



Colorado State Board of Education

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

June 9, 2016, ESSA and Budget, Part 4

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 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 MR. CHAPMAN: And to much dismay you know I'm
2 writing that we would hope to have an additional draft of our --
3 our the SSA state plan to begin vetting more thoroughly by late --
4 by the end of September and that may be an overly ambitious goal
5 but I think that a lot of it is the vetting of it and -- the
6 modifying of that along the way.

7 So it's hard for people to react to something
8 that doesn't exist so having that initial draft is really
9 important that we've pulled that together quickly and I do think
10 that we've got a really good start on it through our -- our
11 waiver. And the idea is to present what's happening in Colorado
12 and -- and put the onus on the U.S. Department of Education to
13 say no to what we've proposed as opposed to putting together what
14 they've said we should put together like it's -- it's almost like
15 the burden of proof is on we're guilty until proven innocent. And
16 I kind of want to avoid that scenario because I think we're doing
17 good stuff.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

19 MS. MAZANEC: I want to make sure I understand
20 this right, that the Hub Spoke committees, which is the what,
21 CAES, CASB, et cetera, they are going to be responsible for
22 writing this that's what the plan is right now? Looks like --

23 MR. CHAPMAN: No these both committees will be
24 really drafting and presenting at the Hub Committee for its
25 reaction to -- to say, "Hey what about parents? We don't see



1 parents or to -- to really get it to the point that it can be
2 officially submitted to you guys so that you decide whether or not
3 it's the plan that we want to submit to the USDE. So I think that
4 there's an opportunity to -- to have greater as Dr. Scheffel
5 suggesting really anybody who wants to get part of the drafting of
6 the plan I think would be great and one of those participating --

7 MS. MAZANEC: Because I'm concerned because it
8 says the -- the Spoke committee will be responsible for drafting
9 associated sections of the plan.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah and then they deliver --
11 they're working -- they are meeting regularly with them. They're
12 bringing that to the Hub committee for reaction. So the -- the
13 Hub committee is really in a position to say, "Hey, we think you
14 need to do more of this or you need to do less of that or why are
15 you including this in that section." To be able to react to it
16 and get it to the point that it's understood and can be supported
17 by -- by all groups.

18 MS. MAZANEC: I would just echo Dr. Scheffel's
19 concern that we -- we need to have a big voice on this.

20 MR. CHAPMAN: That would be on this wonderful.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Commissioner Anthes.

22 MS, ANTHES: Thanks. So I just wanted to -- just
23 recap again this was sort of a plan, a proposal to put in front of
24 you. I think we do -- we're trying to balance sort of the needs
25 of engaging all stakeholders and having this be, sort of a plan



1 that everyone understands deeply and has some voice. But also,
2 you know, making sure that you all are as engaged as you want. As
3 you know, these can be complicated and detail oriented whether we
4 want them to be or not. I know we don't really want them to do it
5 but they take enormous amounts of time and -- and -- and staff
6 capacity to do so.

7 I think what -- what we would love today this is
8 just one idea that's in front of you but would love some pretty
9 clear direction today from you all around how you would like to be
10 involved because the timeline though it seems like we have a year,
11 when we do, it's -- it's very difficult to get all of this
12 together so we -- if we wanted to go this route we would need to
13 start -- start right away. And so if we wanna go a different
14 route we would definitely need that input today.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I guess one thought would be
17 obviously you're involving a lot of constituents and entities and
18 that's fine but I guess what I'd like for the board to consider
19 doing is meeting on the front end of all of those meetings before
20 -- before all this is planned out and sit down with the current
21 documents we have, with the waiver we have, with the rules that
22 have just been released, with the actual law of the SSA and really
23 look at all those documents and any other documents that would
24 likely be brought to those initial meetings with the Spoke and Hub
25 committees so that we're looking at what they're looking at before



1 things start getting even thought through outlined, because having
2 been at many of these meetings, you know, people don't start with
3 a blank piece of paper.

4 They're coming with informative documents that
5 will drive the process and we should be looking at those documents
6 deeply, reading them outlining them understanding them and coming
7 up with priorities that this board wants to see in that plan. And
8 then saying now let these groups do this work but bring it back to
9 us at these punctuated points so that we can look at the direction
10 of the document as opposed to seeing it on the backside.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel do you have an
12 idea of when and how we should hold those meetings? Looking at
13 schedules and time availability of the board. This is -- this is
14 an ambitious undertaking for board members. The board that have
15 significant other obligations in life. Not suggesting that we
16 shouldn't do it but I am suggesting it's a difficult project. Do
17 you have some time line recommendations?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well we already -- it sounds like
19 we need to meet in July anyway and maybe we could take on a study
20 session for a half a day and receive the documents in advance that
21 we would read. I mean it would certainly reading the law and how
22 many members of the board have actually read ESSA but it's a very
23 substantial document. There's a lot of interesting things in
24 there that were not included in the marketing of the document that
25 the general public perceives.



1 Secondly reading the rules carefully and
2 certainly, I mean they were just released and then any other
3 informing documents that you plan to bring to the Hub and Spoke
4 committees. So you know, if we take down a half a day to a July
5 potential meeting and we have those documents in advance that we
6 get outlined reading digest then we can come to the meeting with -
7 - with ideas and an outline in priorities.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Chapman, the draft rules
9 are now out is that correct and they are in the comment phase so
10 we actually would have the draft rules to review at this point in
11 time and they are how many pages long?

12 MR. CHAPMAN: They are 192 pages and we would
13 hope to have initial sweep of those rules completed by the end of
14 June and would hope to have a more polished response by mid July
15 so July 4th meeting we would -- we would be able to provide some
16 useful information at that point.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like a copy of the
18 192.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll get that for you.

20 MR. CHAPMAN: I think that you received an e-mail
21 that you just -- you just click on the link and it gives texture
22 to those.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We will have a
24 relatively early meeting in -- in June -- in July I'm sorry we
25 won't -- you won't have your analysis completely done by then.



1 Perhaps we can just -- will take half a day in addition to our
2 other obligations that day to -- to at least review what you have.
3 Recognizing that it's not nor should we expect it to be everything
4 that you ultimately will be but perhaps putting some of those
5 choices in front of us. I would just observe that -- that -- that
6 this is, you know, while this is the kind of plan that I would
7 generally say would be acceptable to most people involved in this.
8 If I were to put on my cynical hat and I certainly wear it a lot,
9 I can predict you know, within an eyelash of what the position of
10 every one of these groups is going to be.

11 So I don't know if we need to have that table or
12 we just want to surmise that we know the answer and I can bring my
13 -- my great Carnac envelopes and we could probably save a lot of
14 people out of travel money. So to some extent this is a
15 bureaucratized process designed to -- to solicit the kind of input
16 that will allow us to do what we wanted to do in the first place.
17 And -- and I mean, unfortunately you know, the stakeholders are
18 just that they're motivated to protect their individual members
19 who pay dues to those organizations. And I think it's the job of
20 the department and the job of this Board to recognize that we
21 really -- well these organizations are our constituents in terms
22 of delivery. They are not our ultimate constituents, our ultimate
23 constituents are the children. And failure to recognize that and
24 to allow the -- to allow the interests of the adults to outweigh



1 the outcomes we would like to see for the children I think is
2 ultimately inappropriate.

3 And I think that's what Dr. Scheffel is
4 suggesting we somehow see we could overcome at an early stage and
5 it's not an easy task for -- for you all and because you have to
6 live in a world with these constituency groups more than at least
7 then do I. And so let's think we'll -- we'll give it a try at the
8 July meeting see where we end up and see where we go from there.
9 I'll bring my envelopes. Thanks.

10 MS. MAZANEC: So I just wanna clarify you logged
11 (inaudible) invitations for the Hub Committee are doing any of
12 that. Or do you wanna think about, that we work with you first
13 and then work with the Hub? Like on an ongoing basis work with
14 you first and then do a Hub or do you wanna have that meeting in
15 July first and then determine if we wanna put out a nomination
16 process --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That would be my suggestion.
18 Wait till we meet in July and then map out a process.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well that's about three weeks
20 from now --

21 ALL: It's not pretty far away.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- does that -- let's presume
23 we already started down that road in July. Do we have adequate
24 time then if that's when we start?



1 MR. CHAPMAN: That would be fine. So you can
2 make that schedule work.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you. Yes, Dr.
4 Schroeder.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So that was the conversation I've
6 heard here before but I just want to remind us of what just
7 happened with having convened a group that was not largely
8 represented when we did the combined at risk group and the kind of
9 push back we got because there was not representation from others.

10 And so I would like to suggest that we'd be very
11 careful about making this just about the board or just about and
12 then being concerned about those other groups. Those other groups
13 represent a lot of different points of view and we exclude them at
14 our own peril because they have a lot of -- well I'm just saying
15 we screwed up this last time that screwed up but we could have
16 done it better this last time. And this is looking like we're
17 going down that same road by suggesting that we decide in advance,
18 what it is that we're gonna write without getting more input.

19 Well I appreciate the listening tour. I don't
20 think the listening tour asked the kind of questions that we now
21 have to ask. And I worry very much about not being very inclusive
22 and not having some of those deep discussions about different
23 points of view while we're doing the draft as opposed to after
24 we've done the draft and then having a significant brouhaha in the
25 state of Colorado.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: May I comment?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. -- Dr. Scheffel.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I would -- I would just clarify
4 that the -- the Board -- Board members here are not suggesting at
5 all that other stakeholders not have any -- any input. But I
6 think what -- what those -- the problem has been is that often
7 they are the ones driving and writing these kinds of things rather
8 than the state Board which is elected to do this work. The State
9 Board and -- and the department under our direction and that the
10 commissioner's direction. So my concern is not that the State
11 Board is shutting out voices. My concern is that the State Board
12 isn't having a voice. So let's -- let's make it clear that we are
13 not talking about shutting out anyone. I think we we're talking
14 about putting the -- putting the job in the hands of the right
15 people.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's -- that suffices, thank
18 you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you, further --
20 further comments. Thank you very much, I appreciate the
21 presentation. We'll now proceed to item five which is the quick
22 briefing on the department's budget request for fiscal year
23 2017/18 and we're gonna start with Commissioner -- we're starting
24 with --



1 MS, ANTHES: Yes, I think I will be turning this
2 over to Leanne Emm, Associate Commissioner and Jeff Blandford,
3 thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, great.

5 MS. EMM: Thank you. Let me make sure this is
6 working. Is it working?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: You have to talk into it like
8 you're a rock star.

9 MS. EMM: All right, so this is the budget
10 request that we -- are bringing forward to you for an information
11 item today. What we have done in the past has brought this to you
12 as an information and then you have voted on this at a subsequent
13 meeting. How we develop these is we did go around the department
14 and hold units and asked them what their critical needs were?

15 They brought forward those items and then they
16 were vetted through leadership to kind of take the first cut
17 justification of what the requests were. And they were asked what
18 other alternatives they could come up with and exactly did kind of
19 squeeze the areas as much as possible and there were a couple of
20 items that did not make it onto this list after that -- after that
21 squeezing.

22 So these -- these items the total program and the
23 categorical or typical items and those are -- those are developed
24 as the enrollment projections are developed. We work closely with
25 the office of state budget and planning. They basically --



1 basically tell us what to put into the requests and then those go
2 forward. One other thing that I do want to point out here is
3 that, a couple of things.

4 There is a request on here for an additional
5 staff member to come into the department and as we are talking
6 about this we have, Subject Matter Experts here to talk about the
7 request if you have further information needs and also for the
8 concurrent enrollment item, we do have a couple of people from the
9 District of Callahan, the superintendent and principal to speak to
10 this -- to speak to this item. If you have further questions --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Why don't we take them now it
12 would be probably appropriate, as long as we're on that topic, the
13 --

14 MS. EMM: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- request the -- the FTE from
16 -- concurrent enrollment requests \$74,000 --

17 MS. EMM: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- in addition.

19 MS. EMM: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The total administrative budget
21 of the department roughly is what?

22 MR. CHAPMAN: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. When you
23 refer to administration could you be a little more specific.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: FTE and FTE involved in direct
2 delivery of services to districts and excluding the school for the
3 deaf and blind which is its own service delivery agency.

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Got you, it's a little and please
5 don't quote me on these because I'm going for everybody but it's a
6 little less than a hundred million dollars and that does include
7 roughly 25 million that we have for the assessment contracts that
8 are out there. But whole ball of wax excluding the school for the
9 deaf and blind it's a little less than a hundred million dollars.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't believe that's only staff
11 though.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No that would be operating and
13 yes, that's --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That includes --

15 MR. CHAPMAN: (Inaudible) a contract for
16 assessments they're --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Operating any -- anything else
18 we have to do.

19 MS. EMM: And how many FTEs may I ask?

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm sorry, I didn't hear what your
21 answer was on the number --

22 MR. CHAPMAN: It's a little less than a hundred
23 million dollars for just the administration, things like that.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You gotta get closer.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: Is this?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: There you go.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Bingo.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay, I just had to learn and I'm
4 sorry.

5 ALL: Speak into that.

6 MR. CHAPMAN: The FTE is about 400 at just CDE.
7 That again would include CSTB or the Charter School Institute.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's licensure all of the
9 components what I call direct service.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes, Mr. Chair.

11 MS. EMM: Including federally funded staff and --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. And the state so state
13 funded part of that is how much in general fund?

14 MR. CHAPMAN: In percentage terms and it's not
15 just the general fund since the state education fund comprises
16 such a --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Taking out the past
18 (inaudible).

19 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, and I'm sorry there are
20 programs that are funded at the department level reinstated but
21 all -- all totaled the percentage breakdown is about 58-42, 58
22 percent being federal funds and 42 percent being state funded as -
23 - as far as staff operating things like that.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So the administrative portion
2 would be something around 40 million dollars in general fund
3 money.

4 MS. EMM: All funds, all state funds --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Generally in cash funds.

6 MS. EMM: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. So -- so the -- the
8 proposed increase of six hundred two thousand dollars is
9 percentage wise about two, three, two percent? No point two.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: About point two. I -- I don't have
11 my adding machine here.

12 MS. EMM: Or about point two, yes. Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I always lose decimal points
14 someplace. So when we hear from the Superintendent Principal from
15 Calhan about the concurrent enrollment piece.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if I could I'd like to
17 have Misti Ruthven just kind of just in --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Misti, you want to give
19 us a quick introduction an then --

20 MS. RUTHVEN: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

22 MS. RUTHVEN: Thanks.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

24 MS. RUTHVEN: Cool played musical chairs here.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: As long as everybody has a seat
2 we're okay.

3 MS. RUTHVEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to give
4 a brief -- can you all hear me? A brief introduction of
5 concurrent enrollment as a reminder this service about one third
6 of all juniors and seniors in high school across our state. This
7 is in excess of 30,000 students and currently there are no
8 dedicated staff at the department to support concurrent
9 enrollment. We've heard it frequently and actually we've received
10 three calls just last week from districts that are asking for
11 assistance in things such as streamlining process class ability
12 partnership with higher education.

13 And these are things that we hear clearly from
14 administrators principals as well as receive direct calls from
15 students and parents with various concerns about navigating
16 concurrent enrollment is a process. We hear stories from
17 districts such as they might -- there might be a dozen forms that
18 students parents are asked to complete in order to roll for one
19 class. Students oftentimes are taking multiple classes. And
20 sometimes these forms and processes are duplicative.

21 So we do have a -- a superintendent Linda Miller
22 from Calhan schools as well as Dave Slothower and he's the
23 principal of Calhan schools and they'll share with you their
24 experience and concurrent enrollment. I think you'll find this
25 interesting in that they found concurrent enrollment to be such an



1 administrative burden that they have elected no longer to
2 participate in concurrent.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's discouraging. Ms.
4 Miller, would you like to start?

5 MS. MILLER: I -- I think --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And thank you for making the
7 trip today.

8 MS. MILLER: -- absolutely.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We appreciate.

10 MS. MILLER: I think if we were appropriate from
11 Mr. Slothower.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Slothower?

13 MR. SLOTHOWER: We been asked to out when some of
14 the issues of difficulties that we encountered in trying to
15 provide permanent classes to provide you with some sort of
16 context. I administrate two schools high school about 145
17 students a middle school about 120 and we moved away from the
18 concurrent enrollment approach last year because as I look at the
19 problems that we encounter I think I can distill them down to
20 probably two main areas.

21 The first was just providing the courses and that
22 has a few components which I'll talk about and then our
23 administrative liaison with the partnering institutions. We are
24 geographically located about 42 miles northeast of Colorado
25 Springs which is our nearest institution of Buck. I speak



1 community college being our nearest institution of higher
2 education. And so for years we were able to qualify instructors
3 with partner institutions. What we found is that we were always
4 aware of the changing landscape of qualifications required to --
5 to qualify those instructors with our partners.

6 ALL: I'll get right on a little louder. Sorry.
7 There you go. Myself I'm.

8 MR. SLOTHOWER: Not sure that's good but the
9 changing landscape of requirements to qualify instructors with our
10 partner institutions became really untenable. The gentleman
11 before me spoke about the difficulty in filling teaching positions
12 of course at rural schools were aware of that -- that difficulty
13 in while I am certainly respectful of and recognize the -- no
14 higher level higher education institutions right to -- to vet
15 their instructors will not -- I'm not suggesting that we change
16 that.

17 We were -- we ended up partnering with, in the
18 four years while I was joining my tenure of administrative mess,
19 with six different institutions. Now absent that, there are a
20 couple of other options we can transport students to the nearest
21 institution for instruction but we're in a situation there where
22 it would require about two hours of transportation for one hour of
23 instruction which becomes I think more just wrapped up in
24 constructive.



1 There's also distance learning options available
2 to us but the difficult thing we run into not just my difficulty
3 but with colleagues in the black forest league with my work is
4 that everyone has a lot of different schedule. Finding a schedule
5 that again is not disruptive to the overall process became really
6 untenable and was not feasible. The second issue we mentioned
7 with that -- that administrative liaison is with one business
8 merge. We are dealing then with five different financial
9 administrative platforms. Five different means and modes of
10 transmitting transcripts and getting that to the students in a
11 timely manner because they need that for their continued
12 education.

13 And so my brief -- my suggestion is I think what
14 we would've found hopeful was if you will a clearing house which
15 would partner care or help join resources with opportunities.
16 Because as we begin to build this understand that this
17 administrative responsibility for building this program falls on
18 myself and my counselor. Only two people, and we probably I have
19 to do that in a piece no version by reaching out to as many
20 institutions as we can as we can identify and typically that
21 happens in our experience. We would either lose our qualification
22 or I -- I should say we enjoy very little turnover, but as -- as
23 we do have turnover then we would be looking for different
24 institution within the partner and that would typically happen in
25 August, you know, which is not a good thing when you have 18



1 students already enrolled. And so for those reasons we moved away
2 from the -- the approach that we could provide consistency is a
3 big thing for us it's -- give me the background you need.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, thank you. Thank you, Mr.
5 Slothower. Yes, Dr. Flores.

6 MS. FLORES: Have you thought of asking the
7 institution to come to you because you know I know that I taught
8 in institutions where I went to school districts and that was more
9 efficient. So that happens to if you could ask the institution
10 and the institution could come to you if you have 18 students.
11 That's a sizable amount of students where one person doing the
12 traveling and --

13 MR. SLOTHOWER: I seem that's -- that's a
14 possibility I can tell you that at a time that we've been doing it
15 that has not been available to us.

16 MS. FLORES: You have asked.

17 MR. SLOTHOWER: We have asked but in one case we
18 did. But again it was on a very, very part time basis and I had
19 questions about the quality of the instruction.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions for Mr.
21 Slothower? Yes, Ms. Miller.

22 MS. MILLER: Like, does this work?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have to put it really
24 close.

25 MS. MILLER: We worked with Pikes Peak season.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Closer.

2 MS. MILLER: Opportunities. Closer? Okay, that
3 we've done just what you've said where we've tried to get an
4 instructor from a college to come and present instruction to many
5 schools so that there is more than just 18 but 40 students but
6 that's not something that's been very successful.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: So can you just outline I think
9 some of the incentive pieces. So for example the universities
10 want to partner or the community college -- colleges want to
11 partner with the high schools because of a win-win. So in the
12 universities I've seen as they typically have somebody that is
13 working with feeder schools so as to look at the syllable by the
14 nature of the instruction and the nature of the assessment to
15 ensure that it meets the criteria. So you saying that that's now
16 you're trying to do that with different universities or higher
17 entities community colleges and that they just don't have anybody
18 to coordinate with or they're not incentivized to do it or when
19 you call them has no one to call me what it doesn't really look.

20 MR. SLOTHOWER: Are the universities not
21 incentivized is that what you're asking?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well when you try to reach out to
23 them because you want to partner with them for concurrent
24 enrollment what happens there no one to call there's a lack of --
25 what's the problem?



1 MR. SLOTHOWER: We will -- we will run into the
2 fact that the one English instructed for example that I have does
3 not meet the requirements of this institution but might meet the -
4 - meet the requirements of another institution. And so the
5 problem that becomes we're dealing with we're really
6 administrating up to four different programs that we deal with for
7 different institutions across the curriculum. Does that make
8 sense. And so typically we lose that partnership with that
9 partnership will change.

10 I -- I'll give you one great example. I had a --
11 a teacher who had been vetted by a local institution and had
12 taught successfully for six years, and then the requirements
13 changed, and that teacher was no longer capable -- no longer able
14 to be qualified by that institution. And so we don't really have
15 the option of changing again -- again a small school changing
16 faculty member. So we have to find another partnership which is
17 really a time consuming process.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what would the person at CDE
19 do? Help you find partnership?

20 MR. SLOTHOWER: I think the best -- the best
21 solution I can offer is I know there are institutions out there
22 that we have not contacted for lack of just being aware that they
23 were willing to do that. And again if there was some sort of a
24 clearing house where schools could say here are the resources I
25 have is there can they be partnered with whatever opportunities



1 that we may not know about to find out what kind of partnership we
2 can we can establish there.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

4 MR. SLOTHOWER: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions? Thank you
6 very much. I'm sorry. Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

7 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry to what I'm trying to
8 understand I'm trying to get this clear is that you have students
9 who want to participate in -- concurrent enrollment but you have
10 difficulty finding colleges, universities, junior colleges that
11 you can get a fit with either because the paperwork is too
12 cumbersome or the requirements for your instructor are too
13 difficult to meet or they are vary.

14 MR. SLOTHOWER: They very.

15 MS. MAZANEC: So that means that your students
16 can't -- they may be able to take concurrent enrollment for one
17 school but not others.

18 MR. SLOTHOWER: Exactly.

19 MS. MILLER: I think I got it.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Good, thank you very
21 much, Mr. Slothower and Ms. Miller. Thank you very much for
22 attendance. All right. Let's go ahead and then Ms. Emm. Proceed
23 with looks like the other budget increases standard three --
24 revisions and legal fees and will work on cutting Mr. Dill's
25 allotment shortly.



1 MS. EMM: Thank you. On the standards revision
2 of give it just a very brief overview of this. But we also have
3 content expert Melissa Colman is here if you have further
4 additional questions this decision item would provide funding in
5 order to convene the 13 committees that would be needed in order
6 to look at the rewriting of the standards that's done every six
7 years. There is that requirement.

8 So this -- this would provide that funding in
9 order to bring the people together. It's not something that is an
10 annual occurrence so therefore we don't have the funding
11 structures in place in order to absorb that work from a from a
12 cost standpoint in order to do that and this would obviously
13 provide the resources there in order to do that. There is no FTE
14 associated with this. However there would be some contracted --
15 contracted people on part time basis in order to do some of this
16 work.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Emm's, my understanding
18 that if this were -- if we were the -- legislature would agree to
19 a phase in of review of standards to a year something like that
20 this number could be reduced substantially.

21 MS. EMM: That's my understanding I'm going to
22 look at.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What -- what do we think the
24 number would be if -- if what we need the number would be if the



1 legislature agreed to that and is that an advisable course of
2 action.

3 MS. EMM: Thank you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chairman, yes we
5 would have some revised numbers for the Standard revision process
6 should the legislature agree to a phased in approach. One of the
7 things that we would want to consider is the work that's necessary
8 in this next year as well as in subsequent years in order to kind
9 of support that. I did work out some different budget numbers
10 based on that. So just opening some spreadsheets for you just
11 depending on the scenarios some of those annual costs could come
12 down to somewhere around 200,000 based on whatever the different
13 scenario would be whether it's three in one year three the next
14 year three The next year or if we were to do a kind of a rolling
15 basis for two every year then the costs would come down on kind of
16 you know a portion way.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So that will be made clear to
18 the legislature and they can recognize they have to pass a bill if
19 they want that. Okay. Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So if this were on a rolling
21 basis so that every year some of this standard. Is six years that
22 all of us -- is it a six year cycle that's on the original?

23 MS. EMM: Correct.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: With that then mean that we would
25 actually have a FTE for an individual who would be handling it --



1 handling a couple of each year. I mean how what's -- what's
2 another way of visualizing the process before we start asking for
3 the money to figure out how best to do this?

4 MS. EMM: So the consultation and the FTE that's
5 -- that is necessary to conduct this process is largely existing
6 in-house as it is except for two pieces. One would be around some
7 project management for the work which is something because this is
8 a large project we don't have an in-house project manager for that
9 and as well as arts content expertise as in terms of some budget
10 on different prioritization that needed to happen in relation to
11 content specialists that were not approved by the legislature in
12 the previous session. We would have to bring in some contact I'm
13 sorry Content Specialist within the arts in those years when they
14 are reviewed. So we would look at --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So it would be consistent it
16 wouldn't be consistent position or might be consistent position
17 but it will be filled by different individuals based on that
18 content areas that we're looking at.

19 MS. EMM: That's correct (inaudible).

20 MS. SCHROEDER: And we also had the convening
21 costs as well --

22 MS. EMM: Correct. So those would be --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: -- on a regular basis.

24 MS. EMM: Right. So one of the one of the
25 benefits of doing more content area is that one says that



1 sometimes you can you know have one venue in multiple rooms within
2 it versus just perhaps one or two content areas at a time kind of.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure.

4 MS. EMM: You can save some costs in relation to
5 convening more at once.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions on this item.
8 Okay, seeing none last item is the legal fees Mr. Dill. Is it I--
9 is it safe to say that some of our more expensive litigation is
10 going to be ongoing in the coming years. The masters case the
11 Douglas County voucher cases and some others is and is that a
12 significant driver of legal fees?

13 MR. DILL: Mr. Chair, over the last several years
14 I think that the litigation caseload has increased and become a
15 significant driver. But we're looking at potential new litigation
16 cases that could arise in the future especially regarding Senate
17 Bill 163 and the accountability clock as we move forward with that
18 particular process.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So your advice would be to
20 stick with this particular increase recognizing that one of the
21 most important things the board will be doing in the coming 12 or
22 18 months is trying to deal with turnarounds and schools in need
23 of improvements. So should that be litigated. Will we need a
24 vigorous response to any actions that a plaintiff might choose to
25 take against us.



1 MR. DILL: That's correct in addition as -- as we
2 discussed with the State Board earlier today as the process of
3 reviewing the ESSA compliance and regulations goes forward we
4 assume that that will take up an increasing amount of time for
5 attorneys in our office.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you question from
7 Mr. Dill or Ms. Emm, did you have any comments on this budget?

8 MS. EMM: No. All I would -- all I would say is
9 that at the board's pleasure we will bring this back in August for
10 a vote to move forward. This would then go to OSPB to incorporate
11 into the Governor's budget request and then we'll work through the
12 process.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So in that case would you --

15 (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