



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
December 10, 2014, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on December 10, 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: So then, having said
2 that, the next item on the agenda, 17.01, District
3 presentations regarding low performance and turnaround
4 support. A familiar face remains at the table.

5 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. Good afternoon.

6 COMM. HAMMOND: Keith, before you, you know,
7 you've just heard about what happens, and you've just
8 voted on that as it relates to schools. What we feel
9 very much is an -- is an obligation we have as a
10 department to the maximum extent of our feasibility and
11 everything that we could do is to help our districts,
12 especially those that are in turnaround and priority
13 improvement situations.

14 And that's what we want to talk about. That
15 also plays into what Pam was talking about. Last year
16 you heard from specific districts. I think that was an
17 incredible discussion we had with district leadership.
18 You're going to hear from us recommendations to -- but
19 now getting into the school outlook where we hear from
20 schools. So, with that, sorry to interrupt, Keith, but
21 this is really the flip side of the coin. What are we
22 doing to help to the extent that we can? So, thank you.

23 MR. OWEN: Great. So, Mr. Chair. The -- we
24 wanted to briefly talk about an opportunity again this
25 spring for the state board to have conversations with



1 local school districts specifically around the
2 performance of schools that are falling into the lower
3 categories and schools that were, for example, that were
4 on the list that we showed you earlier going into year
5 five of turnaround performance.

6 So, just quickly I'm going to talk a little
7 bit about -- go ahead and go to the next -- well, stay on
8 the first slide. We've got eight districts that are
9 entering year five, July 1st, 2015. We got 30 schools
10 within 18 districts that are entering year 5, July 1st,
11 2015. I'll briefly describe this again. So, their
12 rating for next year is set.

13 Now, they have an opportunity to change that
14 rating by bringing additional information, going through
15 the request for reconsideration process next fall and
16 winter. So, this could change. You could be dealing
17 with 5 districts, you could be dealing with 10 schools,
18 but this is giving you I think a pretty -- we're getting
19 closer and closer to what we're going to be dealing with
20 when it comes to getting towards the end of the
21 accountability clock.

22 And so -- if you can go to the next one. We
23 wanted to, last year, have you start talking with school
24 districts in advance of just a district coming before you
25 and having to make some decisions about actions that are



1 required under state law. We wanted you to really have
2 an opportunity to hear from that district to understand
3 some context of what they're working on, how they're
4 working to address these issues in the local communities,
5 and then really starting to understand the challenges
6 that they're facing in the work that they're doing.

7 I really think last year -- and what we
8 heard from a lot of you, is that you felt like those
9 conversations were very valuable, that you had an
10 opportunity to really get a better understanding of what
11 school districts were working on. What we're bringing to
12 you today is now an opportunity of -- that you've talked
13 to districts to really start talking to some districts
14 that now have large concentrations of schools that you're
15 going to be dealing with and, or the district you're
16 going to be dealing with.

17 So, there's a couple of combinations here.
18 There's some districts that are working that are going
19 into year five, and they've got schools doing into year
20 five. You've got some districts that are not on the
21 clock and they've got schools going into year five. So,
22 you got some different combinations here. But we're
23 going to be giving you a list of recommended districts we
24 think would be good for you to talk to specifically about
25 school performance.



1 Really wanted your feedback and input on
2 whether you think that was just right, whether you think
3 we should make some changes to it. Our hope is to send
4 out invitations to these districts in January and really
5 get some of these dates on their calendar and on your
6 calendar.

7 So, if you can go to the next slide, Peter.
8 I think I went through that. We're looking and targeting
9 three dates right now for those conversations. March,
10 April and May of 2015. We're trying to target about 40
11 minutes for these conversations. I know it's tough to do
12 that that quickly, but about 20 minutes for the school
13 district and then about 20 minutes for conversations,
14 questions. We're going to try to squeeze three, maybe
15 four, one meeting into each meeting. Which I think,
16 again, is another challenge. It's a lot in one
17 afternoon. But historically working with Carrie Markel
18 and the commissioner we've been able to identify the
19 second day of the board meeting as an opportunity to do
20 that.

21 So, with that, in front of you, you have the
22 recommended list of school districts that we've been
23 thinking about would be important for you to talk to and
24 invite. And I want to talk a little bit about the
25 criteria that we used to try and narrow this down.



1 There's a lot of schools, and there's a lot
2 of districts that fall into these categories, and
3 unfortunately, I don't know that you're going to have
4 time to talk to everybody and so we had to prioritize.
5 If you look at the bottom of that criteria piece you can
6 see the first level of criteria that was applied was any
7 district that's in turnaround in year five, we think
8 it's, again, important for you to talk to that district
9 again. They did (indiscernible) make progress. They're
10 potentially subject to early action by you, and we think
11 it's important to have a conversation.

12 So, there's one district that fell into that
13 category, Aguilar Reorganized, and we felt like even
14 though they talked to them last year it's important to
15 have them back. Then the next kind of filter was
16 districts with schools in turnaround year five, and so if
17 you look at that list that I shared earlier, you had a --
18 you had a handful of districts there that had schools
19 going into year five of turnaround. Really think it's
20 important to talk about that. These are more than likely
21 the schools that are furthest away from being able to get
22 out of that category before you have take some type of
23 action. So, we think it's important to have
24 conversations.

25 Ignacio has a school that falls into that,



1 Montezuma-Cortez has a school that falls in that,
2 Publicity (ph) 60 has a school -- several schools that
3 fall into that, and Douglas County has a school, or two
4 schools, that fall into that, and Denver County I think
5 had another school that fell into that category, so
6 that's why those were included for the first time. A few
7 of those included for the first time.

8 As we go down that list, districts in
9 priority improvement year five, that didn't present last
10 year we wanted to make sure again, anybody, any district,
11 that's getting close to the end of the clock that maybe
12 is not moving out of that category you have a chance to
13 talk to. And then we looked at the last filter, which is
14 really high concentrations of schools that are
15 potentially going to be in year five or going into year
16 six in priority improvement or turnaround. And so that
17 pulls in Huerfano School District, which is in
18 Walsenburg, Adams-Arapaho, which is Aurora School
19 District, Greeley 6, and South Conejos.

20 If any of these districts decline or choose
21 not to come, we have a list of some additional ones to
22 invite which start with Adams 12, which has I think one
23 or two schools that are on the accountability clock going
24 into year five, and the Colorado Springs 11 has again, a
25 handful of schools. Adams County, you've heard from last



1 year, and so we can certainly extend the invitation to
2 them again. And then Mapleton and Lake were the final
3 two there. So that's the list of the schools that we
4 recommend.

5 Again, if you go to slide 8. We've asked
6 the districts as they present to really make sure that
7 they focus in on the progress that they're making, that
8 they also summarize challenges, root causes, frame those
9 with data, and talk about some major improvement
10 strategies that they're working on. Their vision for
11 showing significant improvement quickly, and how is a
12 district differentiating in showing support to these low-
13 performing schools.

14 And then we're also starting to have
15 conversations with the districts about -- you've seen the
16 state framework, you've seen the accountability choices
17 and the pathways that are available. What are you
18 thinking if you can't make the kind of progress that's
19 necessary? What do you want to talk to the state board
20 about? What are some of the decisions you want to make
21 locally? And starting to get them to think about that as
22 well.

23 So, again, it's not a time -- these
24 conversations aren't a time for them to make an appeal to
25 you about a rating or a category, that's not the purpose.



1 It's really more of a conversation. So, we have the
2 list, we also wanted to spend a little bit of time taking
3 any feedback that you might have about what worked last
4 time, what you'd like to see differently. And, Madam
5 Vice Chair, with that we'll certainly entertain
6 discussion, any questions that you have, guidance.

7 MS. NEAL: Any questions, board? Elaine?

8 MS. BERMAN: I have a -- I have a bunch of
9 questions. I can pull my big chart out, but without
10 doing that. Douglas County, that kind of surprised me.
11 What schools do they have in the -- in turnaround?

12 MR. OWEN: There's two charter schools
13 there, Hope Elementary and Hope Middle School going into
14 year five both in turnaround.

15 MS. BERMAN: And doesn't Hope have a
16 designation of an alternative education campus? That's
17 at the high school level?

18 MS. NEAL: The high school.

19 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. They do at the high
20 school level.

21 MS. BERMAN: But they don't qualify for the
22 AC for -- at the elementary and middle school level?

23 MR. OWEN: At the element -- Mr. Chair,
24 that's correct.

25 MS. BERMAN: Okay. Can you talk to us a



1 little bit about what kind of actual recommendations the
2 state board could make to districts and what bold actions
3 or recommendations might look like? I mean I -- let me --
4 -- say something contextually. I mean, I think -- I think
5 different districts in the state approach unsuccessful
6 schools differently. I mean, you can use the term
7 unsuccessful, failing, turnaround.

8 I mean, some districts have been very
9 aggressive when they see their schools aren't performing
10 and they either turn them into charters, they you know,
11 release all their staff and higher new staff and new
12 leadership, but there's a very different approach by
13 districts throughout the state. And I think our role as
14 the state board is to be very vigilant, to be very tough,
15 to -- but also to understand what the local context is.
16 So, I think this is probably going to be the hardest work
17 that the state board has ever done to make these
18 decisions, and my state statute it does fall within our
19 purview to make those decisions.

20 So, I think we're going to need a lot of
21 help and guidance, because we're, we -- you know, we're
22 going to get lobbied. We potentially will get lobbied,
23 so help us think through what kind of bold actions or
24 recommendations the state board could take around some of
25 the turnaround schools.



1 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. So, we handed out our
2 famous chart, and on one side is the -- really the
3 pathway for schools, and the other side is the pathway
4 for districts. And so you have some, I think, different
5 choices that you could make. In conjunction again, how
6 we've been describing this to school districts, if for
7 some reason they run out the clock and they're not able
8 to make the kind of changes necessary and the performance
9 doesn't pump up, to pull them off of the accountability
10 clock. We've shared this with them as well and asked:
11 What are the things that you think would make sense to
12 come to the state board?

13 So, our first thought is that you'll have a
14 conversation when that happens. You'll set down, we'll
15 schedule these and talk about what the school -- local
16 district's doing specific to district performance and
17 then also if it's necessary for school performance and
18 let them explain what they think might make sense as
19 these choices. So, you could see that for districts
20 you've got a variety of choices that are available to you
21 under district reorganization, take over the management,
22 charter school, innovation status, or closing schools.
23 So, you've got a -- you got those kind of variety of
24 choices that you can apply.

25 The conversation could then be to send the



1 commissioner back with the district and negotiate some
2 conditions to reinstate accreditation, because the
3 trigger for a district is going to be the loss of
4 accreditation.

5 And so, after having that conversation,
6 again, we've never done this, so this is kind of how
7 staff has been mapping this out and working with the
8 Attorney General's office as well. Those conditions
9 could be negotiated with the school district, the school
10 -- local school board goes back, acts on those
11 conditions, show you evidence that they've taken the
12 action that you've requested. They bring that back to
13 the state board through the commissioner, and then you
14 have the ability to reinstate accreditation. You've
15 taken action specific to one of the recommendation --
16 recommended paths.

17 If the local board says: No, we appreciate
18 your ideas and the you know, the guidance that you're
19 giving us, but we are not going to take the actions
20 you've recommended. At that point you've lost
21 accreditation from the State of Colorado as a school
22 district. What that exactly means is the subject of, I
23 think, some debate. And so, we've been, again, working
24 with the Attorney General's office specifically around
25 what does loss of accreditation mean to a school



1 district.

2 There's been some thought that that would
3 harm school's ability to -- at the local high school --
4 to accredit its own high school so that kids are
5 impacted. Our initial read is that's not necessarily the
6 case. We don't think that it impacts a district's
7 ability to accredit its own schools. What we do think
8 though, is that if they don't meet the conditions to
9 reinstate accreditation, that it could force a more
10 stringent approach to one of the actions from the state
11 board. So for example, a forced conversation around
12 district reorganization, management of the school
13 district, because the district now has lost accreditation
14 and there's some -- there's some things that will kick in
15 potentially.

16 And, again, this is pieces of the puzzle
17 that we're working with the AG's office on, but our hope
18 is that we don't have to go down that path with any
19 district that we can agree upon some conditions, bring
20 those back, state board would approve those and reinstate
21 accreditation.

22 So, with that for a district, that's kind of
23 the pathway. When it comes to schools, again, you tell -
24 - you have a conversation, I think, with local school
25 district, with the board. You would then go and work on



1 some conditions for re-in -- for -- that you would expect
2 to happen with the schools in that community. If a local
3 board says: Yes, we're going to do that. Their
4 accreditation rating can continue to stay the same. If
5 they choose not to accept those recommendations or work
6 towards agreement the department and the state board,
7 through the department, has the ability to lower their
8 accreditation rating as a district.

9 A little bit different paths for districts,
10 and a little bit -- than for schools. So, with -- it's
11 not loss of accreditation at that point if they don't
12 take the action you've recommended on a school, it's the
13 lowering of accreditation. Okay?

14 And, again, similar paths for you to
15 recommend to the -- to the districts around their
16 schools; essentially you could convert them to charter
17 schools, innovation schools, you can close them or revoke
18 a charter, or you can ask a private group to oversee and
19 manage those schools locally and provide that as a
20 condition to the local school board to take action on.

21 Again, our trigger between the State Board
22 is through the local board. You give conditions. That
23 local board has to act on those conditions and bring
24 evidence that they've acted on it.

25 MS. BERMAN: So, Keith and Peter, I mean, we



1 have a little bit of track record here where you've been
2 working with districts and schools now for a few years
3 and have been giving recommendations. Do you, you know,
4 are there examples of districts that you have provided
5 recommendations and they have not adopted them, and if
6 that is the case would you then be recommending that we
7 act sooner than the five years? Because if we are that's
8 pretty much right now.

9 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

11 MR. OWEN: So, and I'll also let
12 Commissioner Hammond add to this if he wants. We have
13 taken the approach that we want to be partners and work
14 with schools and districts that we understand there's
15 some very difficult situations and challenges that many
16 of these districts and schools are facing. And what
17 we've seen in other states where they've taken more of a
18 heavy-hand approach to local communities. And you've
19 heard examples, I think, across the country on takeovers,
20 you know, management districts. Some of the results of
21 those are coming back and they're not what people I think
22 had hoped for.

23 I think there's a real value in getting a
24 local community to understand the challenges, but then
25 having them help create the solutions. And I think when



1 we, you know, when states try to prescribe solutions to
2 local communities and districts and even, you know, take
3 over some of those conditions, I think it's a very --
4 it's a challenge to sustain that kind of work. And so,
5 our hope and our intent has been really to provide that
6 support to districts where needed. Some districts
7 absolutely are like: We're working on it. We're making
8 the progress that we need to. We appreciate your
9 concern, but we're going to make our way off. And some
10 of them have, and some of them have really been diligent
11 about that.

12 MS. BERMAN: So, Keith, I respect you, but
13 you haven't answered my question.

14 MR. OWEN: Okay. I -- Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

16 MR. OWEN: I can't give you, like, a
17 specific example of a district we've said: Do x. And
18 they've said: No, we're not going to do it. This is a --
19 this is a relationship of you -- showing the performance,
20 showing the information that we have, and then saying:
21 What are you doing? Listening to what they're doing
22 locally.

23 They have a unified improvement plan that we
24 review. We go through it, we give feedback on it, but
25 ultimately, they're responsible for making those



1 determinations and those changes in the local community.

2 MS. BERMAN: So, if I hear you correctly,
3 then we shouldn't have any schools on turnaround at the
4 end of year five, because they -- all the school district
5 have accepted the recommendations, assuming we know what
6 we're doing, you know what you're doing, then we should
7 be in great shape. I'm pushing you a little bit here.

8 MR. OWEN: No, no. I think, Mr. Chair.
9 It's a great question. And I don't -- I don't mind the
10 push. The -- there is a level, though, of, I think,
11 trying to let local communities figure this out versus
12 taking a very heavy-handed approach to imposing a
13 solution. And I think the commissioner, the team, have
14 really tried to strike that balance of support. And what
15 we're going to talk about a little bit later, that
16 Peter's been really working on, is trying to get
17 districts and schools to voluntarily agree to some
18 conditions on the front end through a network, a cohort,
19 and getting them to participate in pushing the district
20 that way through a voluntary process, which I think we're
21 seeing some early markers of success there.

22 Are all of the districts in the state, the
23 schools in the state going to come off of the turnaround
24 rating? I do not feel confident that they will. Is
25 there an opportunity for the State Board to take early



1 action on those districts and say that you want to turn a
2 district -- a school in one of those districts into a
3 charter, close the school? Absolutely. The
4 commissioner's weighing that and looking at that option
5 of the recommendation, and we could certainly -- we've
6 been really struggling with the 10 schools that we showed
7 you earlier. I would say out of the mark that we have,
8 those are 10 very challenged schools in the state with
9 respect to performance and what's happening in those
10 local communities. You've got 10 schools in, I think, 5
11 districts or 4 districts that are going into year 5 of
12 turnaround, and if you look at some of the points that
13 they're earning on the performance framework, very low.

14 And it's not that this is the first year
15 that they've had challenges, this is going into five
16 years now. And so, do we think at this point that
17 saying: Yes, let's recommend to the state board that we
18 close all those schools is the right action? I don't
19 think we're quite there yet. I think some of these
20 districts have absolutely embraced an opportunity to get
21 support from the state.

22 But why I was hesitating a little bit, is
23 some of these districts have taken this challenge on
24 their own, and they are working, and they're not
25 necessarily listening to us, but they're doing other



1 things outside of what we would recommend. And so,
2 Denver's a great example of that. We don't necessarily
3 give a lot of prescriptive action to Denver Public
4 Schools, but they've taken a lot of these challenges on
5 themselves. We've been monitoring watching, when we get
6 state grants, different supports, we absolutely try to
7 leverage those. But again, it's a balance, and I think
8 if your direction and your support of the commissioner is
9 that you want us to bring back recommendations on early
10 action with any of the schools that are in turnaround,
11 it's the only group that we can apply it to, we
12 absolutely can do that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, let me push a little
14 bit further and join the conversation. This is a
15 conversation about support, and I think the first
16 criteria in valuable support is clarity. And the
17 statute's pretty clear, and the requirement of the state
18 board, you know. State board shall not allow a public
19 school to continue, et cetera, in a crisis with -- before
20 -- for the period of time, before requiring the school
21 district or the institute to restructure or close the
22 school district.

23 So, I think clarity and resolve and voice
24 from this board into the conversation is the first and
25 most important piece of support that can be offered, so



1 people aren't thinking it's a gray mush, that they might
2 be able to walk their way through. It's something that
3 has to be resolved. There's student's futures at risk,
4 and so I think -- I would just add my voice, and it's odd
5 that the two are not going to be actually sitting in
6 judgment or the ones with steel spines all of the sudden.
7 But the reality is that I think that is probably the most
8 valuable thing you can offer at this point is a unified
9 voice from the board that says: This is important, and
10 it's not going to be something people walk past.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, the other
12 thing I might mention to Member Elaine Gantz Berman's
13 comments.

14 MS. BERMAN: Whatever my name is. You don't
15 only -- don't have to remember it for much longer.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll never forget it.
17 The -- is that there is certainly, I think, an attitude
18 and a feeling in some school districts, and I think
19 you'll see just like you might see with some of the
20 provisions of 191 when they're applied, is you will --
21 your first action will potentially be challenged by
22 lawsuit. And so, I think that you need to be prepared,
23 and we're prepared that not necessarily everyone agrees
24 that all of these provisions that have been outlined here
25 -- that there are some interference with local control,



1 and that they want to make a challenge to that based on
2 that premise.

3 And so, I don't want to be naïve and lead
4 you down a path that the minute you take some action that
5 you're also not going to be caught up in the middle of a
6 lawsuit. So that's been told to me by several different
7 attorneys in several different districts that it's
8 something they're studying and they're looking at. And I
9 can tell you that I think that's a real possibility the
10 first time you take action on any school or district in
11 the state.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And my response back to
13 that would be that's valid and -- but there are really
14 two courts that this conversation would be played out in;
15 one is the legal courts potentially, and the other is
16 court of public opinion. There are students who are
17 clearly not being well served in the crosshairs of this
18 second, you know, court of public opinion and they must
19 be aware of that, and that may be where we need to lead
20 and lean in order to make -- press the case, or press the
21 argument.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yep. I might mention
23 one other thing, Mr. Chair, if it's okay.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That I think maybe



1 highlights some of the questions earlier. Is that it
2 gets to be a challenge to try to look at that group of
3 schools in a uniform way. You've got some schools inside
4 districts that now in the middle of the third year the
5 district changed leadership. They've got a new
6 superintendent, the school came to you, got approved for
7 an innovation school, they haven't climbed their way out
8 of the turnaround category, but they've done some things.
9 What's the action that you would recommend as an early
10 action on that school? And that's where it gets to be, I
11 think, really difficult to go school by school.

12 Some of the -- some of the, I think, the
13 examples maybe are a little bit more clear and again, if
14 you want us to put a fine pen to that and look at where
15 there's clarity, I think we can help do some of that.
16 But there are -- there is work going on in all of these
17 districts specific to these challenges, and some of it I
18 think's having an impact, some of it's taking longer than
19 we would hope. And there's a real reality I think, to
20 some of the schools and districts that they're not going
21 to make the kind of changes in the next six months that
22 are going to allow them to pop out of that category.

23 MS. BERMAN: So, with that group, that's the
24 group I think we -- we have to defer to your judgement.
25 We don't know -- we're counting on you to let us know



1 which schools you really don't think are going to be able
2 to climb out. And I will reiterate what the chair said,
3 make sure we go out in agreement, that this is about the
4 kids. This isn't about the adults. It's not about the
5 teachers, it's not about the administrators. It's about
6 that we don't want to lose another decade or generation
7 of kids. And if we're post-poning a year, which we know
8 it's going to be inevitable, then I don't think we're
9 doing our job.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. So other
11 questions, comments. Angelika?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: In the list of
13 recommendations at the 5-year mark that was in 162, or
14 whatever the legislation was, would you add anything to
15 those?

16 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

18 MR. OWEN: Would I personally add anything
19 to them?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Would you recommend any
21 additions given that this law is, what, four or five
22 years old. What have we learned, and --

23 MR. OWEN: Sure, SO Mr. Chair. And I think
24 Peter can talk about this, too. I think it was
25 necessarily blunt for some reasons in that there's a



1 specific pathway that was outlined here, and I think the
2 reason for that was to not give a lot of discretion. I
3 do think it makes some sense if a school district, for
4 example, you're going to hear about the turnaround
5 network and the work that they're providing and the
6 supports they're giving to a group of schools. If you
7 had some discretion to allow a school to participate in
8 that, but then extend their time before one of these
9 other actions takes place, that might be a valid other
10 box to check that would allow you to have some faith that
11 they're working on the problem specifically that they
12 need to be working on, but at the same time it's not
13 forcing a solution that maybe wouldn't fit in a
14 community.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we legally have the right
16 to do that?

17 MR. OWEN: I think you have some flexibility
18 to push, Especially in this transition year, on some of
19 those more creative solutions. Again, I think what you
20 have to think through is let's look at the opportunities
21 that are outlined in each of these, and then see how we
22 might apply the language that's there to the right
23 outcome. And I think it might require a statute change
24 if you wanted to get pushed on it. But it's certainly
25 something that we could take back and work more with Tony



1 on as well.

2 It's some -- it's an option that we've been
3 exploring, is if you have a group, a district or a set of
4 schools that are willing to agree to some conditions that
5 we know are getting in the way of student performance,
6 and they're able to do that on the front end, would you
7 allow more time to let them do that? And again, this is
8 where it gets more challenging. A school district that's
9 been struggling just hires a new superintendent. They're
10 trying to work on some of these specific issues doing a
11 few things with schools, and then to uproot that in the
12 middle of that change could be problematic, or it could
13 even be damaging to the progress in the short term that
14 they're maybe making.

15 So, I think one of the things that we talked
16 about in -- when we first started working on this couple
17 years ago is we want to certainly come in from the point
18 of view of do no harm. We don't want to come into a
19 situation and make it worse for a local community, or for
20 a local school district, and actually have outcomes for
21 kids go to an even lower place.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Assuming some of these
23 recommendations which we've already read about, which
24 you're going to present, are things that we agree to,
25 shouldn't our, at a minimum, year three districts be



1 doing these, instead of year five? I mean, I -- for
2 future purposes, I realize we've been wondering what's
3 going to happen, but we really shouldn't allow us to get
4 to year five for all those districts that are on two,
5 three, and four.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We have a request to
7 speak directly into microphones here so we can be heard
8 better. You're welcome.

9 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. So, with that, I
10 think that's a great question, the -- I think we have a
11 couple examples where we've done that.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

13 MR. OWEN: So, Viola School District and
14 Karval School District both had very low-performing
15 online schools. In year three the commissioner -- we met
16 with the leadership, the school board, the
17 superintendent, and just last year and the -- in the
18 prior year they both closed those online schools. Now
19 they're off the clock and I think Karval's even a
20 district accredited with distinction this year.

21 And so, there's, I think, opportunities to
22 leverage and push, and those are going on all the time.
23 We have conversations -- and a lot of these districts,
24 and the schools that you're talking about, are in
25 districts, they're just in different years on the



1 accountability clock. And so, we don't want to wait till
2 the very end, but we also want to be respectful of the
3 fact that many of these districts are doing work that is
4 supporting the kind of outcomes that we'd want. And they
5 are seeing progress in pockets, in different areas, and
6 it -- so it gets very tricky, I think, to try to apply
7 one kind of solution.

8

9 So, again, commissioner, we've set down and
10 tried to think through: How do we let districts -- defer
11 to district's good judgements in the best way that we
12 can, knowing that they're going to hit a wall with the --
13 a clock at the end of year five, how do we give them as
14 much flexibility to try to move out of that as we can and
15 supports while they're trying to do it. Versus the
16 action of taking early action that could potentially
17 cause other issues on districts that are doing current
18 work. It's a balancing act.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Come down here. Deb.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: One of the things that I
21 think predicts success in moving out of this -- these
22 categories, is hiring somebody or having somebody on
23 staff that's very savvy about the formula that determines
24 what category they fall into. So, one might say: Well,
25 broadly speaking, they need to put a reform model into



1 place, they need to address leadership, they need to
2 address literacy, they need to look at progress
3 monitoring data so that testing low-achieving kids
4 frequently, like every two weeks. You can do all that.
5 But some of the districts I think that are struggling,
6 they're throwing everything at it that they can possibly
7 spare, hoping that something will stick and that they'll
8 be able to raise their ratings. But what I've seen is
9 apart from that work, which is the work that we want to
10 go on, is a savvy level of understanding of the formula
11 itself and which factors have the biggest impact on
12 moving the category.

13 And so that makes me feel bad at times,
14 because some districts now that, and they're able to hire
15 or find somebody for their staff that is highly detailed
16 inside those data to ensure that they're moving. And
17 others are reading the research and throwing everything
18 they can at a reform model; doing professional
19 development for their principal, sending their teachers
20 to the professional development, training for x number of
21 sessions in literacy and doing things, but things that
22 may not have an actual impact unless they're very savvy
23 about how this really works.

24 So, I will hope the department is unveiling
25 that and creating very transparent understanding of how



1 many points do you have to move within this pie chart, in
2 which categories, based on balances and weights to move
3 out of this category by year five. And some of the
4 districts know that, and others don't.

5 MR. OWEN: That's a great point. Mr.
6 Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

8 MR. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think you're
9 going to hear a little bit about some of that support
10 through the network and how we're trying to develop that
11 for school districts, so --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, without further ado,
13 let's give Mr. Sherman the floor.

14 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair, could I ask for one
15 clarification.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It's your presentation.

17 MR. SHERMAN: No, no. It's just with the
18 upcoming invitations for districts and schools, does the
19 board feel comfortable with the list that we provided and
20 the -- and using the months of March, April and May to --
21 and we could certainly come back and talk about more, but
22 the timing is getting to be such that I think it'd be
23 helpful if we could get invitations out in January, so we
24 could certainly come back early January and talk about it
25 more, if that's pleasure of the board. But I just wanted



1 to raise that one more time, if there's consensus.

2 MS. NEAL: Right down here. I would say
3 it's not a problem. We should be able -- as long as you
4 remind us that we're getting there.

5 MR. SHERMAN: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My only thought is,
7 on page 8 of the hard copy, where you have Present to the
8 Board, and you have a list there, that when you talk
9 about, well, with everything, I think it's good to have
10 schools or districts that are comparable in terms of free
11 and reduced lunch, and all that, to show some districts
12 have made, it, or some schools have made it. So --
13 because I think that's an important comparison for not
14 only the schools and districts that are going through the
15 turnaround, or priority improvement, but also for the
16 state board.

17 And then my other question, and we can maybe
18 come back to this, because I want to make sure you get
19 through the presentation, is more information on the
20 state review panel, when is it going to be appointed,
21 who's going to be on it, you know, what's the timetable
22 of everything? But just before we adjourn today.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Please ask the board
25 members to talk into their mic, because we -- I can't



1 hear back there. Maybe it's just that I have bad
2 hearing, but I can't hear anything. Thank you.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: And I have candy in my
4 mouth, so I apologize.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: On page 8, the list of
7 questions, I would be grateful if we were very clear to
8 the districts and schools who come to speak to us that
9 they do answer very specific questions. In particular,
10 I mean, all of them have merit. They've only got 20
11 minutes, I don't want them to skip number 8, which is
12 what if we were to follow the law. I think it's only
13 fair for them to think about whether -- if, I mean, the
14 first initial reaction I would think would be shock. But
15 after that, maybe think about, well, what would this look
16 like if we did this or that? What would be the affect on
17 our kids? What would be the affect on our community? Et
18 cetera.

19 So, I think what I'm asking for is a little
20 -- is more structure than the last time when we went
21 through this, so that we don't turn around and ask these
22 same questions. Oh, I guess one more question to ask
23 them is: Other than money, what are some specific needs
24 you have? Because I believe Paul asked every district
25 that came forward, or somebody asked: What do you need



1 from us to get there? So, they've already answered it
2 once, but I'd like to hear that again.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ready?

4 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fire away.

6 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair, I --

7 COMM. HAMMOND: Chair, I'm going to ask you
8 to do one thing, okay?

9 MR. SHERMAN: Please.

10 COMM. HAMMOND: Because we're really short
11 on time, I -- they really -- the board really needs to
12 hear your presentation. Okay? If you could bear with
13 it, we'll try and click through this as quickly as we
14 can.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll hold questions,
16 that'll help, too.

17 COMM. HAMMOND: Okay, so if you would take
18 that into consideration as you go through this.

19 MR. SHERMAN: Try to expedite it as quickly
20 as possible.

21 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you.

22 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair. And also, I just
23 want to introduce my colleague, Lindsay Jekkel (sp),
24 who's on our staff who is a director of our turnaround
25 network. She is going to share some of the slides from



1 our presentation.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent.

3 MR. SHERMAN: So, as Dr. Owen has
4 talked about, I just want to point out that we are trying
5 to respond to the data around the priority improvement IN
6 turnaround districts and schools. We are working with
7 districts and schools in particular to think about ways
8 we -- to make systemic changes in those districts around
9 some of the systems that they have that we know are -- or
10 tend to be sort of pernicious in the challenges that they
11 have. We're doing that. Our methodology is that we're
12 doing that through working with schools also. Which is a
13 bit of a departure for my office. And historically we've
14 worked with districts predominantly, and we are working
15 with schools directly.

16 Some of our work, to some of the earlier
17 questions, may or may not be couched, or given in the
18 context of the pathways around the accountability, but we
19 do believe some of the work that we're doing will lead to
20 solutions, or to help folks lead to solutions.

21 We also are -- this work, we're trying to
22 seek the place where CDE has some authority and has some
23 leverage and some influence with the districts knowing
24 that the districts -- that there is a local control
25 environment in our state, and that we do respect the



1 decisions that local districts and superintendents and
2 school leaders have, that they can make within their
3 schools.

4 Where am I on my slides? So, again, you got
5 to see the data. I won't go over that. About 72,000
6 students are my rough estimate of how many students are
7 in the schools that are in priority improvement or
8 turnaround, so we know that that's a significant number
9 of students that are in our state that are in schools.

10 Of course, not all of those students are low
11 performing, or -- but we know that the environments are
12 ones in which, generally, students are not performing.
13 So, therefore, we felt that we needed a strategy that
14 would provide more strategic support to select schools.
15 We want to work with -- in partnership with districts as
16 well as with some schools. We've had -- we also
17 recognize that we've had some inconsistent structures for
18 supporting low-performing schools. In large part we use
19 the performance frameworks, which come out annually, and
20 we know that we need data that's more regular and that's
21 more frequent in order to be able to work with folks out
22 in the field.

23 And then we also know that CDE is trying to
24 be a learning organization, and so there is no special
25 sauce, there's no silver bullet. We know that we have a



1 lot to learn with districts, and we know that there are -
2 - tend to be solutions in the local districts and
3 schools. And so, part of our work is to work to uncover
4 that.

5 We do have a theory of action. I won't talk
6 through this, you have the slide. But there is, I think,
7 some good thought and some good theory behind some of the
8 work that have gone into the network. I'm going to skip
9 through that.

10 So, just a couple of highlights around the
11 turnaround network. We developed this idea about a year
12 ago, and then we've put it into place this year. We --
13 first off, that it's a mutual decision for schools and
14 districts to enter into this network with us. There is
15 no state takeover. There's no -- there's no action that
16 -- where the state -- where we're forcing folks to engage
17 with us. Schools remain in their home district.

18 We're learning together between the
19 district, between the schools and between CDE, and we are
20 really -- the context of this network is that we want to
21 hold schools to a higher standard, and to higher
22 expectations for more accelerated performance. And, in
23 return, we feel that we are -- we can allocate more
24 resources and more attention to those schools and
25 districts.



1 So, some of our goals with the -- with the
2 network -- and as I've talked about, there's really sort
3 of three different parties at the table within our
4 network. There's CDE, and there's my staff, Lindsay and
5 our other colleagues, that are working very much directly
6 with schools and with the district. We've insisted --
7 so, of course, we're working with school principals in
8 our select schools, but we've insisted that we have
9 someone at the district level that generally is the
10 supervisor of that principal. Because we want to be sure
11 that the district is at the table, so when we encounter
12 challenges or successes in those schools, we want to be
13 sure that the district is there, and is doing their part
14 to help create those systems and those conditions for
15 success for that school.

16 So, some of our goals; for schools certainly
17 to see accelerated growth, to increase their capacity and
18 really support their systems around school culture,
19 around academics, around talent management, and around
20 operations of those schools. So how are the principals
21 able to manage those different systems better, and what
22 kind of conditions do they need to help support them?

23 With goals for district are really, again,
24 to sort of improve their practices around those
25 conditions. So, what's the district's part? In a very



1 large district it looks one way, in smaller districts it
2 looks another. So, some examples may be that there may
3 be that there may be -- there may be teacher recruitment
4 timelines that are challenging at the school level that
5 we would push on district and say: Hey, give them some
6 more free -- some more flexibility, or some more leeway,
7 so that principals in your lowest performing schools can
8 find the best candidates that are out there, or can find
9 those candidates first.

10 Around school culture, maybe there needs to
11 be an extended day, or maybe there needs to be a schedule
12 that's tweaked a little bit. We want districts to
13 recognize those and to support those kinds of goals and
14 systems in the schools.

15 And then we would like districts to be able
16 to think about, reflect on, what are the policies and
17 what are the practices in the local district that can
18 support, or that potentially are getting in the way of
19 some of their schools and their performance, and how can
20 they reconsider those, or adjust those along the way.

21 And then goals for CDE, for our part in
22 this, is really to set high expectations. And I think
23 this conversation that we've been in for the last hour-
24 and-a-half; it's very public, and it's very urgent, that
25 we make some significant changes. And I -- so our part



1 is to really highlight the urgency that we have here.
2 But it's also with our staff to really model what we see
3 as best practices in some of these areas that we'll share
4 with you today. So, we have -- we hold ourselves to very
5 high standards. We -- in our professional development in
6 our convenings, and we're asking and hoping that our
7 districts adopt some of those practices as well.

8 And then, I think we can also provide --
9 this network represents the most intensive level support
10 that CDE has been offering to schools to date, or in the
11 last couple of years, I should say. All right, I will
12 pass it over to Lindsay.

13 MS. JEKKELE: Sure. So, Mr. Chair, thank
14 you. Thanks for letting me have an opportunity to share
15 with you sort of the intensive work that we're doing with
16 our schools. And what I hope to do is give you a
17 snapshot of what's happening in some of our turnaround
18 schools. And per the earlier discussion, we have three
19 of the schools in our network are year five schools in
20 one district. And so, we want to talk a little bit about
21 what is a support we're providing and give you a sense of
22 what's going on in their buildings and what practices
23 we're trying to build. Both with the school principal
24 and with their district partner.

25 So, what you have in front of you is the



1 Turnaround Network Timeline. And this timeline actually
2 chunks out what are the services that we're providing to
3 our network. And I'm going to dig in a little roadmap.
4 We'll dig in a little bit on this idea of performance
5 management and why we selected that as our bet of what
6 CDE can really help build the capacity for districts to
7 do with their schools.

8 So, our turnaround network has four key
9 elements, the first being school walkthrough. So, this
10 district's partner we've identified is the principal
11 supervisor. And what we're -- honestly, what we were
12 usually dealing with was a principal supervisor who may
13 have had a drop-in policy with a school. Maybe just
14 popped by once a month, sort of checked in with a
15 principal. And we've been pretty prescriptive to say
16 that we want those district partners on site in the
17 school at least weekly. Sort of digging in really deeply
18 with the principal on some of these core strategies, and
19 we'll talk a little bit about what some of those
20 strategies are.

21 So that's sort of a first basis of what
22 we're trying to do, is help build the capacity of the
23 district partner to drop in, ask questions, sit side-by-
24 side with their principal to say: Is anything getting in
25 your way? Are you seeing successes? How can I help and



1 advocate for you with the district, and where can I find
2 additional resources for you?

3 We're paring that with a monthly, what we
4 call, a performance management site visit, and this is an
5 intensive, half-day, sort of step back meeting with CDE
6 with the district partner and with the principal where we
7 dig into some of their local data, and ask some pretty
8 intense conversations about are you on track, or are you
9 off track?

10 And when we look at some of that data what
11 really resonated was that some of these schools are
12 trying things, they're trying PD with teachers, they're
13 trying extended time, and they're not getting the
14 traction that they're -- they need, and this performance
15 management minute -- meeting is an opportunity for us to
16 dig in with them and say: You're doing all of this. Are
17 you getting the results that you want? Why or why not,
18 and can we help you focus and prioritize on what your
19 critical next step is?

20 The third element of our network is bringing
21 these guys together four times a year for a total retreat
22 and step-back meeting where these school principal's get
23 an opportunity to network with each other, share what
24 they're doing, and learn from some best-in-class
25 professional development providers. This is something we



1 think the state can do really well, is bring people
2 together and provide examples of excellent professional
3 development.

4 And we're also providing an annual review
5 for these schools, that's an extra set of eyes, it's not
6 the accountability structure, but it's somebody to go in
7 and talk about and look at the systems within the school
8 that's not just our eyes, not just the district, but
9 really what's going on in the school to help inform our
10 improvement practices.

11 So, who's in our network? So, our network
12 is a pretty diverse group of schools. Like I mentioned,
13 we have a few schools entering year five of turnaround.
14 We have a few schools that were higher in the priority
15 improvement, or priority improvement category, and we've
16 prioritized schools that were in years two, three or four
17 to sort of get ahead of that end-of-the-clock option. We
18 have some urban schools, we have a suburban school, we
19 have two mountain and more rural schools where the
20 districts partners is the superintendent.

21 And we're trying to build a practice that
22 works for a pretty diverse group of turnaround and
23 priority improvement schools. A quick plug for
24 increasing our support as we talk about it. We're just
25 now, with these new frameworks, in the process of



1 recruiting an additional cohort. So, starting with a new
2 cohort of schools and targeting another 10, 12, maybe 15
3 schools to do this intense level of work with and
4 prioritizing those same schools of years two, three or
5 four priority improvement or turnaround schools.

6 We'll work with them over the spring to help
7 identify their improvement strategies for the year and
8 then launch this process of performance management as
9 they enter into the next school year. Blazing fast
10 through this.

11 All right, so what we mean by performance
12 management, and this is the meat of what we're going to -
13 - well, we gave you an example of what we're doing, and
14 what our initial situation was with a lot of these
15 schools, is we do an annual review of their school plans.
16 It gives us a good sense of what's -- what they're
17 tackling, what they're trying to do, but it's not
18 sufficient. Some of these guys have some major systems
19 that they need to redesign, and they need to take a
20 really close look at that and on a shorter cycle to know
21 whether or not it's having the impact they want to have.

22 So, our performance management structure is
23 with -- is we're trying to establish really common
24 routines for when our staff is on site, when the district
25 partner is on site, for setting extraordinarily clear



1 goals and metrics, both for school outcomes and for
2 implementation and practices. On a monthly basis how do
3 you know that what you're doing is having the impact that
4 you want, and that we've asked for really transparent
5 accountability. We can't help them -- our schools
6 problem solve if they don't come to the table as a
7 partner and are honest with us about what's going on in
8 the -- in the school.

9 So, our expectations are that within a year
10 all of our network schools will increase, on some of
11 these leading indicators of school change as we see the
12 state assessments at the end of the year, but often times
13 these schools are struggling with things like high
14 average daily attendance. Schools aren't in school.
15 They have schools who are frequently chronically absent
16 and have high instances of school suspension or behavior
17 incidents. So, we expect to see improvements on those
18 leading indicators within one year, and we're asking
19 schools to set ambitious goals around those and track
20 them on a regular basis.

21 So, a quick example of what we have in front
22 of you, this brightly-colored page is an example from one
23 of our schools' unified improvement plans, and so this is
24 the place where our schools will identify a major
25 improvement strategy such as: We're establishing a data-



1 driven instructional cycle in our school. That is a big,
2 meaty strategy for a principal to break down and
3 implement, and so we've asked them to break down those
4 action steps in month-by-month chunks where we can sit
5 down and have a conversation about whether or not that
6 strategy is on track or off track, why or why not, and
7 what can we do to get it back on track if it's not on
8 track.

9 And so, when our district -- when we're not
10 there our district partners are not just popping in to
11 ask how is it going, but in this example, if they're
12 launching a new professional learning community, the
13 district partner is actually going in to observe that
14 professional learning community and give the principal
15 feedback on that. And in a lot of cases this is a level
16 of support that our district partners have not provided
17 in the past but gives us really good information about
18 whether or not the system is having the impact on adult
19 practice that we want.

20 We pair that with the second page as sort of
21 the school leading indicators page. In our UIPs, schools
22 have to set annual targets. We've asked them to walk
23 that back into monthly chunks using data that they use
24 locally, so a lot of our schools use NWEA, or Acuity, or
25 STAR data, and we've asked them to break that down so



1 that we can sit down with them halfway through the year
2 and discuss whether or not they're on track to meeting
3 those annual performance targets, because as Keith has
4 mentioned, they're not meeting those targets during the
5 course of the year, it's not likely they'll meet them at
6 the end of the year. So, this helps us monitor whether
7 or not they're seeing the movement in school achievement
8 we want them to see during the school year.

9 We've also set network-wide goals, and this
10 is a chance for our schools to look at each other's data
11 in real time and say: I'm on track. You're knocking it
12 out of the park. I want to see that. I want to go see
13 what they're doing and really build a collaborative
14 community of turnaround schools working together and
15 implementing their improvement plans. Questions so far?
16 Good? Yes? Perfect.

17 MS. NEAL: We're not done?

18 MS. JEKKEL: Not quite.

19 MS. NEAL: Okay.

20 MS. JEKKEL: Sorry. Just realizing I'm
21 moving, so -- and then, finally, we're aggregating this,
22 and so from CDE's perspective it's difficult to know
23 what's going on at 180 school buildings at all times, and
24 so what we've done with our network schools is come up
25 with our own systems and dashboards to collect this data.



1 And it's not evaluative, like, they're great, they're
2 not; it helps inform our support for the schools.

3 So, we are -- an example is that we -- once
4 we looked at all of our network school strategies,
5 everyone is trying to build a more robust system of data-
6 driven instruction. And a lot of their school's struggle
7 to say exactly what that looks like and how they plan to
8 implement it over the course of the year.

9 After our first round of performance
10 management visits most schools' implementation was
11 slightly off track in what they should have been
12 expecting by this time in the year. Teachers maybe
13 weren't secure in what they needed to do. It wasn't
14 having the impact they wanted. That allows our staff to
15 have a conversation about some trends and find an example
16 for our network schools to go observe a day-to-day at a
17 highly effective school that looks like theirs where they
18 can see what it looks like in action and bring back the
19 lessons learned to their campus.

20 So, this helps us inform also where we need
21 to differentiate supports. Where we see that goals are
22 off track, we may set up weekly coaching calls with that
23 districts partner, and we're able to respond in real time
24 to what we're seeing across the network. Which has been
25 very beneficial for informing our work, because we don't



1 want to be doing things that aren't matching those
2 school's needs. Yeah.

3 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair, we just have a
4 couple of more slides, but we also invited two folks from
5 two different districts just to speak to you really for
6 just a moment or two about their experience in the
7 network, and then we have some closing remarks and then
8 we'll be happy to take questions, if that -- if that fits
9 into the timing.

10 COMM. HAMMOND: And again, board members,
11 we're sorry. We're racing through this.

12 MS. JEKKEL: We're racing.

13 COMM. HAMMOND: Normally we'd have a lot
14 more time.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No this is important, and
16 we'll manage to shoehorn it all in, and it will fit.

17 MS. NEAL: We'll get it all in.

18 MR. SHERMAN: Okay, thank you. So, I just
19 want to introduce two individuals from the field. This
20 is Wendy Wyman, who is the superintendent at Lake County
21 Schools, and this is Kim Walsh, who's the director --
22 executive director of schools in Adams 12. And we're
23 working with schools in both of these districts in our
24 network, and I just asked both of them -- both of them to
25 come to speak a little bit about their experience.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. Walsh, welcome.

2 MS. WALSH: Thank you. Thank you. I'm
3 honored to be here today. Just a little, quickly
4 about our district, we have 982 students in 4 schools,
5 one of those schools is a pre-K school, and I've been
6 the superintendent -- this is my third year, and I was
7 a principal for one year in the districts before that,
8 and I'm excited to be here on behalf of our community
9 efforts at turnaround.

10 About three years ago we discovered through
11 examination of data, classroom walkthroughs, and
12 assessments of our overall districts systems that we
13 needed to make significant improvements in changes in
14 three overall areas. And those were curriculum and
15 instruction, culture and climate and then
16 infrastructure across the district.

17 We're making significant improvements and
18 changes across our system to support a higher level of
19 student learning. At the beginning of this school
20 year we significantly restructured our school system
21 so that now we have a K-2 school that's focused on
22 primary instruction, a 3rd through 6th-grade school
23 that offers schools an opportunity to strengthen
24 intermediate schools, and then a 7-12th grade school,
25 because we recognize that pre-collegiate work needs to



1 begin at seventh grade.

2 While we still have substantial work to do,
3 we're encouraged by the fact that our districts has
4 moved up from priority improvement to improvement this
5 year, and one of our two turnaround schools has moved
6 up to a priority improvement. We know that we haven't
7 arrived but feel that that indicates that we are at
8 least on the right road in doing some of the right
9 work.

10 Our experience has shown that implementing
11 comprehensive reform requires readiness, determination
12 and resources. So, we're partnering with three
13 different partners in this work. The CDE Turnaround
14 Network, Gates Family Foundation and Expeditionary
15 Learning. And the turnaround office, or turnaround
16 staff, and now the turnaround network have been
17 integral partners in our work.

18 Readiness was a really important step for us
19 in this work, and we spent time talking with our
20 community and going out and reaching out to the
21 community to help the community really understand that
22 we needed their support to help the schools move
23 forward. The turnaround network, or at that time
24 turnaround staff really helped us to think that
25 through.



1 Now, in the turnaround network, we're doing
2 significant work with the Relay's Graduate School of
3 Education, so two of our principals and myself have
4 participated in the Relay Graduate School of
5 Education, which has -- which is impacting our work in
6 the districts by -- we're implementing weekly feedback
7 meetings across the districts for every teacher in the
8 district. So, every teacher in the district each week
9 has a 15-minute observation in their classroom by
10 their evaluator and then a half-hour meeting where
11 they focus on a specific aspect of instruction to work
12 on and improve, and these meetings are very
13 collaborative, and we're seeing great success with
14 them.

15 Also, as a result of the participation in
16 the Relay work, we're seeing much more effective and
17 targeted professional development and better processes
18 and practices across the schools to improve climate
19 and culture. And, finally, you've heard about the
20 features of the turnaround network, but the monthly
21 support visits that we have are -- from our consultant
22 -- are incredibly helpful. I, along with another, our
23 district data director and principals walk classrooms
24 and evaluate what we're working on. And it's really
25 helped principals to think about their role as



1 instructional leaders and how they implement that in
2 their class -- in classrooms working with teachers.

3 We also participate in quarterly
4 professional development that's been very effective in
5 helping our principals think through how they can
6 manage and monitor change in their schools.

7 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

8 MS. WYMAN: And I guess I'll speak at --
9 more about the local level working at the specific
10 sites. We are a district of 42,000 students, and I
11 would say I am novice as a turnaround director. I'm
12 glad I don't have a lot of experience with that, and
13 I'm glad I have friends to help with that.

14 I would say the two most critical elements
15 for us are replication, so what are we learning in the
16 turnaround work that we can apply to other schools
17 that have entered into priority improvement or
18 turnaround status. And I would say that that's been a
19 huge success in part of the work we've started this
20 year already.

21 And I would say the other piece is really
22 understanding that the turnaround net -- the
23 turnaround schools are also uniquely individual, and
24 they can't get lost in a school, a district, of
25 42,000.



1 And so, with our thought partners and
2 support from CDE, we've really been able to push in
3 some of those areas around hiring, special education
4 staffing, class size reduction. When we can say we
5 have -- there is great accountability for the school,
6 and we need to do some things differently. And so,
7 our superintendent, our Board of Education, have been
8 very willing to give us some latitude when we have
9 schools that have unique differences. And I would
10 also agree with the monthly visits. They're
11 accountable, we have accountable visits entering data
12 into the performance management tool, and having a
13 thought partner to say: Can you help me with this?
14 I'm -- this is what I'm struggling with.

15 At the Executive Director Level there's not
16 a lot of peer-alike folks in our districts, there's
17 three of us. And so, to have additional thought
18 partners in this really tangled work has been very
19 beneficial.

20 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

22 MR. SHERMAN: I just want to point out there
23 are two other folks in the room from Pueblo 60, Dr.
24 Jones, the Superintendent, and Dr. Dinero (sp), the
25 President of the Pueblo Board. They also have four



1 schools in our -- in our network, so we appreciate
2 their support as well. So just to -- just to
3 conclude, a couple of lessons that we've learned so
4 far, we're just about a semester into this -- into
5 this network, and we're -- we've already learn--
6 reflected on a lot, and learned a lot, and adjusted
7 quite a lot along the way. We really do need more
8 opportunities for our schools to be able to learn from
9 other successful schools. I know that's been a theme
10 of conversation amongst this board. We've been able
11 to bring these folks out to some successful schools
12 already, but we need to do more of that.

13 We really need to have more intensives
14 supports around data-driven instruction. How do we
15 use data, and that's incredibly complicated and
16 incredibly nuanced, around the culture and personnel
17 of each school, so we really do need to increase that
18 support. We need to increase our support around the
19 district partners. Around folks like Kim and Wendy
20 and how do they manage whether it's at the
21 superintendent level, or at an executive director
22 level. How do they manage both down, with schools and
23 principals, but also up. Kim has the wonderful task
24 of having to work with her CAO and superintendent and
25 then their local board, and push upward as well.



1 And, as you know, that can be challenging
2 and probably perilous at times, also. So, we
3 recognize that we need to build support the districts
4 partners in that way. We also need to provide more
5 frequent, high-quality PD. We're in the process of
6 engaging with different external partners. We have
7 someone who who's coming to present to our next
8 quarterly meeting from an -- from the outside who's an
9 expert in some of these areas. And so, we're going to
10 continue to develop our relationships. And then also
11 just how do we align with other units here and at CDE.
12 In particular we're working with the choice and
13 innovation folks we're working with educator
14 effectiveness, we certainly work with improvement
15 planning and federal programs very closely.

16 Some of our hopes and wishes: We hope and
17 intend to include more schools in the cohort next year,
18 and have somewhere between 20 and 25 schools all
19 together. We want to engage with schools and districts
20 for -- closer on the accountability at clock per one of
21 the questions that was asked earlier. We want to provide
22 more opportunities on sort of a next concentric circle
23 out for professional development for schools and
24 districts that may not be part of our network.

25 We want to build more capacity in select



1 districts, so we really are looking for districts that
2 are interested to engage with us at the districts level
3 in this way, to be able to say how can we really engage
4 with you around some of the systems, and how can we
5 support you and make that sort of more intensive level
6 of support at the districts level? And then, really,
7 how do we align the support that we're providing through
8 our turnaround network with that of the turnaround
9 leadership grant that is just getting started right now.
10 So, thank you very much. Appreciate your patience and
11 tolerance of our presentation and open to any questions.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Interesting presentation.
13 Thank you all very much.

14 MS. NEAL: Yes, thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions?

16 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, can I just say one
17 thing?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, Mr. Commissioner?

19 COMM. HAMMOND: I do have -- I'd be remiss if
20 I didn't thank Lindsay and Peter and all the staff that's
21 behind them, and all -- when you look at CDE it's all
22 units that we're involving in this. It's taken quite a
23 bit, to say the least, but that is a part of our service
24 and support role, even though you may not hear that a
25 lot really.



1 We believe in this and this is new. We're
2 seeing good benefits and I just -- I would be remiss if
3 I didn't thank everyone in staff for all their hard work
4 and what they're trying to put into this, so thank you.
5 And, sorry, go ahead.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: My pleasure.

7 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll start down here. Dr.
9 Scheffel, Jane, questions? Comments?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, thank you.

11 MS. GOFF: No, no, no.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.
13 Questions over here? Pam?

14 MS. GOFF: Make them short, please.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you for the presentation.
16 I've heard you talk an awful lot about providing training
17 goals, a lot of meetings and staying on track. One of
18 the -- one of my concerns is what do we know about how
19 much that actually works in schools that are challenged,
20 and particularly in schools that have a challenged
21 population? You know, I'm just concerned that we make
22 sure that we're doing the things that actually change
23 outcomes for students, because, I mean, I can't help but
24 think of, like, the charter schools in Harlem, or other
25 parts of New York where what changed things was



1 expectations and what they expected of the children and
2 the intensity of their instruction of children.

3 And it seems to me that what I'm hearing a lot
4 of here is a lot about leadership, and a lot about
5 training teachers, but I want to be sure that we are
6 actually giving the students what they need to succeed.

7 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair. I think it's a -- I
8 think you make some great points and I -- and there's
9 some good questions in there, and I think on our staff,
10 and in the development of this network and our other
11 supports, we ask ourselves often what is the unique role
12 of the state, and what can the SEA -- what is our role?
13 We -- as you know, we have 170 schools on our
14 accountability clock. We -- I don't believe it's our
15 role, nor do we have the capacity to work with each of
16 those individuals. We certainly don't have the capacity
17 to work with every one of the teachers in those schools.

18 So, we believe strongly that being able to
19 work with some select schools in this way, and these are
20 not typical meetings, I would point out. When we have
21 our monthly visits, when we have our quarterly
22 convenings and we probably have more meeting -- more of
23 these convenings next year, because we're just realizing
24 that we -- there's a great need for that. They're not
25 a sit and get by any means. We're very much roll our



1 sleeves up and we -- our goal with our -- with this
2 network is to work ourselves out of a job. It's not
3 CDE's role to be a performance manager at the school
4 level. It's our job, I believe, to be able to work with
5 districts to be able to help train them and coach them
6 to be able to do that work.

7 So, we see this as a gradual release over time
8 where we want to be able to step away, but we're really
9 focused on sort of the systems that we think are
10 necessary in districts and at the schools to be able to
11 really target kids so that kids are not left out. And,
12 you know, if we ever had the chance to dig in more on
13 this performance management, you'd see that it's very -
14 - it's very much about school data, directly.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Great.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm, when you say that your
18 work is aligned with some of the other departments, it
19 would seem to me that some of the things that we learned
20 earlier today about elevate and having example of the
21 various Elements that are a part of our teacher
22 evaluations and having examples, that that would be
23 something that we would be sharing with teachers who are
24 trying to just -- just visiting a school where great
25 things are happening, and having that occur for three



1 hours, isn't quite the same as providing an opportunity
2 to repeat and try and then go back and look at it again.

3 So, are we pushing some of that information
4 that we are including in our -- in our efforts and
5 through elevate to really clarify what do these various
6 professional practices look like to the work that you
7 all are doing?

8 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman. Very much so.
9 And I think that, as you know, that Elevate data is
10 really nascent. It's just in the beginning stages of
11 that. I think we work with Katy Anthes and have been -
12 - they have a network of schools that they work with,
13 and so we are talking about where the overlap is, and
14 certainly as that data becomes more -- as we have more
15 of it and we get further into that we'll certainly --
16 that'll be part of our conversations as well.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: And there are national
18 examples out there. to the extent that you don't have
19 it yet, there are a lot of other places to be looking at
20 some of that, that are on the networks online.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Oh, I guess I did have a
23 question. Maybe this is for Peter, or maybe Lindsay,
24 but is -- Lindsay, is your role based on a grant? Are
25 you representing a vendor, or you work fulltime employee



1 of CDE, or when you talk about the turnaround network is
2 that a generic phrase for the 170 schools you served, or
3 is that a specialized phrase that is a certain turnaround
4 approach? Based on a vendor, or (indiscernible).

5 MS. JEKKEL: Yeah. Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

7 MS. JEKKEL: We are -- it's a certain approach
8 with a subset of schools, so part -- our staff is also
9 responsible for supporting schools that receive the
10 turnaround grants, so we provide a different level of
11 support for those schools who received the turnaround
12 grants, but this is a different approach for how do we
13 engage with a districts and with a school on setting
14 some priorities on that work as we do that.

15 So, this is a new approach, and our office
16 participates in a state turnaround policy network, a
17 national policy network, and we tried to borrow
18 elements of some of the statewide networks that are
19 happening in other states. Just come up with what can
20 our Colorado model be with our emphasis on sort of
21 building the capacity of the districts and the
22 schools. Not sort of a takeover model, but what can we
23 learn from those?

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How are you funded
25 (indiscernible)?



1 MS. JEKKEL: Oh state -- no, no. I'm not a
2 vendor. No.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But, I mean, how are
4 you -- ?

5 MS. JEKKEL: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're funded through
7 a grant as a person representing a model, or
8 (indiscernible)?

9 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

11 MR. SHERMAN: Yeah, Dr. Scheffel. That
12 office is primarily funded out of federal funds.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right, that's
14 (indiscernible).

15 MR. SHERMAN: Okay, and one of the things
16 that we've looked at as well, is an opportunity thank
17 you revitalize the school improvement grants, the
18 school improvement grants, the federal dollar grants
19 that we get. How might, you know, there's been mixed
20 results with those across the country. And so, one of
21 the things we thought we could do is utilize some of
22 those school improvement grant funding to help support
23 this kind of a concept. And so that's part of the
24 structure of support as well.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So the federal



1 dollars are part of what grant?

2 MR. SHERMAN: They're part of federal funds
3 that come in -- Mr. Chair, I'm sorry.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

5 MR. SHERMAN: They're part of federal funds
6 that come in from Title I, and they're also -- it's a
7 combination of several federal sources, but there's
8 another piece that is part of the school improvement
9 grant that's funding some of the work that they're
10 doing. The convenings, the professional development,
11 that type of work.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So you're part of a
13 federal initiative that Colorado got a grant to
14 implement and then you're serving a portion of the 170
15 schools.

16 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry if I'm
17 not being clear. It's not -- the funding to support
18 this comes from federal funds. The initiative is a
19 state initiative.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Chair?

21 MR. OWEN: And this is not additional
22 funding, this -- these are -- these are -- we're
23 essentially -- or, my office has been funded from
24 these federal grant funds for a number of years pre --
25 before I was here. But we're not -- we're only



1 reallocating some of the grants that might be -- might
2 have been granted out. Otherwise we're reallocating
3 those to try to leverage and try to target more some
4 of these systems that we know need improvement. But
5 there are no additional funds that have been added
6 into our system as a result of this.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So how does somebody
8 get into your network? They apply.

9 MS. JEKKEL: They apply it. Through a --
10 through a request for applications. Just an
11 application process. Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So, is there a
13 certain amount of money that is out there for the 170
14 schools?

15 MS. JEKKEL: There is, but there is that we
16 cover the cost of them participating, so coming to
17 travel, too. So, they're not necessarily awarded a
18 grant to participate. They can school- it -- they
19 aren't awarded a grant program, so it's a portion of
20 those turnaround dollars are allocated to supporting
21 the turnaround network activities.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So how do you -- how
23 do you know who get in and who doesn't get in?

24 MS. JEKKEL: We create an application
25 process where the schools -- they have -- we have an



1 eligibility list of all the priority improvement and
2 turnaround schools. They apply, write an application
3 that says: Here's why I think this type of support
4 would be beneficial to us. And then we have a group
5 of external reviewers who look at those applications
6 and the highest-scoring applications are accepted into
7 the network.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, and is it
9 certain percent of the 170? 5 percent, 10 percent?

10 MR. SHERMAN: No. Mr. Chair. It's really -
11 - its' really been just about our capacity again.
12 This is our pilot year. We decided we probably had
13 the capacity for about 10 to 12 schools. We started
14 off with 10 and 1 school, actually 2 schools, dropped
15 out early on. We felt like it wasn't the right fit.

16 Again, that number of 20 to 25 for next year
17 is About what we think we have the capacity to work
18 with.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So that'll be
20 interesting to compare the progress of those 20, let's
21 say, with the other 150 that don't get that kind of
22 support maybe to see how well the model works.

23 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair, we will certainly
24 track that data, and we'll also track any funds that
25 go to those schools, because we're very interested in



1 the ROI on this -- on this as well.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

3 MS. JEKKEL: Mm-hmm.

4 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

5 (Meeting adjourned)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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 9th day of March, 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