



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
June 10, 2015, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 10, 2015, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Marcia Neal (R), Madam Chair
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MADAM CHAIR: Back to order.

2 MS. MAZANEC: It changed pretty
3 dramatically, right?

4 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

5 MS. MAZANEC: A lot more state money.

6 MS. FLORES: No, not anymore.

7 MS. MAZANEC: State money. (Indiscernible)
8 has changed. (Indiscernible).

9 MS. FLORES: It is so flat as far as
10 ultimately the money that they get, that they can't do it
11 in so long.

12 MADAM CHAIR: I want to thank the rural
13 schools for being so patient. Bruce? I said I want to
14 thank you for being so patient. You've been here all
15 day. now we're actually going to take it up, okay?

16 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

17 MADAM CHAIR: The next item on the agenda is
18 the consideration of the Rural Alliance Council's
19 Student-Centered Accountability Project. Commissioner?

20 MR. DURHAM: Thank you very much. And we've
21 talked about this at two other meetings (indiscernible)
22 various materials. I'm going to turn this over. Take
23 your time to (indiscernible) to lead off conversation.
24 And several people from the Rural Alliance are here
25 (indiscernible). Elliott?



1 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Asp?

2 MR. ASP: Good evening. Good afternoon,
3 Board Members. I'm glad to have with us representatives
4 from Rural Innovation Alliance. I recall (indiscernible)
5 meeting they presented their own concept (indiscernible)
6 system. They're back here in -- which -- which was very
7 favorably received by the Board. They're back here at
8 this -- this meeting requesting that you formalize that
9 reaction (indiscernible) resolution that endorses that
10 work and supports them going forward (indiscernible) the
11 Department to assist in that work, particularly
12 developing a (indiscernible) plan among other things.

13 We have several of the representatives here
14 today. We have Brian Haskins -- excuse me, Brian Hanson
15 from Mancos School District, the superintendent; Bruce
16 Jenkins (ph) from (indiscernible) school district; also,
17 Paula Stephenson, who's executive director of Rural
18 Caucus, Kathleen Gebhardt from Children's Voices; Family
19 CH from Buena Vista Schools folks with here today.
20 They're not here to make a presentation. They would like
21 to make a few remarks about the resolution and then move
22 that forward to -- for your discussion (indiscernible).
23 Would you like to step up to the podium?

24 MR. HANSON: Madam Chairman of the State
25 Board and everyone here, I -- we'd just like to thank you



1 for your consideration of our resolution. As we stated
2 at May meeting, we spent a lot of time and effort working
3 on this. I'd also like to thank Elliott and Tony for
4 meeting with us this morning and fine-tuning it. It was
5 -- I mean, I think we're all in agreement that's the
6 right work and the right time to do it. We'd be happy to
7 answer any questions that you might have about our
8 resolution. And we'll just go from there.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Anyone else?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm just reading this,
11 because this just got handed out. I'm just reading this,
12 because this just got handed out (indiscernible).

13 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

15 MR. ASP: Just clarify that, and I -- I
16 apologize to Dr. Scheffel for that. The -- it's -- it's
17 not very much different from the first resolution that we
18 sent to you. There's a couple key pieces if you want to
19 (indiscernible).

20 MS. SCHROEDER: It's a little -- it's a
21 little bit different though, right?

22 MR. ASP: Yeah.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

24 MADAM CHAIR: If you can tell.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I read that last -- last
2 night, so what's different?

3 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

4 MS. MAZANEC: I mean, I have it in front of
5 me, but I --

6 MR. HANSON: So if you will -- I guess
7 that's all.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Got you.

9 MR. HANSON: If you'll look on the first --
10 the first page, second paragraph from the bottom, what
11 was changed is we had originally "education professions
12 in school districts because accountability has been
13 singularly to the statewide assessment system and a
14 growth model that is statistically questionable." That's
15 been scratched and restated that -- that as the sentence,
16 the -- "the appropriate use of results of the Colorado
17 growth model with small numbers of students in many rural
18 school districts where small -- that have small student
19 populations." So it's just a minor change.

20 In the -- in the last paragraph --

21 MS. MAZANEC: First page?

22 MR. HANSON: On the -- last paragraph on the
23 first page, correct, we had -- we had lumped
24 "standardized tests" into the whole bad category, I
25 guess, for lack of better words. And so we changed that



1 to "large-scale state standardized tests." Because there
2 are a lot of --

3 (Overlapping)

4 MR. HANSON: -- state testing, because there
5 -- there are standardized tests that are -- we -- you
6 know, NWEA, ACT, you know, some of those kind of things.
7 So that was the change.

8 And then going to the second page, one, two,
9 three, four, five, six, seven paragraphs, it says, "Now,
10 therefore be it resolved that the Colorado State Board of
11 Education endorses the Student Center Accountability
12 Project and supports, we had approved," change that word
13 to "support."

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

15 MR. HANSON: The RIA request to develop and
16 pilot an alternate multi-year student center
17 accountability center and directs the Department to work
18 with the RIA as they finalize a proposal and
19 implementation plan that will be submitted to the State
20 Board in this fall. And that -- those changes came about
21 this morning. We met at 9:30 meeting -- Paula, Bruce,
22 myself, Elliott, and Tony. And we're all okay with the
23 changes as presented. Okay.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I think they're an
25 improvement. I think calling the growth model invalid,



1 which some of your resolutions did, I would want to ask
2 you to show me why. And so I'm really glad that you -- a
3 little bit more measured in your concerns. We all have
4 concerns, but I don't know that it's necessarily invalid.
5 It's just not very helpful.

6 MR. HANSON: Correct.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So in general, I -- I'll say
8 this much: I -- I'm -- the changes are kind of the
9 changes that I wanted to see. I'm a little unclear what
10 the last two "now, therefore be resolved" actually
11 commits us to. And I say that only in terms of, yes, we
12 would want to submit this as part of our ESEA waiver,
13 assuming that it's approved. I mean, I -- I'm hoping
14 that you're not trying to put us into some kind of a
15 legal box.

16 MR. ASP: I think we're using the term
17 "waiver" a little generically there. The waiver that Dr.
18 (Indiscernible) is the waiver from (indiscernible)
19 itself. We're talking about proposals we're preparing
20 for assessment/accountability waiver around the
21 assessment and accountability requirements of
22 (indiscernible).

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

24 MR. ASP: So that's (indiscernible).



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And they are the sort of
2 things that were approved by the Board as -- as opposed
3 to legislature. Are we looking at waivers that come from
4 the legislature? Waiving legislative?

5 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

6 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I'm -- I'm just trying
8 to get this clear in my head.

9 MR. ASP: (Indiscernible) as well. The way
10 -- one waiver we have is this waiver requirement of no
11 child behind (indiscernible) placed for several years.
12 And -- and (indiscernible) now in the process of
13 (indiscernible). What we said in that waiver
14 (indiscernible) come forward with a proposal for
15 accountability and assessment pilot.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

17 MR. ASP: And I think the language in here
18 is referring to that (indiscernible) proposal.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much
20 (indiscernible).

21 MADAM CHAIR: Wait here. Jane?

22 MS. GOFF: Thank you. (Indiscernible) about
23 the (indiscernible) of the -- of the (indiscernible)
24 resolution. And I don't have a mic here. I'm sorry. I
25 know where they are, but they're not very good. The



1 copies of the resolutions that came from (indiscernible).
2 Are they -- are those substantively different than this
3 now (indiscernible) that they already (indiscernible).

4 MADAM CHAIR: You're close.

5 MS. GOFF: (Indiscernible) wording or -- or
6 do we have two sets of what could be construed as
7 different ideas lying around?

8 MADAM CHAIR: You got that?

9 MR. HANSON: Maybe I'll just stand up here
10 (indiscernible). Okay, so this is -- this is my
11 language. This isn't language that represents the group
12 when I answer that question.

13 Resolutions that -- the content of the
14 resolutions that our local boards pass and the content of
15 the resolution that you have in front of you are -- are
16 similar in -- in the "whereas" statements. Our board's
17 resolution do not have the therefores saying, you know,
18 we as local boards are directing you as the state board
19 to do X, Y, and Z. But the content of our local board
20 saying you -- you know, this one size fits all isn't
21 working for rural districts, that -- that there's more to
22 accountability than a single test that we support that --
23 that our employees have been doing in trying to get this
24 project off the ground and -- and moving forward. So yes



1 and not, if -- if that makes sense. Or do you want more
2 clarification?

3 MS. GOFF: It makes sense.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: They weren't identical.
5 They weren't identical.

6 MS. GOFF: They're not the same. I guess my
7 question is you've got two sets of ideas possibly
8 construed to mean a portion of the (indiscernible) the
9 entire alliance or individual local (indiscernible) don't
10 agree with saying support bill model or -- or at one --
11 one side of this is saying that the bill model is not
12 valid. And it's not inferred that way somewhere else.

13 MS. MAZANEC: So the original -- I'm sorry.

14 MS. GOFF: It's okay.

15 (Overlapping)

16 MS. MAZANEC: Go ahead. Please.

17 MS. STEPHENSON: Madam Chair, Board Member
18 Goff, the original -- the resolution that the --

19 MADAM CHAIR: Speak into the microphone,
20 please.

21 MS. STEPHENSON: Oh, sorry. The resolution
22 that the members of the RIA passed was written several
23 months ago when we first started this project and was
24 passed by those boards as support of the work that we
25 were trying to do as a group to move forward. The



1 resolution that you all have has been crafted based on
2 the conversations and the input that we have had as a
3 group and then with CDE and with you since that time. So
4 it better reflects the changes that we wanted to make and
5 to -- and -- and the collaboration that we wanted to
6 ensure moves forward with you all and with the Board as
7 we move forward in this process.

8 So, you know, no, there's been no time to
9 even talk to all the districts about how we tweaked it
10 this morning, but they are all supportive of and had seen
11 the original resolution and -- and had given us the go-
12 ahead to make any changes that we needed to this morning
13 when we met with Elliott and Tony. So I --

14 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Yes, it makes good
15 sense.

16 MS. STEPHENSON: Okay.

17 MS. GOFF: No, I would hardly think that 100
18 percent of those who signed (indiscernible) that they're
19 all -- that they're all (indiscernible) or universally.
20 But I think we all learned that -- that kind of lineup of
21 communication (indiscernible). And if there's a group of
22 people out there that aren't (indiscernible) different
23 resolutions, whether it's at the alliance level or
24 whether it's here or (indiscernible). If it turns out to
25 be interpreted differently (indiscernible) report, that's



1 a problem. I'm just clarifying. Is everybody on the
2 same page about what this says? The answer is --

3 (Overlapping)

4 MADAM CHAIR: (Indiscernible) same page.

5 MS. STEPHENSON: Yeah, it's my knowledge the
6 answer is yes, it got sent to everybody. That was it.

7 MR. HANSON: Well, and what I would say to
8 that, I mean, being the superintendent, you don't do
9 these type of things unless you keep your board apprised
10 of every change. So I mean, as soon as we did this, I
11 sent a -- an email out to my board and said, hey, here's
12 the changes that we made. I mean, obviously I've not
13 heard back from them, but they also have charged me with
14 doing what I can to make this happen. So for me, and I
15 can only speak for me and my board, we're -- we're on the
16 same page with it. And the changes that we made, to me,
17 don't substantively change the original resolution.

18 MS. STEPHENSON: Yeah, one other point I'd
19 like to make is at no point in time have we said that the
20 district's passing their own resolutions in supporting
21 our work trying to move forward. It doesn't obligate
22 them to stay in the project. If they end up three days
23 from now saying, oh, wait, we did have a different
24 interpretation, they -- they could drop out. But it has



1 been sent to everybody. It was sent to all the boards
2 again. So I believe we're all on the same page.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have a notion how many
4 of them will accept it?

5 MS. STEPHENSON: Will what, I'm sorry?

6 MADAM CHAIR: You say they can opt out if
7 they want to. I'm saying do you have a notion of how
8 many of them will choose to do that or -- or choose to
9 stay?

10 MS. STEPHENSON: To date, I have not heard
11 from any of the districts that have --

12 MADAM CHAIR: That you have not heard --

13 MS. STEPHENSON: -- that are still involved
14 at this point --

15 (Overlapping)

16 MS. STEPHENSON: -- that they want to drop
17 out. We started with one or two others that, you know,
18 several weeks ago, because of changes in personnel had
19 decided it was not the right time for them, so they had
20 already removed themselves. But right now I haven't
21 heard anything as far as anyone else --

22 (Overlapping)

23 MS. STEPHENSON: -- removing themselves from
24 the process.



1 MS. FLORES: So they're all in.

2 (Indiscernible) motion?

3 (Overlapping)

4 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to motion?

5 MS. MAZANEC: Are we finished discussing?

6 MADAM CHAIR: As a motion in the -- somebody
7 wants to make the motion?

8 MS. FLORES: Do you want to ask --

9 MS. MAZANEC: I wanted to ask a question.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Go. Go ahead.

11 MS. MAZANEC: I mean, is there someone to
12 ask?

13 MS. STEPHENSON: I'm sorry, I thought you
14 said, "Motion," so I sat down.

15 MS. MAZANEC: So I appreciate the -- the
16 resolution. And I think this center piece of it, if I'm
17 understanding it, is all about accountability, saying
18 that the current approach doesn't meet the needs of the
19 subset of districts.

20 So my question is this: Legislation often
21 leads to a one-size-fits-all approach, right? Which
22 doesn't work for a subset of districts, especially those
23 defined as rural. So what is behind the reality that it
24 doesn't work and does what you're proposing address that?
25 Right? Because what we get, of course, is we need



1 accountability. Everybody believes that. Nobody doesn't
2 believe that. But what's the best way to achieve that?
3 And what you're saying is the current approach doesn't
4 really achieve that. It really doesn't give the kind of
5 data that we need. It really does to a narrowing of
6 curriculum, teaching to the -- all the things we've heard
7 that, you know, standardized assessments can have kind of
8 unintended consequences about.

9 So can you -- will you be able to say or as
10 you flesh out the details of this, will you move in the
11 direction of saying based on these changes, we're going
12 to be better able to support achievement. We're going to
13 be able to support higher educate -- higher graduation
14 rates. We're going to be able to demonstrate better
15 parent and student -- student satisfaction. You know, is
16 that -- I mean, because this is a general document. So,
17 I mean, is that the direction that you're moving?
18 Because we want to be able to support it based on that.

19 MS. STEPHENSON: Right. Madam Chair?

20 MADAM CHAIR: (Indiscernible).

21 MS. STEPHENSON: I was going to say yes,
22 absolutely, that's been our goal from day one, is to
23 really look at more of a whole body of evidence, to
24 create an umbrella structure where we have univied --
25 unified diversity, is what we're calling it. So a broad



1 umbrella structure that districts can operate within, but
2 they're also able to within that look at accountability
3 and focus on different areas that are meaningful for them
4 and their communities and close opportunity gaps that
5 they might have that another district doesn't. So, yes,
6 absolutely, that is the goal of what we want to do.

7 And I think when we spoke with Elliott and
8 Tony this morning, that's the piece we want to have put
9 in place for you when we come back in a couple month's
10 time. We've been working on it for a while, but --

11 MS. MAZANEC: So you're fleshing out the --

12 MS. STEPHENSON: Exactly.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Okay, thank you.

14 MS. STEPHENSON: Does that help?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comments or
16 questions? Anybody want to -- is there a motion?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Here it is: I move to
18 formally endorse the Student-Centered Accountability
19 Project, and in doing so, demonstrate the board's support
20 for the work of the Rural Initiative Alliance to develop
21 --

22 MADAM CHAIR: Innovation.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, sorry. It is -- it is
24 that witching hour for me -- Rural Innovation Alliance to
25 develop and gain approval for an alternative



1 accountability system that is valid, reliable, and
2 meaningful to students, staff, and communities.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second?

4 MR. DURHAM: Second.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: I second.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Seconded by Steve.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: I need coffee.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Do we need to call the roll or
9 do you want to call the roll? Okay, staff, please call
10 the roll.

11 MS. BURDSALL: Steve Durham?

12 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

13 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Flores?

14 MS. FLORES: Yes.

15 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

16 MS. GOFF: Aye.

17 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

18 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Marcia Neal?

20 MADAM CHAIR: Aye.

21 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

25 MS. MAZANEC: 7-0, woohoo.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. You could sell a -
2 -

3 MS. MAZANEC: Congratulations.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. All right. We
5 need to move quickly into a request from Holyoke School
6 District. This is 18.07, to approve its Innovation Zone
7 application on behalf of Holyoke Elementary School,
8 Holyoke Junior/Senior High School, and Holyoke
9 Alternative School. Who's doing that? Commissioner,
10 you, or --

11 MR. DURHAM: No, right now the --

12 MADAM CHAIR: Elliott or --

13 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

14 MADAM CHAIR: Who's the Innovative at
15 Holyoke?

16 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible). Gretchen?

17 MADAM CHAIR: Gretchen. Oh, thank you.

18 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

19 MADAM CHAIR: 18.07 if you're looking for
20 it.

21 (Overlapping)

22 MS. BURDSALL: -- here. You're going to
23 have two different districts who are coming before you
24 this afternoon, because this is their first time creating
25 an Innovation school inside their district, and as you



1 all recall, the first time a district does that, they
2 need to come before you to also be approved as a
3 district.

4 You guys are going are going to hear from
5 two districts about their plans for their Innovation
6 school. And then you are asked to give them that
7 recognition (indiscernible) Innovation so that
8 (indiscernible). Any questions for me before I turn it
9 over (indiscernible)?

10 MADAM CHAIR: So are you going to call them
11 forward?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: What? What did you --

13 MS. BURDSALL: (Indiscernible) Holyoke --
14 (Overlapping).

15 MADAM CHAIR: Holyoke, would you please come
16 forward?

17 (Pause)

18 MADAM CHAIR: Welcome. Glad you could be
19 here. Who's going to do this presentation --

20 (Overlapping).

21 MR. MILES: We all have just a little bit to
22 add.

23 MADAM CHAIR: What?

24 MR. MILES: Each four of us -- each of the
25 four of us have just a little bit to add.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. That's great.

2 MR. MILES: All right.

3 MADAM CHAIR: You want to start?

4 MR. MILES: Yes, thank you. Commissioner
5 Hammond, State Board, thank you for hearing the Holyoke
6 Innovation Zone application today. I'm Bret Miles,
7 superintendent with the Holyoke School District. Today
8 represents the -- we -- what we hoped to be the finale of
9 22 months, from our first exploration into this
10 Innovation statute to today, where we get to come before
11 you with the recommendation of CDE staff.

12 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

13 MR. MILES: And maybe. I'd like to thank
14 Commissioner Hammond and the staff. I think we had our
15 first meeting with Commissioner Hammond and Dr. Owen and
16 Joe Holly (ph) was there, Dr. Asp. That was over a year
17 and a half ago where we met in this room. As we've moved
18 the channels with the Department at each level, we would
19 like to let you know that there, your staff has been even
20 more and more helpful as the -- we've made this move
21 forward.

22 I'd also like to just quickly say a thank
23 you to Kim Delay (ph) and Michelle Murphy (ph), who's
24 here, Beth Reel (ph) with the Casbee (ph) staff. Without
25 their experience and -- or their expertise and experience



1 and -- and their determination on their project, we
2 needed their help all the way along the way. So we
3 really appreciate that.

4 Our plan is based on what we believe to be
5 some basic truths. Number one, the intent of some laws
6 do not fit the many rural school systems, including
7 Holyoke. Number two, we have an outstanding -- we have
8 outstanding community support, clear direction from our
9 board's own strategic plan, and a local accountability
10 that's greater and more intense than any state
11 accountability system can be. And number three, we know
12 our people. As you see on our application, that was
13 basically the centerpoint of our application. We know
14 our staff, we know our students, we know our parents.
15 That affords us many advantages, as we can create very
16 personal educational programming and very personal
17 accountability.

18 So as you were aware, our plan has two major
19 components. First, we're seeking a waiver from the TS
20 gold assessment in our kindergarten. Our replacement
21 plan outlines a comprehensive assessment that we have in
22 place in conjunction with our local preschool. We
23 understand that the intent of the gold assessment could
24 be very needed in many school districts where your kids
25 are coming to you from a large variety of places. This



1 fall, we'll have 45 new kindergarten students, 40 of them
2 coming from our local preschool, of which we work very
3 closely.

4 Our kindergarten teachers, preschool
5 teachers conduct what we believe to a very innovative
6 kindergarten roundup program. We have for years. And
7 with the assistance of the staff understanding the new
8 law, have even enhanced that roundup process. We just
9 feel like that the assessment takes away too much time
10 from the instruction for too little of new information
11 that we get, since we already have such a comprehensive
12 approach. And I know you saw in our application the
13 several different screening tools that -- that we use and
14 we're very proud of. We know we're identifying these
15 issues with our struggling readers, because we are --
16 we're consistently beating the state average in our third
17 grade reading and writing. And we know we're preparing -
18 - preparing the kids well.

19 The second part of our application is around
20 teacher evaluation. When Senate Bill 191 first came into
21 effect, our district was a leader in implementation. And
22 if you talk with Katy Antha (ph), she could really attest
23 to really good work that was done in our district as we
24 put together plans to implement this law.



1 We're glad we did that, because only by
2 going through all of that to the degree that we did of
3 developing policy and looking at each element are we
4 confident that we're not going to glean information that
5 we don't already have. And instead, you'll see in our
6 replacement plan we've significantly increased the amount
7 of time that our principals are evaluating our teachers.
8 And we believe that we will be able to hold our teachers
9 accountable for better instruction by being in the
10 classroom more, by having a more formal written
11 evaluations than we will by adding some numbers to their
12 evaluation.

13 I'd also like to say that we feel like this
14 Innovation Zone is just part of how we do business in
15 Holyoke. We are very proud. We feel like we've made
16 great strides in student achievement. Just recently,
17 your Department had recognized the Holyoke school
18 district for closing its socioeconomic gap in all tested
19 areas over a six-year period. We're very proud of that.
20 We implemented a data-driven dialogue system that we keep
21 in place all year. We no longer accept D's towards
22 credit for graduation with our students. We have a
23 rigorous grading place that requires students to redo all
24 work that doesn't meet the standard. We are using the
25 Department's sample curriculum document, which has really



1 helped us to focus instruction and it's helped us to
2 spend our time on developing the student-friendly "I can"
3 statements in each classroom.

4 We've been working with our neighbor school
5 districts to develop assessments to match these new
6 Colorado academic standards. And we put time in our
7 calendar every week for our teachers to collaborate
8 together and have even purchased technology to help us
9 track each student's achievement by the standard.

10 So we really feel this Innovation
11 application is more than just a couple waivers. It is
12 allowing our district to pull together all the pieces in
13 one system, under the guidance of our board's strategic
14 plan. We feel like we're moving forward in the right
15 direction. And as you know, we're getting results. And
16 so we believe this plan will allow us to continue down
17 the path and meet the needs of our students. So I'd like
18 to turn this over to Pat Wiebers, who is a member of our
19 board of education.

20 MS. WIEBERS: As Bret said, I am Pat
21 Wiebers. I serve on the board of education. Bret and I
22 sat together in a presentation (indiscernible) 13 to get
23 our board started down this path and to open the initial
24 conversation. But board of education is invested in this
25 application. Our staff and community are also invested



1 in this application. Our district operates in what we
2 called a shared leadership model. This model has several
3 committees that operate, made up of staff, parents, and
4 community members.

5 We have worked this process through our
6 model and have had great input from parents and community
7 members who do not have students in our schools. Our
8 Standard of Excellence team, which serves as a district
9 accountability (indiscernible), make the final vote of
10 support. And even though they did -- would touch many
11 more lives along the way, I confidently share with you
12 today that this plan has been thoroughly investigated
13 from start to finish and it is a community project and a
14 community plan for our school in alliance with the goals
15 of our board of education. Ultimately, that's why our
16 board unanimously voted to improve the resolution
17 supporting our application for the Innovation Zone. I
18 will now pass it on to Ms. Ortner (ph).

19 MS. ORTNER: I'm Susan Ortner. I'm the
20 principal of Holyoke Junior/Senior High School. And
21 today I'm the voice of the junior and senior high school
22 staff, as well as the elementary staff.

23 Mr. Miles first talked to -- to our staff
24 members teachers about this possibility a year ago,
25 spring of 2014. As principals, we've given him staff



1 time for updates several times over the course of last
2 year to help keep teachers in the loop. It was no
3 surprise when we took our staff vote this spring that we
4 had 100 percent support from our principals and
5 (indiscernible) teachers. We also had an unanimous vote,
6 as Mrs. Weiber said, and a great deal of support from our
7 parents and community members who serve us
8 (indiscernible).

9 Teachers are supportive of more evaluations
10 (indiscernible) principals are supportive of more time in
11 classrooms and more would post evaluation (indiscernible)
12 teachers. We say this is a (indiscernible) foster
13 (indiscernible) and student performance. We
14 (indiscernible) spreadsheets. (Indiscernible)
15 Superintendent John McCleary.

16 Madam Chairman, State Board of Education,
17 I'm John McCleary. I'm really excited to be joining the
18 Holyoke School District on July 1st. We've been working
19 very closely to have a transition plan. And I've been
20 kept in the loop and I am pleased to implement this plan.
21 This type of staff and community involvement and this
22 type of action of making things work for Holyoke School
23 District is one of the reasons why I was so attracted to
24 this school district in the first place and thrilled to
25 have been offered the position. And since I was hired,



1 I've worked with Mr. Miles, Mrs. Ortner, the Board to
2 understand the background of the application and the
3 extensive involvement of teachers, principals, parents,
4 and community in this plan.

5 I was even fortunate enough last April, this
6 past April, to attend the final meeting with -- with
7 Holyoke admin and CDE staff, so was able to see what
8 their perspectives are, what CDE staff's perspectives are
9 on this plan. And I believe it's going to help and it's
10 going to continue making Holyoke the best school district
11 that we can be.

12 Again, we'd like to thank the support of
13 Commissioner Hammond for everything that he's done and
14 the entire Department, as well as thank you for your time
15 and for listening to us on your agenda today. So any
16 questions?

17 MADAM CHAIR: No, thank you very much. I'm
18 very excited. Do you have a question?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, of course I have a
20 question. So there are parts of this I'm very
21 comfortable -- first of all, I want to commend you for
22 the process that you've gone through to get the support.
23 Believe me, I'm not surprised the teachers would support
24 backing out of 191, so -- but I do believe that you've
25 vetted this through well.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd like to (indiscernible)
2 question.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: The -- the waiver from the
4 school readiness piece makes a lot of sense to me,
5 because the way it's been explained to me, there's too
6 much redundancy, based on the number of rules. I'm
7 confused in reading about the waiver of using student
8 data in your teacher evaluations, because throughout the
9 description, which is a tremendous evaluation process in
10 terms of observations, you talk about using the data.
11 And I can't figure out what it is that you don't want to
12 do. And I'm -- I needed more specificity than I found in
13 here for that particular piece. Can you help me with
14 that?

15 MR. MCLEARY: I can. When we worked with
16 staff on our last visit, the evaluation instrument, as
17 you can see, requires that data is used as part of those
18 conferences and those post-conferences. That has to be
19 part of the conversation. And we've written it into the
20 document so that those dates are even documented with it.
21 What we're moving away from is using it as a number that
22 ends up in the summary. So we're very much committed to
23 using the data, have been for a long time, even asked the
24 Board for professional time in our calendar to have more



1 conversations around the data. I just don't need it to
2 add it to a number at the end.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So you don't like the
4 computer program that does all the cranking of the
5 numbers?

6 MR. MCCLEARY: Correct.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

8 MADAM CHAIR: It's cold.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I know, it's cold now. Are
10 you aware of the study of the six -- in your district's
11 school districts that suggest that using student data and
12 student evaluations is a better predictor than the
13 classroom observation?

14 MS. MAZANEC: I never heard that.

15 MR. MCCLEARY: I -- I'm not exactly sure
16 what you're --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Help me, Katy, what's the
18 name of that study? The six Denver public schools was a
19 part of the study.

20 MS. MAZANEC: There are so many studies.
21 We're trying to figure out --

22 MS. ANTHA: The med study?

23 MS. SCHROEDER: The med study, thank you.
24 I've been trying to figure that out. Are you aware of
25 that?



1 MR. MCCLEARY: Just vaguely familiar --
2 couldn't -- couldn't comment.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So I understand your
4 concerns. My concern is how do I know that you're not
5 eliminating something that is very, very helpful?

6 MR. MCCLEARY: For six years, the district
7 has had a very comprehensive study, parent, and staff
8 survey that comes in each year, the comments about --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: The --

10 MR. MCCLEARY: We use that data each year.
11 It is run through the Standard of Excellence Committee,
12 which is our accountability committee. It's published.
13 We're not afraid of --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm -- I didn't see that
15 in here.

16 MR. MCCLEARY: But it -- it wasn't included
17 in the --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: It was?

19 MR. MCCLEARY: It was not --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

21 MR. MCCLEARY: -- included in there as that.
22 But it's another thing in one of the many things in the
23 district we're extremely proud of. And we feel like that
24 that's very accountable. Possibly the only way it would



1 be in here would be in those documents of our annual
2 report to the community. We -- there's a section --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So my -- my -- my point --

4 MR. MCCLEARY: -- about the perception.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. My point is that in
6 a teacher evaluation that the feedback from his or her
7 students, and perhaps parents, but especially the
8 students, can be a huge factor in helping improvement,
9 which is really what the whole purpose of the evaluation
10 is. It's not to ding anybody, but it's to have
11 discussions about what ways to improve. And if we hear
12 from kids -- and it's the same thing with data.

13 I just want to share with you an observation
14 I've made over time, which is that another time, we had a
15 district come to us asking for a waiver. And at the
16 time, that district was a district accredited with
17 distinction. And so we felt we really shouldn't -- we
18 should grant anything, because they're doing right by
19 kids. And what's happened is they're no longer a
20 district of distinction. And I have no idea whether the
21 waivers that we granted had anything to do with that.
22 But based on that, it's my recommendation that we go
23 ahead and approve what you want to do, because I think
24 it's a great idea, but we need some feedback. And we
25 need to make sure you're not accredited with distinction.



1 MR. MCCLEARY: No.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: And so you've got a lot of
3 room -- we've got a lot of room (indiscernible), even
4 districts accredited with distinction. There's always --
5 and that was one of the things actually I didn't see. I
6 didn't see a continuous improvement plan as part of this,
7 but I'm hopeful that that is a part of your overall
8 system of improvement.

9 So what I'd like to suggest to us is that we
10 give you the chance to go do this. I think we need to go
11 learn from this. My -- one of my problems with granting
12 waivers to a system that we're still evaluating is that
13 when you're gone, then we don't get the feedback to tell
14 us here are some improvements that need to be made for
15 the future for the entire system, not just for Holyoke.

16 So I'm hoping that you might consider coming
17 back to us in three years, reporting, having us look at
18 how your kids are doing and how your system is doing.
19 And then if things have fallen apart, we have a whole
20 different conversation than if -- if in fact the whole
21 state can learn from the kind of work that you've been
22 doing, especially for smaller districts.

23 MR. MCCLEARY: We've had --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Just that --



1 MR. MCCLEARY: I think we've always had a
2 very good relationship with the Department and definitely
3 willing to share. Moving forward, I don't see any
4 reason, but certainly if things aren't working, this --
5 our community isn't going to stand for holding firm with
6 the same path if things aren't working. The -- the true
7 accountability, as I call it, that you have in -- in our
8 community, much more so than a -- than a label won't --
9 won't stand for it. And that's one of the reasons we're
10 -- I'm very proud to work there.

11 MR. MILES: And one of the things I -- I
12 really like, Ms. Schroeder, what you said about data and
13 about the med study. And one of the things I love about
14 working in a small school system -- and I've dedicated my
15 career working in small school systems -- is that you can
16 make almost immediate course corrections as you're
17 progressing through something. You can say, hey, listen,
18 Mrs. So-and-so is the first grade levels not implementing
19 this reading program right. Let's go talk to her. Let's
20 model a couple lessons. And then let's follow up on when
21 it's done.

22 And so the data that you can derive into a
23 normal classroom, being in from a classroom setting like
24 that is it's -- it's more immediate. And that's where I
25 think that maybe there might be a little bit of a gap



1 between rural districts and -- and larger school
2 districts with data usage, is because you can actual
3 monitor the data usage and then see how the teacher
4 responds to that data. And I think that's pretty -- I
5 think that's pretty important.

6 And so that would certainly be an
7 expectation for admin to have on our teachers. And so I
8 think that would be a fair expectation (indiscernible)
9 they would have to have on Holyoke School District is
10 that we will monitor that data and we'll make course
11 corrections and -- and immediate fixes when we need to.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: But hopefully you'll also
13 learn some things that you can share -- we can share with
14 others.

15 MR. MILES: Absolutely.

16 (Overlapping)

17 MS. SCHROEDER: And it's very possible that
18 there are things about 191 that don't work particularly
19 well in the large districts either. And --

20 MR. MILES: Yes.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- you're a better -- in
22 some ways, a better incubator for some alternative
23 processes that then can be a stand. But we want a
24 systemic change for kids. I agree that one size does not
25 fit all, but we can probably have some alternatives,



1 whereas one -- there's a perception that right now we're
2 on a one-size-fits-all. So I would be grateful for your
3 help. But I do want to just not send you loose and --

4 MR. MILES: Absolutely.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: -- I hope that's okay. So
6 I'm ready to make a motion, if that's all right.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have a quick question.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, go ahead.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Deb?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. I just had a
11 question. Could you just give a quick summary of what it
12 is that you're going to be able to do if this is granted
13 that you can't do now besides teacher evaluation? Is
14 that the centerpiece?

15 MR. MILES: Both of them, both of these,
16 really, talk about using our limited time and energy on
17 classrooms. And so what we see with both of these
18 examples, the assessment, the readiness assessments, that
19 additional work, and the additional work of -- of trying
20 this fit numbers into that teaching piece is that we feel
21 like we can better use our time. So if we have our
22 teachers focusing on our kids instead of going through an
23 assessment with a student who can already read a
24 beginning novel, then -- then that's better for our
25 district.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is it about the -- the
2 number of assessments and how they're used in teacher
3 evaluations? I mean, I read this, but I apologize, I'm
4 not able to distill what do you want to do that you can't
5 do now?

6 MR. MILES: We want to eliminate as much
7 time as we can away from our classroom, proving things in
8 documentation, spending more time with our students and
9 our parents in the classroom.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: By doing what, testing less
11 and -- and by --

12 MR. MILES: Yeah. So if we don't have to go
13 through the entire gold battery for kids who are already
14 reading. So we have, as most schools do, you have some
15 fantastic teachers who can say I need to spend some time
16 with these three kids, but now I'm going to have to spend
17 45 minutes each with all of these kids just to document
18 where they are through this assessment.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is it primarily around the
20 READ Act or is it -- because I noticed that you -- seems
21 like you're doing TSA gold with more kids, am I right?

22 MR. MILES: We would like to only have that
23 done with through the preschool and then when they get to
24 kindergarten, work with them just through our



1 intervention teacher and focus our classroom instruction,
2 rather than spending more time documenting.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Learning and teaching.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is there a list somewhere
5 that says right now we're giving these tests, we'll get
6 the waiver, we'll only give these under these conditions?

7 MR. MILES: It would just be the gold.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had a hard time --

9 MR. MILES: It would just be the gold not
10 being given in the kindergarten.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's the only thing --

12 MR. MILES: Correct.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- you're eliminating?

14 MR. MILES: Yes.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: And the data piece --

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't --

17 (Overlapping)

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that's 191.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, that's what I thought.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Fifty percent of 91 -- 191.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: The data piece of 191?

22 Meaning?

23 MR. MILES: Correct. So when -- when you
24 have to take the student achievement data and formulate
25 that to have a single number on evaluation takes a great



1 deal of time that our -- we feel like our principals
2 don't have, that they should be in the classroom instead
3 of doing that. We don't have a department where we get
4 to send that off to. We don't get to send that off to
5 the fourth floor and have them crunch that data for us.
6 And so we feel like this is a better use of our
7 principal's time, by being in classrooms, giving
8 feedback, meeting teachers in post-conferences than
9 trying to go through that.

10 What we found when we first started to put
11 this together was the conversation changed. When we
12 wrote our first policy and the conversation started
13 change, "But I didn't have that kid. You're putting that
14 kid in my formula, but I didn't even have that kid until
15 December 14th. Should that kid be in my formula?" "I
16 didn't even --" "I only get -- that kid gets pulled out
17 of my classroom down to the ESL teacher's classroom
18 during that time. Should that student be in my data?"
19 And you're having those kinds of conversations instead of
20 conversations around instruction, around formulative
21 assessments. And we feel like that this an -- a better
22 way for us to focus on improving teachers.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you're -- you're not
24 wanting to -- you're -- you're wanting to develop your



1 own system of evaluating teachers; is that right? Not
2 doing 191.

3 MR. MILES: Well, 191 is pretty broad, so
4 several elements. But really the --

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: You're questioning the 50
6 percent or --

7 MR. MILES: Yes, the changes --

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- the metric --

9 (Overlapping)

10 MR. MILES: -- the metric of turning the 50
11 percent into one single number on a teacher evaluation.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Well, and then
13 that -- that -- that metric is really in question as far
14 as research. In fact, we heard from some -- an expert
15 that became before us and -- and questioned that. And
16 then there's a lot of research also that shows that, you
17 know, that metric should be or that test should be used
18 for something for what it was meant to be used and not
19 for evaluating teachers. So --

20 (Overlapping)

21 MADAM CHAIR: -- I question that. I would -
22 - teachers need to -- to learn and when you have
23 supervisors, you have people who know their skill and are
24 helping the in the classroom, I think that's -- that's
25 much better. That's learning, as opposed to on one



1 number that really basically doesn't spell out much of
2 anything.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have one comment,
4 Madam Chair.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, Deb?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess this is a bigger
7 issue for me. It's for the Board. I have a hard time
8 when I read these Innovation applications really
9 distilling down what exists, what people are asking for,
10 what are the implications. Maybe it's the nature of the
11 application or is it all the words or something? I mean,
12 I'm looking at it, thinking what does it really mean? Is
13 it going to be more testing or less testing? Is TS Gold
14 going to be given to more kids or fewer kids? Are the
15 metrics for teachers going to be more or fewer? Are they
16 going to be more subjective or more objective? Or are
17 you just asking for the ability to just put together a
18 plan? I mean, I don't know, to me, the application
19 itself is flawed, so that I have a hard time saying yes
20 with enthusiasm --

21 (Overlapping)

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- or no with enthusiasm or
23 anything with enthusiasm. So that -- that's a problem
24 maybe that we need to solve.



1 MR. MILES: We -- we share -- we share your
2 --

3 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

4 MR. MILES: I mean, that's --

5 (Overlapping)

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I apologize.

7 (Overlapping)

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: I tried to read closely, but
9 --

10 (Overlapping)

11 MR. MILES: -- the way you are and the way
12 Holyoke School District is, there's -- we're running into
13 a lot of areas where there are -- there are a lot of
14 questions and not necessarily all the answers.

15 But the one thing that we -- we are as a
16 district is incredibly committed to our kids. And we
17 really feel like that this plan is a good first step
18 towards that. It feels pretty safe to me, the things
19 we're requesting to -- do you want to talk about that?

20 And -- and when -- it's not that we're just
21 saying we're ready to do anything or we're using a -- a
22 research-based teacher evaluation instrument, research by
23 Charlotte Danielson being used in several school
24 districts. We have looked at many options, our teachers
25 feel like that is a language that they understand. It



1 speaks best to them. So we still have very specific
2 criteria that we're asking them to -- to shoot for, just
3 working around the messiness of one number and especially
4 with our end counts. I mean, that -- that's another
5 issue that complicates that.

6 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

7 MADAM CHAIR: Jane, did you have a question?

8 (Overlapping)

9 MADAM CHAIR: No, yes, I -- I want to
10 clarify something. When it comes to the Innovation
11 status, there's part of this I have concerns with. I
12 really do. And because it starts waiving 191 and it's
13 setting a precedent. There's no doubt about that. What
14 is a -- what is an appropriate substitute plan? I don't
15 know. District has proposed one. Will that satisfy it
16 in the end? I don't know. But when that Innovation
17 status -- Innovation statute was passed, it'll
18 (indiscernible). Unless you -- unless you can prove that
19 the district is doing harm to the students, which I don't
20 see how you can, then basically we just pass it through.
21 So it makes it very awkward for us and really puts
22 (indiscernible) ask a lot of questions for whatever
23 constraints they feel is appropriate (indiscernible).

24 So that's why it does becoming confusing for
25 them and us, because we're basically, unless you're doing



1 harm to the students and one is waivable can be waivable,
2 we have to pass law. I think the issue we have to point
3 out to, it is setting precedent in some of these areas
4 and it's worthy to note them setting precedent in some of
5 these areas. It could go to others.

6 So I think as these go through, you have
7 every right to say is it working? They shouldn't -- can
8 we see some results (indiscernible), you know? Because
9 right now, Innovation status, they, I think by the
10 (indiscernible) clarify, districts are supposed to report
11 back to their district how they're doing every three
12 years. But they don't have to tell you.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

14 MADAM CHAIR: But there are two -- two
15 motions.

16 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible) in the future,
17 because if you're granting people Innovations to do
18 things, is it making a difference?

19 MADAM CHAIR: There are -- there are two
20 choices though of motions here. And the second one
21 requires that third -- every three years the district
22 needs to decide whether it is doing the right thing or it
23 wants to continue. So in a way, that provides some --
24 you know, they can't just go off down the path. If you
25 do the second motion, yeah.



1 MR. DURHAM: Right, if you do the -- what
2 she's talking about, there's some parameters. But that's
3 -- it actually doesn't qualify that. So one
4 (indiscernible) if they want to agree to something like
5 that and say, hey, that makes sense, we could report back
6 to you when we report back to our board in three years.
7 That would be a nice information to have, but that's
8 (indiscernible).

9 MADAM CHAIR: Jane, did you have something
10 to add?

11 MS. GOFF: I don't (indiscernible). It's
12 such an awkward (indiscernible).

13 (Overlapping).

14 MS. GOFF: Ditto, ditto, ditto, all down the
15 line here. I -- I -- I have had this question in my mind
16 about Innovation as to what -- what -- whomever you speak
17 to, that's -- there is another definition or meaning
18 behind Innovation put on the list. I -- it -- what does
19 that mean? I -- I don't know. I'm not -- I don't -- I
20 have a --

21 (Overlapping)

22 MR. DURHAM: It's very (indiscernible).

23 MS. GOFF: I have my vision of it. I have
24 my ideas. A lot of it's based on what we hear is going
25 on in districts. But is -- absolutely no offense



1 intended here, no -- no direct criticism -- is it
2 innovative nowadays to bring teachers and -- and staff
3 members together once a week? Is that innovative? You
4 know? Is it innovative to be -- to be rescheduling or
5 relooking at how -- how the staff is evaluated and
6 whatever the name may be or the not number that used in
7 coming to those decision? It's just very hard.

8 When Denver was young and fresh in the
9 Innovation Act, there -- a majority of their schools, the
10 obstacle was how to deal -- now, this is different,
11 because it's a large school district -- how to deal with
12 the allocation, the distribution of the funds? And if
13 there -- there is autonomy, greater autonomy for decision
14 making in these schools and budgeting and everything
15 that's contractual or district policy related, that's a
16 large district thing that a small district has on another
17 kind of scale. So, you know, I guess it's -- it -- the
18 questions are how are you going to manage your budget and
19 your distribution and your program differences and what
20 is a small district -- is it where do we -- any of us fit
21 in the word "innovation" if we're really -- it's coming
22 across as sounding like we don't want to know what the
23 data is in order to move somewhere, you know, to learn
24 something.

25 (Overlapping)



1 MS. GOFF: I'm having a little trouble with
2 the not having a number. I love quantitative, but --

3 MR. MILES: One of the standards --

4 MS. GOFF: But you got to have some quantity
5 once in a while too.

6 MR. MILES: So as we understood it, one of
7 the -- the standards here is that in the Innovation Act,
8 when we can have our board, our community, and our staff
9 come together to say that we can get just as good of
10 results or better results if we do things differently,
11 that's the basis of an Innovation plan. And -- and --
12 and that's where we came to this from the start and we
13 feel like we have that unique recipe, where we have all
14 of those people on the same page working with our board
15 and that flexibility. We believe we'll make a difference
16 and we're not shy at all about -- about the follow up.

17 MS. GOFF: Well, I guess -- and I'm sorry --
18 but how will you know? How will you know? What are you
19 going to use to measure that? And then my other -- and
20 we can go on after this -- the rural districts among
21 everybody are talking on -- on a different level about
22 the graduation guidelines and how do we make this fit.
23 So I would have a question about what is this looking
24 like in the secondary schools, and particularly the high
25 school. What do you see as being a day in the life of a



1 high school, in Holyoke, your high school under and
2 Innovation plan?

3 And there again, I think it's -- I think
4 it's important that -- that we can -- you know that we
5 are supportive of you in this and we are eager to be
6 hearing about it and involved and just aware, because it
7 is something that's going to be important, if not
8 already, to every other district in the state regardless
9 of size. And so I -- I just -- we have questions. We're
10 -- we're in a hard time. But there's a little column
11 over here talking about grad guidelines and worry about
12 how those are going -- how anybody's going to fit in
13 there. And then we have an Innovation -- our Innovation
14 neighborhood, all of us, that -- and some other things
15 going on that it's -- it's -- it's difficult. It's a
16 challenge right now, but sooner or later some of this has
17 got to come together. And we put it all under -- in a
18 conversation that relates to each other. That's all.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Deb, you said (indiscernible)
20 another comment?

21 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah, I was just conceptually,
22 you know, I believe in local control and I agree that you
23 know your needs better than an entity far above you. On
24 the other hand, I -- I don't understand if what you're
25 doing is innovative enough, because I can't really



1 understand the application clearly. If I were to walk
2 out of this meeting and someone were to say to me it's
3 great that you gave them Innovation status, now they'll
4 be able to do this when they previously were going to
5 have to do that, I'd have a hard time --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: That's not (indiscernible).

7 MS. SHEFFEL: -- distilling that in -- into
8 language and -- and feeling good about it, I guess. I
9 don't know if do we ever turn down an Innovation request
10 and can we get more information?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: We can. We can.

12 MS. SHEFFEL: I don't know Danielson's
13 approach. I mean, I -- I don't know if that's innovative
14 --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, that's just part of
16 the fierce 50 percent. There's nothing special about
17 Danielson at all. It's part of the -- it's a -- it's an
18 observation rubric.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's the 50 percent.
21 What they're asking for is to get rid of the other 50
22 percent. It's very problematic.

23 MS. SHEFFEL: So then it's not tied to
24 student achievement. There's no student achievement?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's not tied to
2 achievement. So in the plan, you talk about how you are
3 going to use it, and it's beyond confusing. And before
4 you come back, I hope that you will clarify how you are
5 using student outcome data in your evaluations. Because
6 you're saying you don't want to come up with one number,
7 so maybe you want five numbers for a teacher.

8 (Overlapping)

9 MS. SCHROEDER: But you got to be able to --

10 MS. MAZANEC: You have to take the test.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: -- to clarify how you are
12 using student -- because you say in here that you are
13 using it. And that's the only reason I'm -- that I'm
14 comfortable saying okay for three years, figure this out
15 and come back to us and explain it. But don't come back
16 and say we are not using student outcomes in our
17 evaluations of our staff, whether it's a teacher or a
18 principal, because that's the whole intent of 191.
19 That's the whole belief of our public. Our public is
20 strongly supportive of using student-outcome data to
21 evaluate teachers.

22 (Overlapping)

23 MS. SCHROEDER: It's problematic, it is
24 imperfect, and so I get your concern, but to just bail



1 and say, no. And I don't read that in your application,
2 but I don't get --

3 MR. MILES: Right.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- you -- what Deb is saying
5 about not having clarity. There is no clarity in here.

6 (Overlapping)

7 MR. MILES: When you say our public, I can't
8 speak to who you say for your public. When I said --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: My voters.

10 MR. MILES: -- our public, and we know our
11 public in Holyoke is supportive of this (indiscernible).

12 MS. SCHROEDER: I appreciate that, but there
13 is a whole statewide public that is sending you money.
14 We are sending our tax dollars to all the districts. And
15 so that's not your only constituency. It's the most
16 important constituency. I've been a board member, school
17 board member. It is a critical constituency, but you may
18 not ignore the fact that there's a statewide support
19 system to help everyone -- almost every one of our
20 districts. And you have some -- you do have an
21 accountability obligation to them too. I don't want us
22 telling everybody how to do everything, but your kids
23 have got to be doing better actually than they are doing
24 today.



1 MR. MCCLEARY: So one of the -- just to kind
2 of -- just to --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, I'm getting
4 emotional.

5 MR. MCCLEARY: No, that's okay. But just to
6 sort of cap some of the things that we're talking about
7 is that -- is that if you -- if you didn't want to deal
8 with the Innovation status -- and that's -- that's the
9 semantics of the legal description of it is they
10 should've called in an alternative compliance plan.

11 (Overlapping).

12 MR. MCCLEARY: And then most districts
13 wouldn't touch it. Yeah, exactly.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: That's how he sees it.

15 MR. MCLEARY: Yeah. And so I mean --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

17 MR. MCLEARY: So -- so I mean, as an
18 educator and as a superintendent and as a principal of
19 schools and as somebody who's been a principal and a
20 superintendent at the same time, I'm deeply committed to
21 the fact of complying with legal requirements in the
22 state of Colorado and -- and my -- and our public, it's
23 deeply committed to understanding exactly how their
24 students are performing on tests.



1 For example, this next fall, even before the
2 first (indiscernible), all those students will be
3 assessed on their NWA. So that's pretty exceptional.
4 You know, when I worked in Pueblo, at it's public city
5 schools, we did that one time as a turnaround schools.
6 We brought all the kids or tried to bring them all in
7 before school even started, so you could get a good
8 baseline. But this is a -- a district that -- that does
9 that on a pretty regular basis.

10 So we were at the leadership -- we were at a
11 leadership committee hearing the other day and -- and the
12 committee said -- said, well, you know, everybody's
13 really been overtested, because, you know, that's kind of
14 the -- the word on the street, right?

15 MS. SCHROEDER: That's partly true.

16 MR. MCLEARY: And -- and they said -- yeah,
17 and part true.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: It's true.

19 MR. MCLEARY: And they said, yeah, so what
20 would you like to do with NWA, because of all the part
21 testing that's occurred. They said, well, we really want
22 to go back to three times. I said, so you want to go
23 back to three times on all the part testings? Yes. Why
24 do you want to go back to three times on NWA? Because,
25 you know, because, I mean, look at all the testing.



1 Because we really feel like we get things that we can
2 make a difference with in our students' lives and in our
3 students' performance from NWA. Said, well, that really
4 gets to be really problematic when you're scheduling all
5 this, you know, all this testing into a school year. So
6 why don't we do it before school starts?

7 And so those are things that -- that -- that
8 we can do. And then we come from a farming community.
9 And -- and there's a belief there, and I'm not trying to
10 be offensive or anything else, but we -- we kind of
11 believe in -- in rural America and in rural farming
12 communities that we can do better. We can do things
13 better, you know? Not just for ourselves, but we can do
14 things better than folks in Denver. I mean, it's just
15 always been that kind of attitude. And it's not true.
16 It's not, you know. But at the same time --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: But it's very natural. It's
18 terribly natural.

19 MR. MCLEARY: We -- we really --

20 (Overlapping)

21 MS. SCHROEDER: It's very natural.

22 MR. MCLEARY: We really believe that we can
23 do better by our kids. And so when you say, well, what
24 are we -- what are we innovating, it's actually freeing
25 us up to do a lot of other things that the district is



1 being very innovative on. I mean, for example, the one
2 laptop initiatives, the teacher -- the shared leadership
3 program that goes on. You know that we have over eight
4 committees where they have shared leadership from the
5 committee and from the community and from the staff?

6 So -- so we do a lot of innovative things,
7 but some of the compliance is getting in away with some
8 of that. But at the same time, we'll still be held
9 legally responsible to make sure that we are in
10 compliance and our students (indiscernible) monitored by
11 the State to make sure that they're making --

12 (Overlapping)

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. And I -- I think if
14 I --

15 MADAM CHAIR: Just like to point out to the
16 group in general, we -- I allocated ten minutes for this
17 --

18 MR. MCLEARY: Sorry.

19 MADAM CHAIR: -- discussion. We somehow got
20 a long ways away from ten minutes. I think that part of
21 the solution, and I know this and all, but there are two
22 alternative motions and the second one says this approval
23 is for three years and is conditional from the following,
24 that every years when the local district does its own
25 statutory review, it submits that review to the State



1 Board with the understanding that the State Board will
2 review that Innovation status after the district does and
3 decide whether or not to continue the status or to revoke
4 it. So there is a review in there that I think is very
5 important.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you agree to that?

7 (Overlapping)

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean, I think that's
9 really important to us.

10 MADAM CHAIR: So I would suggest that
11 somebody make it (indiscernible).

12 MR. MILES: Yeah, there's no way that our
13 community will wait three years.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I -- I make the motion that
15 Marcia just made, or do you want me to restate it?

16 MADAM CHAIR: The motion number two.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Motion number two.

18 MADAM CHAIR: In -- in which you have the
19 three years (indiscernible). Comments?

20 MS. SHEFFEL: Can I ask one more question?

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

22 MS. SHEFFEL: I apologize. Can I ask the
23 Commissioner, is this the first such waiver of its kind
24 that we are considering?

25 MR. DURHAM: No, (indiscernible).



1 MS. SHEFFEL: Related to this system,
2 accountability system?

3 MR. DURHAM: Oh, and it relates to 191.

4 MS. SHEFFEL: Yes.

5 MR. DURHAM: You're absolutely right.

6 (Indiscernible) and we reviewed that with Legal and they
7 have every right to request that. I might say that -- I
8 might encourage you, because, again, if you've heard my
9 explanation before, it is what it is. I think if the
10 group agrees to the three years, that would be wonderful.

11 (Indiscernible) and then also (indiscernible) I would
12 encourage the Board (indiscernible). You all have
13 studied the Innovation Act, because it's part of the
14 study (indiscernible).

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

16 MS. SHEFFEL: We've already decided.

17 (Overlapping)

18 MR. DURHAM: Just what you did with the
19 (indiscernible).

20 MS. SHEFFEL: Yes.

21 MR. DURHAM: I really believe all those
22 stories (indiscernible), but it would be great if we had
23 some data come back --

24 (Overlapping)

25 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, you need to know.



1 MR. DURHAM: So you could be in a position
2 to say is this really working or not and -- and have
3 that. Right now the Innovations Act doesn't allow you to
4 do that. So that would give me time to talk about it,
5 see if you want to change (indiscernible).

6 (Overlapping)

7 MS. SHEFFEL: May I ask the Commissioner one
8 more question? And then I'll stop. Is there any
9 appetite on the Board to ask for more information? I
10 guess I -- like I said, my lack of clarity concerns me
11 about what actually is being requested.

12 MR. DURHAM: Did you have any
13 (indiscernible).

14 MS. SHEFFEL: Angelika?

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Deb, I -- when you said that
16 previously, I wondered whether just as we changed with
17 the rules to do the side by side, what's in the rule and
18 what's in -- what's in the law and what's in the rule?
19 I'm wondering if we shouldn't think about having some
20 kind of a format that's included in an application that
21 talks about what is it that's normally done in a school
22 district and what is the waiver? Because I actually read
23 this things several times, to be honest with you, trying
24 to glean out what it is that you were trying -- and I --
25 and I don't mean to be critical there, but you don't have



1 any specifics. And I think that what Deb and I are both
2 struggling with is you say you're going to use student-
3 outcome data, achievement data, but I can't figure out
4 how you're going to use it or how you're going to do it
5 and how you're saving more than five minutes of input
6 time.

7 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair and Ms. Schroeder,
8 Dr. Schroeder, I think this is what we're doing. You'll
9 have to correct me, but it's pretty free on how you can
10 submit information on the Innovations Act. If you start
11 putting parameters around that, I think you're going to
12 have to get advice from you attorney to tell you just
13 what you can or cannot (indiscernible).

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

15 MR. DURHAM: That -- that's what I'm trying
16 to say. It allows -- it was originally intended to
17 almost bypass staff and come right to you for approval
18 when it was originally designed. In fact, you can almost
19 make an argument that we looked at it, that it comes to
20 you first and -- and to CDE and subject to no harm, they
21 get to do it.

22 MS. GOFF: Exactly.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Exactly. Well, that's
24 dependent how you define harm.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So -- so would your suggestion
2 be that we delay this decision?

3 MR. DURHAM: Did I understand that we
4 actually can't deny this? I don't think we can. If it -
5 - short of you proving that it harms students
6 (indiscernible).

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, harm -- it's harming
8 students.

9 (Overlapping)

10 MR. DURHAM: So let me ask the attorney.
11 I'm not --

12 (Overlapping)

13 MADAM CHAIR: I would really like to move us
14 along here.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: I know.

16 MADAM CHAIR: If we did it with the -- the
17 three-year, would that meet your qualifications,
18 Commissioner?

19 (Overlapping)

20 MR. DURHAM: I -- I thought I would offer
21 you something to give information about.

22 MADAM CHAIR: You did, thank you very much.

23 MR. DURHAM: If the district agrees with
24 that and that's, you know, back and forth, but they agree
25 to it, then you have an --



1 (Overlapping)

2 MADAM CHAIR: All right, Board, what is your
3 pleasure then?

4 MS. GOFF: But what's so difficult? May I?
5 May I speak?

6 MADAM CHAIR: My -- my question is what is
7 your pleasure? So if you're going to ask --

8 MS. GOFF: Yes, I am.

9 MADAM CHAIR: -- answer that.

10 MS. GOFF: I mean, what's so difficult in
11 understand that they do this, all this testing that
12 kindergarten has to do, which is a lot, because I talked
13 --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: We're talking about 191.
15 We're not talking about (indiscernible).

16 MS. GOFF: Well, it's testing. And they do
17 it before, which I always went in two weeks and had those
18 students --

19 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think --

20 (Overlapping)

21 MS. GOFF: And -- and that's what you're
22 doing. They're doing a good thing.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: That's not -- that's not
24 what we're arguing about though. We're arguing about a
25 different piece of the Innovation --



1 MS. GOFF: They are going to -- they are
2 going to use that number.

3 MADAM CHAIR: What number?

4 MS. GOFF: They have to. The number that
5 they're going to get from -- from park (ph) test.

6 MADAM CHAIR: How do we get out of this
7 Board? How do we get this discussion --

8 MS. SHEFFEL: Can we have the attorney
9 general comment?

10 MADAM CHAIR: We're going to be here all day
11 if --

12 MS. GOFF: Make a motion. Get a motion on
13 this.

14 (Overlapping)

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Nobody second it.

16 MS. MAZANEC: -- somebody to say about the
17 question.

18 MS. GOFF: Tony's got an answer to your
19 question.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Got something wonderful to
21 say?

22 MR. DYL: Madam Chair --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Good.

24 MR. DYL: I don't know how wonderful it is.

25 But this is what the statute says regarding the State



1 Board's approval for denial of an Innovation plan.
2 (Indiscernible) after each Innovation plan, "The State
3 Board shall designate the district innovation, unless
4 State Board includes, one, the likely result is a
5 decrease in academic achievement or, two, it is not
6 fiscally feasible." So I think the Commissioner's
7 correct. Quite literally the short ten-year is -- shall
8 approve it unless you think it'll make things worse.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Exactly. But you can approve
10 it either with the three-year term or -- and that would
11 be my suggestion, approve it with a three-year --

12 MR. DURHAM: That's up to them. If they
13 would agree --

14 (Overlapping)

15 MS. SCHROEDER: They did. They did agree.

16 MS. MAZANEC: I think they said they would
17 agree to that.

18 MADAM CHAIR: So Angelika actually read that
19 motion. I move to approve -- because I made her.

20 (Overlapping)

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Would somebody please second
22 this motion if --

23 MR. DURHAM: I second.

24 MADAM CHAIR: So if somebody will second it

25 --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Steve. Steve
2 did.

3 MADAM CHAIR: -- we can vote on it.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Steve did.

5 MR. DURHAM: I did.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, good for you, Steve, all
7 right.

8 (Overlapping)

9 MADAM CHAIR: Then moved and seconded that
10 we --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: We're trying to teach you
12 about motions.

13 MADAM CHAIR: -- approve motion number two.

14 MR. DURHAM: I'm a slow learner.

15 (Overlapping)

16 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry, what -- what is
17 motion number two mean?

18 MS. SHEFFEL: Well, it's the one that
19 Angelika read.

20 MADAM CHAIR: We approved motion number two
21 with the three-year term.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Which is --

23 (Overlapping)

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Three-year (indiscernible)
25 approve on their request for an Innovation Zone



1 application. It's for three years and is conditional on
2 the following: That every three years when the local
3 school district does its own statutory review, it submits
4 that review to the State Board with the understanding
5 that the State Board will review the innovation status
6 after the district does and decides whether or not to
7 continue the status or to revoke it.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Give this away to check, see
9 if it (indiscernible). Okay, want to call roll?

10 MS. BURDSALL: All right, Steve Durham?

11 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

12 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Flores?

13 MS. FLORES: Yes.

14 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

15 MS. GOFF: Yes.

16 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

17 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

18 MS. BURDSALL: Marcia Neal?

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

20 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

21 MS. SHEFFEL: No, and only because I dontund
22 the application. Thank you.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

25 MS. BURDSALL: Okay.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. The motion carries.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you all for your time.

4 It was an enlightening discussion. You've got to say
5 that.

6 (Meeting adjourned)

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 5th day of February, 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