a licensed administrator.

24 MS. FLORES: So this is what reform is doing  
25 to kind of lowering standards for -- for charter schools? I



1 mean, I see it is that when you have someone who's not -- I  
2 would say not qualified to evaluate a teacher.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Commissioner?

4 MS. ANTHES: I just have one more piece of  
5 clarification on this. Actually Senate bill 191, for all  
6 schools, allows someone to evaluate a teacher as a designee,  
7 as long as they've gone through appropriate training, and  
8 that training can be designated by the district, it could be  
9 a training that -- that CDE offers. There's a number of  
10 trainings. So that actually is applicable to all schools  
11 and districts.

12 MS. FLORES: Okay, so, but that person is  
13 under an individual who does have a license, a D --  
14 administrator's license.

15 MS. ANTHES: They don't have to have a type D  
16 license if they go through another appropriate training for  
17 evaluation.

18 MS. FLORES: Okay, so -- so this would assume  
19 that they already have that training, have had that  
20 training. Okay, now why do -- do these -- these  
21 applications have me -- mentioned that they are not going to  
22 go through the regular HR, I guess through the -- I -- the  
23 school district HR. So they're under a different HR and  
24 that's their own HR.

25 MS. ANTHES: Yes. The employees of the



1 charter school are employees of the charter school, not the  
2 district.

3 MS. FLORES: Okay. And so then these people  
4 employ teachers who may not be licensed, meaning in the  
5 normal sense of what we've been talking about, licensed as  
6 in their area and have 36 hours of work, have passed a test.  
7 You know, all these licensure issues that we've been talking  
8 about. But -- so the -- the charters dispense, these  
9 charters dispense with those rules.

10 MS. ROSENSWEET: So charters are not required  
11 to hold the license if they have a waiver for it. But it's  
12 my understanding that that is applicable across the state  
13 now, if someone were to seek a waiver meeting the bar for  
14 hire that is established by CDE -- by you guys.

15 MS. FLORES: Okay, so they --

16 MS. ANTHES: This is nothing different in  
17 terms of the charters that come before you. They -- they do  
18 have that waiver for teacher licensure. So this is -- this  
19 is no different than all of the other charters that have  
20 come before you in seeking that waiver.

21 MS. FLORES: Yes, but it's it's very eye  
22 opening that they don't have to follow -- kind of rules that  
23 other schools have to. And yet, you know, charter schools  
24 are usually, in Denver, have the highest number of kids who  
25 -- who one would say were poor kids. They would be kids who





1 are at schools, and most of these schools are schools that  
2 are hard to serve. And so these are the kids that are  
3 getting, you know, these teachers, where there are no rules  
4 as far as licensure and such.

5 MS. ROSENSWEET: Doctor Flores, that the -- I  
6 think in these particular waiver requests, and actually all  
7 the waiver requests so far that have come before you from  
8 charter schools, in the replacement plan defines highly  
9 qualified, even though that is not used anymore, is still  
10 the bar that they set to determine hire. So that is what  
11 DSST and STRIVE, and GALS (ph), the boys' school, have  
12 outlined in the replacement plans of -- for these three  
13 requests.

14 MS. FLORES: So they have 24 hour -- 24 hours  
15 as far as, now this goes to you, Angelica, 24 hours instead  
16 of the 36 hours.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, what --

18 MS. FLORES: I mean, you were concerned  
19 about.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a different  
21 topic.

22 MS. FLORES: Well, it's not a different  
23 topic. This is what we're doing to -- to schools and to  
24 kids in Denver public schools, and -- and most of these  
25 charters are ha -- work with hard to serve kids.



1 MS. ROSENSWEET: Yes. I just want to share a  
2 little bit about the outcomes of the other schools in the  
3 networks. So the other middle school that is run by the  
4 people who run the boys school is meeting expectations on  
5 the SPF. All of the DSST high schools are rated  
6 distinguished on our SPF and of the STRIVE middle schools --

7 MS. FLORES: Yes but -- but that's because of  
8 your SQR which doesn't really talk about whether they're at  
9 level. It just compares one school to another school. So,  
10 and -- and that's been hard for me to understand, too. And  
11 I have been talking with people, with teachers and others in  
12 the school district. In fact, I was in a meeting last night  
13 where this was very much talked about, and how you do the  
14 evaluation of teachers in schools. So it gives me great  
15 concern. I have another question and this may be a piddling  
16 question in concern -- as far as what I've been asking, and  
17 that is federal holidays. What about the 4th of July? Do  
18 you make them work on the 4th of July? Teachers.

19 MS. ROSENSWEET: Dr. Flores, are you  
20 referring to the national holiday waiver that's on the  
21 automatic list?

22 MS. FLORES: Right.

23 MS. ROSENSWEET: So that statute actually is  
24 more of a calendar waiver to allow a charter school to set  
25 their own holidays, in addition to the ones that are



1 traditionally set nationwide.

2 MS. FLORES: Right.

3 MS. ROSENSWEET: So it's just not that it  
4 allows a school to not necessarily start August 1st and June  
5 13th or whatever the -- the standard school year is. So if  
6 they want to go longer into the summer or they are a year  
7 round program, it's just the autonomy to set their own  
8 calendar. And so that's why it's been automatically granted  
9 to charter schools. It was put on that list.

10 MS. FLORES: Okay.

11 MR. HARPER: And I was saying in terms of  
12 general public schools and Angie, correct me if I'm wrong,  
13 but most charter schools when it comes to federal holidays  
14 follow the district calendar.

15 MS. FLORES: Okay.

16 MS. ROSENSWEET: Correct.

17 MS. FLORES: Okay. So it was just to say  
18 that they would just follow a different date line as far as  
19 when school begins and when school ends.

20 MS. ROSENSWEET: Yes, absolutely.

21 MS. FLORES: Okay. Are those teachers  
22 allowed to be part of a union? To be able to unionize?  
23 STRIVE, the boy school and DSST? Are those schools -- are  
24 those charter schools allowed to -- to unionize?

25 MR. HARPER: So I will say in terms of



1 charter schools, and these and -- and -- you see in the  
2 waivers and charter, applies all of their employees are at  
3 will and -- and are on yearly contracts. And so they do not  
4 have active unions within their offices of their charter  
5 management organizations now.

6 MS. FLORES: Okay. Thank you.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Do I have a motion?

8 MR. DURHAM: I move the adoption of 20.01,  
9 20.02, 20.03. I believe the rest of them have been adopted;  
10 is that correct?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Is that --

13 MS. ROSENSWEET: Correct.

14 MADAM CHAIR: I --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

18 MR. DURHAM: Okay. So, I'll -- I'll make  
19 that as a motion.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Second?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Any objection to the passage of  
23 those three items? Thank you folks for coming --

24 MS. FLORES: Thank you for coming. I really  
25 appreciate it.



1 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair, there is one other  
3 -- it's not a DPS school. So you're off the hook. It's the  
4 charter school on behalf of Caprock. That one was still on  
5 -- pulled from the consent agenda.

6 MR. DURHAM: Oh.

7 MS. CORDIAL: So since Kelly is right here,  
8 do we want to just --

9 MR. DURHAM: Which one, I'm sorry?

10 MS. ANTHES: I think she put it back on.

11 MS. CORDIAL: She -- she had put back on  
12 Douglas County, Milestone and then also Greeley's innovation  
13 application. She did not put --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I meant --

15 MS. CORDIAL: -- Charter school institute.

16 MR. DURHAM: She didn't put Globe or --

17 MS. CORDIAL: Globe was never pulled.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible -  
19 simultaneous speech).

20 MADAM CHAIR: Globe was never pulled.

21 MR. DURHAM: Which one was --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was --

23 MR. DURHAM: Where is it? What's the number?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 20.05.

25 MADAM CHAIR: 20.05.



1 MR. DURHAM: I'll move 20 -- 20.05.  
2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).  
3 MS. FLORES: And you know it's the same  
4 thing.  
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.  
6 MS. FLORES: If -- if you look at them,  
7 they're the same.  
8 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So, are you ready for a  
9 motion?  
10 MR. DURHAM: I'll -- I'll move 20.05.  
11 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.  
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.  
13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any objections,  
14 colleagues? Done. Thank you.  
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.  
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Just wanted  
17 to make sure they got approved.  
18 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. You call this  
19 dotting i's and crossing t's, I believe.  
20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yup.  
21 MADAM CHAIR: So the next item on our agenda  
22 is guest speaker Chief Legislative Analyst with JB  
23 C, Craig Harper. He's going to give us an update today on  
24 mill levy -- uniform mill levy proposal. I --  
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) stands



1 for.

2 MADAM CHAIR: -- oh, it's an acronym. Shoot  
3 me. Joint Budget Committee. I'm guilty of my own --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Harper, did you change your  
6 mind?

7 MR. HARPER: I'm getting the file ready so --

8 MADAM CHAIR: Oh absolutely --

9 MR. DURHAM: Oh good.

10 MADAM CHAIR: -- I can't tell what you're  
11 doing so -- come -- come join us. That would be --  
12 accountants do that.

13 By the way while he's doing that, I did find my papers that  
14 I was looking for earlier underneath Dr. Anthes's lunch.  
15 So, I have a cop --

16 MS. ANTHES: My fault. I take full  
17 responsibility.

18 MADAM CHAIR: No -- no, you -- It's my  
19 mistake. Could you -- you still have that? There is an  
20 addendum that I might pass around. This appendix that I was  
21 speaking about for the agreements for tomorrow. This is  
22 what I had in my note. Did you give it back to me?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, you never gave it to  
24 me.

25 MS. ANTHES: Did one of you want to see my --



1 MADAM CHAIR: I had two copies.

2 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

3 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you give that  
5 back?

6 MADAM CHAIR: So I'm passing that around. So  
7 that when we talk about it tomorrow, you'll know.

8 MR. DURHAM: Could we get maybe enough copies  
9 for the morning?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That would be -

11 MADAM CHAIR: You want copies for tomorrow?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 MADAM CHAIR: So I'll have -- I'll entrust  
14 you --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, actually copies  
16 for today for tomorrow.

17 MADAM CHAIR: And then the other one was the  
18 -- was the sheet that Ms. Rankin had prepared for State  
19 Board questions. And I don't know if you're interested in  
20 having a look at that for yourselves, to fill out as you're  
21 preparing or you -- as you're listening. Do remember this?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Questions for the  
23 districts?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just a worksheet --





1 MADAM CHAIR: It's just a worksheet for  
2 ourselves.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jeez. I always like  
4 worksheets.

5 MADAM CHAIR: So, there's some really good  
6 things about being a terrible housekeeper and just keeping  
7 everything.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know what  
10 they're talking about.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was last April, by  
12 the way.

13 MADAM CHAIR: That was last April?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for the faith  
15 in memory -- but that's -- pretty long time.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, it's not that I remember.  
17 It's just that I kept everything in one spot.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Well, if it hadn't been for  
19 Katy's lunch, I'd have had it earlier. We might want to  
20 show this -- you might want to show this to -- to --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I didn't know what you  
22 were talking about. We don't carry that around --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Julie, so she knows what I'm  
24 talking about.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not exactly --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) one  
2 sided -- you have to go -- yes.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Oh yay! This is going to be  
4 really great to have this. Yeah, but I don't think I have  
5 the basics. If I had the basics, I would be --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have the  
7 reputation

8 --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, it's like tax law. Hi.

10 MR. HARPER: Hello.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Welcome. Yes, you kind of have  
12 to almost chew on that mic.

13 MR. HARPER: Are the -- is this one on?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 MR. HARPER: Okay. Thank you for having me.  
16 My name is Craig Harper. I'm the Joint Budget Committee  
17 Analyst. Well, you really do have to almost chew on these.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

19 MR. HARPER: I'm the Joint Budget Committee  
20 Analyst for the Department of Education. And thank you for  
21 inviting me over to talk about the Uniform Mill Levy  
22 Proposal that the JBC is considering at this point. It's  
23 still on the Committee's list of potential legislation. I  
24 don't know what the prognosis for that is but at this point  
25 it's on the list of bills that the Committee is considering.



1 I presented this first to the JBC in December. It's been  
2 kind of sporadic discussions since then with myself and the  
3 Committee soliciting feedback from -- from the field. If we  
4 jump right into it -- and please stop me with any questions.  
5 This is my first time in front of the State Board. So, if  
6 any -- if you have any questions, please stop me. There's a  
7 question slide at the end but you don't need to wait for  
8 that one.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

10 MR. HARPER: So we'll just jump right in.  
11 This is the only true background slide that you're going to  
12 see on K-12 Funding and School Finance or Total Program, as  
13 we call it. It is the largest line item in the State  
14 budget, at this point. The total cost for School Finance is  
15 about \$6.4 billion in the current year. Two-thirds of that  
16 is State money. So it's about 4.1 -- oh, I'm pushing on a  
17 button that's not going to do anything 'cause I'm pushing on  
18 my computer. There you go. This is going to take a little  
19 getting used to. \$6.4 billion in total funding in school  
20 finance. I'll note upfront that this is not all of the  
21 money going to schools. Obviously, this doesn't include  
22 categorical funding. This doesn't include any federal  
23 funds. This is only what the school finance formula  
24 actually allocates. So this is just the total program  
25 budget. \$6.4 billion in total funding, that's after the



1 negative factor, before the negative factor's around \$830  
2 million higher than that. \$4.1 billion of that comes from  
3 the State. You can see the breakdown there, but it's mostly  
4 general fund which is nearly all income and sales tax. The  
5 other third is from local revenues and that's actually the  
6 topic of this particular proposal and the -- the  
7 presentation today. It's \$2.3 billion in total local  
8 revenues in the current year and \$2.1 billion of that which  
9 is 93 percent of the local revenue is from property tax, and  
10 the property tax is the -- the topic today. Again I'm  
11 hitting the wrong button. There we go. So, the way that  
12 the school finance formula actually deals with that money is  
13 the -- first we look at how much local revenue is available  
14 and this is true at the district level and the state level.  
15 So for each school district, if their total program budget  
16 coming out of the school finance formula is \$5 million and  
17 they have \$3 million in local revenue which is going to be  
18 mostly property tax, the other \$2 million is going to be  
19 coming from the State. So th -- the math there is pretty  
20 simple. You get the property tax and specific ownership tax  
21 which supports the local share. That's your first layer of  
22 revenue. That's kind of the foundation is the way that I've  
23 been describing it of the school finance system, and then  
24 any gap that's between that local revenue and what the  
25 district needs, the State fills.



1                   And that makes this dynamic with property tax  
2 unique among property taxes in the State. This is the only  
3 case where that's true. When you pay property taxes for  
4 other local services, if the revenue drops, services change  
5 or they have to find a way to raise the revenue locally. In  
6 this case, if the revenue drops, the State comes in and back  
7 fills the money. And it -- that's putting an increasing  
8 amount of pressure on the State budget. It's true at the  
9 district level, it's true at the State level. So I usually  
10 don't deal with the district. By district numbers, that's a  
11 whole different staff and your staff here. I'm looking  
12 strictly at the statewide numbers, but for my purposes, it's  
13 \$2.3 billion of local revenue available and then my job as  
14 the analyst for the JBC is to figure out how to fill that  
15 gap between with the State revenue sources.

16                   The formula is really designed to equalize  
17 local capacity. The measure of local capacity that I've  
18 used for this proposal is assessed value per pupil. That's  
19 really how much assessed property value you have in a school  
20 district on a per pupil basis. If you have a lot of  
21 assessed value per pupil, then a relatively low property tax  
22 can raise quite a bit of money for the district. If you  
23 don't have much assessed value per pupil, then it takes a  
24 much higher property tax to raise the same amount and that's  
25 some of what's played out here. But, a system that was



1 designed to equalize the capacity is actually having to  
2 spend a fair amount of its time equalizing different mill  
3 levies, different tax rates in the different districts. So  
4 we're asking the school finance system to do double duty,  
5 both to equalize the capacity for revenue, raising at the  
6 local level and discrepancies in the tax rate. That  
7 resulted in me writing this proposal to the JBC in December,  
8 which was to return the State. The word return there is,  
9 kind of, important. The school finance act of 1988; I  
10 cannot keep track of this. I need to tape this thing to my  
11 hand. The school finance act of 1988 set up a uniform mill  
12 levy. It was set at 40 mills actually which is an  
13 interesting number because right now our statutory ceiling  
14 is 27. So the school finance act of '88 set a uniform  
15 statewide mill of 40 mills. If your school district was  
16 fully funded locally at a lesser mill levy, so we'll talk  
17 about Aspen here in a few minutes. Right now Aspen is at  
18 four mills. If they were at six mills, they wouldn't need  
19 any state money at all to cover their total program budget.  
20 Under the '88 act --

21 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Harper, for someone who is  
22 listening to this, tell them what a mill is. What it does.  
23 We're all -- we're all looking at our property tax bills  
24 right now or should be. Just real briefly, look at the  
25 mill, but what do they -- what -- what did the assessor do



1 with it to come up with that number they owed just for the -  
2 - a real -- I realize that's very basic, but I think there  
3 going to be some folks --

4 MR. HARPER: Madam Chair they --

5 MADAM CHAIR: -- wondering.

6 MR. HARPER: I -- I pulled the wrong  
7 presentation for this. I actually took those slides out.  
8 If you want me to switch it, I can put those slides back in  
9 or --

10 MADAM CHAIR: No.

11 MR. HARPER: -- for the document that goes  
12 online. There's a multi-step process here. First, you have  
13 a property assessor in each county that looks at the value  
14 of the property and ass -- and assesses, gauges the market  
15 value. They take the value of that property and then they  
16 multiply it by what's called the assessment rate which is  
17 going to be an extremely hot topic in the general assembly  
18 this year because Gallagher's going to reduce the  
19 residential assessment rate. So if you live in a hundred  
20 thousand house, at this point in the current year the  
21 residential assessment rate is 7.96 percent. And so you  
22 would take that \$100,000 house. The assessment rate is the  
23 portion of that value that you actually pay taxes on. You  
24 take the \$100,000, multiply it by the 7.96 percent which  
25 gives you about \$8,000, 7,960. That's the portion of your



1 value that you're actually paying taxes on and that's  
2 assessment rate is statewide. At this point  
3 it's 7.96 for residential, 29 percent for commercial.  
4 That's a Gallagher -- Gallagher issue is the gap between  
5 those two. The reason that you're paying taxes on such  
6 different proportions of the value. That assessed value is  
7 the -- the product of that multiplication. So you take the  
8 value, multiply it by the assessment rate, that gives you  
9 your assessed value of your property which can then be  
10 rolled up to the assessed value of the whole school  
11 district. Once you have that piece, the assessed value of  
12 your property, that's where you apply the mill levy. One  
13 mill is one 1000. So 27 mills is equal to.027. I really  
14 wish I had those slides.

15 MADAM CHAIR: No slides?

16 MR. HARPER: I used them this -- no, I used  
17 them this morning, but I think the one -- the 27 mills is  
18 0.027, one mill is 0.001, and you take that mill levy and  
19 multiply it times your assessed value, and that is always  
20 going to raise the same amount of money. If it's 7.96 is  
21 your assessment rate on a \$100,000 house, your assessed  
22 value is 7,960. One mill is going to raise \$7.96 if I'm  
23 doing the math right on the top of my head. So that's --  
24 that's your mill and it -- the mill levy is really your tax  
25 rate, it's the way to think about it. Having to use the





1 term mill levy makes it extremely confusing and people, kind  
2 of, back away as soon as the topic comes up, but it's really  
3 not any different than an income tax rate or any other tax  
4 rate that you have. It just has a different -- a different  
5 name on it and a slightly different calculation, but the  
6 mill levy, 27 mills is com -- in one district is comparable  
7 to five mills in the other. It really is a multiple of more  
8 than five. Those are directly comparable tax rates. We pay  
9 roughly four percent in state income tax and these are just  
10 as comparable as saying four percent in income tax versus 20  
11 percent. It's -- the mill levy is your tax rate.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

13 MR. HARPER: Does that work?

14 MADAM CHAIR: I hope so.

15 MR. HARPER: We can't hear the people that  
16 are listening online, but hopefully that worked for them  
17 too. The proposal here is to go back to a uniform statewide  
18 mill levy, unless a district is locally funded and that's  
19 been a point of confusion since I brought this up because we  
20 have a certain number of districts with very high property  
21 values. Aspen is the one that shows up here today where if  
22 you put them at a uniform mill levy, let's say theoretically  
23 you put them at 27, it would be far more money than the  
24 school district is even, sort of due under the School of  
25 Finance Act. They're fully funded at six. So you would qua



1 -- more than quadruple their budget. And if -- if they're  
2 fully funded at six, then my proposal would keep them at  
3 six.

4                   The second piece is that if you're fully  
5 funded at less than whatever uniform level the general  
6 assembly picks and the voters approve down this, kind of,  
7 imaginary path. If you're fully funded at less than that,  
8 then your mill levy can float. So that if you're fully  
9 funded at four this year and it only takes three next year,  
10 you dropped to three. But if the next year it's back up to  
11 four, you would go back up to four because what got us into  
12 this particular situation with discrepancies is that mill  
13 levies were pushed down by a different dynamic and they  
14 can't go back up. So you end up with di -- taxpayers in  
15 different districts pra -- paying very, very different tax  
16 rates and there's no local control over this -- over this  
17 tax rate at all.

18                   MADAM CHAIR: Oh. Board Member, McClellan.

19                   MS. McCLELLAN: Is it just -- it -- I hope  
20 it's okay to interject a small question here.

21                   MR. HARPER: Absolutely.

22                   MS. McCLELLAN: Part of the way that the  
23 float works responsively is that we pay these taxes in  
24 arrears, right? So we're always paying in the rearview  
25 mirror for the year that just passed? So that's how that



1 float can be responsive because by the time we're paying it  
2 as property owners, we're paying for the year that just  
3 passed. Is that correct?

4 MR. HARPER: Correct.

5 MS. McCLELLAN: Thank you.

6 MR. HARPER: And I think that that pre  
7 taxpayer's bill of rights, these -- the local mill levies  
8 actually did float that each district. This long predates  
9 my interaction with this budget except maybe as a student in  
10 Colorado, but the -- each school district had a targeted  
11 level that -- of revenue that they were going to raise, and  
12 then they set the mill levy in order to hit that target  
13 level of revenue. Now, their mill levy is fixed and it  
14 raises what it raises and to the extent that it falls short  
15 of whatever the goal might have been, the State's left  
16 picking up the tab. But it -- if you wanted it to -- if it  
17 -- if this were to pass and it could float, then yes it  
18 would be responding to the prior years change.

19 I almost did it again. Oh, the last kind of,  
20 point there is somewhat important. I think a uniform mill  
21 has given people the impression that understandably, I mean  
22 I'm the one who picked it and this was my -- my oversight.  
23 But it gives the impression that this is truly uniform  
24 statewide. The end result is that it's uniform for  
25 districts that are receiving a State share. If you're fully



1 funded without the State share, then you have your own mill  
2 levy. This is uniform for people that are actually getting  
3 State money for school finance.

4 MADAM CHAIR: So we have had districts though  
5 that have full -- have been fully funded and then they  
6 closed the mine or whatever and they're back on getting  
7 State funding. Is there a probation for that?

8 MR. HARPER: That's absolutely correct, and  
9 that  
10 -- it's almost from -- as the JBC analysts looking at this  
11 from the State perspective, that's really the worst case  
12 scenario that we have. It plays out with mine closures, and  
13 it plays out on a much more frequent basis with oil and gas  
14 development, where you get a spike in prices. I took a lot  
15 of the sort of background slides out of this, but Primero is  
16 a dist -- district that we'll talk about today. And in the  
17 early 2000s they had -- I believe it was natural gas down  
18 where they are. But -- an oil and gas bubble that pushed  
19 their property values way up. And it was true -- it was the  
20 oil and gas value that did it. That bubble burst, and those  
21 property values went back down. Well while that increase  
22 was happening in property values, their mill levy pushed  
23 down to 1.68 with no discretion on the part of the school  
24 district at all. There's no, the key caveat for me to make  
25 up front is there's no local control over these mill levies



1 at all. You all don't control it. It's really statutory  
2 that says your mill levy is what it was the year before  
3 unless it has to ratchet down. But that the oil, the oil  
4 boom there pushed their mill levy down to 1.68 mills. Then  
5 the value drops, and the mill levy is still stuck at 1.68  
6 mills, and all of a sudden the district is applying this  
7 really low mill levy that happens to be the lowest one in  
8 the state to a much lower amount of property, and it raises  
9 a lot less money. And that -- that's a dynamic that hits  
10 the state really hard, and it happens in that situation with  
11 mine closures, oil and gas development. You see the same  
12 trends with real estate boom and bust in some of the resort  
13 communities, where if the mill levy can't respond at all,  
14 you end up with these depressed mill levies, and the State's  
15 -- the State's left picking up the tab. Do that one first.  
16 So, this is another new -- new slide for anyone who's seen  
17 this in the JBC room before. They realized I kind of needed  
18 to tell people what I meant by tax equity. I tried to find  
19 a good pithy definition of taxpayer equity. When you search  
20 tax equity on the internet, you end up with a lot of  
21 discussion about solar panel financing. I'm not sure why,  
22 but it -- that's what you get.

23                   So I made up my own. But I think it works.  
24 In my mind, an equitable system of taxation would treat  
25 identical taxpayers similarly. So, within a system of



1 taxation within the state, we all pay the same income tax  
2 rate. It could be graduated, that would be a different -- a  
3 different working of equity, but it's the same rules. We  
4 pay the same income tax, we pay the same sales tax, and  
5 that's part of the State sales and income tax system.  
6 Within a given property tax district, taxpayers are also  
7 treated the same. So two identical taxpayers living in  
8 identical homes within a school district are paying the same  
9 tax rate. That works again for every other local service  
10 where within that district you're treating all your  
11 taxpayers the same. But it's this interaction of the total  
12 program property tax with the State tax system that I think  
13 makes this system -- makes our current system break down,  
14 because we end up with as we'll see in a second taxpayers  
15 paying pretty different rates. Last year the  
16 Joint Education Committees and the Joint Budget Committee  
17 brought in a few school finance experts, national experts to  
18 talk about recommendations for how to improve the school  
19 finance system. And one of their key -- key recommendations  
20 was that a preferable system would start with a uniform or  
21 an equal level of effort at the local level as measured by  
22 the mill levy, and then bill equalize that with State funds.  
23 Which is really what our -- our formula was originally  
24 designed to do. You start with a similar level of local  
25 effort that raises very different amounts depending on how



1 wealthy or poor the district is in property terms, the State  
2 fills the difference there. That's really not where we are  
3 today though. This is a map of the mill levies across the  
4 state. If you're in white on this chart, then you're paying  
5 less than six mills. Primero which we'll get to in a second  
6 again is the lowest in the state at 1.68. If, but if you're  
7 in white you're at less than six mills. If you're in dark -  
8 - the darkest blue you're at more than 25 mils. And again  
9 those tax rates are directly comparable. So, the four mills  
10 in Aspen really is roughly one fifth to one-sixth of the 27  
11 mills being paid in Fort Morgan, Adams 12. I think Deer  
12 Trail. There's a bunch of both urban and rural districts at  
13 that ceiling, and those -- those rates are really directly  
14 comparable. There's obviously a fair amount of ground in  
15 the middle there between those two extremes, but we have  
16 quite a bit of variation in the mill levies. And this is  
17 the way that that actually -- actually we're going to first  
18 -- in order to make this reasonable, I tried to boil it down  
19 to five illustrative districts. These weren't picked at  
20 random. I'm not going to say it's a random sample, but I  
21 don't think that's necessary for this analysis. Primero  
22 down there by Trinidad it's in the extreme southern part of  
23 the state. I picked that one simply because it's the lowest  
24 mill levy. It's an outlier. It's kind of an interesting  
25 case.



1 Aspen is your sort of prototypical resort  
2 community with high assessed value, relatively small pupil  
3 count. That means very high assessed value per pupil, and  
4 as a result a mill levy that has been low. Jefferson is  
5 obviously the second largest district in the state. You're  
6 more familiar with these numbers than I am in a lot of  
7 cases, but Jefferson is just kind of an example of a big  
8 urban district. They happen to be paying over 26 mills.  
9 They're at about 26 and a half. Adams 12 is a lower value  
10 urban district with -- they are at the ceiling of 27, and  
11 Fort Morgan is one of the pretty good number of rural  
12 districts that are paying the ceiling of 27 mills. So that  
13 -- that's how I picked these five. You could pick any five  
14 you want and run the same kind of analysis. But I think to  
15 the extent that this idea has any legs at all, it's because  
16 of slides like this one which show the impact on individual  
17 taxpayers. This goes back to sort of my homemade definition  
18 of taxpayer equity. But the idea that identical taxpayers  
19 would be treated similarly. This is what happens if you  
20 have the statewide median value of home which in 2015 was  
21 apparently about \$248,000.

22 If you have the statewide median value of  
23 home in these five districts, this is how much you're paying  
24 in property taxes to support school finance. If you live in  
25 Primero, you're paying \$33. Again, with no local control,





1 no fault of the district, no fault of the taxpayers, but  
2 that's what you're paying. The State is covering 85 percent  
3 of Primero's budget at that level with -- with the mill levy  
4 that they're paying. Aspen, you're only paying \$87 if  
5 you're lucky enough to find a \$250,000 house there. But  
6 you're only, you're only paying \$87 there. The State is  
7 only covering about 20 percent of Aspen's budget. If you  
8 manage to eliminate the negative fact, I should say all of  
9 any percentages that I give you are after the negative  
10 factor. So, if you did eliminate the negative factor with  
11 State funds, the State share of each of these would go up,  
12 in Primero it would be over 90 percent, in Aspen it would be  
13 over 30 percent. Jeffco though, once you jump up into the  
14 mid 20s for your mill levy, all of a sudden if you're, if  
15 you're a hypothetical individual taxpayer that was trying  
16 your luck in Primero, and then got a job in Aspen, and then  
17 got a job in Jeffco, and you've managed to move into the  
18 same value of house in each place, all of a sudden your  
19 property tax bill specifically for school finance with this  
20 interaction with the State system jumps to over \$500. If  
21 you're at the ceiling and we've got more than 30 districts  
22 that are, then you're paying \$532 on the exact same value of  
23 house. When I meet with either public groups or virtually  
24 anyone and you kind of lay this out, they want to know why,  
25 and I can explain why it happened as a result of the



1 implementation -- implementation of TABOR. But in my  
2 experience, the taxpayers don't usually find that to be a  
3 very compelling reason why they're paying five or six times  
4 the tax rate that someone in Aspen is to pick the one that's  
5 the easy comparison.

6                   The same dynamic plays out on the commercial  
7 front. Remember that when you asked the question that I  
8 should have started with about what's a mill and how does  
9 assessed value work. You have the 7.96 percent residential  
10 assessment rate and the 29 percent commercial rate but then  
11 you apply the exact same mill levies for both. So, the  
12 proportions here, this chart is the tax paid per \$100,000 of  
13 market value. I didn't know how to get a statewide median  
14 business value, I don't think that would have been a number  
15 that had any meaning at all. But per \$100,000 of market  
16 value, this is how much you're paying in the total program  
17 mill levy. Primero residential, if you find a \$100,000  
18 house there, it's only \$13, if you're a business, you're  
19 paying almost 50. Aspen and, again, the gap between the  
20 residential and the commercial here, that's a Gallagher  
21 impact which is related but really a separate issue in  
22 policy terms. Aspen \$35 residential, \$128 for the  
23 commercial. But then you see that same big jump on the  
24 commercial side the proportions end up being the same  
25 because the -- the -- the rate that you're applying is the



1 same.

2 All of a sudden you go from paying \$48 in  
3 commercial property tax in Primero to \$128 in Aspen and then  
4 you're up to about \$770 in Jeffco or \$783 per \$100,000 of  
5 market value. And anyone who's at the ceiling and again,  
6 the ceiling districts there's a smattering of them, both  
7 urban and rural but it -- it's scattered all over the state  
8 and it really comes down to the timing of when property  
9 value increases happen in those districts. If it happened  
10 before 2007, you saw mill levies go way down. If it's  
11 happened since then, you haven't seen the same dynamic. So,  
12 how did we -- how did we get here? There's -- I stumbled on  
13 some really interesting historical research from legislative  
14 council staff from the late 80s from why they did the  
15 uniform mill levy in 88. It turned out it was almost  
16 exactly the same dynamic. You had mill levies that were all  
17 over the map, literally, just like in this case and it was -  
18 - it was putting a lot of pressure on the State budget. The  
19 general assembly passed uniform mill levy then, it didn't  
20 have to go to the voters as it does now. So, you had an  
21 entirely different process to make this change at that  
22 point, but they passed the 88 act with the uniform mill levy  
23 in response to exactly the same dynamic that you're seeing  
24 here and some of their charts were even similar which was  
25 interesting. 91 districts have largely transitioned to



1 that. Again, that uniform mill was 40.08. Districts have  
2 largely gotten there. The general assembly gave them a few  
3 years to transition to that levy. There are some districts  
4 for whom any unifo -- any level that the General Assembly  
5 picked above 20 would be a pretty painful increase. I think  
6 one of the policy decisions that they would have to make is  
7 A, where to set it and how long to give B, how long to give  
8 people to get there. But they gave them several years in  
9 88.

10           The districts were just getting there in 91  
11 and then in 92 TABOR passed and the end result here with  
12 this particular scenario on school finance property taxes,  
13 has been to put the system back -- back into a scattershot  
14 of mill levies around the state. 2007 recognizing that this  
15 was becoming pretty untenable, The general assembly passed a  
16 mill levy freeze that froze most districts. If they had  
17 received taxpayer approval to retain revenues above the  
18 TABOR cap, or in informal terms, if they had if they had  
19 debriused then their mill levy has been frozen since then  
20 with a few exceptions and those exceptions actually tied of  
21 the cases like you talked about with the mine where,  
22 although, it's the inverse. If their property value goes up  
23 enough and you've seen this several times lately with  
24 contingency reserve fund districts, where their property  
25 values have gone up enough because of oil and gas that it's



1 actually it would have over-funded total program and if  
2 that's the case, then the mill levy has to go down.

3                   They can't collect more than total on this  
4 mill levy than total program allows them to collect. Then  
5 what happens, it pushes it down then the price fa -- falls  
6 out of the bottom of the natural gas market. The mill levy  
7 is stuck down there again. They're applying it to the rate  
8 and then they come to the general assembly and to you all at  
9 mid-year and say, we thought we were in good shape. We need  
10 help. And the contag -- contingency reserve fund is the sort  
11 of backup source to give them some State money to help with  
12 that scenario but it's -- it's continued to play out where  
13 they're going to over collect the mill levy goes down even  
14 post freeze because they would over collect on total  
15 program.

16                   MS. FLORES: May I just ask a question.

17                   MR. HARPER: Of course.

18                   MS. FLORES: (Indiscernible).

19                   MADAM CHAIR: You got an answer?

20                   MR. HARPER: Doctor Flores, I the -- the  
21 supplemental that the committee and the generals, actually  
22 the general assembly has now approved fully funded the  
23 amount that those six districts were due under the criteria  
24 that the general assembly passed last year. It's -- it  
25 ended up being about 1.3 million, if I remember off the top



1 of my head but it is fully funded once that money from --  
2 comes in in April, you should be able to fully fund those  
3 districts. There may be more that could apply under some  
4 different criteria, but for that specific subset of  
5 districts, it was fully funded for this year. Just a couple  
6 of state wide pictures just -- We were digging into specific  
7 districts there but these next two next graphs are -- are  
8 state wide and it's kind of, looking at what the mill levy  
9 looks like against assessed value per pupil. Again, being  
10 kind of, a local capacity of one mill. Property tax is  
11 going to raise a lot more money in a district that has a lot  
12 of value per pupil than it is in a district that doesn't  
13 have much.

14 Total program mill levy again, that's just  
15 your tax rate up the left axis there. You can see the lower  
16 your assessed value per pupil, in most cases, the higher  
17 your mill levy. So, it's a in taxi -- tax policy terms, it  
18 starts to look rather regressive. The lower the value, the  
19 higher the rate. And again, that makes -- that makes sense  
20 if you get far enough out there on the right side that -- on  
21 the higher value side that they're fully funded. Then, I  
22 think the argument there is, you know, if Aspen's fully  
23 funded at six and they pay six, then they're all set and  
24 they shouldn't be higher than six under our state -- under  
25 our State policies. But you get some pretty strange



1 dynamics where, well A, I think for many people the -- the  
2 slope of this nonexistent line here is problematic and the  
3 -- the higher volun -- the overall trend of the high the  
4 higher the tax rate, the lower the value. I think that  
5 would be problematic on -- in some equity terms.

6                   The oth -- the other interesting piece is, if  
7 you look, pick any kind of random point below about a  
8 million and a quarter per pupil there, and you have  
9 districts with very similar values per pupil, which is  
10 really the driving force behind how much money it's going to  
11 raise, paying very different rates. Which is that it's --  
12 the scatter on this plot is really what's driving a lot of  
13 the State cost. Not -- I'm not going to say that it's the  
14 majority the costs are a huge piece of the cost but it's on  
15 the order of hundreds of millions of dollars to backfill the  
16 discrepancies and mill levies on -- on this chart. The  
17 second one shows the State share of to -- State share of  
18 funding on the vertical axis against assessed value per  
19 pupil. And this one is more what you would expect where the  
20 State share is highest in the districts with the lowest  
21 value. I mean, that's  
22 -- that's the way that the equalization works, but it also  
23 shows that we are asking it to do double duty with the State  
24 share being really different for districts that have a very  
25 similar capacity by this measure. Again, if you draw the



1 line somewhere below a million dollars per pupil there,  
2 virtually any dollar amount you pick in terms of assessed  
3 value per pupi -- per pupil you're going to see very  
4 different tax rates. And that ends up being a very  
5 different State share of total program which is driven by  
6 the very different tax rates. I mean, these two charts are  
7 kind of inextricably linked but I -- you expect to see with  
8 any equalization system, you would expect to see State share  
9 go up as value goes down and State shares go do -- go down  
10 as value goes up. It's the amount of scatter here that's  
11 creating a lot of discrepancies between school districts.  
12 So the issues and concerns to try and wrap up that I raised  
13 for the JBC are, when I meet with the public, it's really  
14 hard to explain or justify why the tax rates are so  
15 different. You talk to someone from Jefferson County and  
16 say well you're paying \$500,000 -- \$500 on that house, but  
17 this other person is paying 30 to live in the same value  
18 house, and your State sales and income tax are subsidizing  
19 that low rate, it doesn't sit very well with a lot of  
20 people.

21 I don't know what that means for the  
22 prognosis of it, but it -- the taxpayer equity is I think a  
23 big deal here particularly because it -- this is the  
24 foundation of our school finance system. So if you layer  
25 more and more State money on top of it in some ways, it





1 almost makes the inequities here worse. Second bullet there  
2 is related to that one which is, to the first one which is  
3 that taxpayers in high mill levy districts are paying in  
4 high the high levy and paying the same State income and  
5 sales tax that's supporting the State share of funding. So  
6 they're really paying twice in order to subsidize the lower  
7 mill levy and the other districts. School district equity  
8 which is obviously a lot closer to you all as normal,  
9 wheelhouse when you have districts coming in to talk about  
10 their funding shortfalls. State funds that would otherwise  
11 equalize and supplement low property value districts are  
12 inherently having to go to backfill these mill levies that  
13 have been pushed down in districts with really low tax  
14 rates.

15                   That means that there's less money available  
16 for everyone because it's being diverted into districts to  
17 backfill these low tax rates. This -- the second piece is  
18 one that the Joint Budget Committee has talked about a fair  
19 amount over the last year, and that's -- they've really been  
20 focused on overrides and the potential for inequity with  
21 when you layer mill levy overrides on the system, that is  
22 the property tax piece for education purposes that has true  
23 local control. The voters approve them up to a limit set by  
24 the general assembly. They can vote for -- they can vote  
25 for that, or they can vote it down. That makes it very



1 different from total program. As I noted to house education  
2 this morning, I think most voters in the state if you told  
3 them will give you the option of cutting your property tax  
4 to 1.68 mills, and we'll backfill it all with State funds,  
5 most of them would take the deal, but they don't have the  
6 choice. For override purposes, that is a local control  
7 issue. My concern in terms of equity as the analyst for the  
8 JBC is that I suspect and the data bears this out. It's a  
9 lot easier to override on a really low mil levy than it is  
10 on a high one. And there's two reasons for that. One is  
11 the low mil levy means you have a lot of value, a small  
12 override will raise a lot of money. Adding a mill or two in  
13 Aspen is going to add a third of their budget actually as --  
14 as a school district. Adding a mill in Adams 12, is going  
15 to be layering a mill on top of 27, and it's not going to do  
16 very much. So that the interaction with overrides here in  
17 terms of inequity is challenging.

18 MR. DURHAM: Sir, what is the mil -- mill  
19 limit on overrides? Do you know off top your head?

20 MR. HARPER: Off the top of my head, I  
21 believe it's 25 percent for most districts. 25 percent of  
22 total program funding, or \$250,000 whichever is greater. So  
23 if you have a really small district with a really small  
24 budget, then they can go up to 250,000 even if it's higher  
25 than 25 percent. For a certain subset of districts and you



1 have staff in the room that could answer this far better  
2 than I could, it's up. I think they've raised it to a 30  
3 percent limit. So there is for a certain subset of smaller  
4 districts it's 30 percent is my memory.

5 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

6 MS. RANKIN: Is there a cap on that? Is 30  
7 percent the most you can have so far?

8 MR. HARPER: Thirty -- 30 percent is the most  
9 you can have at this point.

10 MS. RANKIN: So, with -- if we had a uniform,  
11 or if they did have uniform mill levy in the past, did they  
12 still have often override that could go higher? I know Aspen  
13 would love to just take the top off their's because they can  
14 do it.

15 MR. HARPER: You could -- the overrides have  
16 been in place in Colorado for quite a long time. I don't  
17 know when they came in, but under this, my proposal as I've  
18 framed it leaving all the big policy questions unrecommended  
19 because I think those are strictly issues for you all in the  
20 general assembly, wouldn't touch the overrides actually.  
21 They would still be able to override, it's just that we  
22 wouldn't be telling them we're good with you paying four  
23 mills and overriding on top of that and getting a bunch of  
24 money. It would, it would change that dynamic, but they  
25 would still be able to override.



1 MS. RANKIN: So, would that also provide  
2 inequities by that? I mean would we, would we see similar  
3 inequities of districts that could take the top off mill  
4 levies and some that couldn't?

5 MR. HARPER: To the -- to the extent that you  
6 keep the overrides in place and you don't have any State  
7 system to equalize the override money, one of the things  
8 that the experts presented to the committees last year was  
9 that in some states they have override systems in place  
10 where, if you override based on a level of effort, if you  
11 override five mills, then the State will match that. For  
12 districts that can't raise much money, that opens up a lot  
13 of really interesting policy scenarios. The State doesn't  
14 have any money. So, equalizing overrides isn't really in  
15 the cards for us budgetarily at this point. I think as long  
16 as you have overrides in place, the inequity concerns are  
17 going to be there. I think right now this dynamic is making  
18 those inequities worse. I think it's making it easier to  
19 pass the overrides in low mill levy districts, and again the  
20 -- the data that I've seen is the 33 districts with the  
21 highest mill levies, or 38, or whatever the number is in 30s  
22 with 27 mills. A lot of them actually don't have overrides,  
23 a decent percentage don't have overrides, and the average  
24 per-pupil amount in overrides is about \$500.

25 If you look at the other end of the spectrum,



1 the districts with the lowest mill levies nearly all of them  
2 have overrides, and the average amount is \$1,500 per kid.  
3 And they, we're helping it support that or enable that with  
4 having these, by my definition in this proposal artificially  
5 low mill levies that the State is subsidizing. So I think  
6 you can't -- I don't think you can have overrides without  
7 concerns about inequity. The State has always come down  
8 much more squarely on the side of local control, and  
9 allowing people to spend more on schools if they wanted to,  
10 rather than a strict look at equity. But I think right now  
11 we're building that system of overrides with the potential  
12 concerns there on a pretty shaky foundation of property tax.  
13 And it's make -- I think it's making it worse.

14 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

15 MR. HARPER: And that was it. Actually  
16 there's one -- I didn't talk about this one. People often  
17 want to know what would be the point or another way to look  
18 at this slide is how much is this costing the State. We've  
19 had members ask a few -- legislators ask a few different  
20 questions about this. The first question they ask is, okay,  
21 well, if we wanted to do this and we wanted to make it -- we  
22 want to do the move to your uniform mill proposal and have  
23 it at the same level unless -- as long as you're getting a  
24 State share, what would that mill levy be to not raise any  
25 new money? So, this is the first nonexistent bar there at



1 22.4 mills is revenue neutral. Based on our best estimates  
2 with currently available data, if you set the uniform mill  
3 at 22.4 mills, local revenue in total would be exactly the  
4 same as it is under current law.

5 MS. RANKIN: It would be redistributed  
6 between communities.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be  
8 redistributed and almost every school district in the state  
9 takes a hit. Because the districts that see an increase in  
10 their budget, are the ones that have the really low mill  
11 levies. Districts like well, all of the metro area and  
12 every sort of, population, larger population center in the  
13 state sees a big tax decrease under this scenario. Plays  
14 out well for taxpayers wallets, but for the school  
15 district's purposes it spreads the State money even thinner  
16 because you have these big districts that see a big drop in  
17 their local share. So, you see pockets of increase revenue  
18 but you have kind of an ocean of decrease and it ends up  
19 being the same total dollar amount, but it spreads the State  
20 money differently in most districts take a hit. 27 mills is  
21 the number that the general assembly picked as the ceiling  
22 in the mill levy freeze. So that's -- you could run this  
23 kind of model with literally any mill levy you wanted. 27  
24 mills is the ceiling at this point. Under current law, we  
25 have between 30 and 40 districts at that level. If you set



1 it at that level with the caveats that I had up front about  
2 districts that are fully funded at lower stay lower, it  
3 raises about \$378/380 million and that -- that's new local  
4 money that's not in the system now and equalizes the tax  
5 burden a bit or completely.

6                   If you wanted to get rid of the negative  
7 factor, because I was trying to give some bookends with  
8 these estimates. Obviously, there's a lot of public  
9 interest and field interest in getting rid of the negative  
10 factor. Finding that \$830 million in the State budget has  
11 not panned out very well to date. If you wanted to do it  
12 with local revenue and rebalance that State local scenario,  
13 right now it's two-thirds State one-third local, rebalance  
14 it a little bit. That takes 32.5 mills. That's a tax  
15 increase for everyone in the State. Not a massive increase  
16 in some terms for some people. Potentially, a big increase  
17 for others. Still well below the uniform mill from '88, but  
18 it's still an increase for literally every person in the  
19 State because right now the ceiling is 27. The last  
20 editorial note and this is just because both I and the Joint  
21 Budget Committee have found this somewhat frustrating since  
22 we've been looking at this, you mentioned looking at your  
23 tax bills, it is impossible from your property tax bill to  
24 identify what this particular mill levy is. When you look  
25 at your property tax bill, it lumps every education property



1 tax measure into the same number.

2                   So, and I live in Denver and mine showed up  
3 at I think, it was 50 mills or so with overrides and bonds  
4 and all the stuff that's lumped in there. In Denver it's  
5 25.5 but there's no way from looking at your bill to  
6 understand what you're paying. The experts that the  
7 committee has brought in last year, seemed to think that  
8 Colorado wasn't that far off of the equal level of effort  
9 but it was because the numbers that they were looking at  
10 were those mill levies, the totals, and they include every  
11 override, they include every bond and once you put those in,  
12 it changes all of these charts because the districts with  
13 the lowest mill levies if they're really overriding on top  
14 of it, those levies go up and it pulls people closer  
15 together. But there's -- when you look at your property tax  
16 bill, this is, there's no way to identify this mill levy and  
17 it really is unique because this is the one that interacts  
18 directly with the State budget.

19                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20                   MR. HARPER: And that was all I had.

21                   MADAM CHAIR: Questions? Board Member  
22 Mazanec.

23                   MS. MAZANEC: So, where does this proposal  
24 stand right now?

25                   MR. HARPER: That's a great question. I





1 presented it in December. The committee has talked about it  
2 at that briefing. It came up briefly at you'all's hearing  
3 with the committee. It's come up a couple of times since  
4 then. It's still on the list of legislation that the Joint  
5 Budget Committee is considering just as a brief bit of  
6 background. For the JBC to carry a bill, it has to be a six  
7 0 vote. Generally, when they, we only have six members. I  
8 mean, it has to be unanimous for them to call it a joint  
9 budget committee bill. This one is still on the list of  
10 bills that they're considering. I can't speak at all to  
11 what its prognosis is. It may well get introduced by other  
12 members even if the committee doesn't elect to introduce it.  
13 I don't -- I don't know where that stands but it's still --  
14 I'm still getting enough questions that I assume there's  
15 some interest in it, but it hasn't been drafted or  
16 introduced. I know it hasn't been introduced, and to the  
17 best of my knowledge it hasn't been drafted, although I --  
18 frankly I wouldn't even know.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Just one quick follow. So has  
20 there been discussion with school districts, you know,  
21 school district boards or superintendents and what's the  
22 feedback that you get from them?

23 MR. HARPER: I've met with kind of, the  
24 alphabet soup of their representatives for the capitol  
25 purposes and the reception is positive among some. I think



1 the school Board representatives that I've met with -- met  
2 with have been pretty darn positive on the idea of changing  
3 the State local balance. The taxpayer equity piece tends to  
4 get people's attention. I can't speak for either CASB or  
5 CASE. I know that there's some sentiment among districts  
6 and their representative organizations that they need the  
7 big fix, and I'm not sure what the big fix is or what its  
8 prognosis is for passage. But this may not be ambitious  
9 enough for some of the folks to stop at this point. So,  
10 I've met with all of them but I don't know. Nobody said hey  
11 that's a bad idea. It's been more of a --

12 MS. MAZANEC: Maybe not quite good enough.

13 MR. HARPER: Not quite good enough.

14 Interestingly, if you -- with some of the superintendents,  
15 in particular, when you talk to them, the initial response  
16 is well, that would be a tax increase for my people; they'd  
17 never vote for it. But then when you layer on the next  
18 question of, well I -- it would, if they put it at 27,  
19 you're at 25, it would go up two, I understand that they  
20 might not vote for it, but -- and all of the caveats about  
21 it not being any school district's fault, fully  
22 acknowledged. The question that comes up is, how do they  
23 feel about subsidizing Aspen? And then the response is very  
24 different frankly. And that's that's where the kind of, the  
25 taxpayer piece of this changes. I think school district



1 funding is -- is one issue and people's willingness to look  
2 at potential tax increases there. I think to the extent  
3 that this has any legs at all, I think it's based on that  
4 taxpayer equity angle that you really do have these very  
5 different rates playing out across the state.

6 MS. MAZANEC: You might be doing a lot of  
7 explaining if they pass this.

8 MR. HARPER: That would be a great scenario.

9 MS. MAZANEC: This topic is, can be sort of,  
10 an eyes glaze over explanation for citizens.

11 MR. HARPER: I think the only route around  
12 the eyes glaze over response that I've had, is these charts.  
13 Those tend to get people's attention, when you say, look,  
14 this is a statewide system. This is how much you're paying.  
15 And in some cases, again, it's really driven by when the  
16 values increased, if oil and gas development really came  
17 into a district before 2007 and pushed those mill levies way  
18 down, but they didn't get into the neighboring district,  
19 either the resource wasn't there or they just hadn't gotten  
20 there yet, you can have neighboring school districts with  
21 really different rates and then you get people in the  
22 situation of saying, well, you mean I'm paying 25 and my  
23 neighbor across this imaginary line is paying six; that  
24 doesn't seem fair. Their house has the same value as mine.  
25 Why am I paying five times as much? So, these tend to help



1 with that but as soon as you say mill levy and assessment  
2 rate people's eyes glaze over including mine.

3 MS. MAZANEC: And is 800 million enough to  
4 earn 300 or 400 million enough to make it worth the effort?

5 MR. HARPER: That would be a highly political  
6 question that I -- I mean I don't know what the -- I don't  
7 know what the answer to that is. I don't know where people,  
8 I know that some of the districts and their representatives  
9 have said this isn't a big enough fix. I don't know if --

10 MS. MAZANEC: They're probably the ones who  
11 have the most money.

12 MR. HARPER: And the most overrides,  
13 probably.

14 MS. MAZANEC: And the most overrides

15 MR. HARPER: But I think the 830 million is -  
16 - that's a big enough number to get all of their attention  
17 frankly. But I don't think any of them think that that 32.5  
18 mill uniform is a likely scenario. So, where they draw the  
19 line of, I think for the school district purposes, it needs  
20 to be new money. Again, if -- even if you bring new money  
21 into this, if you bring in new local revenue, if you raise  
22 400 million in local revenue and you cut the State share by  
23 that much, the school districts lose. It -- It's just  
24 redistributing the same pie. If you keep new money in the  
25 system, then I think for the school districts it becomes



1 worthwhile and then the question is, what are the voters --

2 MS. MAZANEC: (Indiscernible)

3 MR. HARPER: Well, yeah.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

5 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair. I think  
6 it's a great job of simplifying a very complex issue. I  
7 think more discussion of it there is, the better. I just  
8 threw out one thing, I've always had a definition of a fair  
9 tax. It may help you going forward. That's a tax that  
10 someone else pays. So, keep that in mind. It'll help you  
11 in your presentation.

12 MR. HARPER: I like it. Thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

14 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you so much. Ms.  
15 Mazanec asked my question, but I guess my follow up would  
16 be, as we go forward, if this does gain traction and  
17 continue to develop and go forward through the process, it  
18 would be really great to have the ability to digest whatever  
19 input we get from the districts.

20 MR. HARPER: Thank you.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

22 MS. FLORES: It seems so unfair. When we  
23 have students in our state that per pupil get so little in  
24 comparison to even the surrounding states, then it makes it  
25 very hard. I mean, very hard to bear. And I -- I lived in



1 -- have lived in other states, and I think the scarcity in  
2 Colorado is great. I mean, really it's great.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

4 MS. RANKIN: I have a couple of questions.  
5 First of all, how did they arrive at 27? That's the question  
6 and then a follow up question. Do you have a chart or  
7 something that shows if you lowered it by two points or  
8 raised it by two points how that would affect every  
9 district. I mean, is there such an interactive spreadsheet  
10 like that, so you could really tell who's going to lose, and  
11 of course if they're going to win.

12 MR. HARPER: I can't answer the first  
13 question at all in terms of how they arrived at 27.

14 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

15 MR. HARPER: You'd have to find some  
16 legislators that were part of the 2007 bill. That was the  
17 year that I joined the JBC staff. So I -- I was not -- I  
18 have no idea at all on the 27.

19 MS. RANKIN: Just wondering if it was a  
20 numerical reason they did it or just picked a number.

21 MR. HARPER: I would be shocked if it was a  
22 numerical reason. I mean --

23 MS. RANKIN: It's not the usual case.

24 MR. HARPER: My guess, my guess is because  
25 they were looking at a chart that looked -- the chart hasn't



1 changed in terms of where districts are except for the few  
2 that have gone down since then. They were looking at the  
3 same numbers that I am and my guess is that they had some  
4 that were at 27 and they didn't have anyone that was above  
5 27 if I had to guess. And they said the highest that we  
6 have now is going to be the statutory ceiling, in fact,  
7 that's how they would have had to have done it. Because  
8 they would have -- if anyone -- all right, they could have  
9 brought people down to 27 but they couldn't have raised  
10 anyone up. So, my guess is that that was about the highest  
11 that people had, or they may have pulled it down some  
12 because they were recognizing that we had a pretty  
13 inequitable spread between -- if people were at 30 and  
14 Primero was already at one, it was even worse. They  
15 narrowed it the only way they could if they did, but they  
16 didn't have anyone very far above 27 that I'm aware of. I  
17 could be wrong about that though. I just don't know where  
18 the 27 came from.

19 MS. RANKIN: And then the second question  
20 was, do we have a spreadsheet or something where you can  
21 plug in and just see how these districts change?

22 MR. HARPER: We have legislative council  
23 staff which is sort of a partner agency in the legislature.  
24 I've worked with them and we have a spreadsheet that we can  
25 use to model, kind of any level that you would pick. It's



1 not as easy as just dropping in a number because you have at  
2 any number that you choose, you're going to have districts  
3 that fall out of the uniform group and then you have to  
4 track down who, who is fully funded at a level lower than  
5 that uniform level and then set them at the full. So, it's  
6 kind of an iterative process but we can model just about any  
7 scenario you want.

8 MS. RANKIN: Is it, is it because they can't  
9 afford to go up to what the expectations are?

10 MR. HARPER: It's because they would be full  
11 -- they can't over collect total program. So, Aspen, for  
12 example, again they're the one that I have the number in my  
13 head. They're paying 4.4, if they were paying 6.6, then  
14 they wouldn't need a dollar from the State. So, they, they  
15 would go up to 6.6 and stay there, but if you set it at  
16 eight then you capture Aspen at less than eight. But then,  
17 if you move it up to 12, there's going to be another  
18 district or two that would be fully funded in that level.  
19 So, it's not as easy as just kind of a --

20 MS. RANKIN: Plug it in.

21 MR. HARPER: -- press a button and get it to  
22 spit it out. For most districts, it actually is that easy  
23 just because it's most of them are going to be at the  
24 uniform level. It's a relatively small group that are fully  
25 funded at a lower, lower rate.





1 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Flores.

3 MS. FLORES: So, I mean, I, I -- one of the  
4 things I'm going to ask from -- from us and I guess from CDE  
5 is that we get the mills for the districts that we're  
6 looking at because I think that would be very important.  
7 The other is if -- if -- if statistics like this, tables  
8 like this and if you've been presenting this and especially  
9 to our legislators across the street, if it doesn't move  
10 them, and knowing that we have school districts that are in  
11 such need then, what is going to do it. I mean, is it  
12 another court case? That's all I can think of because I  
13 think that is -- the inequity there is great.

14 MR. HARPER: I think there's there's  
15 obviously concern in any legislative body about any proposal  
16 that would raise taxes on people. And I mean, that's a real  
17 issue for this proposal. Unless you set it at 1.68,  
18 somebody's taxes are going to go up. If you set it at 1.68,  
19 then everybody but Primero goes down. But unless you set it  
20 there somebody's taxes are going to go up and that, that's a  
21 big -- that is a persistent hurdle to any legislative  
22 proposal.

23 MS. FLORES: But it's on the backs of our  
24 students. And -- and I think that, that that's going to be  
25 hard to sleep kind of seeing that. It doesn't seem fair.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

2 MR. HARPER: Yeah. That's why I recommended  
3 it but I can't speak to the legislative prerogative.

4 MS. MCCLELLAN: I apologize if you already  
5 covered this, but as I'm going back over this and still  
6 digesting this and bringing myself up to speed on this, what  
7 exactly happens to the bond measures and mill levy overrides  
8 that a district has already passed? Does this take the place  
9 of all of that or do we still have those overrides on top of  
10 the 27 if that were to pass?

11 MR. HARPER: That is a multi-million dollar  
12 policy question that they would need to address in however  
13 they drafted it. I think your two options are, either you  
14 just push everyone to use your example at 27. And I was  
15 very careful not to recommend a level in my recommendation,  
16 but if we were to use your example of 27, you either push  
17 everyone to 27 and then they can keep their overrides on top  
18 of it assuming that you want to leave the override system  
19 intact. Or for districts that are well below 27, you allow  
20 them to use some of that overri -- override money and  
21 basically convert the override mill levy to this one to help  
22 them get closer and avoid having such a big increase but  
23 then their override money goes away. And I think if I were  
24 looking through a crystal ball, I think giving them the  
25 option of doing that is what would probably make sense to



1 me, if I were the one putting it together. But I think that  
2 those are your two basic options are either push everyone to  
3 27 and if they have a five mill override then they'll still  
4 collect that five, or if they're at 22 and they need to get  
5 to 27, they could use the five override mills to get there  
6 and not actually see an overall tax increase but their  
7 override would go away. So, I think --

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: But then they could go back  
9 for another override.

10 MR. HARPER: Correct. And you would give  
11 them -- and that would be the local control question to give  
12 them the option of either converting the mills or keeping  
13 them as override and then going with the tax increase.  
14 Under the scenario where they could use some of it to absorb  
15 the increase, for example, I'm quite certain that Aspen  
16 wouldn't have to see any tax increase at all and there would  
17 be several districts in that scenario where the State is  
18 paying and they're collecting -- or the State is paying a  
19 State share; they're collecting overrides on top of it. If  
20 they wanted to convert the override then they wouldn't have  
21 to see the tax bill go up, but they would lose the gravy of  
22 the override money.

23 MS. MCCLELLAN: So if I understand correctly,  
24 district by district the decision makers or the voters would  
25 have to understand the net impact so that they could get to



1 the next decision point about what to do about their prior  
2 decisions regarding the mill levys and override -- the mill  
3 levy and bond measure overrides because if we've used that  
4 as a fix over time for some of our financial woes, then  
5 district by district results without that fix could be  
6 dramatically different.

7 MR. HARPER: I think -- I think that that's  
8 correct. I mean they would need the -- the proposal is  
9 actually framed very specifically as a statewide vote. So  
10 it would not be -- if this had to pass district -- school  
11 district by school district, then I think we can safely  
12 assume it couldn't pass. But they would need -- in order to  
13 decide how they would need to -- how they would -- how they  
14 would elect to treat the existing override money. If the  
15 general assembly gave them the discretion in the measure  
16 that went to the voters then they could either say, you need  
17 to do that now or you can -- I mean that you could give them  
18 time to make that decision. Kind of phased in over a period  
19 of time and say, somehow your total mill levy needs to be  
20 twen -- in your example, 27 mills by this date. You can  
21 either just put it at 27 and keep the overrides or you can  
22 convert some or all of your -- I mean but there would be a  
23 time lag where they would be able to -- in my imaginary  
24 world where they would be able to make that decision.  
25 Again, all of this is subject to the will of the people that



1 would introduce the bill.

2 MS. MCCLELLAN: So, perhaps district by  
3 district, they would have a companion decision point with  
4 respect to --

5 MR. HARPER: Correct.

6 MS. MCCLELLAN: Okay. Thank you so much.

7 MR. HARPER: And I -- I think that would be  
8 one option -- one option. Again, there's a few different  
9 ways that they could treat it but that would keep --

10 MADAM CHAIR: You're saying the voters would  
11 have to decide that not the school Board? How to treat the  
12 override.

13 MR. HARPER: That would be at the discretion  
14 of how the bill was introduced I think. I mean I -- I,  
15 there's a constitutional issue there that there are people  
16 in the room that could may be able to answer better than I  
17 could. I don't know what the discretion would be, but the  
18 overall idea that I've heard discussed would be to allow  
19 them to use some of the override money to reach the -- the  
20 goal tax rate. And if they needed to go back for more  
21 overrides to do it then they can -- that would be a local  
22 decision point.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Any other -- Board Member Goff?

24 MS. GOFF: I'm sitting here first of all, in  
25 the Jefferson County and the Adams 12 are quite striking



1 those two.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, I'm not surprised.

3 MS. GOFF: Now, that -- that makes me think  
4 really rather difficult task looking ahead at helping people  
5 understand -- to actually see that and maybe solidify some  
6 really grumpy feelings anyway, but --

7 MADAM CHAIR: You're saying now they're  
8 really going to be grumpy when they find this out.

9 MS. GOFF: Well, yeah. And that -- that kind  
10 of bothers me, the idea of that being right in people's  
11 faces and in Adams County as well. Because they've worked  
12 very hard to raise their -- to get those elections passed  
13 and they've really approached it differently. The other  
14 thing though just a thought really. I'm thinking here but  
15 are you saying, Craig, that about \$830 million, let's say,  
16 it's -- the whole package ended up being about with the  
17 negative factor; is sort of? Is -- is that -- naive I grant,  
18 probably a naive question. I'm just pondering, would you --  
19 are you saying that that would be a really welcome thing to  
20 have happen? And would it be long lasting? I mean are we  
21 looking at -- if an override or some sort of an election  
22 created a solution that was worth about \$820-30 million. Is  
23 that something that's -- that can last a while or does that  
24 only do it for one year?

25 MR. HARPER: I -- this is -- I don't deal as



1 much with the statewide budget numbers so how big of a  
2 difference in terms of the overall State budget I really  
3 only do K-12 in the attorney general's office. I've heard a  
4 lot of discussion about structural issues where let's say  
5 you put in 830 million over some period of time that's quite  
6 likely without a -- without other policy changes that some  
7 degree of negative factor would come back because  
8 eventually, you're probably going to hit a point again where  
9 the State can't -- can't cover the obligations that are in  
10 statute and then -- and they're in the Constitution. So I'm  
11 not -- and to your first question about whether it would be  
12 welcome, I wouldn't try to answer that as an analyst, I know  
13 that the districts would welcome an additionally \$130  
14 million, they may not welcome the policy to get there if it  
15 means this kind of change, but they would certainly in most  
16 cases welcome the money. But in terms of how long it would  
17 last, I think that's where the interaction between this  
18 proposal with you all's' normal wheelhouse and equity between  
19 districts and how districts are funded and that kind of  
20 thing. And the lens of individual taxpayer equity gets  
21 pretty messy because, you could solve the taxpayer equity  
22 problem here, and make the educational funding worse. So, I  
23 mean, because by my definition of taxpayer equity, it would  
24 be an improvement to put everyone down at Primero's level  
25 because then everyone would be experiencing the same rate.



1 That would ex -- that would completely blow up the State's  
2 budget obviously. If you took Denver, Jeffco, and all the  
3 other big districts and put them from 27 to 1.6, there's no  
4 way that the State could afford it.

5 MADAM CHAIR: We'd have to leave the State.

6 MR. HARPER: So, I think there's -- there's a  
7 lot of gray area there but my -- my proposal here is really  
8 to try and get the foundation. If you think of the property  
9 tax as the foundation of the school finance system, try and  
10 shore up -- shore it up to where it's -- and I hesitate to  
11 use this word, but to where it's fair. And that people are  
12 -- that the rep -- the burden is distributed on a fair  
13 basis, and then you can make decisions about how to address  
14 any other issues in the system later. I mean, I've really  
15 tried to frame this as we need to pick a number as a state  
16 in my opinion and fix this piece. And then once you've done  
17 this, then it's easier to start looking at state fixes and  
18 adding more state revenue to the school finance system  
19 either through new revenue or cuts or whatever, but to try  
20 and get the -- the base of the building solid before we  
21 start building more on top of it. Rather than building on  
22 top of something that I think is really -- I mean, it -- it  
23 looks inequitable to me on that chart. So trying to layer  
24 on top of that I'm -- I'm trying to get it to where this is  
25 fixed and then the -- the other discussions, I'm not going





1 to claim that this addresses any structural issues. And  
2 frankly, I think that's where some of your district  
3 representatives come down on it is. We agree this is a  
4 problem, but we want the big fix and the big fix is what  
5 you're referring to. That will sort of, take that away down  
6 the road and that's not what this would do without a much  
7 bigger increase.

8 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

10 MS. FLORES: We have -- we had two districts,  
11 Jefferson and Denver County who asked just this past  
12 November for a mill and bond and you have Denver, I mean, I  
13 think we have about enough -- have the same number of  
14 students, wouldn't you say -- for -- in Denver? It's very  
15 close. So, here is Denver that passed close to \$700,000,  
16 \$700 million in mill and bond and then I just couldn't  
17 believe that Jefferson, you know, couldn't, or wouldn't, I  
18 don't know. So and then the closing of those five schools  
19 or maybe three schools that -- that that is -- I don't know.

20 MADAM CHAIR: What's your question?

21 MS. FLORES: Well, my question is, why -- why  
22 would we have a system that would allow that? I mean where  
23 Denver does, Jefferson doesn't, but yet the money is -- is  
24 really needed I mean, in Jefferson. And in Denver, I mean,  
25 here we have Mark Fiorentina who's -- who tells me, it's not



1 enough, we need more money, we need more money. And I think  
2 that's close to -- it's, you know, three-quarters of a  
3 billion dollars and it's not enough. I don't know.

4 MR. HARPER: I think you --

5 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have a comment to that?

6 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

7 MR. HARPER: I don't -- I don't think so. I  
8 -- I mean the -- the override question is a big one. The  
9 equitability of the override system is a really big policy  
10 question and we've -- I think I do think that this -- this  
11 scenario makes it worse and makes it harder because I mean  
12 Jeffco is paying 26.5 or 26.6 mills at this point.

13 MADAM CHAIR: What's Denver paying? What do  
14 you have --

15 MR. HARPER: 25.6. So there are just  
16 slightly below, slightly lower.

17 MADAM CHAIR: That's not the big difference.

18 MR. HARPER: But if -- but if you look at the  
19 ability to pass overrides in a district that has a much  
20 lower mill levy, that -- I think the -- the inequities are  
21 related between the override system and this one just  
22 because it -- then there are certain school districts in the  
23 state and you all would know them better than I would, that  
24 are probably going to pass virtually any override that comes  
25 in front of them. I mean Boul -- Boulder --



1 MADAM CHAIR: Boulder did turn one down in my  
2 time there. It's a long time ago but they did turn one  
3 down.

4 MR. HARPER: I -- but I think Boulder is now  
5 overridden to the limit forever.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Not only to the limits but also  
7 the new one. They can -- was pass -- I mean.

8 MR. HARPER: Whatever the limit is -- so, I  
9 mean, you have districts in that category but to the -- if  
10 you have districts that are more in the middle, then passing  
11 the override on top of a mill levy that's already --

12 MADAM CHAIR: High.

13 MR. HARPER: -- in my mind inequitably high  
14 is going it's -- it just makes sense to me that it would be  
15 harder and I think the data bears that out.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you  
17 very much.

18 MR. HARPER: Thank -- thank you for all the  
19 time. I didn't expect to take up this much of your time,  
20 but thank you very much.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Appreciate it very much.

22 MS. RANKIN: We should have them come like at  
23 least twice a year.

24 MADAM CHAIR: We're getting kind of geeky,  
25 aren't we?



1 MS. FLORES: Real -- really no.

2 MS. RANKIN: It's just -- it's such a great  
3 refresher.

4 MADAM CHAIR: It is.

5 MR. HARPER: Thank you.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Harper. I hope  
7 I'm right that we're at the end of our agenda.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Madam chair.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

10 MS. CORDIAL: We do have the disciplinary  
11 matters that were on the vote. Were on for action that  
12 haven't been voted on yet.

13 MADAM CHAIR: 19.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah, 19.09 --

15 MADAM CHAIR: I tried to do that before to do  
16 that and you wouldn't let me.

17 MS. CORDIAL: -- through 19.12.

18 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Nineteen. All  
19 right. Patience, patience. Folks, we're getting close.  
20 So, the next few items on the agenda are the consideration  
21 of disciplinary matters. The first disciplinary matter  
22 proceeding, concerning an authorization, case number 2016  
23 EC759. Is there a motion? Board Member Rankin.

24 MS. RANKIN: Concerning disciplinary  
25 proceedings, concerning an authorization, case number 2016



1 EC759, I move to adopt the findings in a stipulation and  
2 final agency order. And to authorize the approval of said  
3 stipulation signed by the credential holder no later than  
4 March 13th, 2017 that provides in part that the credential  
5 holder voluntarily agrees that his substitute authorization  
6 number 171572 will be revoked. That's a person.

7 MADAM CHAIR: You must love (indiscernible).

8 MS. RANKIN: If sai -- if said stipula --  
9 stipulation and final agency order is not signed by the  
10 credential holder by May -- March 13th, 2017, I move to  
11 adopt the findings of the proposed summary suspension --  
12 issue and order of summary suspension of the authorization  
13 and instruct Department staff in the State Attorney  
14 General's office to prepare the documents necessary to  
15 request a formal hearing for the suspension or revocation of  
16 the authorization pursuant to Section 24-4-104 (4)(a) C.R.S.

17 MADAM CHAIR: That was a long and proper  
18 motion.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any objection to  
23 that? That motion is passed.

24 MS. CORDIAL: I'm sorry. Who second to that?

25 MR. DURHAM: Three or four --



1 MADAM CHAIR: Everybody.

2 MR. DURHAM: Pick one.

3 MS. CORDIAL: All right. Steve.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Pick one, anyone. Okay. All  
5 right. Our next disciplinary proceeding is concerning a  
6 license charge number 2016 EC1661. Is there a motion? Board  
7 Member McClellan.

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: Concerning disciplinary  
9 proceedings, concerning a license charge number 2016 EC1661,  
10 I move to adopt the findings of the proposed summary  
11 suspension of the license holder's Colorado professional  
12 teacher license. Intuition -- to issue an order of summary  
13 suspension of the license and instruct Department staff and  
14 the State Attorney General's office to prepare the documents  
15 necessary to request a formal hearing for the suspension or  
16 revocation of the license pursuant to Section 24-4-104  
17 (4)(a) C.R.S.

18 MADAM CHAIR: That's a proper motion. Is  
19 there a second?

20 MS. MAZANEC: Second.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Mazanec. Ms.  
22 Mazanec seconded. Are there any objections? Onward. The  
23 next item is a disciplinary proceeding concerning a license  
24 charge number 2016 EC1789. Is there a motion? Ms. Mazanec?

25 MS. MAZANEC: Concerning disciplinary



1 proceedings, concerning the license charge number 2016  
2 EC1789, I move to adopt all findings of the proposed summary  
3 suspension of the license holder's Colorado professional  
4 teacher's license and to ensure an order of summary  
5 suspension -- I'm sorry, and to issue an order of summary  
6 suspension of the license and instruct Department staff and  
7 the State Attorney General's office to prepare the documents  
8 necessary to request a formal hearing for the suspension or  
9 revocation of the license pursuant to 24-4-104 (4)(a) C.R.S.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. That's a proper  
11 motion. Is there a second? Ms. Rankin seconded. Any  
12 objections? One more. Disciplinary proceedings concerning a  
13 license charge number 2017 EC63. Is there a motion? Ms.  
14 McClellan.

15 MS. MCCLELLAN: Concerning disciplinary  
16 proceedings, concerning an authorization, case number 2 --  
17 2017 EC63, I move to adopt the findings that the proposed  
18 summary suspension of the credential holder's authorization,  
19 issue an order of summary suspension of the authorization  
20 and instruct Department staff and the State Attorney  
21 General's office to prepare the documents necessary to  
22 request a formal hearing for the suspension or revocation of  
23 the authorization pursuant to Section 24-4-104 (4)(a) C.R.S.

24 MADAM CHAIR: That's a prom -- proper motion.  
25 Is there a second?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Second.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second. Yes.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Two seconds.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seconds.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two seconds.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Any objection, colleagues?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Technically, value a  
8 third.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was asleep.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Are there any objections? That  
11 motion passed. Okay. So Ms. Cordial, where are we?

12 MS. CORDIAL: Now we are on Board Member  
13 item, Board Member reports.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Board Members, reports. Board  
15 Member Durham, do you have a report?

16 MR. DURHAM: Just two things. I -- coming up  
17 next week, I'll be visiting Peyton School District in El  
18 Paso County. And I did get a very nice thank you note from  
19 Cabinet Member DeVos about her confirmation.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

21 MS. FLORES: Well, I guess I visited with  
22 parents and teachers and administrators last -- last evening  
23 of -- for Denver public schools. And they were -- I -- I  
24 guess the big issue was the closing of schools and how  
25 parents don't feel that the District has -- invites them in





1 to really discuss what is going on with the closure of  
2 schools. There's not enough time. It's just boom, we're  
3 going to close it, and they're not included in the  
4 conversation of whether to close it or what to do next. So  
5 that was kind of sad.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Board Member  
7 Rankin.

8 MS. FLORES: Oh. May I say one thing?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, sure. Go ahead.

10 MS. FLORES: I was really disappointed that I  
11 didn't get invited to -- to read the Mr. -- Dr. Seuss book.  
12 I mean, I -- I already have my books and everything ready  
13 but there was no invitations to go read it in school.  
14 Anybody else get it?

15 MR. DURHAM: I didn't get it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did anybody --

17 MS. MAZANEC: Mean on Dr. Seuss' birthday?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think that he  
19 does this year -- sometimes --

20 MADAM CHAIR: So, none of us -- none -- none  
21 of us --

22 MS. FLORES: I wasn't invited; I don't know  
23 why. I like that Doctor Seuss.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin, do you  
25 have a report?



1 MS. RANKIN: On February 23rd and 24th, I  
2 attended the CASB conference. I was there both days and was  
3 on the panel with some of the Board members. Dan  
4 Snowberger, superintendent from Durango School District, was  
5 in Denver to receive a charter school award for the mill  
6 levy override that was distributed among all public schools  
7 including the charters in his district. Community --  
8 community there should be commended for voting that mill  
9 levy override. I also have been writing to Club 20 about  
10 our education accomplishments here at the Board and what we  
11 have to look forward to. They're keeping very close tabs on  
12 what we do, and they have similar committees set up on the  
13 western slope that talk about the same issues that we do in  
14 their education committee, and I kind of updated him on what  
15 we were doing. The last one is -- is the most important  
16 one. I received a Full Card from Marie Greenwood and I'd  
17 like to just read a couple of paragraphs. Thank you for  
18 bestowing on me this great honor of Trailblazer in  
19 education. Thirty years of teaching first grade in the  
20 Denver public schools was the joy of my life. I want to skip  
21 the next paragraph. It's personal. Denise Kaufman was a  
22 great help in directing my son Jim. And Misty; thank her  
23 for her kind assistance. They made it possible to attend  
24 the wonderful impressive meeting. I cherish the copy I  
25 received of the great recognition speech given by



1 Commissioner Anthes. What an honor. This recognition by  
2 the State Board of Education is truly my greatest of honors.  
3 Sincerely, Marie Greenwood.

4 MADAM CHAIR: That's nice. I -- I did read  
5 one of the two books that she gave to us.

6 MS. MAZANEC: I was wondering where those  
7 books are..

8 MADAM CHAIR: They're in the State Board  
9 office Library.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, you got that  
11 personally?

12 MS. RANKIN: I wrote her personally. I got  
13 this back and I just wanted to share it with you..

14 MADAM CHAIR: That's very nice. Thank you.  
15 Board Member McClellan.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: I just want to continue to  
17 thank staff. Once again, I've had about a half a dozen  
18 meetings with staff members who've been so patient answering  
19 my many questions and helping to give me an overview and  
20 some detail about their departments and I very much  
21 appreciate it. I also enjoyed attending the Rose Foundation  
22 dinner on February 8th and also being part of the panel at  
23 the Brown Palace for CASB. That was a great experience.  
24 And last but not least, it was a great pleasure to attend  
25 the School District Performance Awards on March 1st. That



1 was a very happy occasion. Thanks very much.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin. I mean --

3 MS. MAZANEC: Mazanec.

4 MADAM CHAIR: -- Mazanec. Okay. Yeah, and  
5 my apologies.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I also got a nice letter  
7 from Secretary DeVos, so --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you?

9 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. So, I'm going to have to  
10 frame that. I mean, that's my first cabinet official. What  
11 did you say?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry?

13 MS. MAZANEC: Do you need to be scolded?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I said --

15 MR. DURHAM: She said she'd be nicer.

16 MADAM CHAIR: I should be nicer toward, like  
17 --

18 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, yeah. Then maybe --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Congratulations.

20 MS. MAZANEC: -- then maybe you could get  
21 something to pin on your wall. I'll work on that for you.  
22 Anyway, that's -- that's about it.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff.

24 MS. GOFF: Well, actually, in a couple of  
25 weeks, four of us are going to probably get to shake



1 Secretary DeVos's hand --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is so.

3 MS. GOFF: -- in Washington, when we attend  
4 along with our Commissioner, perhaps. We will all be in  
5 Washington, for the sort of, semi joint CCS's of the NASBE  
6 Legislative Congress, so, we'll have an overlap day and  
7 evening I think, something like that. And some visits  
8 planned to the Hill, so we're hoping to check in and spend  
9 some time with at least one or two or three of our  
10 congressional delegation, including some House members and,  
11 hopefully, both Senators; that would be nice. We are lucky,  
12 just a quick reminder, I'm sure everybody knows, we've got  
13 one Representative Jared Polis, who is on the House  
14 Educational Labor in the workforce, I believe it is. And  
15 then Senator Michael Bennet is part of the HELP committee,  
16 which is the Health, Education, Labor, and Pension  
17 committee. So we've got, kind of, got a nice break, in the  
18 way of state representation on two very important  
19 committees. So, we'll have -- we have that coming up.

20 I have been spending, again, some time with  
21 Adams County Districts in general and following their parent  
22 development -- parent and student development groups. Adams  
23 -- Adams County Youth Initiative has just completed their  
24 fourth or fifth Annual Student Survey, and they are in --  
25 this next year coming up, they're in the process of



1 revamping it somewhat so they can address some different  
2 issues. But they've -- they found it to be helpful in  
3 determining where their youth's status is and where it's  
4 going, and in helping them as a whole community. It's not  
5 just schools but everybody getting together and figuring out  
6 ways to literally collaborate and run -- run a cooperative  
7 shovel program to get these kids job -- or kind of, into job  
8 thinking and searching and school success and healthy lives  
9 and seems to be working. So it's going to be interesting to  
10 follow through on. Other than that, not too much. Jeffco  
11 is in the middle of among any -- among many things, down to  
12 the final stages of identifying a superintendent set of  
13 finalists and trying to deal with the money issues, and  
14 close schools, and never a dull moment in our school  
15 districts. So it's, it's that time of the year, I guess.  
16 Thank you.

17 MADAM CHAIR: And I think you all have  
18 covered everything I attended this last month and if not I  
19 have forgotten. We have no one here for public comment?

20 MS. CORDIAL: We do not.

21 MADAM CHAIR: So, the last --

22 MR. DURHAM: They left.

23 MADAM CHAIR: I know. Well, any future  
24 business that you all want to add to them? So, let me just  
25 really briefly remind us that I'm been using Ms. Cordial's



1 at a glance, to look ahead, we'll be voting on the -- maybe,  
2 voting on the ESSA plan next month. We will have some more  
3 turnaround hearings to the districts. I think it's Aurora  
4 and Douglas County that are on -- at our next Board meeting  
5 and then we have a special meeting in April on the 24th.

6 MS. CORDIAL: That's correct.

7 MADAM CHAIR: And we will be Greeley and  
8 Pueblo.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Correct.

10 MADAM CHAIR: We expect to have a charter  
11 school appeal next month, and we'll continue to get  
12 information about standards review and revision, school  
13 finance, data privacy, some more of those wonderful rule-  
14 making hearings --

15 MS. CORDIAL: Just a couple.

16 MADAM CHAIR: That looks like you've got four  
17 of them. Right. Right. I like --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, I like that scissors one,  
20 that talk about -- have a short report about field testing.  
21 And that's all that I have. Plus what we added on today.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Yes.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Flores.

24 MS. FLORES: I was just thinking, that the  
25 department has worked so hard on this S-upping (ph) that we



1 need to do something special for -- for the Department cause  
2 they've been working so hard.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Another cake?

4 MS. FLORES: I -- I don't know. I mean we  
5 could give a test, like maybe building a --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Give a test?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you say a test?

8 MS. FLORES: Yes, like building the best  
9 banana split or something.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or maybe we go out to  
11 dinner and some cocktails with them.

12 MS. FLORES: Well --

13 MADAM CHAIR: You want me to hammer this  
14 thing?

15 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. We need some adult  
16 beverages.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many are there?

18 MADAM CHAIR: That's a lot of people.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sure (indiscernible)  
20 would love to be taken out.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great, let's do it.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You probably need an  
23 adult beverage.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree.

25 MS. FLORES: Couldn't we do something like





1 that?

2 MADAM CHAIR: You may think about it and make  
3 a suggestion. In the meantime I would like to recess the  
4 meeting.

5 MS. RANKIN: Well, maybe not dinner but maybe  
6 cocktails.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Yeah.

8 MS. FLORES: Can we have cocktails in here?

9 MADAM CHAIR: We can't have -- no.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not here.

11 MADAM CHAIR: No, we can't.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, what is this?

14 MS. FLORES: Escort you a block away, let's  
15 belly up to the bar.

16 MADAM CHAIR: We're not adjourned, we're  
17 recessed --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Recessed.

19 MADAM CHAIR: -- until tomorrow.

20 MS. FLORES: Okay, we'll be thinking.

21 (Meeting adjourned)

22

23

24

25



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

2 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Electronic  
3 Transcriber, for the State of Colorado, do hereby certify  
4 that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set  
5 out.

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

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
12 and seal this 5th day of October, 2018.

13

14 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

15 Kimberly C. McCright

16 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

17

18 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

19 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

20 Houston, Texas 77058

21 281.724.8600

22

23

24

25