



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
March 9, 2016, Part 4

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on March 9, 2016, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We're okay.
2 Yes, Commissioner? You wanna start this one? The next
3 one?

4 MR. ASP: I will be glad to. Turn this over
5 to Dr. Colzman, the Executive Director of Teaching and
6 Learning to just kind of honestly, very simple and short
7 conversation.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Cool.

9 MS. COLSMAN: So thank you Mr. Commissioner,
10 Mr. Chair, and members of the Board. The request for the
11 Board to arraign for additional options for consideration
12 for the reporting system for kindergarten school readiness
13 pursuant to Colorado revised statute sections 227-1004 and
14 227-1019. We recognize that this reporting system has
15 sparked a great deal of discussion and we've endeavored to
16 provide options and statutory requirements for the Board.

17 The February meeting, we brought forward two
18 options, one which would involve districts securely
19 submitting de-identified individual student level data to
20 the state -- for the state to aggregate for overall state
21 results and disaggregate according to the reporting
22 categories and statutes, school, free and reduced cost
23 lunch, eligibility status, ethnicity, and gender.

24 This is noted as option 1 on the table that
25 we've provided for you. There was a motion to approve



1 option 1 at the February Board meeting and this motion did
2 not pass. For this reason, you will see that this option
3 is grayed out. Option 2 was also presented at the February
4 meeting for consideration where districts would not submit
5 any individual child level data to the state but would
6 instead report to the state only the information at the
7 aggregate levels for the state to -- and to produce the
8 reports that are required by statute.

9 So just to quickly orient you to the table,
10 so you'll see options 1 and 2 on the table. Option 1 is
11 grayed out. We've indicated whether or not that particular
12 option requires individual student level data to be
13 submitted to the state, whether or not there would be the
14 option for parents to opt out to reporting and whether or
15 not that option aligns the statute, and for those options
16 that we've been able to bring forward to the Educational
17 Data Advisory Committee, whether or not they've expressed
18 support for that.

19 After meeting with Board Member Scheffel to
20 explore further options, we've provided three others for
21 your consideration. Options three and four are variations
22 of option 2. Option 2 again is reporting of aggregate
23 level information which means no individual child level
24 information would be reported to the state. Option 3 would
25 be that same except that the social and emotional



1 development category would not be reported. Option 4 would
2 be that districts only submit in one of the domains, which
3 is the language and literacy domain.

4 And after a conversation with Dr. Scheffel
5 on earlier this week, we also started thinking about
6 another option which was based on a report that we've seen
7 report produced by the State of Washington which is
8 reporting out not at even according to the particular
9 domains as they're named. So for instance, not saying,
10 here's the number of kids meeting readiness indicators and
11 language and literacy or in social, emotional development,
12 but instead according to how many kids are meeting the
13 indicators in different amounts of the domains or a
14 continuum.

15 So you'll see an example of that at the
16 bottom. It's easier to see the -- an example of it than
17 it is I think to explain it. So what you'll see there is
18 the way that this is reported out is- you'll see that 5.9
19 percent of kids are not meeting indicators in any of the
20 areas. All the way up through, you'll see that the report
21 will let you know that 39.5 percent of kids are meeting all
22 of the indicators, and you can see some variation in
23 between.

24 The benefit to that could be that you could
25 see some incremental growth over time of kids meeting more



1 and more indicators of school readiness. Again, this would
2 not necessarily tell you which domains that they are
3 increasing but this would kind of both produce- only
4 aggregate information being provided to the state and also
5 the information would be de-identified according to even
6 which domains they have.

7 But in any case, what we wanted- we endeavor
8 to do today was to provide you with some additional options
9 to consider and indicate whether or not we've had an
10 opportunity to present these to IDA for consideration and
11 we also have Tony Dill here to discuss that column related
12 to whether or not that statutorily aligned. But that's the
13 totality of our presentation for today.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Good. Thank you. Any
15 questions? Yes, Dr. Schroeder?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Under option 2, I'm not sure
17 I clearly understood. Would you still provide the
18 information for each category by subgroups? Even though
19 they're not identified by kids?

20 MS. COLSMAN: Correct. So what that would
21 entail is that districts would submit, kind of, by school
22 and by category, the percent of kids in those different
23 meeting indicator- readiness indicators in each of the
24 categories.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Unless there are size
2 issues?

3 MS. COLSMAN: Correct. Because it's --
4 right, once that there's a small size, it becomes --
5 individuals can actually become identifiable.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you speak to how the
9 records are de-identified? So direct versus indirect
10 identifiers or any other characteristics embedded in the
11 data that alone or together could create the conditions for
12 identifying an individual. How is that data protected so
13 that it cannot be- so that student data PII cannot be
14 identified?

15 MS. COLSMAN: So with options two, three,
16 four, and five, there wouldn't even be a need to de-
17 identify the data because instead what we would get is
18 aggregated information. So we would hear that a particular
19 school that, you know, 45 percent of them are meeting the
20 indicators in language and literacy. So we would never
21 even have any individual information to de-identify.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: So the districts would have
23 that information?

24 MS. COLSMAN: Correct.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And is there any condition
2 under which the state would request that information from
3 the district?

4 MS. COLSMAN: The reporting system that the
5 State Board adopts would provide the parameters around the
6 data collection. We could not collect data other than what
7 the Board has authorized.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, further questions?
10 Dr. Schroeder would like to comment?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'll just make a --
12 make comments which is, as I said previously today, you
13 know, CAP4K was passed in 2008 and there are very few of us
14 around since then. It was based on a philosophy of a P20
15 seamless system for kids that did require longitudinal
16 information system, so that we could see to what extent
17 there are barriers between transitions and what are the-
18 what are the things that we need to do to help. So to the
19 extent that we don't pick option 1, we really can't do the
20 kind of analysis that was intended by the P20 philosophy or
21 system.

22 That said, in reading the responses we've
23 had from families, I am stunned. I'm absolutely stunned by
24 the lack of faith that our parent community of young kids
25 and maybe a lot of other people have in the capacity of the



1 Department of Education to protect the privacy of kids. To
2 believe that we're going to sell the information is- I
3 mean, I've just been shocked. I've been shocked enough to
4 know that this time, we can't have a pitch with any kind of
5 information system in this state because there's so little
6 confidence in what we do and who we are here at the
7 Department of Education.

8 And that's a job that I think is before us
9 to make sure that we are not what we have been accused of
10 being, and that can't be solved by supporting collection of
11 data that frightens families. So much as it's gonna kill
12 me today, I can't support what I know we should be doing
13 because we can't do it as long as we have this lack of
14 confidence in who we are and what we do.

15 And I've been here through all these years,
16 so I'm pretty stunned but let's move on and see what we can
17 fix, and for now, make sure that we don't send the data
18 here because otherwise our parents- some of our parents --
19 I mean, this doesn't come from out of my community but
20 that's not the point. It comes out of a community and
21 they're all riled up. And so let's not add -- let's not
22 add that -- to that because we won't- we won't get greater
23 confidence in what we do if we force it.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: I think that there -- I don't
2 know, there may be some concern about giving information to
3 the state, period. I don't think that any of the concern
4 that is being expressed by parents is specific to this
5 department. So what -- I think that -- I think that if
6 they were in Kansas and this was what is being done, they
7 would still be -- they would still be suspicious.

8 I think parents have and rightfully so --
9 concern about the endless appetite for data on their
10 children in education, and we've had as -- we talked about
11 before, we've had data for decades. That data has not
12 improved educational outcomes that we can tell.

13 So in this cyber world, parents are even
14 more concerned about where that data is going. If you
15 wouldn't even necessarily have to be intentional about it -
16 - that data could be in the wrong hands. So I don't think
17 that it's quite accurate to say that all of the parents who
18 are concerned about data being provided to the state are
19 concerned because they don't trust the specific Department
20 of Education or any of our staff. So it's the first thing
21 and second of all, I think I lost my second of all. It'll
22 probably come back later.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, (inaudible) Dr.
24 Scheffel?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Maybe what you were thinking
2 of is that there is a huge distrust of cybersecurity,
3 right?

4 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: And this has been breached
6 multiple times and many of members of the public have
7 experienced it, and so it's been at multiple levels in
8 various sectors of our culture. So I think that's what's
9 driving a lot of this and it's not as though- I mean, we
10 can always have greater techniques to protect data but I
11 mean I think -- I think people have seen those techniques
12 fail, and I think that's what we have to be extremely
13 sensitive to -- especially with young children.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec?
15 (Inaudible).

16 MS. MAZANEC: I remember now. The other-
17 the other point I wanted to make is that Dr. Schroeder's
18 statement that, "We cannot do what we should be doing", I
19 think also illustrates the divide between what some people
20 think is necessary to drive good outcomes in education
21 versus what parents are willing to allow you to have in
22 order to drive good outcomes.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion. Yes,
24 Dr. Scheffel?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So there are five options and
2 are we proposing one of these? I -- I like option five but
3 I don't know what we're doing in terms of --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There's a motion? Anyone
5 wants to make a motion? We can put that on the table.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'll make a motion for option
7 five.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. There's been a
9 motion for option five. Is there a second to that motion?

10 MS. MAZANEC: I'll second.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved and
12 seconded for option five. I would probably go ahead and
13 make one observation. I think -- I think Ms. Cols'
14 comments this morning about the use of data to potentially
15 pigeonhole or direct children over the long term into their
16 adult lives and denying them particular opportunities, you
17 know, I don't know. We certainly have seen that -- sort of
18 the two-track system that's well used in Europe that
19 probably does result in the denial of opportunity based on
20 early indicators and -- and really pigeonholing kids and
21 putting them into- into tracks from which they may or may
22 not be able to escape or you certainly increase the
23 required escape velocity for kids that get labeled in
24 certain fashions.



1 So I think that's the other factor. It's
2 not -- I don't think it's a distrust to the department, I
3 think it's a distrust of government generally. And, you
4 know, until -- until I think they start doing a little less
5 and get to roll back to what it needs to be and the idea
6 that we can use these early indicators to put some kids in
7 an industrial crafts track as opposed to a college track
8 should and does concern parents. So that's -- I think
9 that's the problem with the data. Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: And when we look at data
11 badging, I mean, if- which- this isn't part of that, but
12 when we looked at the whole idea of collecting data on kids
13 P20 and look at England's experiment with this. I mean,
14 there -- there's a lot of tracking that goes on creating
15 class systems that we really don't wanna be feeding into.
16 So I mean, I think that's behind also a lot of this angst
17 over data. So it's a good discussion for us to be having.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin?

19 MS. RANKIN: I -- I just wanna pile on to
20 what Dr. Scheffel was talking about with PII in technology
21 and how computers can be hacked, and we have that fear, but
22 we also have the fear of the human factor, the more hands
23 that touch that technology and deal with the technology,
24 and at different levels of understanding the technology. I
25 -- I again, come to the defense of our State Board, I -- I



1 -- I mean, our Department of Education. I -- I really come
2 to their defense on this. Because it's -- it's not -- it's
3 not their fault, it's just the way things are going these
4 days and they're going so quickly, and the parents are
5 sitting back, they're not understanding except for what
6 they hear on TV with a lot of things that are fearful of
7 technology. So we have that human messiness in there too,
8 and I- I think we need to- to be wary of that but we also
9 need to be even more wary as Dr. Scheffel said about our
10 students- about our students and about our parents.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You only have turned on
12 the TV and listen to the Apple case. It draws all starkest
13 issues that we wanna deal with as a society and that's --
14 that's a data case. So I don't think this is going away
15 anytime soon. So we have a motion. Yes, Dr. Schroeder?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So I guess I would like to
17 know why we can't do option two? We give so little
18 information under option five -- that I think we risk
19 having folks who really cared about knowing, about early
20 childhood coming back and telling us what we need to report
21 as opposed to being very thoughtful about the privacy
22 issues but at the same time providing the information
23 that's in the legislation is pretty under the statutory
24 alignment, it's really not even clear whether we are
25 meeting the legislative requirements.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, my only thought
2 would be in, I mean, perhaps others have thoughts on board.
3 But my thought would be, we want to do the least. We -- we
4 want to -- districts have the data they need to impact
5 student performance and -- and instructionally assist.
6 Parents can have access to those data locally at the
7 district. The state needs aggregate general information on
8 readiness and- and the language in the statute is ambiguous
9 enough to suggest that we don't have to report it by
10 category, and because we don't have to, I don't think we
11 should.

12 I think we should be as broad as we can,
13 we're giving the legislature what it asked for in terms of
14 a general -- a percent of students that are ready and --
15 and that's sufficient for what they need. I -- I think
16 that the districts are the ones, and the parents are the
17 ones that need more details so that they can address issues
18 structurally and they have those data. I don't -- I don't
19 think we should be centralizing information that we don't
20 need to centralize.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: It just means we don't know.
22 Outside --

23 MS. COLSMAN: The district (inaudible).

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Outside the school district.
25 We at the Board level know very little.



1 MS. COLSMAN: We can go to our districts and
2 meet with them. I mean, the people they need to know --
3 know, would be my thought.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't -- I just don't
5 agree.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, further
7 discussion? Seeing none. Ms. Pearson, would you call a
8 roll on-

9 MS. BURDSALL: Option five.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: On option five.

11 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

12 MS. FLORES: Aye.

13 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff?

14 MS. GOFF: Aye.

15 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec?

16 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

17 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin?

18 MS. RANKIN: Aye.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel?

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

21 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

23 MS. BURDSALL: And Chairman Durham?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. The motion is
25 adopted by a vote of six to one. Thank you very much. I



1 appreciate it. Thank you. So we are now ready for 16.01.
2 So that's the School Turnaround Leaders Development Grant -
3 - district grant recipients.

4 MS. BURDSALL: I have a motion.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do we have a motion? Yes.

6 MS. BURDSALL: I move to approve the School
7 Turnaround Leaders Development Program recommendations to
8 grant recipients for participants in the amount of the
9 grant awards.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that
11 motion? Second?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Second. Ms. Rankin has
14 been moved.

15 MS. RANKIN: I'm trying to find my
16 paperwork.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Second. All right. So
18 discussion of -- let's see, Commissioner would you --

19 MR. ASP: Mr. Chair, with us today Peter
20 Sherman the Executive Director of District and School
21 Performance, and there is -- there is person with him.
22 Thank you.

23 MR. SHERMAN: Hi. Good afternoon, Mr.
24 Chair. So there is a motion on the floor. I'm here to
25 speak a little bit about that this School Turnaround



1 Leaders grant program. Today, we come to you with the
2 participants side of that. Where is my slide. May I?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's right there.

4 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you. Okay. No. That's
5 not my slide. Sorry.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

7 MR. SHERMAN: That's no problem. So just in
8 this -- as you know the most -- the role of the School
9 Board is -- we bring recommendations for the grant to you
10 and you hopefully approve those. This again is a state
11 funded grant. There are two sides to it. One which funds
12 provider organizations. We were -- I was here, last saw me
13 here in November where we added two more, one new
14 organization, one additional program to that provider list.
15 This is our second year in the program.

16 And then the other part of the program -- of
17 the grant program is for participants. So for districts
18 and schools who apply to the department for funding to send
19 individuals to these identified provider programs for
20 leadership. This is both for aspiring leaders or teacher
21 leaders for current principals and for district staff. So
22 very specifically that support schools that are in
23 turnaround or priority improvement. Thanks. I'm gonna
24 flash through a few of these slides.



1 Again, the role of the State Board is to
2 approve the recommendations for the participants. We
3 adjusted the timeline earlier in the fall. So for the
4 participants piece, it needs to be approved by April. So
5 we have a little bit of time but we're asking for your
6 approval today, so that we can get the words out and such
7 that all these individuals can go and begin to enroll in
8 the programs.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Scheffel?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So can I just ask -- clarify
11 and question? Or do you want to keep clarifying or should
12 I ask now?

13 MR. SHERMAN: Feel free.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is this right that --
15 where does the money come from state money -- where the
16 funds?

17 MR. SHERMAN: It's state funds, and I
18 believe it's general fund.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Based on a grant or just
20 general funds?

21 MR. SHERMAN: It's based on -- it was based
22 on legislation.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. And so the schools are
24 in turnaround or priority improvement that apply to the



1 department to get money in order to hire a vendor which is
2 listed on this document help them with leadership?

3 MR. SHERMAN: To train leadership. That's
4 correct.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Train leadership.

6 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: And is this the first time
8 we've seen this list?

9 MR. SHERMAN: No. This is the second year
10 that we've been in this pro- that we've gone through the
11 grant program. So each year we go through the process for
12 looking at providers, as well as participants. So this is
13 your first time seeing this list of participants.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so last year there was a
15 different list or the same list?

16 MR. SHERMAN: Last year it was different.
17 There was a different pool of applicants. I believe that
18 we awarded to, I think there were nine different applicants
19 that were awarded last year.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what I love to know who's
21 the vendors were last year? And what impact they made on
22 behalf of the schools it turned out a priority improvement?

23 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: As I talk to these schools
25 who are on priority turnaround. Basically, I think in



1 terms of research to need help with literacy is the biggest
2 predictor getting off -- getting out of these buckets. And
3 so I worry that the -- the way this vendor -- the types of
4 support they provide may not target that issue but I don't
5 know. And I try to do research on that. But I wonder do
6 you have a year of data from previous list of vendors?
7 What difference do they make?

8 MR. SHERMAN: Sure, and just --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: That might help us inform
10 this.

11 MR. SHERMAN: So just to give you a context.
12 This -- this Leaders Development Program is one of many
13 ways that the department are supporting our low-performing
14 schools. This is not particularly -- especially focused
15 around literacy. It is focused around a variety of where
16 of aspects -- really outlined by our principal quality
17 standards. So really a variety of different aspects of
18 leadership at the school level.

19 But to answer your question, so we awarded
20 four providers last spring, and I believe about 80
21 individuals began to attend those programs. Most of those
22 programs are either one or two years long. So those all-
23 those all began last summer. So we don't have data at this
24 moment about the impact that they've had thus far, it's
25 been a fairly short engagement they've had. There are



1 reporting requirements, both for the provider side and the
2 participant side, and so we'll be getting our first set of
3 reports from those participants from the individuals coming
4 up. I believe it's due to us by June 30th and we'll be
5 glad to share that when we get those.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: We have discretion over the
7 RFP, in terms of inviting individuals to apply that have a
8 certain skill set. I mean, in other words on what basis
9 they're -- they're chosen?

10 MR. SHERMAN: Do- do you mean for provider
11 organizations or for individuals?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: CDE writes the RFP and
13 entities apply to be a vendor or provider, right? What
14 kind of language is in the RFP? Because, you know, on what
15 basis would they be applying saying, yes, we have the
16 expertise, no, we don't have the expertise.

17 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. Yeah, I don't- so I
18 don't have the RFP for the providers right in front of me
19 but there is a whole array of different criteria that we
20 look for in that RFP, and I'd be glad to get a copy to you.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Who drafts that language in
22 the RFP? We have discretion over what's in the RFP?

23 MR. SHERMAN: We do, yes. Staff do.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So that's what I'm saying. I
25 guess as I looked at previous iterations of it. I don't



1 think it has the right leverage points in the RFP. So then
2 when I look at individuals who applied at sports at
3 schools. I'm thinking, I would be this successful helping
4 raised during the achievement, you know.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why did we approve
6 those last year?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm trying to remind myself
8 what was on that list. I mean I'd have to go back and
9 look.

10 MR. SHERMAN: So a couple of the
11 organizations -- I can pull it up really quickly but the
12 organizations that are on our provider list. The
13 University of Virginia, the Denver University -- University
14 of Denver has a couple of programs, Catapult Learning which
15 is a local Colorado organization. The Promethean paired
16 with the University of Florida which has just approved this
17 year in November, the relay program. I'm sorry.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Generation.

19 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you. Generation Schools
20 which is an organization --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm looking at the list.

22 MR. SHERMAN: Great. Thank you.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd love to see the RFP.

24 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. Happy to share that
25 with you.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

2 MR. SHERMAN: Additionally, we write the RFP
3 for the participants. So for districts and schools that
4 apply.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: What were asking. What
6 expertise are we asking for which drives would applies to
7 be an expert? And my question is what is the likely the
8 skill set to help these schools get out of priority
9 improvement and turnaround? And if the RFP doesn't have
10 the essence of the right skill set then these might be
11 great vendors, but they might not be providing the right
12 set of skills to help the students. Anyway, continue. I'm
13 sorry. I'm just trying to --

14 MS. FLORES: Can I ask a question?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

16 MS. FLORES: How much money is the state
17 providing for these? Yeah, on a yearly basis.

18 MR. SHERMAN: Let me flip to the very last
19 slide quickly. So the allocation is \$2 million per year.
20 A hundred thousand dollars of that goes to staff and
21 administer the program. This is the breakdown of the award
22 of- the recommendations and the awards for this year, so
23 far. So 1,000 -- \$191,429 were approved by you on November
24 11th of 2015 for the additional provider programs. And
25 then today, our request on the motion on the table is for



1 that \$1.7 million to be distributed out to 13 different
2 applicants which would support 48 individuals to attend a
3 variety of different leadership programs.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think, Mr. Sherman,
5 there's a body of evidence would indicate that if you can
6 go and back to our reading proficiency discussions that if
7 -- if you get all these kids and these turnaround districts
8 or schools on track to read at grade level -- by fourth
9 grade that you go a long way to solving a number of those
10 problems. How many of these grants are -- are trying to
11 deal with proven- where things that we believe have a high
12 correlation to academic success, and have a track record
13 that if you can- if you get these kids on grade level it
14 has to trickle up through the other grades?

15 MR. SHERMAN: Yeah. I would suggest that
16 all of them are. Some of the criteria by which we choose
17 providers are. First of all, we didn't elect to have a set
18 of providers that all do the same thing. We -- we were
19 very intentionally chose and wrote the RFP, so that we
20 would have an array of providers to be able to meet
21 different kinds of needs based on what those need, what the
22 needs are in different schools and districts, both Metro
23 area and rural areas, in large and small districts. And
24 knowing that all turnaround schools are not the same, that
25 they have -- that they struggle with different issues.



1 So -- so some of the common threads through
2 those providers they are looking at school culture, we all
3 know that are having a positive school culture is critical,
4 and sometimes is the foundation for making improvements.
5 So some of those providers are especially strong in that
6 area. Others are around academic system. So what do you
7 do with assessments? How do we know how our kids are
8 doing? How do we -- how do principals coach teachers to be
9 able to instruct better? And how do we know that how to --
10 are principals holding them accountable to strong
11 instruction?

12 So we have a number of providers that really
13 focus on that. We also have some providers that focus
14 around district systems, so we know that there are a lot of
15 standalone schools that are doing really well, despite the
16 district in which they are and, you know, these are --
17 these are principles that often struggle against their
18 local system. So we know that systemic efforts around --
19 in districts and building districts capacity support their
20 schools are a big factor as well. So we have some
21 providers that focus on that area as well. So as -- as
22 districts and individuals come to- schools come to us and
23 say, hey, this is an interesting grant. We're interested
24 in applying for it. We try to help them, direct them
25 toward those providers that we think will meet their needs.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: So are we -- are you -- and I
3 know, I apologize for the interruption. I know you needed
4 continue to the presentation but is there -- is it your
5 goal to we would approve this budget, these vendors -- this
6 budget and these vendors?

7 MR. SHERMAN: The vendors have been
8 approved. So this -- this particularly are recommendations
9 for funding.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Recipients of the funds?

11 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when did we approve the
13 vendors?

14 MR. SHERMAN: On November 11th.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

16 MR. SHERMAN: And twice last year. There
17 were two other -- two other motions.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. Maybe a good time for
19 us in terms of looking up leverage wise because this would
20 relate to the data around impact of these grants.

21 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Does it work?

23 MR. SHERMAN: Uh-huh.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do these leaders in these
2 school are they able to use this support to turn around
3 their schools?

4 MR. SHERMAN: Uh-huh.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I guess some of the input
6 I'm getting is -- it's not targeted enough to really put a
7 pulse on why they're in these buckets of priority
8 improvement or turnaround. And I would like to see them
9 get out of those categories, if you would too-

10 MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: And they would too. So I --
12 I think maybe it's a good time to really look at thing.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's
14 something we'll be able to do before you all vote next year
15 for vendors and that will have the first year of
16 implementation data in, and you can really look at that
17 impact before vendors come forward next year.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: How does the \$100,000 salary
19 for the administrator work? How does that get identified?
20 Is that something that the Board had approved or how does
21 that work?

22 MR. SHERMAN: It's part of the statute, it's
23 written in the statute. So that's the- I mean, that's
24 where those funds are allocated to the department.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Up to \$100,000 or is that
2 identified as the salary? How does the salary get chosen?

3 MR. SHERMAN: Those funds are distributed
4 amongst a couple of different individuals that support this
5 program. There's quite a bit of work that goes into the
6 RFP process and the selection process and then maintain
7 those relationships and supporting the leaders in the
8 schools and the districts that are participating in these.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thanks. Please proceed,
11 Mr. Sherman.

12 MR. SHERMAN: So again, as I also shared
13 with you a memo, I apologize there was one typo and I have
14 an adjustment but it was just in a number. But as-

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just a number.

16 MR. SHERMAN: Just a number, right? It is -
17 - it's -- It is -- it was --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How many (inaudible)
20 you're planning for?

21 MR. SHERMAN: I guess, I don't wanna draw
22 attention to the- to the typo, only suffice to say that.
23 Suffice to say that there is- that they're- we're
24 recommending the award of \$1,708,570 to- that award goes
25 out to these 13 different districts or schools. This year,



1 we had 21 applicants and we have awarded- we're
2 recommending awarding to 13 of those based on a very
3 competitive process. Of those 21 applicants, there was a
4 request for about \$4.6 million.

5 So there was quite a bit more demand for
6 these funds than we had to supply for. So again, it was a
7 very competitive process. What you see up here on the
8 table was the result of that competitive grants process run
9 by CDE but also which included outside folks that were-
10 that served as reviewers as well. So I'm happy to take any
11 questions, but I'll let you look through the list
12 yourselves.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions on the list from
14 the Board?

15 MS. MAZANEC: I really have a question. I
16 will be anxious and very interested to see what kind of
17 results we get from these programs.

18 MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely.

19 MS. GOFF: I'm just thinking that maybe if
20 we place some of these people with really --
21 superintendents and principals that are making a difference
22 for kids and -- I'm sorry, thank you. I see movement over
23 here on the side. So -- so if -- I mean, if you had a
24 clinical model and this looks like you do a clinical model
25 of some kind, but I'm just wondering whether- that's quite



1 a disparity and in the numbers and you spent 20 on some,
2 you spent 40,000 on another, I don't know whether -- I
3 don't -- I'd like to see the results in.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin?

5 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

6 MS. RANKIN: So Mr. Sherman, we are taking
7 existing teachers in existing turnaround schools, sending
8 them to a program to make them better teachers in those
9 same schools to go back and put that into effect; is that
10 correct?

11 MR. SHERMAN: Both teachers, principals, and
12 district staff.

13 MS. RANKIN: So when it says six plus
14 participants, some can be of age; is that correct?

15 MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

16 MS. RANKIN: So and- you say this is your
17 sec- the second year you've done this?

18 MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

19 MS. RANKIN: Is that what it is? Because I
20 see one of the schools that I was in that I assumed they
21 were already participants in this but does this mean
22 there's three more? I'm looking at Lake County, right now.
23 Were there some last year? And now we're adding three more
24 to this? The others have graduated from the program? How
25 does that work?



1 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct. I don't --
2 yes, that's correct. So it would be including other
3 individuals. So we're not sending the same individual
4 through programs over and over.

5 MS. RANKIN: So if a school was turnaround
6 and had three come in and all of a sudden they are- is
7 there a certain level they get to where you go back and
8 give it to turnaround again? I mean, I -- I thought maybe
9 Lake County was gonna be out of turnaround?

10 MR. SHERMAN: We certainly hope that they
11 will be, but I know that they haven't. They have a lot of
12 needs.

13 MS. RANKIN: So we're adding more teachers
14 until we're sure they're secure?

15 MR. SHERMAN: We're adding more support.
16 Yes, we're continuing and we're engaged with many of these
17 districts and other ways beyond this just as the years of
18 training.

19 MS. RANKIN: I have to say, visiting Lake
20 County Schools, the teachers there are very excited about
21 what they're doing. I mean, just their attitude is worth a
22 lot and it's not just two or three teachers, it's -- it
23 carries over. So I think that's an interesting observation
24 for some of these that really wanna get out of turnaround
25 status.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any the other comments Mr.
2 Sherman?

3 MR. SHERMAN: No.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So I think this year it
5 looks like (inaudible) is pretty well cast, we're going
6 down the road. But if the Board becomes more involved in
7 this turnaround issues, if looking forward to next year,
8 let's say, there was an overwhelming majority on the Board
9 to say, let's direct as much of this -- much these
10 resources as possible to -- to the literacy component. Or
11 not literacy, I'm sorry. The reading -- the READ Act
12 component that strengthening that in grades one -- K-3 in
13 these districts. Could we shift gears? I understand
14 there's apparently leadership program but you could perhaps
15 define leadership in some interesting ways that might
16 include a greater emphasis on the READ Act and
17 implementation of READ Act. Could we refocus or, you know
18 -- and go in a very different direction -- is that within -
19 - is that possible legally?

20 MR. SHERMAN: I mean, I think again as you
21 mentioned, I mean, this is -- this statute was written very
22 specifically for leadership, as we know leadership is broad
23 and includes- obviously includes instructional leadership
24 as well. So I think if, you know, if we and we can revise
25 the RFP as needed.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So the Board wanna take a
2 look at that going -- going forward. It would be possible
3 to do that. Yes, Ms. Mazanec?

4 MS. MAZANEC: It just occurred to me. One
5 thing I don't know is how do the teachers and
6 administrators who get these grants, how does the training
7 happen? Is it remotely? Do -- is it, you know, web kind
8 of things or do they go -- physically go somewhere?

9 MR. SHERMAN: So we have -- we have eight or
10 nine different providers and with a variety of different
11 programs, so they're all a little bit different. We strive
12 in one of our criteria for the provider organizations are
13 to have as much of this as possible happen at the site
14 level. We know that the context of the school matters.

15 MS. MAZANEC: So that the trainers goes into
16 the schools, where?

17 MR. SHERMAN: We encourage that as much as
18 possible absolutely.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

20 MR. SHERMAN: But it does occur in a variety
21 of different modes. So it may happen at the school level,
22 it may happen at the district, it may happen regionally.
23 In some cases, one of our providers, which we have -- I
24 haven't gotten to observe yet, uses more of a blended



1 online system. So there is a variety of different ways
2 that that learning occurs.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder then Dr.
5 Flores.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm assuming that as
7 district -- turnaround districts come to request these,
8 that they have- that they have looked very carefully and
9 sort of peel the onion in order to identify what their
10 needs? Where their most critical needs are? Which is my
11 only concern about us deciding- universally, across all our
12 turnaround schools, this is what you need because it may
13 not be. It may be that emphasizing literacy might miss
14 something that's critical beforehand, such as school
15 culture, if that's the problem.

16 And so I think we need to be willing to have
17 the flexibility, if we're confident that the analysis
18 that's been done by the district looks reasonable. These
19 are the hierarchy of needs that we have- that we go in that
20 direction, so we don't start at someplace where it can't be
21 successful because there are other blockers or problems
22 that have to be overcome before we can get there. That's
23 the risk in our deciding what it ought to be.

24 MR. SHERMAN: I would just add.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.



1 MR. SHERMAN: If I may, I'm sorry. So I
2 mean, you know, I just wanna acknowledge, like this is a
3 significant allocation of funds of public dollars, and we
4 certainly take that seriously and I think to Dr.
5 Schroeder's point. As we speak with superintendents or
6 principal supervisors who are begin- as they begin to
7 identify what leaders or which schools they would apply
8 for, for these- for these trainings, we are -- we -- we
9 encourage them to really hold their folks to a high
10 standard and to only choose people for which they want to
11 make an investment over time.

12 We don't have as a requirement here that
13 says like, a leader goes through one of these programs that
14 they have to serve for three or four years largely because
15 we don't feel like that's something that we can hold them
16 accountable to but we very much encourage districts to hold
17 them accountable and say don't send someone through the DU
18 program if that person isn't going to continue to serve in
19 your school, in your district, or at best in Colorado far
20 lowest performing school and districts. But we don't know
21 the individuals to your point, and we expect the local
22 district staff to be able to tell us those things.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Dr. Flores?

24 MS. FLORES: I don't remember and I remember
25 a lot. I don't remember approving this.



1 MR. SHERMAN: This is a -- this is a new
2 recommendation to you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All we approved was some
4 vendors. We didn't approve any amounts or anything like
5 that.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I thought you said we
7 approved (inaudible)?

8 MR. SHERMAN: You would have done this about
9 a year ago. I don't -- I think it was -- may have been in
10 April last year.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: It was at the May 13th board
12 meeting last year, I think.

13 MS. FLORES: And I just don't remember that.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: What happens to our salary?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. I don't remember
16 either.

17 MS. FLORES: I -- this would be very
18 important.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I believe it was
20 on the consent agenda or it was on the consent and it was
21 approved by.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it was on the consent
23 agenda, so we didn't vote on it explicitly. I have to
24 check. So it was on the consent agenda last time they
25 asked.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So that's why it's not on
2 the radar yet.

3 MS. FLORES: Yes.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: This really important because
5 we are creating the conditions for these schools to be very
6 high stakes outcomes in schools. And the assumption is
7 that this fairly substantial amount of money is supposed to
8 help them to get out of this category. Unless we look very
9 carefully about how this money gets spent and ensure that
10 it's highly applied, embedded in the school and not done in
11 a hotel somewhere or some other location --

12 MS. FLORES: At a bar.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Then, you know, we're not
14 really setting them up for success. And so it concerns me
15 that it was on consent agenda and I didn't catch it. So
16 it's really important that we're not just throwing money
17 out there saying, you know, send your folks as a team to,
18 you know, Virginia and have them talk to experts. I mean,
19 this is about going to the district, in the school, looking
20 at the kids that are there, their culture, their situation,
21 their demographics, their uniquenesses and distinctives,
22 and trying to help them figure out where are the leverage
23 points.

24 We know literacy is a huge leverage point to
25 the extent that leadership understands how to do



1 walkthroughs and work with teachers and literacy coaches to
2 bring up literacy. It's a huge predictor of getting people
3 out of negative buckets and getting into better buckets,
4 get out of priority improvement and turnaround, which is
5 what they want. So it really concerns me that these funds,
6 you know, maybe slip through. It's like sounds good I
7 mean, but we just know that unless it's embedded in the
8 school with the teachers on very grassroots level. It has
9 a low likelihood of impacting.

10 We know that ideas learned in a hotel
11 somewhere are very hard to translate when you get back home
12 and you're observing a third grade teacher in terms of
13 curriculum and assessments and, you know, all the things
14 that go with quality instruction. So I -- I just think we
15 should somehow look at this very carefully because this is
16 their only shot of being- being able to turnaround and that
17 that it's a subset of the entire group. I'm sorry that I
18 didn't catch that it was on the consent agenda. I don't
19 remember.

20 MS. FLORES: Yeah. And sometimes, I mean,
21 it takes a while for some of us. I know for me, that this
22 business I've, well, let's talk a little bit about, you
23 know, this -- this particular thing that I read. I know, I
24 read everything, and I note everything and sometimes I'm
25 frustrated when I know last year, that we don't talk about



1 some of them. And part of it is because I didn't know the
2 process and about checking off, and now I'm being very
3 careful about, you know, yes, I do want to know more about
4 this. I asked for -- for instance, I've asked for the RFP,
5 I don't know how many times, and I'd like the RFP. I know
6 that sitting with you would give me some information but,
7 you know, I like RFPs and I get a lot of information from
8 reading an RFP. And I would like an RFP to see how these
9 funds are going out.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Not to first -- we'd be happy
11 when we were working on trying to get a date with you, and
12 I think that's when other stuff was going on for you. So
13 we just wanted to sit down next walk through it what is in
14 RFP with you and then --

15 MS. FLORES: Well, I know what an RFP. I --
16 I read lots of RFPs.

17 MR. SHERMAN: I'll share the links they're -
18 - they're up by now and I'll share the links for those RFPs
19 with Bizy as soon as we're done here.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, good. Any
21 further questions? Is their motion -- you did?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't think so.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why don't we start the
25 motion?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There is. (Inaudible)
2 seconded that we approve the grants as -- grant as
3 recommended for further discussion on that motion.

4 MS. FLORES: Okay. Are we going to
5 recommend that people be chosen not because of, you know,
6 they're my friend at district or whatever but because
7 these people really are going to do something -- that's not
8 to say that your friend in the district is not going to,
9 you know, get things done but really like if we need help
10 in literacy that as Dr. Scheffel suggested, that indeed
11 those individuals who may have a talent in that area are
12 chosen.

13 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Chair. I would like to
14 talk to --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

16 MS. RANKIN: Am I interrupting something?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, no, Miss Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: You know, I have- I have been
19 proud to have a love of my teachers on this list but what
20 I'm going to do I know the superintendents and they --
21 they're part of choosing or the district chooses who these
22 people are. I've been to some of these schools, my
23 judgment on that in the next couple of years is if they get
24 off of turnaround, this is one of the things to me that's
25 going to springboard them. And I know the programs that



1 they're -- they're learning from. I mean, we can study
2 these vendors and what type of programs they use and match
3 that to our school districts that are on here and in two
4 years if they get off of that -- I know one of mine for
5 sure and a lot of it is because of leadership at the
6 superintendent level.

7 I'm not and these others may be at the
8 school level that they're choosing. But that whole thing
9 permeates at least this one system and I -- I'm look to see
10 that they get off turn around. I'm not proud of the fact
11 that I have so many schools on turnaround and we either
12 have to get them turned around or we have to take the next
13 step and I'm ready to do that too. But it's kind of on us
14 to -- to see what our schools are doing I believe, and I'd
15 love to talk to you about some of the things I found out
16 just in the six months I've been here or whatever it is.

17 MS. FLORES: No, I think the money has been
18 spent for quite a- quite a while. And I know that many of
19 the superintendents that were supported in Denver public
20 schools are not there anymore. So I mean, I think I have a
21 little background in following.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the second
23 year.

24 MS. FLORES: Well, this is only the second
25 year in this type of program but that doesn't mean that



1 money has not been spent on training for leadership. There
2 has been other monies and there has been other monies in
3 Denver public schools and that's what I'm referring to.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So if I could just clarify is
6 it true that our vote today has a number of assumptions
7 underneath it. One of which is that the RFP ask the right
8 questions, so as to attract the right vendors that have
9 leverage in terms of helping these turnaround schools come
10 out of turn around. That's one assumption, right?

11 MR. SHERMAN: That assumption I would be
12 sure I would agree with you and you have provided- you have
13 approved those providers to- to date.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right but we -- we haven't
15 looked at the RFP and approved, have we? The language in
16 the RFP that -- that attract certain vendors to do the work
17 because that's my question.

18 MR. SHERMAN: Yeah. And in fact --

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: And underneath this- there'd
20 be no way I could look at this list and vote, no per se
21 because I -- I would have to look underneath it, at the
22 RFP. Did the RFP ask the right questions to attract the
23 vendors who could actually turn schools around? I don't
24 know because I don't know how the RFP was written.

25 Secondly, I don't know what the rubric looks like in terms



1 of the people that reviewed the individuals that applied
2 based on the RFP to find out if they really have the
3 expertise to help the schools turnaround. And then based
4 on all of that work none of which were privy to you all
5 have chosen districts -- 13 of them, right?

6 MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: That will get some of these
8 funds and then we'll choose a vendor off the list or have
9 they already chosen?

10 MR. SHERMAN: They've already chosen that's
11 part of -- that's part of the RFP process.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean, I guess, that's what
13 I object to in this process. I mean, it's -- it's high
14 stakes -- these districts are on turn around. A subset of
15 them can get some money but there are so many assumptions
16 nested in this decision that I- there's really no way to
17 know if this will work. And I have a lot of angst around
18 whether or not it will work only because a lot of these
19 programs knowing some of them in a fair amount of detail,
20 do nice work on leadership but in terms of their ability to
21 really have the targeted expertise on achievement, I really
22 would question that. And so that's my concern with this
23 way of doing business because it's our- we have this high
24 stakes thing that's going on in our state and we're hoping



1 this works. So I mean, I think there's -- there's problems
2 in --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: We're crossing our fingers
4 and hope it works.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Adding faith if this is gonna
6 work.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, just reflect
9 back what I've heard from you from you all about going
10 forward. So I think it might help, if what I'm hearing
11 from you is you all would like to be part of the RFP
12 process for the vendors especially before that goes out
13 next year, make sure we have them matching the needs --
14 needs of the schools in the districts in finding
15 improvement and turnaround with the vendors can provide and
16 making sure that's explicit not RFP. So we can have that
17 conversation next fall before the -- the RFP goes out and
18 talk about that. The same time we'll be able to --
19 sometime next fall, I'll be able to share some results --
20 some early results from the first year of implementation
21 and bring that back to you.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because all the districts are
23 doing are saying, we're in trouble, we need help, there's a
24 pot of money. Let's apply for it. You know, what I don't
25 know is how did we track these vendors? What real



1 expertise do they have? I've looked at their websites. I
2 don't know that they have the right expertise to help our
3 turn around schools.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You don't have to know
6 my name.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think we currently maybe
8 just take a break all the time.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wonder why some
10 --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why -- why do- why do
13 some districts -- how is it you get denied?

14 MR. SHERMAN: So we follow -- they can -- we
15 follow as most -- with most competitive grants here from
16 CDE. We follow fairly rigid process with our RFP which
17 includes criteria, and it includes a scoring rubric and it
18 goes through a review process. So out of those 21
19 applicants that we had on this round in particular they're
20 scored and they are -- they are ranked by those criteria
21 and the 13 were those- were those that were at the top of
22 the list. So -- so the applications that are at the bottom
23 of the list were lacking in some fashion around the
24 criteria. They may not have described well enough the
25 needs that they have in their district or their school.



1 They may not have described well enough the connection
2 between the leaders and those needs and the providers that
3 they've applied for. Generally, they didn't do an adequate
4 job of describing what their needs were.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me just say that it
6 strikes me, and I don't know if this is true but this is
7 just the first thing that comes to my head is that a school
8 that is struggling, you know, to provide what their
9 students needs are and some of these schools as we know are
10 in really challenged neighborhoods, challenged
11 demographics. It concerns me that they might not be able
12 to get the help they need because they don't have a good
13 enough application but they have the need. So I- I don't
14 know if there's- if it's all statutory. There's no getting
15 around a bit if I would like us to somehow be able to focus
16 a little more on need and then quality of application.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we've been working
18 on providing support to districts in the grant writing
19 application and making sure that if there's a --

20 MS. MAZANEC: Help them write a good
21 application.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know what we're doing
23 lots of other but with that piece of it as well but
24 absolutely, I think that what was so hard this year is we
25 had such a huge response to the RFP, that there were so



1 many -- 4.6 million dollar requests and we didn't have that
2 much money to give out.

3 MR. SHERMAN: If I may just add, every one
4 of those- every one of those recommendations up on the list
5 is not -- we're not recommending that they, how do I say
6 this? Sorry. We're not recommending that they be awarded
7 the full amount that they applied for. Every one of those
8 dollar amounts up there are only a partial amount. If we
9 had -- if we had awarded the full amount that each of the
10 applicants they would probably be four or five listed up
11 there. It was very important to us that we'd be able to
12 spread those funds out across two different.

13 And then just Ms. Mazanec to your point, we
14 are a little ways into the application we added some other
15 priority points because we- we knew that we were getting a
16 lot of interest from a whole variety of different folks out
17 in the field. And so we added sort of different ways that
18 applicants might get sort of priority points that we called
19 them and one of those was for a small and rural districts
20 because we- just to your point, we know that the capacity
21 of some of our smaller districts to be able to write
22 applications or -- or less and that -- it has a bigger
23 toll.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just one quick question
2 in evaluating the vendors, do they do, sort of, a self
3 analysis of the success of their prior clients?

4 Mr. SHERMAN: Yes, they do. Part of the RFP
5 process is that they have to provide us with data and with
6 outcomes from the work that they've done. And then again,
7 their annual reporting requirements that will start to see
8 those coming in the next two months and as Ms. Pearson said
9 we'll share that- we'll be glad to share that with you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. Thanks.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Sorry. Ms.
12 Scheffel? I'm tired, you'll break me down eventually.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you describe the kind of
14 help you give to districts because what I hear from some is
15 that we applied, we didn't get it, we didn't get any
16 feedback, you know, what kind of help do you give to
17 districts to help them get a grant?

18 MR. SHERMAN: Sure in --

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: 19 out of however many.

20 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. Myself and my staff, we
21 spend time speaking with folks on the -- the phone -- out
22 of all the eligible districts we reached out explicitly to
23 every one of those districts and said, hey, we want to be
24 sure that you're aware that you're eligible for this, and
25 we'd be happy to help you funded. Some of those



1 conversations were short. Others were an hour, where we
2 really sat down and looked at lists of schools and I said,
3 tell me about the leaders. Tell me about the challenges
4 those schools are having, and let me help you understand
5 which some -- which of these providers might be able to
6 meet some of those needs. But don't let me be the person
7 to make that decision for you. Here's all the information
8 about each of those providers and I know a lot of those
9 districts then set up appointments and had conversations
10 with different providers and interviewed them further.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what do I say to a
12 district that said, we applied and we got no feedback and
13 we were declined.

14 MR. SHERMAN: All applicants got feedback in
15 the last couple of weeks, so they would have gotten written
16 feedback.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: But not soon enough to fix it
18 to get money or is it after the facts or how does that
19 work?

20 MR. SHERMAN: We have a very particular
21 competitive grants process that we go through and as Ms.
22 Pearson said we are -- that's a process that, you know,
23 we're putting energy into trying to improve. But yes, I
24 mean, once there are -- there are certain protocols that we



1 abide by around that because we- we want that process to be
2 defensible as well.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I appreciate it. I guess, I
4 would just say I have issues about how we're supporting
5 these turnaround schools and whether or not we're setting
6 them up for success or not success based on how we're
7 supporting them and maybe we can reanalyze that as a Board
8 and I think it's up to us to figure out what will work.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion. Okay,
10 seeing none. Do we have a motion and a second in front of
11 us which is to approve the grants as listed. Ms. Burdsall,
12 would you call the roll?

13 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

14 MS. FLORES: Aye.

15 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff?

16 MS. GOFF: Aye.

17 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec?

18 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin?

20 MS. RANKIN: Aye.

21 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.

25 MS. BURDSALL: And Chairman Durham?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. The motion passed on
2 a vote of five to two. And we are gonna take a 10 minute
3 recess right now.

4 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600