



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
June 11, 2014, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 11, 2014, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come
2 back to order. We'd like to welcome the lieutenant
3 governor to the table here. We've got a seat warmed up
4 for you. There we go.

5 MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I wasn't
6 quite ready for you.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, well, we're always
8 ready for you.

9 MS. NEAL: We're ready for you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is this the summertime
11 sartorial setup? Is that what we've got going here?

12 MR. GARCIA: Mr. Chair, I hate to admit that
13 I locked myself out of my car where all my clothes are
14 hanging, so this is what I've got.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well you look good. You
16 look good, and can I take my tie off? Would that be all
17 right?

18 MR. GARCIA: I just haven't been able to get
19 back to address that particular issue. And I have a lot
20 of things that I wanted to cover, so if you'd give me a
21 moment to get to my notes, because I don't want to miss
22 anything.

23 But, again, I really appreciate the
24 opportunity to come before -- come before the board, talk
25 about some of the things that I'm working on both at



1 Department of Higher Ed and in the governor's office, and
2 to get your input as well. That's critically important.
3 And I will say just by way of preface that on Monday
4 evening I had the opportunity to speak to a group that
5 came out of the -- one of the Harvard graduate programs,
6 and these were all CEOs who were at the tale end of their
7 careers, very successful folks who were coming to
8 Colorado to learn a little bit about what we were doing
9 in education here. And one of the things they were
10 really delighted to hear about was the strong working
11 relationship we had between the Department of Higher
12 Education and the State Board of Education, and it's not
13 something that exists everywhere.

14 So, they're very interested in hearing about
15 the fact that I come before you on a regular basis to
16 share ideas and projects, and to make sure that we are
17 all working towards the same goal. So just wanted to
18 start with that. I will say --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We do appreciate the
20 accessibility that it represents, and we know that you're
21 -- so sometime when you head in here to give us an update
22 and we've really got something tough to tell you, we'll
23 be prepared for that and we'll have built the
24 relationship so we can do that. I hope that day never
25 comes.



1 MR. GARCIA: Well, I recognize that it
2 might, but I do think that building this relationship
3 over time really will help us when and if that does
4 arise, so it (indiscernible).

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sounds good. We
6 appreciate your persistence.

7 MR. GARCIA: I wanted to just give you a
8 quick update on a couple of things. One, we recently
9 completed Colorado Literacy Week, and again, that is
10 something where this department has been involved in the
11 past over the last few years. We toured 13 cities in 5
12 days. This is something that is sponsored by a lot of
13 groups, both CDE's office e-- or the State Library's, but
14 the CDE Office of Literacy, by the Department of Human
15 Services Office of Early Childhood, and by McDonalds, so
16 Ronald McDonald was with us for many of our stops.

17 And the goal is to -- is simply to go around
18 the state, to highlight the importance of early literacy
19 and talk to communities about both what they're doing
20 well, to share with them ideas from around the state
21 about what others are doing successfully, and to try to
22 raise awareness. So, we talk with a lot of local media
23 outlets trying to get families and educators involved in
24 this important issue.

25 We stopped at Florida Mesa Elementary down



1 in the southwest part of the state, in Bayfield, Rocky
2 Mountain Elementary School, the Pine River Library. If
3 you ever get down to Pine River this is a library that --
4 won the Best Small Library in the Nation Award this past
5 year. Remarkable small community-supported library. And
6 also worked with the PASO Program in Boulder, which is a
7 group that works to train Spanish-speaking women who
8 bring children into their home and provide that home
9 childcare services but want to do a better job of helping
10 to prepare those kids for preschool and kindergarten.
11 And so, it's a great program. And, again, just examples
12 of what we've seen around the state.

13 I also want to let you know that we've been
14 working on House Bill 1384, which was signed into law by
15 the governor on June 6th. That is the bill that creates
16 the Colorado Opportunity Scholarship Initiative. And
17 what we're hoping is that this -- and it started with a
18 \$30-million investment. It's inspired by the Denver
19 Scholarship Foundation, and it is intended to go beyond
20 simply providing scholarship dollars. Those are
21 important, but it will pair significant scholarships with
22 student support at the campuses when they arrive. So we
23 want to both support students before they leave high
24 school, during that transition time that summer where we
25 lose so many students, but then encourage the higher



1 education institutions to not just enroll them, but to
2 provide them with the support they need in order to be
3 successful students so they come back for that second
4 year, and ultimately earn a credential.

5 So, we know that this is -- builds on this
6 vision of a fully integrated system between K-12 and
7 higher ed, and foundation in business community where
8 we'll be looking for additional support to grow the
9 program.

10 If we -- we also are facing some real
11 challenges in the Department of Higher Education as we
12 look to re-do the way we allocate funds, state funds, to
13 colleges and universities. And, in fact, we'll be
14 looking to CDE for some ideas, because frankly, it's more
15 of a school funding formula type approach that all of you
16 are very familiar with.

17 House Bill 1319 requires us to develop this
18 new funding formula to do it over the next six months,
19 and to do it in consultation with all of the different
20 stakeholders around the state. So it's a pretty
21 aggressive timeline, and it's intended to award money
22 based on certain factors that we -- some of which are set
23 in statute, and some of which we need to identify on our
24 own, so we'll be looking beyond simply enrollment and add
25 things like graduation rates. And funding graduation, or



1 rather credentials, at different levels and looking at,
2 for example, whether we ought to be investing more in
3 rural schools, or urban schools, or schools with high
4 populations of Pell-eligible students, or schools with
5 high graduation rates that bring a lot of resources by
6 way of research dollars into the state.

7 So, there's a lot of things that we want to
8 be able to compensate, recognize, and reward. And you
9 also have a fixed pot of money. So, it's going to be --
10 excuse me -- challenging as we try to sort out exactly
11 how that will work.

12 The Colorado Commission on Higher Education
13 will be the ultimate decision maker, but we have a very
14 complex organizational structure already. We've hired on
15 a project manager at the department. We have different
16 levels of support. We have an executive advisory group
17 with a broad representation of interested parties, both
18 legislators, business leaders and education leaders.

19 We're going to have stakeholder teams around
20 facilitation funding, modeling and completing a cost-
21 driver analysis to look at what really causes higher
22 education costs to go up and drives tuition increase.
23 And we want to try to link all of this to a coherent
24 tuition policy going forward. So, you'll be hearing more
25 bout that over the next several months. It will kick off



1 at the commission's annual retreat, which will be in
2 July, and we, again, will be moving very, very quickly.

3 We also, and I know you guys are always
4 interested in this, we recently released our remedial
5 report in that we found there was some good news and some
6 not-so-good news. The good news is that the need for
7 remediation dropped three percentage points -- thank you
8 very much -- and we think that really reflects some of
9 the changes we've made to our remediation programs both
10 at the community colleges and to our adoption of the
11 supplemental academic instruction model that we're now
12 using at some of the four-year schools.

13 Certainly, we know that we need to continue
14 to work with our K-12 partners to reduce the need for
15 remediation as students come out, not just reduce the
16 remedial placement once they arrive at the college or
17 university. So that's something we'll continue to work
18 on and continue to report both to you, to the public, and
19 to the general assembly on going forward.

20 We do know, and it's not surprising to you,
21 that low-income students and students from communities of
22 color are dis-proportionately represented as needing
23 remediation. We also know that they are -- do not earn
24 the same number of credits in that first year of college.
25 We also know they're less likely to be retained, less



1 likely to graduate, certainly less likely to graduate on
2 time. That's a state-wide issue, because we know -- you
3 know better than anybody, the changing demographics in
4 our K-12 system. And we've got to do a better job of
5 serving those populations.

6 A couple of quick highlights. About 78
7 percent of Hispanic students enrolled at a 2-year college
8 required remedial education compared to 38 percent at 4-
9 year institutions. 59 percent of free-and-reduced-lunch
10 participants needed remediation compared to 31 percent of
11 non-free-and-reduced-lunch students. But the good news
12 of the first-time remedial students had higher first-year
13 retention rates, then non-remedial students at community
14 colleges. So, some of the things that the community
15 colleges are doing are really working to keep students
16 coming back, even if they've test into remedial courses.
17 And that's definitely a change from what we've seen in
18 the past.

19 And then, as I mentioned, we're looking at
20 lots of different alternatives. I'm happy to discuss any
21 of them with you, but I think you're aware of them. I
22 mentioned supplemental academic instruction, which allows
23 us to take students who test into remediation, but enroll
24 them in a college-level class to give them academic
25 support on the side so that they are not losing time or



1 spending money in a remedial course if they have the
2 ability with a little extra academic instruction on the
3 side, to complete that college level course in that first
4 semester. And we think that's really critical.

5 We also think that concurrent enrollment
6 that is now much more widely used at districts around the
7 state. WE think that will reduce the need for
8 remediation, and early remediation that is addressing the
9 remedial needs of students. Identifying those needs and
10 addressing them earlier while the juniors and seniors in
11 the high school. So those are things that we think are
12 going to be very positive and help us completely to move
13 the needle in a positive way on remediation. And that's
14 all I have that I need to report to you, and I'm happy to
15 take any questions or comments.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine.

17 MS. BERMAN: Thank you for coming, once
18 again. Question on the remediation. When students take
19 remediation courses in higher ed, who pays for that?

20 MR. GARCIA: Mr. Chair, the student does.
21 The student and the state. The student has to pay
22 tuition for the course, even though the student does not
23 get credit for the course. And the state, of course,
24 continues to pay in, at least at the community college
25 level, for those students who are enrolled in those



1 courses. So, it's very costly, in excess of -- I think,
2 the latest number was over \$50-million in total dollars
3 spent state-wide just on remedial courses, again, for
4 which students get no college credit.

5 MS. BERMAN: Do you happen to know the
6 breakdown between what this -- what students pay versus
7 what the state reimburses? Does the state reimburse, of
8 the 50-million, 80 percent? Or -- if you don't have any
9 idea, that's okay.

10 MR. GARCIA: Mr. Chair. Well, at the
11 community colleges the state pays a higher percentage of
12 the total cost, but I would guess that we're somewhere in
13 the area of 50/50. That is that student tuition has gone
14 up as a -- not just in absolute terms, but as a
15 percentage of the total cost of providing instruction.
16 So as the state is paying a smaller share than it did 10
17 years, 20 years ago, and the student is paying
18 proportionately a higher percentage. And statewide it
19 works out to about 2/3 student, 1/3 state if you look at
20 all kinds of institutions.

21 MS. BERMAN: Huh. And when we have these
22 remediation reports, are we also tracking whether that
23 amount is going down, decreasing, or are we looking more
24 at the actual outcomes from the remediation courses?

25 MR. GARCIA: Chair, the cost is going up,



1 and we are looking at that, so we look at the total cost
2 each year. And I remember the first year we did this we
3 were looking at a -- at something like 44-million, now
4 we're looking at 56-million.

5 MS. BERMAN: So even though the need for
6 remediation has decreased by 3 percent, the costs are
7 still going up, and that's because increased tuition
8 rates?

9 MR. GARCIA: Right, and that is it's a
10 percentage base and so we have more -- we're serving more
11 students, although a lower percentage of them need
12 remediation.

13 MS. BERMAN: I'm still learning all of that,
14 and so thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Marcia.

16 MS. NEAL: I'll just add to the remediation
17 discussion and I'm probably most -- the schools get,
18 every year, they know how many of their students are --
19 have to be remediated, which is a good thing for -- not
20 that it improves, but it's very good, I think, that they
21 know. And so, they have that goal and some -- we were
22 doing this in district 51, I don't know if we still are,
23 but we're -- CMU was offering a remedial class in the
24 high school to the high school seniors. Which I thought
25 was excellent, because then -- you know, some of these



1 kids, they don't know they're not proficient till they
2 get there. And so, CMU provided the professors, and I
3 don't know if they're still doing that, but I thought it
4 was a really good pilot program. I mean, and I think we
5 need to -- we need to have more focus on both sides. We
6 need to focus on that a lot; how many kids are not
7 proficient when they're graduating. And you wonder how
8 did they get that diploma if they're -- you know, they're
9 not ready to do math and they're not ready to do -- yeah.

10 MS. BERMAN: Exactly.

11 MS. NEAL: But --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Marcia, that sort of
14 introduced my question was -- which is do we have a
15 trigger at secondary that helps us perhaps in the -- in
16 the plan that students have, that helps us get an idea
17 that here's a student that is going to need to be
18 remediated, so that we can get to that a lot sooner. Or
19 have we not -- have you all had some discussions about
20 that, what we ought to be -- what -- where we get that
21 indicator, that flag, that says this is a kid who knows
22 he or she wants to go to college and doesn't -- probably
23 going to need remediation (indiscernible) trigger.

24 MR. GARCIA: Right. Mr. Chair, Ms.

25 Schroeder, yes and there's several different ways we do



1 that. One, is that we look at ACT scores, we look at --
2 we are now willing to work with the high schools that are
3 willing to administer the Accuplacer earlier, as early as
4 9th grade, so we can identify students who will need
5 remediation. And then, as CMU does, we can give them a
6 community college remedial curriculum. Give them a
7 course, either online or in person, and allow them to
8 take that at the same time they're completing their high
9 school math requirements. And we do know if they have
10 not completing their high school graduation math
11 requirements, they're also likely to need remediation.

12 But the frustrating thing I think for
13 students and for schools is that even if they complete
14 successfully their high school math requirements to earn
15 their diploma, that doesn't mean that they won't need
16 remediation when they arrive at a college campus.
17 Because we're going to look at their ACT scores or their
18 Accuplacer scores and then they find out.

19 And so that's what's dismaying the students.
20 They show up with their diploma fresh in their hand and
21 say, "I'm ready for college." And the college says,
22 "Well, not quite." And then sends them to a remedial
23 course. That's what we want to reduce or hopefully maybe
24 eliminate it.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Is some of the problem the



1 fact that there's a long time-span that maybe some
2 students are waiting three to five years before they
3 enroll and there's a, quite honestly, a loss of skill,
4 math skill?

5 MS. NEAL: I think so, yeah.

6 MR. GARCIA: Absolutely. One of the things
7 that I saw being the president of community college is we
8 have a lot of students who show up and they're 30 and 40
9 years old and they've long since forgotten high school
10 algebra.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Me too. Me too.

12 MR. GARCIA: Or even students who are good
13 at math and finished their high school math requirements
14 by the time they were in 10th grade and then put off
15 taking math as long as they possibly can, and they
16 forget, as we all do.

17 And so, one of the other things we've looked
18 at is not simply testing people and saying, "You place
19 into a remedial class." But testing them and saying, "You
20 have these deficiencies, and you can go to a math lab and
21 work on these things and come back and be re-tested."

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

23 MS. GARCIA: So, have more of the community
24 colleges are doing that, because we find that if we give
25 students a second chance with a little bit of a refresher



1 they can come back and test into a college level class
2 rather than be penalized this semester.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: That's great. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

5 MS. GOFF: Yes, and I don't -- I hope this
6 doesn't come across as a repetitive question. Are there
7 any institutions that are looking to start the SAI, the
8 supplementary instruction program, sooner than what it's
9 -- what the policy review recommendations say? Because I
10 think that was 2017, maybe, that far along down the line,
11 and I don't recall right now whether that's voluntary, or
12 whether that is something that is strongly encouraged for
13 all of the institutions to tie into this.

14 I know they're kind of concurrent
15 enrollment, but are -- is anybody looking to start
16 earlier than the earliest year indicated in the policy
17 recs?

18 MS. GARCIA: Mr. Chair. Yes, Ms. Goff,
19 absolutely. And, in fact, we have, I think, three
20 institutions that are already doing, you got a fourth
21 that's come to the commission and asked for approval. I
22 might not have those numbers right. There was a very
23 interesting Colorado Public Radio story on this just a
24 few weeks ago about Metro's success, because they began
25 implementing it right away and are finding great success.



1 So, we know that some of the four-year schools might not
2 have planned to do it, but as they looked and see the
3 success that some of the other schools are having, we
4 really anticipate that more will do it.

5 So, so far I know we have Metro State
6 University, Western State University, I believe Fort
7 Lewis has also applied, so we are seeing, I think, rapid
8 movement by the institutions who don't want to send
9 students they've admitted away to another community
10 college and know they might not ever come back. They
11 want to serve those schools on their campuses, so we're
12 seeing a pretty rapid adoption of that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions of the
14 Lieutenant Governor? If not, then I will say thank you
15 again for being here.

16 MS. NEAL: Thank you for coming.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I was glad to see you,
18 and you can take July off, because we won't be --

19 MR. GARCIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, it's
20 always a pleasure.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Next item on the agenda,
24 there are two items, both associated with BEST. You want
25 to come on up to the table? The first is the re-



1 appointment of Lyndon Burnett to the Public School
2 Capital Construction Assistance Board, and the second is
3 a report on the -- and I believe it's also an action
4 item, on the Building Excellent Schools Today Grant
5 awards. Mr. Commissioner?

6 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you very much Mr.
7 Chair. We have staff here that will walk you through as
8 you -- this happens every year, or sometimes twice a
9 year, the best projects come to you for approval. But
10 this is also somewhat unique as the chair of the BEST
11 Board is also upped at the first item for re-appointment.
12 And so, I think that's the first thing you have to deal
13 with. And it's been recommended to us that Mr. Lyndon
14 Burnett be re-appointed to the Best Board, as he meets
15 the qualifications. He's done an excellent job, quite
16 frankly.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So --

18 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, Madam Vice Chair.

20 MS. NEAL: Well, according to the State
21 Board rules, the State Board shall appoint three members
22 from different areas of the state, and from urban suburb
23 and in rural school district. One of the three members
24 shall have demonstrated experience regarding public
25 school facilities who is a school district board member



1 and at the time -- at the time of his appointment. And I
2 would therefore make a motion that we re-appoint Lyndon
3 Burnett to his current position the BEST Board.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll second that.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And there's a second. Is
6 --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Reluctantly.

8 MS. NEAL: Reluctantly, we know.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there any opposition
10 to the motion?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not at all.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Baring none the motion
13 carries. Congratulations Mr. Burnett.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, that wasn't
15 enough pain.

16 MR. BURNETT: Thank you, I think.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Now you can ask for
18 money.

19 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

20 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, Mr. Commissioner.

22 MS. NEAL: Do you want a report, or do you
23 want a motion on that?

24 COMM. HAMMOND: Leanne, did you want to
25 start early? I think Leanne was going to start with the



1 presentation.

2 MS. EMM: Yes. Thank you. Mr. Chair,
3 members of the board, before you today are -- for
4 consideration are the recommendations from the BEST Board
5 for the year's grant cycle.

6 One thing I wanted to remind you about is
7 the BEST program underwent the performance audit earlier
8 this year and one of the recommendations that were made
9 through the audit process was that the BEST Board develop
10 a standardized evaluation tool to evaluate the grant
11 applications that included criteria based on the priority
12 assessment data, and also the statutory priorities of
13 health and safety, security overcrowding, technology and
14 all others. And the BEST Board did adopt the
15 standardized evaluation tool and used it this year to
16 evaluate the projects, and this is the first year that a
17 scored rubric and tool like this has been used.

18 On June 3rd, Mr. Burnett, Mr. Newell and I
19 met with the legislative audit committee to also provide
20 an update on the progress that has been made in
21 implementing the audit recommendations. All of the
22 recommendations have been implemented except for the
23 partial implementation of the review of the priority
24 assessment that we spoke about this morning. We can't
25 implement that without the funding to go with it, so that



1 was a partially implemented recommendation. And also
2 then, a partial implementation of the matching
3 requirements that will be done over the summer, that was
4 the legislation that was passed that will be completed
5 over the summer.

6 And what I really want to pass along to you
7 is that the LAC, the Legislative Audit Committee, was
8 very complementary of the work that has been done by both
9 BEST Board and the division staff in order to implement
10 the recommendations. They say that the items that have
11 been implemented will add credibility to the program and
12 will really help as the legislation is looked at this
13 next year in how to fund programs, and they were very
14 pleased to see that the program was highly improved. So
15 -- and they made those statements, and it was very nice
16 to hear them say that to the staff and the BEST Board.

17 So, anyway, with that evaluation tool, I'd
18 like Scott to -- Scott Newell, to just briefly walk
19 through the methodology of this evaluation tool, and then
20 Mr. Burnett can speak to you about how the board used
21 that evaluation tool in this year's cycle.

22 MR. NEWELL: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good afternoon.

24 MR. NEWELL: Thank you. The process we used
25 to evaluate grant applications this year is new, we feel



1 improved, and as Ms. Emm indicated, it was a result of
2 our most recent performance audit.

3 In preparation of the Capital Construction
4 Assistance Board's board meetings, each board member was
5 given a summary book, and that summary book contained
6 narratives of each application, assessment data,
7 financial data, and project data, and a waver if
8 applicable.

9 The specific methodology used at the
10 meetings included an introduction of the project followed
11 by a two-minute presentation from each applicant to
12 discuss the context of their project. Following the
13 presentation, the board chair opened the floor up to any
14 discussions, questions, or comments pertaining to the
15 specifics of the project.

16 After the Capital Construction Assistance
17 Board reviewed the grant application each individual
18 Capital Construction Assistance Board member filled out
19 an evaluation tool. This evaluation tool itself is
20 broken down into 5 categories, with 14 different
21 evaluation criteria. The first evaluation criteria was
22 to identify the project's scope, and this was identified
23 as either health safety security, overcrowding,
24 technology, or other. The additional evaluation criteria
25 were specific to the conditions of the facility as they



1 relate to the state-wide assessment. Financial capacity
2 of the applicant, the project's proposal, which included
3 a demonstration of need, urgency, and compliance with the
4 guidelines. There were also other considerations which
5 looked at the appropriateness of cost and the due
6 diligence of the proposal. The last piece of the
7 evaluation sheet was a check box which denoted the
8 specific board member's decision to recommend the project
9 to the short list. In effect, a no motion from that
10 board member.

11 Capital Construction Assistance Board did
12 not discuss their scores or individual comments with each
13 other, and that process was repeated until all
14 applications were reviewed. Once all applications were
15 reviewed, the division staff tallied those scores in a
16 multi-tabbed spreadsheet, and that spreadsheet first took
17 the projects that were not recommended to the short list
18 and removed them from the scoring evaluation.

19 Then the spreadsheet was sorted by their
20 identified priority needs. So, they were given a
21 priority one for health and safety, priority two for
22 overcrowding, et cetera. Finally, the sorted
23 applications were prioritized by their evaluation score,
24 which was determined by the overall Capital Construction
25 Assistance Board's scores from the 14 categories.



1 Once that effort was completed the division
2 staff actually displayed the prioritized list to the
3 board, and a funding line was drawn at the set amount for
4 that cycle. Once the Capital Construction Assistance
5 Board reviewed the final list and made a final motion,
6 that list was approved and that's the projects that you
7 see before you today.

8 And, Mr. Chair, I'd like at this time to
9 turn it over to Mr. Burnett to talk about the process
10 from the board's perspective.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let me ask a clarifying
12 question first, if I might.

13 MR. NEWELL: Sure.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It sounded to me, if I
15 was understanding properly, that there was a potential
16 round of elimination prior to a health and safety
17 evaluation. Did I miss here, or is that accurate?

18 MR. NEWELL: So, what happened was each
19 project had a completed evaluation sheet, and we use that
20 to justify grants, and we also use that for our non-award
21 letters as well. So, those evaluation sheets still had an
22 identified priority at the time. At the very bottom
23 there would still be a recommendation to move it to the
24 short list. So, for various reasons, whether it be lack
25 of scope, lack of clarity, it could be not identified as



1 a qualifying project, or maybe it's another project.
2 They had the option at the bottom to make a motion to
3 move it to the short list for reasons that --

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Short list being the
5 elimination list.

6 MS. NEAL: No.

7 MR. NEWELL: Well, there were -- there were
8 three phases. So, there's a short list, which took the
9 projects I just spoke about --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let me just cut --

11 MR. NEWELL: Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. What I'm trying to
13 get at is were all health and safety issues brought to
14 the forefront and considered in the evaluation process?

15 MR. NEWELL: Every project was considered
16 during the evaluation process.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But there may be health
18 and safety issues that were not funded.

19 MR. NEWELL: That did not make it to the
20 funding, correct, for a sundry of reasons.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Thank you. Then
22 that helps me understand the methodology.

23 MR. NEWELL: Sure.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I understood it
25 correctly.



1 MR. NEWELL: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sir.

3 MR. BURNETT: Thank you Mr. Chair -- thank
4 you Mr. Chairman. So, this was quite a change from last
5 year. In the -- in the past our boards have discussed
6 these projects, it looked the same as far as the
7 presentation goes, the time amount that the school
8 district had to do the presentation what not, but the
9 scoring tool and the rubric we used -- and I was hoping
10 that it would work this way, and I was very satisfied
11 that it did, it really focuses in on the -- I mean, It
12 was designed right with the wording of the legislation.
13 That was one of the criticisms of the audit committee;
14 they wanted this rubric to reflect exactly what the law
15 says, and so it does. And if it wasn't a health and
16 safety issue then it probably didn't go very far in the
17 process. It has to be, first of all, priority one, which
18 is health and safety. And then going down from there you
19 start looking at the specifics of the application, what
20 they're asking for, who else they'll take into
21 consideration, whether some districts have enough money
22 to do these projects on their own, if they have bonding
23 capacity.

24 All these things fit into the scoring
25 rubric. Everybody goes through and scores this and



1 nobody knows the outcome, so it just felt a lot cleaner
2 and a lot better to me, and I was real pleased the way it
3 came out. And, I mean, everybody sees the list when it's
4 finished and when it's finalized and so I thought it was
5 a much cleaner process and I'm pleased the way it came
6 out. We do have a little bit of tweaking to do on a few
7 of the things on there. Yes and no questions scored from
8 1 to 10 being one of those, so -- but primarily it really
9 worked well, I think, and I think our board's pretty well
10 satisfied with it. We're continuing to work on that and
11 tweak it a little bit more, but it was a great tool.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions? Angelika?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not sure this relates to
14 grants for facilities, but I'm aware of the fact that
15 different districts have different staffing capacity in
16 terms of making really valid applications, different
17 levels of sophistication. For example, in the pricing,
18 in the articulation of what are the needs and identifying
19 whether this is really health and safety, or whether it's
20 a wish list, et cetera. Do you find that, that there are
21 some applications that are -- they may be very important
22 things for the -- needs for the kids, but they just don't
23 do a very good job in the process of applying, and what
24 are -- what resources are available for districts like
25 that?



1 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair, we do see a lot of
2 difference in the quality of the application, the way
3 it's written. We encourage districts, we have a great
4 staff and that's what they're there for, to work with
5 these districts and do that.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

7 MR. BURNETT: To the extent they don't, or
8 don't follow what we tell them, yeah. And there is
9 overlapping. Some of these you read the application and
10 it's clearly about overcrowding or other things, but
11 there is a health and safety component to it, but
12 sometimes it's kind of a stretch. But there is a lot of
13 difference in the quality of the applications we get. I
14 would agree.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: And you're confident that
16 there's an -- there's some support for those folks. It
17 always felt a bit unfair. Certainly, in the other grant
18 -- grants I'm aware of that there were districts that had
19 grant providers, for example, who really knew how to
20 effectively write a grant and others who did not.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, sorry.

22 MS. EMM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. Emm.

24 MS. EMM: One of the findings in the audit
25 was that more targeted outreach needed to be done for



1 those projects that were deemed to have higher needs, and
2 things like that, and so that's one of the things that we
3 will expect to see from revising the priority assessment
4 and updating it to more current data, is the ability to
5 actually do some more of that targeted outreach to
6 specific districts, and ensure that they can bring
7 forward good applications.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

9 MS. BERMAN: I'll just say that my
10 observation and having had more and more opportunities
11 now to see schools that have had the best grants is just
12 awesome what we are providing for kids when we can
13 provide that funding, or at least help with that funding.
14 I know that communities are doing it themselves. It's a
15 huge community piece that brings communities together,
16 but it's just wonderful for the kids.

17 MR. BURNETT: Mr. Chair. If I could, I
18 would say that I'm not really aware that they're using
19 grant writers. This is such a specialty application it's
20 primarily the bookkeeping department, their financial
21 people, and the superintendent that put these together
22 with some help from the boards, but not -- I'm not aware
23 of any that were done by a professional. I mean,
24 that doesn't mean it didn't happen, but I'm just -- I
25 think typically it's the superintendent and the staff



1 that have to get all the information together and write
2 these grants for.

3 MS. BERMAN: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions?
5 Comments? Discussion? I think a motion is in order.

6 MS. NEAL: As almost everybody in the room
7 knows, I sometimes am the fly in the ointment for this
8 group. I have to have these conflicting emotions, and I
9 did it last year, of course, attend the audit committee,
10 at which Leanne did a great job of representing us. And
11 it's well known that I would -- not a real fan of the
12 legislation that created the program. However, having
13 said all of that, I have to respect the work they've
14 done, and how hard they work at it. And I noticed that
15 Pam and I are well represented on this list. We have
16 about half of it.

17 MS. EMM: As you should be.

18 MS. NEAL: As we should be. So given all of
19 that I would make a motion that we accept the BEST
20 recommended grant awards.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: As submitted.

22 MS. NEAL: As submitted.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There's a second,
24 Angelika's the second. Any discussion? No discussion.
25 Is there any objection? Hearing none, motion carries.



1 Thank you very much.

2 MR. BURNETT: Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, good job.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, take care
5 (indiscernible).

6 MS. NEAL: And, Lyndon, we're going to get
7 together and work this out this fall. Right?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, ma'am.

9 MS. NEAL: Well, no. We had the long
10 conversation about what we're going to -- with the group,
11 not the best award, so with a class group.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The next item on the
13 agenda is an action item concerning Title I funding
14 project, multi-district online charter schools. Mr.
15 Commissioner.

16 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As I
17 recall at our last board meeting, we've brought forward
18 to you a pilot project, as a reference, our desire to
19 study the portability of Title I funding. In the past
20 the Department of Education based upon requests we have
21 received of the department, could not support that, and
22 there was not a way to do that.

23 But as time has moved on and as requests
24 have been received, we've come upon a way to make a pilot
25 project work with Hope Online Schools being really the



1 key project in this type of work. And also I -- what
2 people don't understand sometimes, the complexity when we
3 have to do this work -- when you move to a concept of
4 portability, because we have to make it work at the
5 department, is so intensive, because we don't have the
6 systems. This is what led to part of the pilot project
7 being for a two-year period, and during that two-year
8 period and during that two-year period, we would examine
9 the consequences and what are the intended and unintended
10 consequences and what would it take to do this statewide?

11 Because we do believe the Title I funds have
12 not kept up with the current era of funding as they
13 should with our schools. What better way to approve it -
14 - review that with a pilot? We know that the pilot is not
15 about controversy. That's obvious. I'm not so sure what
16 would be (indiscernible).

17 That said, staff have done an incredible job
18 of working this through, and we want to present to you
19 where we're at the rules specificity today, and we hope
20 to gain your approval to move forward. Thank you.

21 Keith.

22 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

24 MR. OWEN: So, good afternoon. And you

25 might recall in Grand Junction we had an opportunity to



1 kind of outline the way that Title I funds flow from the
2 federal government, to the state, out to the districts.
3 And we're going to review some of that today, but
4 immediately after the Grand Junction meeting we did set
5 our team together and really try to figure out what we
6 thought would be the best way to do a pilot to really put
7 some criteria to the question, and to really see if it
8 was feasible to get that done within the 2014-'15 school
9 year. And so, I am happy to say that our team, I think,
10 worked extremely hard and put some really good thought to
11 a very difficult question and, I think, came up with some
12 really good criteria for this potential pilot for you
13 today.

14 So, that being said, we wanted to really
15 study the way that Title I funds were allocated across
16 the state knowing that multi-district online schools have
17 really changed the way that delivery is happening to
18 students and not in the traditional way of a school
19 district's boundaries. But students receiving
20 educational delivery outside of attendance boundaries.
21 And so, we wanted to really make sure, back to our
22 original problem statement, that we're taking a look at
23 that changing landscape and really trying to understand
24 how to help support students inside of that landscape.

25 So, as always, we really want to try to make



1 sure that there are a ton of acronyms in this
2 presentation and throughout the day, and we want to make
3 sure that people are aware, so we did put a glossary,
4 kind of a definition sheet, to really help everyone. I'm
5 not going to read through all of these, but if you get
6 kind of stuck, feel free to jump back into the sheet and
7 really look through it. Because, like I said, this --
8 we're talking federal and state, different definitions
9 now, so we've got a list of acronyms here for everyone.

10 And I think was this where you were going to
11 start, Leanne?

12 MS EMM: Sure.

13 MR. OWEN: So, my (indiscernible) real
14 quick. I might real quick introduce our team of that --
15 if that makes sense, so that you are --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

17 MR. OWEN: So, everyone's aware of who's at
18 the table, and kind of the role that we're going to --
19 they're going to each have during the presentation. So,
20 Leanne.

21 MS. EMM: Leanne Emm, Associate Commissioner
22 for School Finance.

23 MS. BOWLEN: Trish Bowlen (ph) State Title I
24 Director.

25 MR. DILL: Tony Dill, Senior Assistant



1 Attorney General.

2 MS. EMM: Keith, can you also introduce
3 who's in the audience pertaining to this topic?

4 MR. OWEN: Sure. I think we have -- I don't
5 know if I'm going to capture everyone that's here, but I
6 think we have Heather O'Mara, from Hope Online Schools,
7 and I think we have Pat McGraw from Douglas County School
8 District. Anyone else that is from the school district
9 or the pilot that we're talking about here today? Okay.

10 MS. EMM: Thank you.

11 MR. OWEN: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Leanne, fire away.

13 MS. EMM: I will point out one other staff
14 member that has worked very hard on this project, and
15 it's David Schneiderman back here, and it's -- he's our
16 Grant Fiscal Supervisor, and he's worked very hard on
17 this also.

18 MR. OWEN: I would second that.

19 MS. EMM: Wanted to point him out, too. So,
20 anyway, just as some grounding and some reminders, the
21 Title I, part A, of the elementary secondary education
22 act, is that federal program that provides financial
23 assistance for children with low -- from low-income
24 families that help those children achieve the state
25 academic standards.



1 And, as you remember from Grand Junction,
2 there are four pieces of Title I, part A, and they are
3 based on the population and the population and the census
4 poverty estimates, and then the cost of education in each
5 of -- each state. And as we talked, also, it is based on
6 those census data estimates, which incorporate the
7 district of residence for students. And the census
8 bureau estimates the numbers of 5 to 17-year-olds within
9 those districts, and then they estimate the numbers of
10 what are called formula children within those districts.

11 When one of the -- one off the acronyms that
12 we use a lot throughout this -- throughout this
13 presentation is LEA, and what you can do, is you can
14 equate an LEA to a district, so that's how that
15 translates.

16 Under federal law, a special LEA is one that
17 is not on the census list, so when the USDE strikes --
18 when they determine those formulas, a special LEA is not
19 on that individual list. So, CSI, the Charter School
20 Institute, and the charter -- the School for the Deaf and
21 the Blind are not on that list, so they are considered a
22 special LEA. Therefore, we need to go in and adjust
23 every other LEA's allocation to get money to the special
24 LEAs. And those numbers are not on a student-by-student
25 basis, they are derived numbers based on, if you will



1 remember, the bubble chart that I would like to refer to
2 from Grand Junction. It is the -- it was the bubble-page
3 with the -- with all of the formula's in there.

4 This is the illustration of those four pots,
5 so you have, out of our \$152-million, we have the basic
6 allocation, the concentration targeted, and that
7 education finance incentive grant, which is allocated to
8 the state based on the amount of contribution that the
9 state makes towards school finance.

10 And then, each one of these pots is
11 allocated to the school district for that pot, so when
12 we're doing the special allocations, we have to do that
13 special allocation in each one of those pots, and then
14 come up with the total. So, it does -- it gets complex.
15 But I shouldn't say complex, maybe I should say
16 interesting, instead. And it's a manual process and we
17 talked about that in Grand Junction also.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Can I just make one point
19 there, too, on that chart. That some districts qualify
20 for all four of those pots, some districts only qualify
21 for one. And so that makes the allocation that goes to
22 the district, or the LEA, different for every district in
23 the state, and so that creates different numbers of
24 dollars that go to districts, and so that, I think, helps
25 a little bit when we get down the road. We'll explain



1 why some of those allocations look differently. Yeah,
2 sorry.

3 MS. EMM: Thank you. No, that was great.
4 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

6 MS. EMM: Again, this is just a reminder.
7 The census bureau passes along information to the
8 Department of Education that then tells the state how
9 much allocation each district gets, and then we go
10 through the adjustment process, and then once the
11 allocation goes down to the LEA, the LEAs determine how
12 much is available to each school in the district to make
13 those determinations.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And my understanding
15 is that an individual LEA determines that based on free-
16 and-reduced lunch versus a sense of -- census data.

17 MS. EMM: They go through a process, yes.

18 MR OWEN: So, you're reusing different
19 calculations. Okay. Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please proceed.

21 MR OWEN: So I'm going to quickly go through
22 the criteria that -- and the -- really, the pieces that
23 we put together to decide what we should look at when it
24 comes to how we want to put this to the State Board, and
25 the question for the school districts. We wanted to look



1 at a pilot that really was specific around multi-district
2 and online schools. One of the things that we determined
3 quickly after the Grand Junction meeting, is we also
4 wanted to make sure that we understood the impact to the
5 school district that would be potentially shifting
6 resources from to accommodate this pilot program, and so
7 we were able to do that in pretty short order.

8 I'm going to talk through the methodology
9 that we used and the timeline will come up, and at the
10 very end of the presentation we're going to outline what
11 we think would be the measures of success and a
12 reporting mechanism back to the state board over the
13 course of the next two years.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent, okay.

15 MR OWEN: Some of the pieces we wanted to
16 take into consideration when developing the criteria, was
17 we wanted to make sure that we were consistent with the
18 current method that we're using currently for CSI and for
19 'CAUSE DB. There's a method in place, the staff
20 understands that method, USDOE understands that method
21 inside of the guidance that they give to the state, and
22 so we thought it was very important to make sure we stay
23 within that established criteria.

24 We also wanted to make sure that with the
25 stakeholders, that the school district would understand



1 their role in the review and the monitoring process, that
2 will happen each year as part of being a Title I district
3 and being -- taking in Title I funds. The last piece
4 that we really wanted to -- the last piece that we really
5 talked about in Grand Junction was making sure, and
6 Commissioner Hammond talked about this, that USDOE
7 understands what we're doing, and it can look at, and see
8 if there's any issues that they would raise, any barriers
9 that would come from this pilot.

10 And we also wanted to assure that the
11 Attorney General's Office would be in support and feel
12 like this was something that the state board and the
13 department had the ability to do. We've worked closely
14 with Tony Dill, the Attorney General's Office, throughout
15 his whole pilot process, and he has determined that he
16 feels like this is within our authority, within the State
17 Board's Authority, and that this pilot would meet the
18 guidance. And he also has reviewed what the USDOE has
19 given to the state and feels like that falls within that
20 authority. And so, he's here today to answer any
21 questions down the road too, that you might have about
22 that ability. But we feel like that was very important,
23 and we feel like we've met that threshold.

24 So, the criteria. On this first page, this
25 criteria is laid out in sequential order. On the next



1 slide that I'll show you is kind of a visual of all the
2 multi-district online schools in the state, and then how
3 that looks as the criterias apply to each of the schools
4 in the state. But I want to kind of just give you a
5 bullet as to the criteria and why we utilize that
6 criteria for this pilot project.

7 So, the first thing we looked at is that we
8 really had to have a multi-district online school. And
9 this multi-district online school really has to serve
10 students outside of the boundaries of the local education
11 agency. That's really the key and the point that has
12 brought this whole thing up.

13 The second criteria that we applied, is that
14 they must not have CSI as an authorizer. The reason for
15 that, is we already go through a special allocation
16 process with CSI, and so these schools are adjusted --
17 the schools that CSI authorizes are already adjusted for.

18 The third criteria was that at a minimum the
19 student -- they have 10 free lunch students from outside
20 the LEA's boundaries. And why we chose that 10, is that
21 that's already criteria that aligns with USDOE's minimum
22 threshold for basic and targeted grants under Title I,
23 and they've already utilized that 10 student formula
24 criteria.

25 The next criteria was that the school must



1 have a significantly higher free lunch percentage
2 compared to the LEA's percentage. And, again, this
3 reflects the significant impact that the multi-district
4 online school has on the ability of the district to serve
5 resident students that generate the allocation from the
6 feds.

7 And so, the differential there is something
8 that we'll outline as I go through the visual on the next
9 page. The last -- no. The second-to-last criteria is
10 that they are currently serving schools utilizing Title I
11 funds during the '13-'14 school year. Why we felt that
12 was important, is that it demonstrates that there's
13 already a school that qualifies for Title I services in
14 the LEA that is currently receiving and drawing down
15 funds within the school district.

16 And then the last piece is really a piece
17 around their ability to serve USDA school meal programs
18 in the schools at different sites within the multi-
19 district online school. And one of the reasons for that,
20 was that it gives us some assurance that there's an
21 ability for the online school to see direct students, and
22 face-to-face opportunities for supplemental instructional
23 programs that is not always the case with multi-district
24 online schools.

25 (indiscernible) multi-district online



1 schools only deliver the main program, so educational
2 program, online. And so, the ability to supplement that
3 main program online with a face-to-face opportunity
4 really gives us some assurance that supplemental
5 opportunities will take place as a result of that. And
6 so that's the last criteria that we applied.

7 And if I look at the last -- this sheet
8 here, this kind of shows you the visual of the criteria
9 as you take every multi-district online school in the
10 state, and (indiscernible) them through the six pieces --

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Keith, can I ask
12 before you -- I'm sorry. You can't see my hand waving
13 over here.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Clarifying question
15 please, go ahead. Sure.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But before you go
17 onto that on the criteria, was there any consideration to
18 look at a student achievement of the multi-district
19 online school that you would be selecting?

20 MR. OWEN: We didn't -- Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

22 MR. OWEN: Yeah. We did not utilize any
23 type of criteria. Although we are going to talk later
24 about how that's one of the measures that we're going to
25 try to identify with the LEA and with the school as a



1 result of the pilot. But we did not screen any of the
2 schools out based on current student achievement results.
3 Is that what you're asking?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, whether it was
5 a criteria, because I know there's only one multi-
6 district online school that we're discussing, which is
7 Hope, so will you talk to us at least about what their
8 student achievement level is right now?

9 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

11 MR. OWEN: We can certainly talk a little
12 bit more about that and where their current performance
13 and where they're on an accountability clock.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thanks.

15 MR. OWEN: So as you look through applying
16 the criteria you can see the 25, 30 schools and there's
17 two that are in CSI, (indiscernible) drops, and you can
18 see where that second piece of criteria really takes out
19 quite a few schools, because they do not serve to at
20 least 10 students, free students, and that means free
21 lunch-eligible students from outside the school district.
22 And so that drops off another percentage of the schools,
23 two times the free lunch, or a significant difference
24 between the school and the district. Drops off about six
25 more schools.



1 And then you get to having served Title I.
2 That means that within the LEA that's authorizing the
3 multi-district online school already, that this school,
4 it has a substantial population of students that would
5 qualify the school for Title I services. And so, then
6 you go to two schools in the state that qualify under
7 that criteria, Goal Academy and Hope Online Learning
8 Elementary. And then when you go to USDA meal programs
9 you can see that it clearly goes down to one that would
10 fit within the pilot. And that is that Hope Online
11 Elementary currently does serve, my understand is,
12 breakfast and lunch programs in their learning centers
13 across the state. You know, it might just be lunch in
14 some, breakfast in others, but there's -- there is some
15 ability to serve a lunch program in the online learning
16 sites there.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

18 MR. OWEN: One of the things we really try
19 to do, and Trish is going to talk about outreach right
20 now, but -- this sheet shows the implications, the
21 financial implications, of the pilot project and she's
22 going to tell you kind of the communication strategy that
23 we've used with the districts over the course of the last
24 couple weeks to clearly outline the pilot and the impact
25 to them.



1 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 MS. EMM: So, we realize that this was -- it
4 had potential to cause some uncomfortable conversations
5 with districts, so we very, from the beginning, realized
6 the need to reach out to the districts that would be
7 impacted if this pilot were to move forward.

8 So, on the screen you can see the districts
9 that that would be, in fact, impacted. And so, we
10 drafted email communication, but also made phone calls to
11 every, single district. I believe there was only one
12 district from whom we did not get a return phone call,
13 but otherwise we spoke to every district about what this
14 pilot meant for them, what it meant for them moving
15 forward with the current application for '14-'15
16 (indiscernible) as well as answered any questions they
17 had.

18 For the districts that I contacted, I think
19 there was about 10 of them, it was very amendable
20 conversations. People understand that the way in which
21 some students are getting their education is changing,
22 and so there's a need to determine if we need to change
23 the way, in fact, we're allocating funds.

24 Keith, you contacted districts as well, and
25 (indiscernible), my boss, also contacted districts. So -



1 -

2 MR. OWEN: Great. So, we're happy to talk
3 about that further, if there's any questions specific to
4 that. Leanne's going to go ahead and talk through the
5 flow of the funds for the pilot, and the timeline for
6 that, and then we'll wrap up with kind of the criteria
7 and the outcomes piece.

8 MS. EMM: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, proceed.

10 MS. EMM: So, this -- the -- this chart, if
11 you'll recall, looks very similar to the one that we use
12 for CSI, and as we had spoken before, that was one of the
13 criteria's that we wanted to ensure was that we were
14 using the same methodology that we'd use with a special
15 LEAs at CSI and School for the Deaf and Blind that we
16 would with the LEA, with the pilot, with the pilot online
17 school.

18 So, looking at the -- looking at this chart
19 you would see that, for instance, Mapleton's preliminary
20 allocation would be adjusted downward by \$5000, and each
21 one of these districts would be adjusted downward in red
22 with the change the \$547,000 going over to Douglas
23 County. So, again, it's a zero-sum game. There's no
24 additional funds, it's -- you reduce some, give it to the
25 other.



1 And these are preliminary allocations. In
2 the fall we will get final allocations, so these numbers
3 are likely to change again, but I'm not sure, at this
4 point, how significant those changes would be, but that
5 is how we would go through and determine those
6 allocations.

7 MR. OWEN: So, Mr. Chair, the outcomes for
8 the multi-district online school, and I'm not going to
9 say MDOLS, pilot, is two-year pilot with the following
10 research agenda. We really want to -- and this, I think,
11 gets to Ms. Berman's question a little bit. Really want
12 to start the impact of additional Title I, part A funds,
13 going to Douglas County, and the strategies implemented
14 for eligible students, including those in multi-district
15 online schools.

16 But one of the things I want to, I think, be
17 clear about, is this is -- this pilot is really about
18 impacting the LEA, Douglas County School District and the
19 inequity of them authorizing a multi-district online
20 school has caused in their own school district with this
21 difference of free-and-reduced-lunch students being
22 served at a district school that is primarily for kids
23 outside of their school. Boundaries of the LEA and what
24 that's done to the allocation that is derived for the
25 kids that live within Douglas County School District.



1 And so while there is a potential that Hope
2 Online could get some additional funding through this
3 pilot, the LEA, Douglas County School District, I think
4 one of the things that was driving -- they're here and
5 they can talk to if there's questions about this, but one
6 of the things that I sense from the conversations I've
7 had, is that they have a desire to start serving some
8 impact in schools and Castle Rock that are -- the free-
9 and-reduced-lunch count is going up every year, but
10 they're not able to currently serve those schools,
11 because their funds that are generated locally are being
12 used to support Hope Online School.

13 And so, this pilot really is about what's
14 happening at Douglas County School District, not
15 specifically what's happening with Hope. And so, I just
16 wanted to kind of outline that, too. Although the issue
17 is being driven by a school that's being authorized by
18 Douglas County. Okay?

19 We also want to be able to study the impact
20 of descending districts. That was the sheet -- two
21 sheets prior that shows the impact of them and the
22 funding loss that happens there. We want to see over the
23 next year or two what happens, and are they losing their
24 ability to serve because of this or are they able to
25 adjust and make the kind of necessary changes that are --



1 that would become a result of the pilot.

2 The other thing that's important for us, I
3 think, that we want to see throughout this, is what does
4 an effective Title I program look like in a multi-
5 district online school setting that is primarily
6 delivered over online services. Are there opportunities
7 for us to kind of showcase and look at best practices of
8 what supplemental would do for online? How some face to
9 face with online really does push student achievement to
10 a higher level? How that accountability in local centers
11 could maybe help propel a different way of delivering
12 online. And so that's another piece that we really want
13 to take into consideration.

14 One of the -- the second bullet here is
15 really about the adjusted allocation, LEA, which Douglas
16 County, in which I talked about. But we really want to
17 see what Douglas County does over the next couple years
18 with their Title I plan for the school district, and are
19 they able to now serve additional schools, or are they
20 going to make some other choices with the funding? And
21 that's something that is a local decision in every school
22 district in the state has to decide how they put their
23 allocation out that they received from the state to the
24 schools that need to be served. And then for the
25 department, which I think Commissioner Hammond talked



1 about quite a bit.

2 We really want to look at the system
3 challenges that this puts to Leanne's team, and to our
4 Title I team, and their ability to strike these
5 allocations in a different manner, and also how does that
6 impact their ability to get the money out clearly,
7 efficiently, and on time, and do we need to build a
8 different system? If this is the right way striking
9 these allocations, do we need to build a different system
10 and automate it for the future, that keeps the staff from
11 having to do this by hand?

12 And I think over the next two years that's something
13 that we can push for, and then if we have to, potentially
14 work out, if we have the funding, or ask for additional
15 funding to make that happen.

16 And the last piece on the recommendations,
17 based on all the information that we've provided to you,
18 our research with USDOE, our work with the Attorney
19 General's Office, we recommend proceeding with the pilot
20 allocation, we recommend utilizing Hope Online Academy's
21 elementary school for establishing the re-allocation to
22 Douglas County for the fiscal year '14-'15. We recommend
23 this being a two-year pilot, '14-15', '15-'16, and then
24 we recommend two reports to the State Board of Education
25 on the progress of this pilot. One would be April 2015,



1 and why that timeframe? Because that's about when we
2 (indiscernible) the preliminary allocations that we start
3 pushing out to school districts every spring.

4 And so, before we push out allocations in
5 the spring, we really want to talk with you about what
6 we've learned over the course of this year, and make sure
7 that we're still being consistent with what the hopes and
8 expectations were. And then we also want to have a
9 summary report that we would conclude with April 2016
10 that would come to State Board and then talk a little
11 bit, too, I think, about whether we wanted to push this
12 out statewide, what are lessons that we've learned, what
13 are the staffing impacts, those types of things.

14 So that, Mr. Chair, is our recommendation,
15 and this is where we're currently at. We're happy to
16 answer any questions that you or the State Board has.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.
18 Angelika's been patient. She has a question.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So, I'm not sure that I
20 understood clearly whether the criteria that you've used
21 for this pilot is the criteria that you'll ultimately
22 use. In which case we're just talking about one school,
23 one multi-district online school in the future. Assuming
24 that this pilot is -- demonstrates good things for kids.
25 Would that mean this will be the only multi-district --



1 because the criteria went down to that level, and the
2 argument is that the criteria that were chosen were
3 appropriate for a district to have these funds, these
4 Title I funds, so I'm kind of wondering --

5 MR. OWEN: Sure.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Aren't you in that position
7 that you're just talking about one?

8 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, I can -- let me
9 add that (indiscernible).

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Commissioner, please.

11 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you. I mean,
12 ultimately, this -- the lessons learned from this could
13 lead to a complete Title I portability statewide. You
14 heard from Mapleton School District, a letter which
15 really isn't germane to this, it isn't part of it,
16 because there was some reallocation of about \$5000 from
17 there. But an issue they brought forward was a very
18 valid issue that their -- it's just the nature of the
19 beast. You have many -- when you do census the way that
20 the federal government does, to determine Title I
21 allocation.

22 Many undocumented residents are not counted.
23 They could be by the way the census works, and that would
24 increase, for example, districts that have high
25 concentrations of poverty, that would increase their



1 allocations.

2 I would challenge that districts like
3 Mapleton, parts of Denver, it -- there is some
4 inequities, because you have pockets that we know that
5 don't get counted in census. Therefore, they don't get
6 as much money as they probably would.

7 What we have talked about, it may be more
8 fair to go to a complete re-allocation of funding based
9 upon free lunch statewide. No way could we handle that
10 now, and we don't even know what all the consequences
11 would be, because there's so many variables when you get
12 in a hold, harmless, and all the other aspects of Title I
13 funding. It's a nightmare in itself.

14 But it really will help lead the discussion
15 even if -- I doubt we'll ever hear the word
16 "reauthorization", but at some point if that ever
17 happens, that helps guide that, but more importantly,
18 state-wide, if we have the authority to do this at some
19 point statewide, what have we learned here, and we may
20 actually be up on something that could possibly benefit
21 those districts. Just don't know that yet, and that's --
22 but that is an outcome that could fall from the study.
23 So (indiscernible).

24 MS. SCHROEDER: But the argument is that
25 access to those kids is related to feeding them, to



1 providing them lunches or breakfasts, and so if you
2 change the criteria --

3 COMM. HAMMOND: Well, right now -- excuse
4 me. Right now, the criteria is really -- what is
5 reasonable criteria that we can do to handle -- a pilot
6 that we can handle manually. That is reasonable. And if
7 we were able to have the necessary system then there
8 would be no criteria, it would -- Title I would be
9 completely reallocated based upon free -- you -- the
10 census data determines a total (indiscernible) reality.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: I think I understand that,
12 but the idea is that this -- these resources should go to
13 those providers because they have contact with them, and
14 if you change the criteria then you no longer have that
15 content -- contact with those students, and then you're
16 potentially undermining providing the services that those
17 funds are designed to provide. So, if you change the
18 criteria, then you're -- that's significantly different
19 than what happens in brick-and-mortar schools where
20 they're, in fact, they are providing free breakfast and
21 lunch, and they have the opportunity to provide tutoring,
22 or whatever else those kids need. Which you're not going
23 to have in an online environment.

24 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. I think Dr.
25 Schroeder's question is a good one. And I think what we



1 were doing in this pilot is being more restrictive. One
2 of the things we hope to learn is are there other ways in
3 providing supplemental support to students through online
4 settings that wouldn't necessitate potentially having
5 free lunch, free breakfast, or something available for
6 face-to-face. There might be.

7 But, in this situation, with the impact to
8 staff and our ability to have some level of, I think,
9 evidence to support supplemental instructional
10 opportunities going on. It's more restrictive than it
11 potentially would need to be in the future, I think, and
12 that's -- that's why, for this pilot, it is restrictive.
13 I don't know that you'd have to have that restriction in
14 a year or two, that you could potentially step back and
15 say, really, it's about students being served in a
16 setting and there's no funding that's generating -- that,
17 from the district of residents that's funding the support
18 that's happening, what's happening is draining the
19 funding that comes in from students that reside within
20 that district, and they're not being served in another
21 way.

22 And so I think the issue of trying to locate
23 the funds back to where the district of residents, and
24 then flowing those funds to wherever the students are
25 served is something that potentially could be addressed



1 through just looking at free lunch throughout the state
2 and throughout all our schools, and striking a whole
3 different way of allocations in the future that don't
4 have anything to do with census data from the state going
5 out to the districts.

6 But that is a massive undertaking, and I
7 think that's what Commissioner Hammond's getting at, is
8 that our hope is that through this pilot, through
9 studying the way of striking these allocations in this
10 way, it might lead us to just completely scrapping the
11 current system and trying to fund and to develop a new
12 system that gets more precise.

13 It's not going to change the dollar amount,
14 so you're going to still have maybe a little bit more
15 going to one district if it's concentrated and they have
16 a higher free lunch. It's more accurate, but it -- what
17 sit would lead us to is maybe being more precise, so
18 we're getting more precise about the concentration of
19 poverty in communities across the state and in schools
20 across the state, and then the funding's flowing in a
21 more precise manner as well.

22 COMM. HAMMOND: And that could be -- that
23 would be naturally adjusted in such a model every year
24 (indiscernible).

25 MS. SCHROEDER: But we would want to know



1 that for an online school what are the extra services
2 that they can provide without having the physical contact
3 with the kids, to make sure that they, in fact, are
4 getting the extra services that we want to see them get.
5 And, I don't know, is that something you're going to be
6 measuring in the pilot?

7 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. It's actually
8 something that our Title I office is monitoring and doing
9 with every --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

11 MR. OWEN: Every one of these multi-district
12 online schools it's currently a Title I school, they're
13 subject to that type of monitoring. But, as you probably
14 saw through that whole list, very few are actually being
15 served as Title I schools. And so, there is a couple
16 there, in '13-'14, out of that whole group, three, that
17 are being served with Title I funds, and so they're
18 subject to that already.

19 But for this pilot project one of the things
20 we wanted to take into consideration is, you know, how
21 does that look and how is that going to be supported.
22 And one of the most effective ways is having some face-
23 to-face, at least from a more traditional point of view,
24 but there might be some ways to demonstrate that that's
25 not as necessary, and I think we'd have to be open to



1 that.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine had a question.

3 MS. BERMAN: I have a bunch of questions.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

5 MS. BERMAN: Ready?

6 MR. OWEN: Sure.

7 MS. BERMAN: Does somebody want to go before
8 me?

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Anybody down here want to
10 go before Elaine? You've got an hour, Elaine, keep it
11 under an hour.

12 MS. BERMAN: Well, you know, thank you.
13 Well, so a couple things. One is, it looks like we have
14 not heard back from the United States Department of
15 Education regarding the pilot year?

16 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 MR. OWEN: Yes, that asterisk -- and I meant
19 to be clear in the presentation is that yes, we have
20 heard back, and that Tony Dill has the Attorney Generals'
21 Office had a chance to review what they sent to us, and
22 then he was able to send the communication of the
23 commissioner myself supporting that this has -- we have
24 the legal basis to do this.

25 MS. BERMAN: The AG's office and DC?



1 MR. OWEN: Yes.

2 MS. BERMAN: Okay, great. And I -- unless I
3 missed it, did you address my question around student
4 achievement and hope --

5 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? So, if you think of
6 this pilot being specifically for Douglas County, and an
7 inequity that's caused by a school within Douglas County,
8 looking at criteria performance of the school, student
9 achievement wise, wasn't really one of the criteria that
10 we -- that we initially looked at and applied.

11 What we do think is important, is that
12 student achievement as a whole, as one of the things we
13 want to study through the pilot, and the impact on the
14 multi-district online school, is something that we want
15 to take into consideration through the monitoring that
16 happens with Title I, and also through what happens with
17 Douglas County through the LEA.

18 But, no. It was not something that we felt
19 like -- because, again, inequity in the school district
20 we did not feel like utilizing that criteria for the
21 school was important.

22 MS. BERMAN: I'm sorry. I wasn't -- I
23 wasn't clear on my question.

24 MR. OWEN: Okay.

25 MS. BERMAN: I understand it's not the --



1 one of the criteria, but I'm asking do we have the
2 information no what the student achievement is for hope
3 online?

4 MR. OWEN: You bet. We have the SPFs for
5 each of the schools. There's three schools that Hope
6 has. For the pilot it's just the elementary school, and
7 then they have an overall framework for the entire K-12.

8 MS. BERMAN: And how are they doing?

9 MR. OWEN: They -- my understanding, and I -
10 - this is off memory, off the top of my head, but the
11 elementary schools, I think, going into Year 4, prior to
12 improvement (indiscernible) which is on the
13 accountability clock in the state.

14 MS. BERMAN: Okay.

15 MR. OWEN: Yep.

16 MS. BERMAN: My next questions pertain --
17 if we can bring the person up from Douglas County, I
18 would like to ask him some questions.

19 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

21 MR. OWEN: Okay, here.

22 MS. BERMAN: Just re-introduced yourself
23 again.

24 MR. MCGRAW: My name's Pat McGraw, I'm the
25 Chief Development and Innovation Officer for Douglas



1 County Schools.

2 MS. BERMAN: So, are you the Title I person
3 there?

4 MR. MCGRAW: No, I'm not.

5 MS. BERMAN: Why would they have sent you
6 and not the Title I person?

7 MR. MCGRAW: Because this was a -- I've
8 worked with Hope extensively concerning this Title I
9 project for the last five years. I have a very -- a good
10 understanding of what's going on with that, and because
11 of the late notice regarding this meeting I was
12 available.

13 MS. BERMAN: Well this was noticed quite a
14 long time ago.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Question?

16 MS. BERMAN: Well, my questions pertain
17 exclusively to Title I, so let's see -- let's see. Can
18 you tell us, first of all, how many Title I schools do
19 you have in Douglas County, and two, how much do you
20 allocate per student with your Title I monies?

21 MR. MCGRAW: I didn't bring the specific
22 numbers with me today, but what I can tell you is that
23 what has happened in the last five years since -- or six
24 years since Hope has been a part of our program -- I
25 mean, I was here before, and I was here after. When Hope



1 came into our system, we had six schools that were
2 receiving Title funding at that point in time.

3 MS. BERMAN: Are you talking about Hope
4 schools or Doug Co school --?

5 MR. MCGRAW: Douglas County Schools.

6 MS. BERMAN: Okay, great.

7 MR. MCGRAW: So, I was here before, and
8 after that process.

9 MS. BERMAN: Sorry, sorry.

10 MR. MCGRAW: And I apologize if I don't have
11 the specific numbers, but as I said, that's not
12 necessarily my role. And we can provide those to you as
13 --

14 MS. BERMAN: Except we're expected to vote
15 on this today, so I need the information today.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have some of that
19 information if you'd like it.

20 MS. BERMAN: Okay, good.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So are you talking
22 about the allocation that Douglas County receives from
23 the state?

24 MS. BERMAN: No.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, so the



1 allocation that they actually send out to their school.

2 MS. BERMAN: Yes, yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. My
4 understanding is that it's right around \$758. Is that
5 pretty close, Heather, to what --?

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (indiscernible) 837.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 837 per student at
8 the elementary school.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, I'm sorry
10 (indiscernible) question. 758 per student
11 (indiscernible).

12 MS. BERMAN: No. I'm looking at the per
13 student -- the per student --

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, 758.

15 MS. BERMAN: 758? Okay. And is -- so it's
16 758 per student and that allocation is going all to Hope
17 Title I and none to Douglas County students?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At the present time.

19 MS. BERMAN: At the present --

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So,
21 Douglas County gets an overall allocation of 1.2-million
22 in the last fiscal year. Based on that it's about -- for
23 the students that are generating the allocation for
24 Douglas County that's about \$458 per student. But what
25 they -- what they choose to do is they're flowing 850,000



1 in change to Hope, which is almost their entire
2 allocation, because they're required to set aside some of
3 the money for specific purposes.

4 And so out of that 850 it looks like there's
5 -- I'm not the math person, Leanne is, but it's about
6 350-400,000 that is retained by the school district, but
7 they do not serve other schools currently in the school
8 district. Hope Elementary is the only Title I school in
9 Douglas County.

10 MS. BERMAN: Okay, so I can't do the math
11 that quickly, but so what is your administrative
12 overhead, then, on the Title I monies right now?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, they
14 retain about, it looks to me, like about 350,000, and
15 that's for set-asides. They could probably have some for
16 indirect cost. Leanne, I don't know, if you want to --
17 if you have more specifics, or Trish, if you do. But
18 that's about what is kept at the district and the rest is
19 flowed out to the school.

20 MS. BERMAN: So, somebody who has a
21 calculator, can you tell me what percentage that is?

22 MS. BOWLEN: So, Mr. Chair, the district --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 73 percent.

24 MS. BERMAN: 73 percent?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Rough figure.



1 MS. BERMAN: No, can't be.

2 MS. BOWLEN: The district keeps 135,000 for
3 homeless. Homeless is a required set-aside under Title
4 I, part A, and then the rest they take for indirect costs
5 and for direct administration.

6 MS. BERMAN: So, I'm just trying to get a
7 sense from the indirect costs and direct administration
8 what percent you take. So, you're saying it's -- we
9 don't know.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: What's the --

11 MS. BOWLEN: Mr. Chair, the direct
12 administrative costs are capped at 10 percent, so they
13 can't take more -- the district can't keep more than 10
14 percent.

15 MS. BERMAN: It's not that I dislike you,
16 but I can't believe that Douglas sent you when we have
17 all these questions about Title I that you can't answer.
18 Okay my -- so I'd like to -- no offense, but you can't,
19 right?

20 MR. MCGRAW: I cannot.

21 MS. BERMAN: Okay. Then why did we bring
22 someone here from Douglas County that can't address these
23 questions?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.



1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We didn't actually
2 invite anyone to the meeting today.

3 MS. BERMAN: I requested of the commissioner
4 yesterday and from you to please have someone here.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We asked Douglas --
6 we asked Hope if they had anyone that was available from
7 Douglas County to come, but we didn't personally ask --
8 invite anyone from the school district to this. We
9 though because of the nature of this pilot, because --
10 that Douglas County was aware of this and that they -- if
11 they wanted to have somebody here, they would have
12 somebody here.

13 MS. BERMAN: But isn't the whole point that
14 the pilot is supposed to give money to Douglas County?
15 This is not --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. No. Can I say I
17 think the whole point of the pilot is to get money to the
18 kids who deserve it.

19 MS. BERMAN: But they're getting it. All
20 the -- all the --

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And Douglas -- we --

22 MS. BERMAN: All the Title I money right now
23 is going to the Hope kids.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No it isn't.

25 MS. BERMAN: Yes, they just said it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's Douglas County
2 money, it's not Title I money. Correct?

3 MS. BERMAN: It's Title I money going to
4 Douglas that's going to Hope, but not --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. --

6 MR. OWEN: Yeah. So, I think right now the
7 funds that are going to Douglas County School District
8 are being generated by the students that reside within
9 Douglas County School District. Their Title I funds,
10 therefore students that are free -- equivalent of free
11 lunch that reside within Douglas County, where this
12 pilot, I think, is trying to head is right now those
13 students in the district are not being served by Title I
14 funds. Only --

15 MS. BERMAN: Exactly.

16 MR. OWEN: Only because the funding is
17 flowing --

18 MS. BERMAN: Because they're giving it to
19 the Hope students, correct?

20 MR. OWEN: The funding is going to Hope, and
21 Hope --

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's right,
23 (indiscernible) the state.

24 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.



1 MR. OWEN: And Hope --

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Keith has got --
3 seriously, Keith's unlocking this, if you listen to the
4 riddle here.

5 MR. OWEN: Yeah. So, Hope Elementary is
6 serving students from without -- outside the school
7 district boundaries primarily that live within Denver
8 County and Aurora School District, the funding that is
9 generated by the students that reside within Douglas
10 County --

11 MS. BERMAN: Are not getting the money.

12 MR. OWEN: They're -- it's flowing to those
13 kids that are --

14 MS. BERMAN: I understand that. I
15 understand.

16 MR. OWEN: So that's the -- that's the
17 inequity that this pilot is, I think, is attempting to
18 address.

19 MS. BERMAN: Therefore, it's in the best
20 interest of Douglas County to have this pilot operate.

21 MR. OWEN: That's correct.

22 MS. BERMAN: So, I'm saying I'm surprised
23 there's no one from Douglas County here. Okay, let me
24 keep going on this. So -- I don't think you'll be able
25 to answer this next one, too.



1 So, given that it's up to a local school
2 district to decide how to allocate this money, okay,
3 Douglas County is allocating 850,000 -- 850...

4 MR. OWEN: Thousand.

5 MS. BERMAN: Thousand -- no what is it per
6 student?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Per student?

8 MR. OWEN: 758.

9 MS. BERMAN: 758 thousand? No, dollars.

10 MR. OWEN: You got it, dollars, yep, per
11 student.

12 MS. BERMAN: \$758 per student, that is a
13 local district decision?

14 MR. MCGRAW: To a degree it is, but we have
15 to look at Hope does -- necessarily has the students that
16 qualify and that most appropriately need this funding.
17 To go back to your other question, though, as a result of
18 this, and what's happened over the last, I don't know,
19 five years that we've been in the district, what we're
20 doing is we've -- as a result of it we've been working
21 with the Department of Education and with the Colorado
22 Department of Education to look at some sort of a
23 portability for this funding, because as a result of this
24 the schools that we had previously served we don't serve.

25 We do have plans going forward for -- in



1 this pilot. And I want to reiterate, we do support this
2 pilot, because what it allows us to do is it allows us to
3 let these kids that are very needy at Hope be served by
4 the program, and allow us to start programing again for
5 the kids in Douglas County that are generating those
6 funds.

7 At the present time none of the funds that
8 we're utilizing to fund Hope are available for our local
9 kids.

10 MS. BERMAN: No, I understand that
11 completely. So, my understanding, and Keith has already
12 said this, and I think we've heard this from everybody,
13 that it's up to a local district how they allocate their
14 Title I funds, and how much they give per student. So,
15 for example, and I'm saying this to my colleagues,
16 Douglas County has made the decision to allocate \$758 per
17 Title I student and Hope as compared to DPS, which gives
18 \$438 per student.

19 MS. NEAL: Ah, so that's your problem.

20 MS. BERMAN: Well, yes.

21 MS. NEAL: But this is a pilot program,
22 Elaine. Are we going to -- why would we pick at who gets
23 the money? I mean --

24 MS. BERMAN: Because you are robbing Peter
25 to pay Paul.



1 MS. NEAL: It's a pilot program.

2 MS. BERMAN: So, we are taking --

3 MS. NEAL: So, you're saying we shouldn't do
4 this pilot program?

5 MS. BERMAN: Not in Douglas County.

6 MS. NEAL: I --

7 MS. BERMAN: Not in Douglas County. So --

8 MS. NEAL: Only Denver?

9 MS. BERMAN: Let me -- no. Let me -- let me
10 finish. You're going to vote the way you're going to
11 vote and I'm going to vote the way I'm going to vote.
12 But you're talking about that Douglas has -- Douglas
13 could send \$438, for example, per student to Hope and use
14 the remainder, which is that same amount, to their own
15 students, but they have chosen not to do that. So, what
16 -- in the United States, Mr. Lundeen as Chair of this
17 board, Douglas County falls into what order of the
18 wealthiest counties of the United States? It is the
19 ninth wealthiest county in the United States.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, the question --

21 MS. BERMAN: So, we are going to be taking
22 money away from the poorest school districts in the state
23 of Colorado and giving it to the ninth wealthiest -- the
24 first wealthiest state in Colorado, and the ninth in the
25 United States, for the sake of this pilot. I cannot, in



1 good conscience, do that.

2 If this was in another county beside Douglas
3 go for it, but Douglas County do this pilot -- nothing to
4 do with Hope. This has nothing to do with Hope, Heather,
5 this has to do with Douglas County and the lack of
6 respect that the State Board is getting today that you
7 didn't even send anybody that has the information that
8 could actually answer our questions regarding Title I.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so let me respond
10 to the issues -- okay, so let me respond to a couple of
11 issues. Because this is interesting comments, but
12 they're missing a couple variables. The one of the
13 variables that you're missing is the additional students
14 within Douglas County that aren't being served. What's
15 that n? We don't know what that n is, and, in fact, if
16 they were all served, the money was actually flowing to
17 the students that need to be served, it's very possible
18 that that number might be -- a per student amount might
19 be lower than what DPS is doing. I don't know, I haven't
20 ran those numbers, but your cloying at an open-ended
21 question that we don't have an immediate answer to.

22 The - and the reason that this issue is
23 important, is it's all about baby steps. Taking baby
24 steps to break down an old system that no longer funds
25 students. It's a method of moving the money to where the



1 students are as opposed to pooling somewhere, in this
2 particular instance, the two pools that we're talking
3 about would be DPS and Douglas County. And my
4 perspective is I'm not as concerned about DPS in Douglas
5 County as I am about the impoverished students who should
6 be served, and the money should flow to them.

7 This is an opportunity to be the narrow edge
8 of a wedge that drives into that question and gives us
9 the ability to more properly fund students instead of
10 districts. That's where we're going with this.

11 MS. BERMAN: And you and I agree on that.
12 You and I can --

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well then let's get a
14 pilot out there, let's work through these challenges and
15 problems, and figure out a way to do it.

16 MS. BERMAN: I would support a pilot, but
17 not in Douglas County. I can't do it. I can't take
18 money away from really in Aurora and DPS and which time -
19 -

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right, well, good.
21 So, you and I can continue the debate somewhere else,
22 because philosophically we're trying to get to the same
23 place.

24 MS. BERMAN: Because -- okay. And, also,
25 because Douglas has a choice, and they're choosing to



1 give double what DPS is and DPS has a higher cutoff. DPS
2 serves only 66 percent of the poverty level, and my
3 understanding is that Douglas only sees 50 percent of the
4 poverty level. So, on so many different levels I can't,
5 in good consciousness, support this pilot --

6 MS. NEAL: Okay, we've got it.

7 MS. BERMAN: I know you have it. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So that's fair, and good
9 conversation, and then I would argue it's possible on
10 some of the sub-points this may not be perfect, but I am,
11 you know, I personally, I'm only speaking, my -- this is
12 my opinion here, not as chair, but as a board member. I
13 am adamant that we push forward on trying to do something
14 about moving the money towards where the students are and
15 this is a pilot that will, in fact, give us an
16 opportunity to be doing -- baby steps. Just baby steps.

17 MS. BERMAN: Well my understanding --

18 MS. NEAL: And it isn't. Core point, this is
19 a pilot, it's not about who gets what, it's about a pilot
20 to see how to do exactly what Paul is talking about.

21 MR. OWEN: Okay, let me clarify a couple of
22 things.

23 MS. NEAL: You really want to try that?

24 MS. BERMAN: They were prepared for me.

25 MR. OWEN: I do. In all due respect to Pat,



1 okay, you know, thanks for coming. Secondly, we have the
2 numbers. I mean, there's not a number we don't have when
3 it comes to Title I funds. It's a matter of accessing at
4 the (indiscernible) meeting. I think you have some of
5 those numbers. Is there anything you want to add to
6 clarifications?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, and I'd prefer to
8 keep us, at this point, at the level of principals.
9 We're driving forward a principal. I don't want to go
10 back down into the weeds on numbers, but please, go
11 ahead.

12 MR. OWEN: Yep. So, I won't get into the
13 numbers, Mr. Chair, but what I do think it's important to
14 note is that every district gets an allocation from the
15 state. Then it's up to the LEA, the district, to decide
16 the cuts, the schools, the dollar amounts, the flow. So,
17 some districts flow larger amounts of monies to schools,
18 and they -- they're restricted to just a few schools.
19 The only thing that becomes mandatory is when the poverty
20 rate, the free lunch count, gets to 75 percent in the
21 school, then they have to be served. But below that
22 threshold, between 35 and 75 percent, districts have a
23 lot of latitude.

24 Some districts choose to only serve
25 elementary schools, and some will say it's got to be 70



1 percent for your free lunch or higher. Some go down to
2 50 percent, because they don't have the great degree of
3 poverty in their districts, and so they'll serve schools
4 that are 50 percent free lunch. And so that decision
5 there's never enough money to any of the districts to
6 serve all of the kids that come to school each day in
7 poverty.

8 Many schools in the state are 50 percent
9 free-and-reduced lunch or higher, and not getting a
10 single Title I dollar. And so that's the real challenge,
11 I think, of all of this, is the districts have to make
12 really tough decisions about where to foot -- out the
13 funding and how much to allocate to each of those schools
14 based on priority, based on progress towards state goals,
15 and that's the local decision that they each have.

16 So, it -- that amount per kid is varied all
17 over the state. I just want to make sure that that's
18 clear.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. And my argument is
20 overtime, that's where Elaine and you and I are going to
21 unify again. Over time the denominator should be the
22 student, that should be the denominator, not the
23 district.

24 That's where I'm trying to get us to go, and
25 this is the first step, a baby step, on that pathway.



1 That is my argument.

2 Okay.

3 Now that we've completely intensified this,
4 are there other questions or comments from members of the
5 board? No? Then I believe a motion is in order.

6 MS. NEAL: I move to direct the commissioner
7 and the department to undertake the Title I funding pilot
8 project with Hope Online -- Hope Online, I'm sorry, the
9 multi-district online charter school as presented.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?
11 There's a second, Dr. Scheffel, staff, please call the
12 roll.

13 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

14 MS. BERMAN: No.

15 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

16 MS. GOFF: Aye.

17 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Aye.

19 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

21 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

22 MS. NEAL: Aye.

23 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

25 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Motion carries. It was
3 5-2, yes?

4 MS. NEAL: No, 6-2.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it was 6-1.

6 MS. NEAL: 6-1.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How's your math?
8 Jane?

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I clearly need to go up
10 online and learn. You voted aye as well?

11 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Aye, okay, thank you, so
13 6-1.

14 MS. NEAL: I think I'll apologize to my
15 (indiscernible)

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The motion carries, thank
17 you very much.

18 MS. NEAL: You're telling the poor man
19 (indiscernible). I think you owe him a drink.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think I need a
21 drink.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So --

23 MR. MCGRAW: I just want to let you know,
24 that I was notified yesterday that the --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let's just, informal,



1 let's take a two-minute break, because we've got board
2 member reports, then we've got public hearing.

3 (Meeting adjourned)

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



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600