



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
September 26, 2016

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on September, 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 MS. SCHROEDER: Study session. Thank you.

2 Bizy, would you please record the attendance?

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: Here.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: Here.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam, are you on the phone?

9 Can you hear me? Pam?

10 MS. MAZANEC: I'm on the phone.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you hear us?

12 MS. MAZANEC: Sorry. I'm on the phone.

13 Sorry, I had a student.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: You are here, right?

15 MS. MAZANEC: I'm here. I can't find the

16 right button on my phone.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: Here.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

23 MS. CORDIAL: And Chairman Durham.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: He will be here shortly.

2 Thank you very much. If I may, I would like to turn this  
3 over to Alyssa Pearson? To throw us in the water.

4 MS. PEARSON: Throw you in the water? You  
5 asked for wicked. So I have that written down from your  
6 comment last time. So good afternoon everyone. We  
7 appreciate your time this afternoon so much digging into  
8 the accountability clock procedures, and kind of the  
9 processes that we're -- we're thinking about going through.  
10 We really wanna do a deeper dive on some aspects of it  
11 today, and we're glad that you were able to set aside the  
12 time. For those of you on the phone, I will do my very  
13 best to remember that you're on the phone and make sure we  
14 have a time for you all to speak up because I know it's  
15 sometimes hard to jump in.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Jennifer and Pam do you hear  
17 Alyssa?

18 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, perfect.

19 MS. PEARSON: Okay. And if we forget, just  
20 please interrupt us and just jump in. I mean, you have  
21 every right to talk over everybody and if we forget to --  
22 to check with you all. Okay. So today, I don't know.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Are we having the same  
24 problem we had?



1 MS. CORDIAL: We checked it earlier. You  
2 think it's where you were?

3 MS. PEARSON: Where should I point?

4 MS. CORDIAL: It's on that computer there.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Here we go mic. Okay.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. Technical  
7 difficulties.

8 MS. PEARSON: Hold on. It froze last time  
9 too.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, it froze off?

11 MS. PEARSON: The best laid plans.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Awesome. Oh, thanks for that.

13 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So for the agenda  
14 today, we want to do a quick review of the accountability  
15 clock process very quick, you know, you all have seen those  
16 slides probably about 23 times now. We wanna spend more  
17 time talking about the state review panel recommendations,  
18 so we've got Lisa brought copies of the report to really  
19 dig in. We heard that from you all last May when we had  
20 this study session that you'd like some time really getting  
21 oriented to what is in those reports that you have, and  
22 understanding some ways that you could read it, and what to  
23 look for. So Lisa's gonna spend some good time with you  
24 going deep on those. Those of you on the phone, as we're  
25 going through that especially, please let us know if you're



1 not sure where we're at because we wanna make sure you can  
2 track along, it may be a little challenging on that section  
3 especially.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

5 MS. PEARSON: And then I'm going to talk a  
6 little bit about the commissioner recommendation just to  
7 see you know all the different components of what's coming  
8 together with the accountability clock. But we're not  
9 gonna spend too -- too much time on the commissioner  
10 recommendation, but we're gonna have more time to discuss  
11 the administrative procedures. So we shared those with you  
12 all at the September meeting and had them for you to review  
13 prior to today's. So we really wanna be able to have a  
14 conversation based on your feedback, Brenda's gone back and  
15 thought of some different options and the ways to do those  
16 hearings.

17 But -- but they are not like the be all and  
18 done, they're not the only options. So we really wanna  
19 have a conversation with you all about what makes sense  
20 there. And then we made up a practice scenario, and it's  
21 not as wicked as it could be, but it's -- it's not an easy  
22 straightforward one. So I think it would actually be  
23 really valuable to walk through those pieces. I think it  
24 will really help us think through how it -- this will all



1 or all of this could kind of come together. So if we have  
2 time, we wanna set aside time to do that at the end.

3                   So you all have seen the slide. I don't  
4 know, I should go back, you know, a lot of times before.  
5 This is the high level idea around the clock process.  
6 Schools and districts that haven't come off priority  
7 improvement or turnaround after five years are going into  
8 their sixth or their turnaround schools or districts that  
9 are not making progress, they can go through this process.  
10 The ones that are at five years have to go through this  
11 process of the state panel recommendation, the commission  
12 recommendation, and then that optional district option  
13 recommendation, or district proposal. That will come to  
14 you all as the State Board, and then you'll make a decision  
15 based on all those pieces of information, and then the  
16 school or district will continue to receive support and  
17 ongoing monitoring. Accountability frameworks will  
18 continue to come out for them. So we'll see the process  
19 will continue. It's not like you make it -- you set a  
20 direction and we're done right there. But we'll go into  
21 much more detail on these pieces today or some of those  
22 pieces today.

23                   So before we dig in any further, we shared  
24 this theory of action with you all at the last Board  
25 meeting in September. And just -- we didn't have time or



1 didn't take the time then to really have a conversation.  
2 So we wanted to take 10 minutes or so and just to get your  
3 feedback on this. I think you'll also be able to see how  
4 we are envisioning this playing out a little bit more as we  
5 go through the components today. But where CDE is at -- is  
6 we really believe that in order to get to that place where  
7 the accountability clock will have an impact on what  
8 students are receiving in their classroom, and the kind of  
9 education they're getting, we believe that has to have buy-  
10 in from the community what the path is going forward.

11                   We think that's gonna increase the  
12 likelihood that the path is gonna be implemented in a  
13 really meaningful way, and not just what we -- the law says  
14 we have to do something, so this is what we're gonna do.  
15 It will really keep the focus on -- attention on students  
16 and the education they're getting, and lead to better  
17 outcomes for all students. So that's why we really have  
18 been working on how do we work with the schools and  
19 districts on their clock and come together in figuring out  
20 what the best pathway is for -- to move forward. To ensure  
21 that the pathway will lead to what the whole intent of the  
22 law is, is that students are getting access to a high  
23 quality education. So that's where we are coming from --  
24 from that.



1                   We're starting to have some conversations  
2 with some other people and getting some different  
3 perspectives which has been really helpful. I think one  
4 thing that we heard last week is that we want to make sure  
5 -- this doesn't just mean that if somebody put something  
6 forward, we're gonna agree to it. There's still the  
7 responsibility of CDE to make sure the pathway forward is  
8 one that is going to lead or that can be seen to have  
9 potential to lead to better outcomes for kids, and that  
10 it's our responsibility to work with districts, if they're  
11 not there with their recommendation on their pathway to  
12 help continue that conversation, and think about the rigor  
13 of the -- the changes being proposed so that we get to a  
14 point where it really will have the potential to help what  
15 students are getting day to day in the classroom. But we  
16 wanna stop and just see if you all have thoughts or  
17 comments on that.

18                   MS. SCHROEDER: Colleague. Comments. I  
19 guess the one thing that -- that no one else has comments.  
20 How do we know we have the buy-in from the community? What  
21 is there in ours -- process that we're recommending that  
22 gives both you all and the Board some assurances?

23                   MRS. PEARSON: That's a great question, and  
24 then something they can think about more, I mean, there's  
25 pieces in -- in terms of the notification the public in the



1 planned development, but I think we need to think a little  
2 more broadly about. We might know that this school or  
3 district has buy-in, but what does that mean for the  
4 broader community? Does it mean any? So we'll take that  
5 and think through that.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks you. Any other  
7 comments? Deb or Pam?

8 MS. MAZANEC: No, I'm -- I'm good. I'm just  
9 following along. I -- I think these options are, you know,  
10 worth exploring. I -- I think that it's a good start.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I will just say from our  
12 perspective too as we've talked about what does buy-in look  
13 like. I think what we're saying there is that if -- the  
14 more we can have alignment and work in collaboration with  
15 the district around sort of the pathway that they've  
16 thought through with their community, and that they worked  
17 through, and -- and obviously, this would be a two way  
18 ongoing conversation we would have with them, but that --  
19 that -- that's a -- a better sort of approach to take is --  
20 is working with them to refine and make sure the pathway  
21 that they think is gonna work with their community is -- is  
22 implemented in a -- in a rigorous way. And I think we  
23 would be critical friends in that with just pushing, you  
24 know, to make sure that that's rigorous, but, you know, but  
25 that's sort of an important component.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Angelika?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce. Oh. Go ahead Pam.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Angelika.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

5 MS. MAZANEC: It's Pam. I don't really have  
6 a comment on the agenda as far as you've said. Is there a  
7 way to make sure that Alyssa is in front of the microphone  
8 when she speaks? I hear most of what she said but  
9 sometimes it -- maybe when she's turned away from the  
10 microphone I do miss some of it.

11 MS. PEARSON: Okay. We'll tie her down Pam.  
12 Thank you.

13 MS. RANKIN: Bizy, are we using the mics or  
14 the little--

15 MS. CORDIAL: That's just the speaker form.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. I don't know. I can --  
17 I can hear you -- I can hear comprehension's very well, but  
18 it's not a little bit not as well --

19 MS. PEARSON: Is this for the phone? Okay.  
20 Pam, I think it's the difference between the phone mic and  
21 the -- and the room mics that are on. So they're both in  
22 front of me now. Does that help?

23 MS. MAZANEC: That's great.

24 MS. PEARSON: Okay, we'll -- we'll make sure  
25 we pass the phone mic around too as we talk.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks Pam.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

3 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce.

5 MS. RANKIN: If some of these schools have  
6 been on the five year clock for six years, and we have, we  
7 CDE have given them some support, might we not know about  
8 the community support from their reports to us over five to  
9 six years? This should -- should not be anything, in my  
10 opinion, shouldn't be anything new.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, we've been working --  
12 I mean, the department's been working with staff in the  
13 schools. But the broader community may or may not be  
14 engaged -- engaged in that process. I think that's my  
15 concern. And in talking about that, and I apologize for  
16 the sandwich in my mouth, it always helps me to have  
17 anecdotal examples of what's gonna change. What's gonna be  
18 different for our kids with this different plan? And so I  
19 encourage us to not only identify those kinds of things and  
20 identify them with the teachers and the administrators in  
21 their terms of their hopes, but then also be able to  
22 publicize that in a way the parents know this is what's  
23 going to be different for your children. And this is why  
24 we believe it's gonna make a difference in outcomes.  
25 Because if we just keep speaking on that higher edu bubble



1 level, I don't think it's gonna make some big of a  
2 difference. And we don't -- we won't know if we have the  
3 buy-in or we don't have a buy-in. But I completely agree  
4 with Dr. Anthes, that it is about doing this with the  
5 community and us not having us come down and with our  
6 tablets and telling them exactly what to do totally.

7 MS. PEARSON: I mean, I have -- will say I  
8 think we're defining community broadly too in that -- the  
9 district is part of the community as well.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

11 MS. PEARSON: The district, the schools, the  
12 educators are part of the community. And -- and -- and  
13 though yes, you -- you are right. They've been on the  
14 clock for a long time. A lot of them are just, are now  
15 digging in to say what is the new pathway? You know, what  
16 is -- what are we gonna do differently? That's gonna make  
17 a change. And we're just saying that we -- we think that  
18 there's probably a better chance of success, if we're --  
19 we're all in my conversation together, rather than, you  
20 know, the Board has a pathway, the Commissioner has a  
21 pathway, the district has a pathway, and the State Review  
22 Panel has a pathway, and then we have four pathways. And  
23 you know, if the district has some engagement, and you  
24 know, buy-in to that and they know because they're in their



1 community, you know what -- what will have that support,  
2 that's one component to consider.

3 MS. RANKIN: And included in that would be  
4 to answer a parent's question, "What can I do to help my  
5 child improve?" I mean, that should be a part of the plan.  
6 What are the kinds of things that I can be helping my kids  
7 with? It gets pretty complicated and gets kinda weedy, but  
8 I don't think unless we start speaking in that manner that  
9 we're gonna know whether the community is there with us or  
10 with the district or not with the district.

11 MS. FLORES: What about the Board? I'm  
12 just, you know, we keep talking about the district and the  
13 community. And I know that the Board is part the --

14 MS. PEARSON: The local Board.

15 MS. FLORES: -- the local Board, and -- and  
16 isn't the local Board more the entity that would know what  
17 the community, you know, kind of checks on the, it's --  
18 it's a -- a check and balance between the administration  
19 and the Board and the community. So I mean, that's an  
20 entity I think that we shouldn't leave out and that's very  
21 important.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Agree. Any other comments  
23 from Board Members? Go ahead Alyssa.

24 MS. PEARSON: Thanks. So I'm gonna turn it  
25 over to Brenda now, she's gonna give you big picture.



1 We're gonna go into deeper level detail of this later. But  
2 just kinda grounds you in the big process and then we'll  
3 dig in further.

4 MS. BAUTSCH: Okay. Thanks Alyssa. So this  
5 is the flowchart we handed out the last meeting, which is  
6 our vision of how to implement the year five process given  
7 that theory of action that we just discussed. So the green  
8 rows are preferred approach where in the district it is  
9 really leading the pathway. They are engaging their local  
10 community with what action they wanna take. They're  
11 engaging CDE's that we could vet that plan and ensure that  
12 the plan is rigorous enough to result in rapid achievement  
13 gains for students, and then they can present that plan to  
14 the State Board. We'll have a hearing process. The first  
15 meeting and then a second meeting will be held where the  
16 State Board would vote on the directed action.

17 The -- the row in yellow would be a scenario  
18 wherein the district may not want to share their plan with  
19 CDE in advance, so we don't have an opportunity to vet it  
20 and evaluate what, if it's gonna be rigorous enough or they  
21 may just -- they may just disagree with our recommendation,  
22 since the Commissioner may come up with a recommendation  
23 for example for innovation and perhaps the district would  
24 prefer to pursue a charter. So there just maybe  
25 disagreement. But either way, they would come to the State



1 Board and they have a formal opportunity to share their  
2 plans, and they would have a -- a due process to share what  
3 they believe is the best action for their local community,  
4 and again, would engage in that two mini, in that two mini  
5 process.

6                   The row in red at the bottom is the appeal  
7 process. If the department were to recommend the removal  
8 of accreditation for district, there is appeal process that  
9 is already -- have rules have been promulgated for that  
10 process. And so we've included that process here if it  
11 were to come to that. This does only apply for districts,  
12 so schools wouldn't have -- wouldn't be applicable under  
13 the -- the blue red scenario. They would still follow the  
14 green and the yellow for schools. So we are gonna dive  
15 into as Alyssa said, dive into all of these components in  
16 more detail today. Just wanted to start with this overview  
17 to ground us in that and then wanted to also present a  
18 different way of thinking through it and help us guide  
19 through the -- guide us through the study session today  
20 which is a more linear flow of how the recommendation  
21 process will occur for the year five schools and districts.

22                   So on slide six, the recommendation sequence  
23 is outlined with the State -- State Review Panel report  
24 because you've already all received that, for this group,  
25 for this cohort of the year five schools and districts.



1 You've received all these interview panel reports to date.  
2 So next, the Commissioner recommendation will --  
3 Commissioner recommendations will come out and then the  
4 hearings will follow that. So I've outlined some dates  
5 here. So for example, the State Review Panel reports were  
6 out in summer of 2015 and 2016 because of the -- the pause.  
7 Normally, it would just be one year of review panel  
8 reports, so it will be kind of reverse. The Commission's  
9 recommendation we anticipate coming out this fall into the  
10 winter and -- and then that state for hearings would follow  
11 that roughly between January and June.

12 Now, because this district proposal piece is  
13 something we're really trying to emphasize that we want to  
14 be a part of the process, we are allowing districts to lead  
15 when they do come forward with their proposals. So some  
16 districts are ahead, and may have already shared their  
17 plans for actions with the State Review Panel, when the  
18 State Review Panel visited. So they may have shared, "Hey,  
19 we're already thinking about pursuing innovation. This is  
20 what we're doing." So that might have been a piece of  
21 that. Maybe they hadn't done -- they didn't do that but  
22 they will share with CDE what they plan to do.

23 And so the district proposal could be a  
24 consideration for the Commissioner recommendation. And  
25 then of course the district proposal may be shared at State



1 Board of Education hearing. So just a different way to  
2 think about this process, and we're gonna use this flow to  
3 structure today's conversation. So we are gonna do a dive  
4 into really deep into the State Review Panel reports first,  
5 and we'll spend a little bit of time thinking about the  
6 Commissioner's recommendation and the components of that.  
7 And then we will go through the administrative procedures  
8 and (inaudible) which -- which will guide how the State  
9 Board of Education hearings are administered. And then  
10 wrapping it up at the end of our study session today, we  
11 will have a practice example scenario that would encompass  
12 all -- all of these components. So that is the plan. Any  
13 questions?

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 MS. BAUTSCH: Yeah.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane.

17 MS. GOFF: Thank you. This may be  
18 premature, but I'm gonna, I'm going to find it useful plant  
19 my brain a little further ahead of time, timing on this.  
20 If we're -- if we're having hearings on the first two sets  
21 of activity there and we are potentially going to go  
22 through June, when -- when does this take effect? Whatever  
23 the decision is for the various districts? That -- that's  
24 my question because if we're looking at something happening  
25 granted now, we -- we are aware and we know of a couple of



1 districts anyway that are prepared. They've been getting  
2 prepared. We've been -- we've been hearing some things  
3 about what they would like to do regardless of this set of  
4 hearings. But the fall of 2017, are we -- is it  
5 potentially of this decision would be made for start that  
6 soon after we've completed this review?

7                   Do districts involved in this need to be  
8 aware of that because maybe they aren't yet? Or are we  
9 looking at 2018 and in -- in consideration of complexity  
10 trying to integrate what else we've got going on in the  
11 fall of 2017 and trying to integrate this practically and -  
12 - and productively for districts? That's where I -- I, if  
13 I have, can get any certainty about timelines, is it  
14 district dependent? Is it decision dependent? That, I  
15 need to know that before I can really get into this  
16 further.

17                   MS. BAUTSCH: We've been issuing -- the  
18 guidance we've been issuing to districts has been that they  
19 are at the very end of the clock, and they have been  
20 thinking about these actions over the past years  
21 particularly with the -- with the pause, and so they  
22 certainly feel that sense of urgency as well, and many of  
23 them are ready to implement fall 2017, if not earlier.  
24 Some of them have rolled out plans, school year action  
25 plans as well. So our guidance has been fall 2017, I -- I



1 do certainly believe there would be circumstances where you  
2 all may say, if you need a year zero to plan for this  
3 academic year and it hit, really hit the ground running  
4 fall 2018 maybe that there are cases. But for the vast  
5 majority, they should be in a place by the time you get to  
6 you where that plan will go on effect fall 2017.

7 MS. GOFF: So -- so it's your general  
8 feeling right now? Did any one of the -- of the particular  
9 types of decisions or recommendations made would fit what  
10 the districts have been thinking about? Are they thinking  
11 broad based possibility of recommendation? And -- and are  
12 those -- are those in a spot where they can -- any one of  
13 them could be implemented? I'm gonna say as soon as the  
14 fall of 2017? So I mean, it may -- kinda rhetorical, I  
15 apologize for that. But -- but you know, we've got a list  
16 of options here. We all do. So they're -- they're not all  
17 the same. I'm just pondering ahead for the sake of good  
18 work.

19 MS .PEARSON: I mean, it is a good point  
20 because I -- and I think again that when we were grappling  
21 with like what is the best path forward and all the  
22 different inputs? I mean obviously, if the district has  
23 been working with us on planning for it, they're gonna be  
24 more ready to hit the ground running. If -- if a totally  
25 different recommendation comes out, you know, from the one



1 that they've been thinking about planning and we've been  
2 pushing on and engaging with them and -- and working with,  
3 that would be much harder for a district to -- I mean  
4 that's just my guess implement right off the ground because  
5 they've been, you know, trying to think through a different  
6 path. So in that case that might be the place where  
7 Brenda's point is where you might need to give 'em. It's a  
8 very different recommendation, you might need to give them  
9 a year zero, you know, to say we need to think differently  
10 about this given your direction.

11 MS. PEARSON: Okay. But I mean, if it's --  
12 if it's the closure recommendation or if it's a charter  
13 recommendation for a district where that wasn't the  
14 intention to be able, and if it came in June for them to be  
15 able to do that at the start of the school year isn't  
16 realistic, right? Like if it's closure, how can you merely  
17 assure that kids are gonna end up in a different school?  
18 It's too late to do that. So I think it's gonna depend on  
19 timing and how different what the Board -- Board directs is  
20 from what the school or district has been planning for and  
21 what the timing is of -- of that.

22 MS. GOFF: Well, hopefully we won't be, you  
23 know, any of us, in a position where there were any big  
24 surprises. That I don't think that any -- any of us, any  
25 of the school districts, any schools, any communities can



1 afford to take that kind of a risk. So you know, combined  
2 with good communication among all the parties involved up  
3 to now and continuing, assurance is that we are aware of  
4 those good communications happening and some of the six of  
5 them will solve. I would think 90% of the possible  
6 dilemmas. But I'm just curious.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, that's a good question.

8 MS. GOFF: And concerned.

9 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions? I have  
11 one more -- oh you--

12 MS. FLORES: Well, I just was asking. I --  
13 I can't think why -- what -- what would be a big surprise?  
14 Jane? I'm sorry.

15 MS. GOFF: I say -- well, right off, some --  
16 some recommendation made that is really not what districts  
17 have been thinking about, envisioning, and were thinking  
18 about. I -- I see that chances of that happening very,  
19 very soon. As long as we've got good communication going  
20 on all along and have had lately for five years. So I  
21 trust that is the case. And so that surprises one shot in  
22 my mind. But we need to always be wary and aware of  
23 possible changes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

25 MS. GOFF: Thus, whatever it might be.



1 MS. FLORES: Are there districts with whom  
2 you've not had quality communications?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm trying to think  
4 if there's anybody that we're gonna see through. I think  
5 it's varying levels of partnership. But I think I've  
6 talked to everybody and had the opportunity for  
7 conversations with everyone when I had anything to  
8 (inaudible).

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I would -- I  
10 would just add. I think there -- there are cases where  
11 there are districts where we've been working very, very  
12 closely with and there are others where I think they've  
13 been informed. They're aware of these pathways and they've  
14 -- there's been less interest or engagement with us. But I  
15 don't think there -- don't think the end of this clock will  
16 be a surprise to folks around that timeline to your  
17 question.

18 MS. GOFF: No, you're kind of starting to  
19 hit on it. But like I guess it's how aware are we of  
20 communications outside of this -- throughout this with of  
21 course, the department involved in that somehow somewhere.  
22 That's we don't, do we know why? I mean, I think you all  
23 know where the communication has been active and -- and  
24 ongoing and regular, and productive. But that is the whole  
25 idea of communication is just so we're (inaudible). And



1 the willingness that the local areas, entire areas,  
2 communities actually can give themselves permission to ask  
3 for some other inputs. It's okay to do that. So--

4 MS. FLORES: I have one more question I  
5 brought up the last time. The ESSA new laws and rules and  
6 regs whatever. Are they only about -- about turn around  
7 schools? Or do they include schools and districts?

8 MS. PEARSON: ESSA is really focused on  
9 schools. It talks about districts with a lot of schools  
10 that have been identified. But there isn't a process in  
11 there for identifying districts by themselves.

12 MS. FLORES: So our law is different in a  
13 sense that it addresses both--

14 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

15 MS. FLORES: --turn around districts and  
16 turn around schools?

17 MS. BAUTSCH: Hey. Can I -- can I jump in  
18 now on that? As we're starting to dig in more on that  
19 school permits folk committee. You know, Peter and I, and  
20 Brad Bills (ph) are co-leading that. I think we're --  
21 while it's not as explicit in some ways, there really is a  
22 pretty major role for the district in keeping an eye on  
23 these schools and having a role to play I think, and this  
24 fits in with our value of -- that schools don't ever  
25 operate in a vacuum or an isolation. That anything that we



1 do with the school has to be done in partnership with the  
2 district. So it -- it may have a slightly different flavor  
3 than how we have our current system set up. But it really  
4 -- there is absolutely a major role for the district to be  
5 playing in any of the work we're doing moving forward.

6 MS. FLORES: So you are gonna try really  
7 hard to be in line with that new law in this process?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely

9 MS. FLORES: Super. Thank you.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Anybody else? Carry on  
11 please.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Awesome. Okay. We're gonna  
13 pass it over to Alyssa now and really dig into the State  
14 Review Panel.

15 MS. PEARSON: Well, with that intro... I  
16 mean, we not -- we can't reach, oh my God, I'm like  
17 (inaudible) this paper. All right. Ready to strap in.  
18 We're gonna start getting into you guys, okay?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you hear Deb and Pam?

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yup. I can hear fine. Thank  
21 you.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam? Pam? We may have lost  
23 Pam. We get these blanks and I have no idea what they  
24 mean.

25 (Pause)



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

2 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry. I'm not lost.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Hi there. Okay, can you  
4 guys -- can you guys hear Alyssa? Hello.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 10: We'll assume so.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Start talking.

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So -- and I'll try and  
8 translate for Deb and Pam on the phone. Since they just  
9 got a barrage of materials and I'm -- I'm gonna be careful  
10 how I give them out to you so that we're not getting lost  
11 on paper, okay? So help me out there if you're -- if  
12 you're getting confused. So as Brenda had laid out  
13 previously, these are the kind of the three main points of  
14 the -- the rest of this afternoon. So we're gonna focus  
15 right now on the report that just came from your request  
16 previously. Okay, so we have all these reports. But  
17 what's really good way to dig into it?

18 So I'm gonna give you some backgrounds and  
19 then I'm gonna give you a possible way that you might wanna  
20 think about digging into them. And then you guys just ask  
21 questions I'll really try to anticipate as much as possible  
22 what you would want to know. But I could have, I could be  
23 off the mark, so we can make this and adjust as you guys  
24 need, okay? So just as a reminder, the State Review Panel  
25 from the law is a group of educational experts from the



1 fields including district school and district leaders  
2 curriculum leaders. We've really tried to focus on  
3 ensuring that we have certain specialists like ELL  
4 specialists or English language learners specialists,  
5 special ed. Whatever it might be, that is particularly of  
6 focus in that district. We -- they have two main purposes.  
7 One is to provide sort of a critical evaluation of their  
8 documentations. So we use the unified improvement plan for  
9 a large part of that. But there's also any other data out  
10 there. Foreman's frameworks, whatever they have out  
11 publicly on their websites things like that.

12                   So the panelists as they're assigned to  
13 specific schools, have been doing some of that  
14 documentation review on going over, you know, the last five  
15 to six years, depending on capacity. So for turnaround  
16 schools they've -- you know, we try and cycle them through.  
17 For schools and districts that are on part improvement or  
18 at least getting one document review prior to entering the  
19 -- the year five, okay? And -- and I think part of why  
20 that's in there is if you guys remember, you have the  
21 option to act early if needed. If -- if somebody is really  
22 struggling, then it can be recommended that you act early.  
23 So this is one way to have a separate group. Kind of just  
24 keep an eye at least from a documentation standpoint. Are  
25 things seeming like they're standing up? Are they choosing



1 actions that would have a likelihood of helping to turn  
2 that school or district around? And -- but then that  
3 second one and that's really I think our biggest focus  
4 right now and that is providing a recommendation to you and  
5 to the commissioner on potential actions, okay? So the --  
6 that set of reports that you guys received last spring and  
7 the summer prior to that or all the reports with the  
8 recommendations for each of those schools and districts  
9 that had entered year five on the accountability clock.

10                   And then just to refresh your memory,  
11 because of the accountability clock pause, we offered  
12 optionally that folks could get a second round of reviews  
13 since there would be such a time lag and because we're all  
14 kind of new with this and it was a way to just, "Oh this is  
15 what you guys were looking for okay. We -- we know what  
16 should you mean now." So about half of the schools and  
17 districts opted in for that second -- that second round,  
18 okay? Any questions just on the process in general on what  
19 we do?

20                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

21                   MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 12: Are the same--

23                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Kind of a quick question when  
24 there's a break.



1 MS. FLORES: Are the same number of people  
2 on the SRP for district, the same number that are for a  
3 school?

4 MS. PEARSON: So good question. So again,  
5 keep in mind that we have very limited resources. So we --  
6 so you have two panelists assigned, to a district, two  
7 panelists assigned to a single school. When they are -- so  
8 they're doing the -- the document reviews together, and  
9 coming to consensus on that and then also going in and  
10 doing the site visits, classroom visits, things like that.  
11 So for districts, a lot of the focus of the district. Site  
12 visits is on interviewing district staff, school staff,  
13 community, Board, and then doing at least some look at some  
14 of the schools within the district where and then likewise  
15 the school is really focused on those interviews as well,  
16 getting in and -- and really getting a look at the  
17 classrooms as well just get a sense of the school. But  
18 yeah, it is two -- two people that are assigned.

19 MS. FLORES: On the first part where it  
20 says, "Including school and district leaders." Is that  
21 from the specific district we're looking at? Or in the  
22 school we're looking at? Or are those just community  
23 leader type of people that particular type of person?

24 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Good -- good  
25 clarification. So we definitely have recruited school and



1 district leaders, but we would never put them on the State  
2 Review Panel in their own school or district. Just seems  
3 like there might be a conflict of interest there, and hard  
4 to be a little objective. So yeah good clarification.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Excuse me.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Deb, go ahead with your  
7 question.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. Yes. Thank you. My  
9 question is did you say Alyssa that you assign two people  
10 at least from that into each school or district? Is that  
11 what you said?

12 MS. PEARSON: Yup. Yes.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, and then did they come  
14 to consensus or is there any kind of like voting that goes  
15 on between those folk and then it goes back to the larger,  
16 what is it called? Bill and the leadership team?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. The two panelists come  
18 to consensus and then they write up the report. And let me  
19 highlight for you as well just to remind you. This is  
20 really- we tried to set this up so that it's somewhat of an  
21 independent body since CDE is so involved in -- in  
22 preparing the commissioner or helping the commissioner  
23 prepare her recommendation. So while I'm coordinating this  
24 and ultimately responsible, we have contracted with school  
25 works to, you know, to recruit and train and support the



1 panelists. So they're at least getting some -- some  
2 checks, some look at continuity across all the  
3 recommendation and reporting process as well.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, after the two -- two  
5 folks that I assigned to either the school or district, I  
6 guess my question, can they go back to the larger body and  
7 calibrate with what others are doing, or how does that --  
8 how does the larger group coordinate with two that are  
9 assigned to a school or district?

10 MS. PEARSON: So it really is up to those  
11 two. There's just no way to assemble an entire group and  
12 really school works is the one that's helping to calibrate  
13 and ensure that they're following the process as set up.  
14 So part of what we're going to get in today is, at least  
15 you'll get a glimpse of some of the protocols that they're  
16 using and what they're using to dig in with. And then  
17 really the -- the syncing up comes in the training.  
18 They're doing a lot of, you know, scenarios about working  
19 together on that syncing up that way and then focusing on  
20 those reports after that on the row.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Val.

24 MS. FLORES: I just wanted to ask. Is there  
25 -- if these people are from the district wouldn't it be



1 also advisable to, at times have a Board member kind of  
2 involved maybe in the region? I -- I'm just thinking that  
3 sometimes the administration and the Board may not be  
4 together on things and that -- or maybe the Board is too  
5 much into the, you know, into the administration where that  
6 could be an issue and not really the personnel at the  
7 school -- at the school district. So it's maybe politics  
8 with administration and Boards that could be, you know,  
9 kind of telling in. It could be the dynamics that's at  
10 play and -- and not really the people, you know, teachers,  
11 and administrators, principals and such.

12 MS. PEARSON: Sure. So again, just to be  
13 clear the panelists are never assigned to their own school  
14 or districts. But -- and they are interviewing Board  
15 members as well as administration and staff and community  
16 members. So really trying to get a sense of -- of what's  
17 playing out there. And remember too that it's not just the  
18 interviews but they're also looking at the documentation  
19 and things like that as well. So whether it's Board  
20 minutes or, you know, things -- whatever -- whatever  
21 actually is being presented to show evidence that they have  
22 what it takes to -- to pull this off, that's what they're  
23 considering. So absolutely.

24 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

25 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So let's jump -- oh.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce.

2 MS. RANKIN: Maybe I missed it, but how many  
3 people are on the State Review Panel, not the two going up,  
4 but the whole panel? Who selected them? When are they  
5 selected? And I mean, how -- how often do they go out or  
6 is it just a one time -- I need to understand that a little  
7 better.

8 MS. PEARSON: Sure. Sure. So the -- I'd  
9 say there's about a total of -- or at least I see there's  
10 about a total of 50 people total. And again, keep in mind  
11 the number of schools and districts that it's identified.  
12 And this is year five, and that we're -- the panelists are  
13 also trying to look at, you know, schools and districts at  
14 least that are -- are turnarounds that are early on the  
15 clock. So there's a lot of other work being done besides  
16 the 38 entities that were year five. So there's  
17 approximately 50 panelists. They are -- they are usually  
18 by the fall, around now, is when a call will go out for  
19 interested parties to apply. And then this is where school  
20 works really backs and looks at their applications and does  
21 the interviewing. And then kind of a calling down or a --  
22 a narrowing of that focus also trying to fill in gaps  
23 where expertise in particular is needed. Historically,  
24 we've needed more specialists in things like online  
25 programming on the ELL in particular literacies in other



1 area. So we've had to kind of actively recruit in those  
2 areas. But then school works will kind of put together a  
3 package. We run it internally past folks and then we  
4 present it to the Board as a way to -- to finalize and get  
5 your approval. So that's done annually.

6 MS. RANKIN: So can I follow up? So none of  
7 them have been particularly assigned to the same area for  
8 two or three years to watch some of these schools that have  
9 not turned around like -- these people are brand new? This  
10 -- this fall, is this--

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We said we -- we have  
12 some returning panelists. I mean, some of this is -- I  
13 mean, let's be honest, they're not, you know, they're not  
14 always terribly well-paid. But this is something that they  
15 are very interested in doing. So we have a lot of  
16 returning panelists but some just cannot keep up with that  
17 commitment. And so we're -- we supplemented it. So there  
18 are some that have been with the panel from the very  
19 beginning and some that just came on this past year.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Were they assigned some  
21 schools at the very beginning, possibly?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they -- so as -- as  
23 logistically possible. So for instance for those that had  
24 the -- the two site visit reviews, you know, in 2015 and  
25 2016, and then especially if the district was requesting to



1 have the same panelists, then at least one of them was kept  
2 a common. And then certainly where possible trying to have  
3 somebody who's been, you know, doing the document reviews  
4 in previous years. So we have some sense of it. Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Will we -- will we have  
6 the background of those panelists when we review a specific  
7 district or school? Will we know if these have been around  
8 for a while working in this one area or if they're brand  
9 new or does that matter?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like to think  
11 that it doesn't matter, but we absolutely can give you  
12 whatever you're requesting. So if you want, you know, how  
13 long they've been with the panel, maybe some of their areas  
14 of expertise like you guys should just let us know and we  
15 can certainly put together a matrix for you. I mean really  
16 whatever -- whatever you like.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will wait till the  
18 end of today and then we will decide.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Next section is gonna  
20 help us.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So -- so do you  
22 mind if we jump in real quick?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At what point does the  
25 district get to see and review the review panels work? Is



1 this ongoing or is this only given to them for a chance to  
2 look at after the fact?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. So that's a  
4 really good question. They -- because it is an independent  
5 group and because they're preparing the report for the  
6 commissioner and for you, the Board, they -- they  
7 essentially get it after you guys get it. So to date, all  
8 of the districts that have gone and participated in the  
9 site visits have their reports and -- and have them  
10 available. Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Good.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Okay. So I'm  
13 going to -- let's jump in. Some of this should look  
14 familiar. So I'm giving you the first part of the packet.  
15 So Pam and Deb, let's put up your tittles, it would have  
16 come to you and it would be in the file that's called the  
17 SRP Compiled Ratings. So look at that first and then I'm  
18 going to get you into the SRP criteria. Okay, those are  
19 the two files that you're going to want to pull up.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. Thank you.

21 That's helpful.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they're on the very  
23 tight -- so you -- you guys have seen this before but these  
24 are kind of the summary level documents of those year five  
25 recommendations on all the schools and districts. Okay?



1 So that very first one is just the very high level summary  
2 of those, and it listed by your congressional district as  
3 requested. Your districts or the districts, the schools  
4 that participated. The ones in blue are just the districts  
5 that had the -- the -- the site visit and the reports. We  
6 added in that column if they -- if the school has a charter  
7 or has innovation status. Okay, just to give you a little  
8 bit of context. And then in the two mustard color columns  
9 next to that, you get the 2015 recommendation and then the  
10 2016 recommendations. So just to remind you they all got a  
11 recommendation in 2015 and then some of them were able to  
12 opt in in 2016. Okay. So based on all the evidence that  
13 the state review panel considered, this is- this was  
14 ultimately the--

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What do you mean by opt  
16 in, I'm sorry?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So because of the clock  
18 pause and since things were kind of in rest mode, we  
19 offered all of the districts that had a school or if the  
20 district was in year five a chance to go through another  
21 site visit, even though they had been went through their  
22 previous year, just because, you know, things shift over a  
23 year and so they had the option to have the State Review  
24 Panel come in and do another visit and another report. So



1 once and for about half of them you -- you have two  
2 recommendations.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So where there is a blank,  
4 they didn't choose to opt in.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep. So when it's  
6 grayed out, exactly, they did not opt in for that second  
7 visit. When you see the green, it means that that panel's  
8 recommendation changed slightly from the 2015  
9 recommendation. So if you look at like Pueblo Franklin  
10 Elementary School, it was originally Innovation Zone or  
11 closure, and then by 2016 they were just recommending  
12 innovation. Okay. So they were seeing something --  
13 something different that made them kind of tighten up their  
14 recommendation there. Okay, but then on others, let's say  
15 Ignacio Elementary School, it was management in 2015 and it  
16 continued to be management in 2016. Okay. And then that  
17 last column is just sort of what was the most recent  
18 recommendation since you've got a couple of them in some  
19 spots. And then it's -- on the second page, it's totaled  
20 at the bottom for you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I had this question  
22 last time we talked about this. Next to some of the  
23 district names it has N/A, although it's shaded in blue.  
24 Can you tell me what that--



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So that means  
2 that they're districts. So for example Sheridan is in blue  
3 because it's a district, N/A in the school name because  
4 it's not a school, it's a district.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you have to do two  
6 recommendations. You have to recommend the pathway for the  
7 district but then you would also be digging into which  
8 other -- whichever schools that they are on?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's not necessarily  
10 -- I -- I know the answer. It's not necessarily- the  
11 conclusion should not be made that because of one or three  
12 or two schools on -- on here that that's why the district  
13 is under this -- in this situation.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. No. So I mean, it  
15 really is through our performance frameworks, looking at  
16 the district performance frameworks that they were on the  
17 clock. Sheridan is actually an interesting example because  
18 there's no schools in that district that have been on the  
19 clock at least more -- in more recent years. It was just  
20 the district being identified. So we do, you know that  
21 does happen. And so that's why we want to be really clear  
22 when we're looking at a district recommendation versus  
23 something that's specific to a school.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I think I'll --  
25 I'll continue to work through that. I'm getting -- I'm



1 getting it, but I'm seeing it on a couple of places that  
2 are -- I just -- I just had to hear it from you again.  
3 Thank you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So yeah. And  
5 then just to do the reverse, the inverse examples of Denver  
6 has some schools that are year five on the clock and had  
7 site visits but the district itself is not identified to be  
8 on the clock. Okay. So it -- it works both ways. Okay.  
9 So that's very high level summary than the next one, the  
10 colorful one, that's legal length. It's labeled  
11 Separatings for Deb and for Pam and it's a part of that  
12 same first file. If you pull that out, then it's starting  
13 to get a little bit deeper and breaking it down into the  
14 various criterion that are laid out in the law. Those are  
15 listed at the top and then the state review panel gave  
16 ratings for each of those criterion. Okay. So for example  
17 leadership is adequate to implement change to improve  
18 results.

19 Let's look at Denver County at Colorado high  
20 school charter. Number one is labeled -- it's in Orange,  
21 it's labeled Developing. Okay. And we'll go into a little  
22 bit deeper of what does that mean and what -- how did they  
23 get there. But that's sort of like the -- that's how the  
24 key works with this. There were just so much to try and  
25 cram into side-by-side on this. Hopefully that makes



1 sense. And this is really the sub ratings from the site  
2 visits because that's the most recent and most thorough.  
3 And then you've got that for 2015 and then for the ones  
4 that opted in for the 2016, okay? Okay. So for those of  
5 you that are listening in, the Board members are studiously  
6 looking at these ratings and I would assume forming some  
7 pretty good questions on things that they wanna dig in  
8 further.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. To give you at  
11 least a sense of a lay out, this is a tool that you guys,  
12 it's been emailed to you. We will figure out other ways to  
13 make it available as well if you need. But this is really,  
14 this is that high level summary, so you can kind of get a  
15 sense of even things in relation to each other, a little  
16 bit over time when possible. Then I'm gonna, I want you  
17 to, in that last part of that packet, look at the criteria  
18 indicators. Okay, and this I will help to break it down a  
19 little bit. So Pam and Deb, this should be in the next  
20 file for you that is labeled SRP criteria. So now this is  
21 all available publicly on the State Review Panel website.

22 We can certainly send you this website. I  
23 just pulled out a sample of their protocol, so that you  
24 have this available to you as we're talking, okay. There's  
25 a lot more information on kind of their norms, what they



1 are expected to do, their role, a lot more around the  
2 protocols that they're using to interact with schools and  
3 districts. But for this conversation, I thought it might  
4 be helpful for, as we're looking at leadership is adequate  
5 to implement change to improve results. And in Colorado  
6 High School Charters case, they got it developing. If you  
7 now, map it over to this criteria, you can match it up to  
8 criteria 1.1 Leadership Acts or the first pages focused on  
9 that leadership and then it's broken down into several  
10 criteria questions.

11                   So Leadership Acts is a change agent to  
12 drive dramatic achievement gains. Leadership establishes  
13 clear targeted and measurable goals designed to promote  
14 student performance. Leadership analyzes data to identify  
15 and address high priority challenges and to adjust  
16 implementation of the action plan. And leadership  
17 establishes high expectations for student learning and  
18 behavior, okay. So there's a lot that is going into that.  
19 And then even underneath that there are some more specific  
20 criteria that panelists can look at.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. Thank you,  
22 that's helpful.

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, good. So these  
24 guys, I -- I -- I just really wanna show you that the  
25 panels are not just going out and making things up and --



1 and looking where ever. They -- they really are following  
2 this very thorough breakdown of those criteria that are in  
3 the law. Now they're doing this by looking, you know,  
4 having those interviews, by looking at documents. The  
5 schools and districts are spending quite a bit of time,  
6 trying to share evidence with them in advance. So that's  
7 where they would be looking at their Board minutes, that's  
8 where they would be pulling portions of their unified  
9 improvement plan. This is where they would, maybe have  
10 staff meeting or, you know, teacher collaboration time  
11 meeting notes, whatever they can find as evidence to back  
12 it up, okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Many of the  
15 recommendations or innovation status, innovation schools or  
16 innovation proposals can appear to run the gamut between  
17 significant change and not very much. When that's  
18 recommended, have they been talking specifics or they're  
19 just talking generally about the status of some of the  
20 things that might be allowed versus the things that should  
21 be required in an innovation plan.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they -- so they've  
23 been counseled to, you know, definitely give you a broad  
24 recommendation and then any clues that they can embed it  
25 within that summary. So Bill, you might see, you know,



1 overall the State Review Panel is recommending innovation  
2 and then as you read the summary, they'll have things that  
3 they know need to be focused on. But really trying to not  
4 overstep their bounds. Their -- their job is not to come  
5 up with a solution or to dictate how that plan should read,  
6 that -- that is they know left open to others. So they've  
7 really tried to walk that balance of. We're providing a  
8 recommendation, some of our rationale and then we kind of  
9 leave it to you guys after that.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. All right. So  
12 any questions? You at least know some of what's behind,  
13 how they were gathering. I mean, they are -- they are  
14 sifting through mounts of information and really trying to  
15 winnow it down to a single recommendation. And so this  
16 next portion is going to help us get in a little bit  
17 deeper. I've taken a, an actual panel report to do this  
18 and then I've come up with a way maybe, that if you guys  
19 want, you can use to dig in a little bit deeper. We've  
20 gone through this and that is how do you look at your  
21 summary, then go into the detail and actually understand  
22 what's behind, what they're proposing.

23 So for Pam and Deb, you're gonna go into yet  
24 another file. You're gonna be pulling up the example  
25 process for reviewing SRP reports packet, okay? So I'm --



1 I'm also gonna a little bit bossy here, you guys. I'm  
2 gonna ask you, you see these, the two helpful things that I  
3 gave you before. I'm going to ask you to take these, put  
4 them in front of you, and turn them over. I don't, I know  
5 you can probably figure out whose report I put out there.  
6 Technically it's public. But this is about getting into  
7 the report and not focusing on who the district is or the  
8 school, this is just, we're just trying to take a -- a  
9 clean look at the process so that you can ask yourself some  
10 questions, okay? Is that all right? Thanks for playing  
11 with me.

12                                   Okay, so at the very top, it's just gonna be  
13 a little new catcher. On this particular district you'll  
14 see that I just cut out the -- the summary level  
15 information on this particular school. This is a school.  
16 So the first one is just what was recommended. The second  
17 part is the sub-ratings that were provided and their  
18 recommendation overall, okay? So what I am offering is  
19 that my advice, don't have to follow this, would be to at  
20 least start at the summary level. So if you look at that  
21 first page on that example process, maybe take a minute to  
22 just look at what are some of the patterns that you see,  
23 what do you wanna know more about. You see here, that they  
24 did do the 2015 and 2016, okay?



1                   And then you can kind of keep notes on the  
2 back of that page as well. Oh, because it doesn't, didn't  
3 get labeled. Oh, I am sorry. And then under the sub  
4 rating, sorry it -- it may have gotten a little bit  
5 squished. But the -- the first set of colors is under 2015  
6 and the second set of colors is under 2016, okay? Okay, so  
7 I see that some of you are jumping ahead and that would  
8 really be getting into the report itself. So you've got  
9 two things in front of you. I'm gonna ask you to look at  
10 the 2016 one first, okay? The first two pages are their  
11 summary. They give you the recommendation and they really  
12 just walk through as methodically as possible on their  
13 rationale for why they recommended what they recommended  
14 and why they didn't recommend, the other options, the other  
15 pathways, okay?

16                   So if you look at this one, I've tried to  
17 redact, the school and the District from being named.  
18 That's why you see the black marks on there. But you'll  
19 see their pattern, they'll just walk through and really at  
20 least try and line up their -- their rationale. And then  
21 keep in mind, that's all based on evidence that they've  
22 been collecting from the site visits and from the document  
23 reviews and then we will jump into those. Okay.

24                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Does the size of the school  
2 matter and will we know that?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This guys, the size of  
4 the school always matters. Context always matters.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Will we know that, when  
6 you're not redacting.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE1: Yeah, I think you  
8 will. If this helps just to wrap your head around it.  
9 This is, how about a medium size district.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: This is a school in a medium  
11 sized district. This is a medium sized school, actually I  
12 don't know, what that is.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know either.  
14 I'm--

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, never mind.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think, I can  
17 answer that.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I understand.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Okay. So I'm  
20 gonna just keep going because I can see some of you jumping  
21 ahead, which is great. You're getting the hang of this.  
22 So I've just pulled out some sections of then the more  
23 meaty report, okay? So that summary might actually make  
24 you feel like, okay, that makes sense, I've got a good  
25 sense of it. But if you're feeling like you have some



1 further questions, then you're gonna see two reports that  
2 sit behind that summary. The first one is for the site  
3 visit and then the second one is their document review. So  
4 what I've done for you on, for this same school, I've  
5 pulled out the first -- the first section from the site  
6 visit and then after that the first section from the  
7 document review. So if you wanna look a little bit further  
8 at the, is the leadership adequate to implement change to  
9 improve results. We can dig in a little bit deeper on  
10 those.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Another question, where the  
13 district or school invited the panel to come back, do they  
14 do the whole thing again? Do they do the document review  
15 again and do the--

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good question, yeah.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there should be a  
18 second set here?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then you should also  
20 have the 2015, at least the summary, that, yes. There  
21 would be the whole -- the whole pieces behind the two. I  
22 just didn't--

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: --kill a tree for you  
25 today.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I figured I--

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wondered -- I  
4 just wondered whether there was--

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: --some significant  
7 change in the process or--

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. Let me -- let me  
9 talk about that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: --whether it's pretty  
11 close.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a good question  
13 because I -- I want you guys to hear this too. So the --  
14 the process is the same. We tweaked some things that we  
15 knew needed to be tweaked just because some certain  
16 questions weren't clear, what have you. So some tweaks  
17 happened but it really is the full on doing the document  
18 review, then going in doing the day and a half on -- on  
19 site, and then getting any other documentation they  
20 requested, and then doing the reports. So it's the same  
21 flow. When the panelists were being trained to go back and  
22 re-do this, they -- they really were advised to, you know,  
23 you may have been on the site visit the previous year,  
24 you're starting, you start as fresh as you can. You know,  
25 it's natural to wanna compare but where you really need to



1 give it a clean objective look, the second round when you  
2 go in. It might have been a brand new team because we  
3 couldn't get the same panelists back in or maybe the  
4 district didn't want them back in. So they really did have  
5 a much fresher view. So that they really should be seen as  
6 two independent things, but one is more recent than the  
7 other one, okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why would the district  
9 not want them back, the -- the same, the team before?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There was, in a few  
11 cases there were some where they -- they just, it wasn't a  
12 good fit. They didn't feel like, they had the right  
13 expertise, what have you. So we really-

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: This is where I really tried  
16 to reach out and I just checked in to make sure that they  
17 were good with that or if they wanted the same panelists  
18 then we would try and accommodate that.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So that was like  
22 a really quick run through of at least some pieces you have  
23 at your disposal. Any questions or conversation you guys  
24 wanna have of what you're seeing or what you'd wanna know  
25 more about?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: So let's assume there's a --  
3 there's a school that has a final recommendation of  
4 management. That's it? Or then, how far -- how far into  
5 the detail will be available to staff as to what the  
6 district is going to do? How far into the detail would--

7 MS. SCHROEDER: From their -- from their  
8 prepared pathway?

9 MS. PEARSON: They -- they -- I'm assuming  
10 they get to pick the management.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: As an option?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Uh-huh.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: If that's our recommendation  
15 to make it to -- this is -- this means an outside entity  
16 comes in and supports. Does -- CDE make recommendations?  
17 What is that -- what is that process? How is that funded,  
18 et cetera?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are gonna -- that's  
20 part of what our example as today, so to work through that,  
21 what that looks like. But yes, absolutely, just as the  
22 Commissioner Elliot would have a recommendation, that may  
23 or may not be the same as what the panel recommends.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm just trying to figure  
2 out how far into the detail what I get once -- once there's  
3 some agreement.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I think that the state  
5 review panel is one piece of multiple parts of information  
6 that you all are going to be looking at. And so this was  
7 one -- a plan to having sort of an independent not related  
8 to CDE process. So that would be one piece of information  
9 you guys would be looking at. Then, you would also have  
10 some district pieces of information to look at, the  
11 commissioner piece to look at, and then we'd have to figure  
12 out, you know, based on your recommendation what that  
13 actually looked like being rolled out, you know, if -- if  
14 the final -- final recommendation and you all wanted the --  
15 the directive to be, you know, charter, I mean, then I  
16 think we, there would be a process in place to figure out  
17 what -- what that would look like and that would depend on  
18 if the district was prepared to do that, you know, was a  
19 part of their process and planning already under way or  
20 whether that was totally different. So I think--

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm concerned about  
22 resources.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Depending on the  
25 recommendation.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. Which goes back to  
2 kind of our original theory of action which is that some of  
3 this -- you have to take all of these variables into  
4 consideration around what -- what might be the most  
5 successful path forward given all of those things. Given  
6 what the, you know --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So that will be a factor in  
8 -- in the decision making process?

9 Speaker 1: I think that would be.

10 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: You guys can decide if  
12 that's a factor in your decision making but I think it is  
13 possible

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry. Who had a  
15 question, Pam?

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. Which -- which  
17 recommendation or what about the -- the various  
18 recommendations by the state review panel have on the  
19 clock. If -- if -- if the recommendation is innovation,  
20 the recommendation is nurtured charter, what -- what --  
21 what (inaudible) how long before the district soon do the  
22 clock or they prolong the clock or do they get off the  
23 clock?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'll -- I'll go  
25 ahead and jump in. So I'll talk about by design in our



1 system but then I'm -- I'm gonna talk a little bit about in  
2 practice as well. Okay? So in design it's, you know, the  
3 - the recommendation comes out and it really -- it is  
4 intended for you as the Board and for the commissioner. It  
5 really is just there as information to you to help you make  
6 the final -- the final decision. Okay? So its--

7 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, I understand that but, I  
8 mean, how soon we were to -- to make that decision, if that  
9 were the final decision, what effect does the problem with  
10 clock for the school?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So they --they -- regardless  
12 of, I -- I mean, in some ways, again, by design. The state  
13 review panel's work is on the very early end of this end of  
14 clock process. And so this is where I'm gonna -- I'm gonna  
15 sneak a little bit into practice. For some schools and  
16 districts, this was a sort of the first signal that the  
17 state is actually moving forward with this, and in some  
18 ways it was kind of nice for them to have the extra year  
19 because they were able to take that year and do some pretty  
20 rigorous and -- and hard work. And so, I think you saw  
21 some of those recommendations shift as a result because  
22 they really took it seriously. So I'd say that while those  
23 schools and districts remain on the clock. It just puts  
24 some information about what was happening in perspective.



1 MS. PEARSON: Pam, were you asking -- were  
2 you asking after the -- sorry, go ahead.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Go ahead, I mean, so--

4 MS. PEARSON: Were you asking after the  
5 final recommendation comes out and the -- the districts to  
6 the schools takes the action?

7 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

8 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So what we understand  
9 is that the--

10 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. I know you are asking  
11 and talking about our final decision.

12 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Okay. That the school  
13 district needs to earn their way off the clock, so they may  
14 take that action but until they have a priority -- an  
15 improvement or performance plan or distinction of their  
16 districts, they would still be on the clock and monitored  
17 overtime.

18 MS. MAZANEC: So they just stay on the clock  
19 no matter what is recommended?

20 MS. FLORES: They would --

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No matter what's  
22 recommended. They -- they get off the clock--

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, not necessarily. It  
24 depends on the pathway, right. So if the school closes,  
25 then that school code will be retired and that school is



1 essentially off the clock and that is one of the pathway  
2 options. It is typically our practice as well with charter  
3 schools if it's a new charter school being phased in and  
4 the old school is phasing out, that charter school receives  
5 a new school code. So that original school if it's phasing  
6 out, it would essentially be off the clock because you have  
7 a brand new school. So if you're having a brand new  
8 school, then sure, you don't put in -- in something it just  
9 -- if it's just within the existing school that they're --  
10 they're rebranding it or they're doing innovation, if  
11 they're bringing in a management partner to supplement  
12 what's already going on the building, then that same school  
13 code would be in place, and that school would stay on the  
14 clock until they earn their way off by -- by earning enough  
15 improvement rating or higher. Does that make a sense?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. So if they are changing  
18 their new school with our (inaudible), but if they -- our  
19 innovations, they remain until they can earn their way off.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

21 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. They don't need to  
22 rename. If you said that rename the school--

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: She said remain.



1 MS. PEARSON: Got it. Sorry I'm having a  
2 hard time hearing you, Pam. Yeah. They will remain on  
3 until they earn their way off the clock, and they --

4 MS. MAZANEC: I have a couple of other  
5 questions why---

6 Speaker 1: Go -- go ahead.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Where -- when you said earlier  
8 that the state Board that earned the districts will see the  
9 commissioner's recommendations in advance of the hearing.  
10 Do we -- do we know when -- how soon before the hearing, I  
11 mean, how much time will -- will we and the districts and  
12 the school will kinda look at the Commissioners  
13 recommendations? And now, maybe before I ask about also  
14 that, what does the Commissioners recommendations do they  
15 want?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. We're gonna get into  
17 the Commissioners recommendation on the very -- very next  
18 section of this slide deck, and if you go to those  
19 components and in terms of timing, that is still to be  
20 determined by you all, It's in the mention of procedures  
21 right now. In terms of a minimum that there should be at  
22 least -- these -- these documents should at least be  
23 provided at least 30 days that beyond of the State Board  
24 hearing to the State Board with a copy given to the  
25 districts so that the district will have all the



1 information and you all have all the information 30 days  
2 before the hearing date. However, we did wanna discuss the  
3 mention of procedure some more today and get your feedback  
4 around that. We had some feedback from districts as well  
5 regarding those days. So we still needed to discuss that  
6 which is also a little bit -- we could move to that now or  
7 we could do it later.

8 MS. MAZANEC: We can go ahead as planned.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any more questions, Ms.  
10 Mazanec.

11 MS. MAZANEC: No. Go ahead.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

13 MS. FLORES: Thank you. It looks to me as  
14 if there's just a straight road from being a school  
15 district to then innovation which the school district still  
16 controls and then, it leads to charter. I mean, isn't  
17 there any way -- I just -- I'm -- I'm just thinking. So  
18 the school district maybe its personnel has problems  
19 getting teachers to -- to that -- to that area. I'm just  
20 thinking. So, I mean, I'm hoping that we're thinking much  
21 more than that direct road to -- to -- to chartering  
22 schools. I mean I -- that public schools, I mean, I'm  
23 hoping that there are reasons why schools may not be doing.  
24 They may need money. We certainly need money in this  
25 state. I mean, we -- we definitely need money and -- and



1 money -- we don't talk about it and of course we have no  
2 control over money.

3                   But, you know, it's obvious when you -- when  
4 you look at some districts that money would -- would really  
5 help, you know, especially in retaining teachers and I  
6 would think, you know, maybe getting housing. I know in  
7 some other states they provide housing, they provide --  
8 they even -- I mean, I worked for a district that even had  
9 a -- a local oil company where you could get out of town  
10 and go to a large city, you know. And if there was rooms  
11 in -- in -- in the jets they -- could -- you could go on  
12 them. There were planes there. I mean, there's all kinds  
13 of ways to think about it and -- and not just -- I'm  
14 concerned about that not having public schools and making  
15 them private. I mean, I -- I don't know. I think charters  
16 are private, okay? They're none -- they're run by  
17 nonprofits and their charter and their private. So I just  
18 kind of -- I'm queasy about the whole idea of privatizing  
19 that our goal, and this is a goal of reform that we're  
20 going down, and that is charters and privatization of  
21 school districts, sorry, and schools.

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Further questions?  
23 Okay, and you -- oh, I'm sorry.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I guess.  
25 Excuse me. If I am in a position to follow up with this



1 particular example that we've been looking at, I would find  
2 -- I would need to see if we could find out how can a  
3 school go for a one year with the recommendation of  
4 innovation and the criteria are all deemed as developing.  
5 And then the answer too can -- you know, there is a  
6 necessity that -- that agreement -- is there a necessity  
7 that it remain open and the answer is yes, according to the  
8 review panel.

9                   The following year, the personnel gone from  
10 the, you know, perceived flexibility of innovation and --  
11 and change and creation of new ideas into management which  
12 cognitively registers as a little stricter, more  
13 structured environment. When the leadership has been the  
14 same, when the basically -- basically the infrastructure  
15 structure is the same. And the fifth one when there were  
16 likelihood of positive returns on state investment is that  
17 -- that I think can be -- it's easier to compare and  
18 measure from one year to the very next year. You can see  
19 stuff.

20                   But I -- I guess I need to know what are --  
21 what are we basing the -- the good value and the rationale  
22 of a -- of a final recommendation or decision on that kind  
23 of situation. I mean, I'm sure there are 100 additional  
24 questions we could come up with to get to the detail of  
25 that. But I would find that's where we need to be thinking



1 ahead as far as reading and being really prepared for each  
2 one of these -- these meetings we're going to have. But I  
3 -- I find that curious and I hope to get really the  
4 umbrella area sheets.

5                   Yeah. I'm sure hoping then we'll get some  
6 insight learning about a couple of things. One of them is  
7 when is -- what is innovation? What's supposed to be  
8 about? Are we -- are we looking at the law fully like we  
9 should be all of us. And in looking and examining some of  
10 the policies in the -- in the legislation frankly, that we  
11 are involved with and taking care with that. But that's  
12 where my -- when I first saw this I thought, "Wow." I  
13 would need to know more about that before I make a decision  
14 that determines the fate of an entire set of kits. And  
15 just -- can be troubling.

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: So can I just -- in summary  
17 19, I think you've really gotten at the heart of what I was  
18 hoping where we'd go and that is -- so you have a lot --  
19 you have access to a lot of information, right? You can --  
20 you can choose to hit it either at just a high summary  
21 level, go into the report summary or dig in deeper into  
22 these reports. You have all that information available to  
23 you. I think the key part is, you're going to be asking  
24 yourself questions and are these things you need to save  
25 for the hearing itself? When to interact with SBE and with



1 the district? Or is there information that you can dig in  
2 deeper within these reports? I think there's some hints as  
3 to why there was a shift there, but there might also be  
4 things you just need to talk to directly with folks at the  
5 hearings. So that's you -- you're actually went where I  
6 hope you went.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just -- I just do  
8 think it will provide us some great insight into the higher  
9 level of this policy work. As well as addressing the  
10 specific needs in betterment of schools in the district.  
11 Thanks.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

13 MS. FLORES: Yes I think, you know, we would  
14 -- I would hope that we would hear from districts, but 15  
15 minutes -- 15 minutes is not enough for a school district  
16 to make a presentation, and for us to then speak 30 minutes  
17 about it, and then make a decision. It seems we would need  
18 a lot more information, and I would think that our school  
19 district would need more than 15 minutes in order to -- to  
20 make a presentation before the Board. So 15 minutes is  
21 what I read in this document, is what school districts are  
22 going to -- are going to get.

23 MS. PEARSON: So we'll get to that in just a  
24 little bit. I think when we get to you we wanna have that  
25 conversation.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: None of that is final.  
2 Depending Building on how we deal within the  
3 Administrative Procedures Act.

4 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: That's it? Thank you so  
7 much. That is exactly what we want to get to and talk  
8 about. We've got some other options to remedy that. So  
9 just going to go really quickly through the Commissioner  
10 recommendation components, because there were some  
11 questions there as well. And then, we will get to the  
12 administrative procedures as well as the length of the  
13 hearing and the details there.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The Commissioner's  
15 recommendation now that you've seen what the state review  
16 panel criteria looks like, the -- the Commissioner's  
17 recommendation, will consider a variety of factors. One  
18 will be the state support and engagement over the past five  
19 years. So for example, if the school or district has  
20 received a grant, or they've received direct services from  
21 the -- from the state, we have record of that and can  
22 attest to how effective that intervention was or wasn't.

23 The unified improvement plan, we will also  
24 conduct a review of that. The state review panel does and  
25 we will look at that as well, to see how the plan was



1 written over the past five years, and -- and if they  
2 responded to the feedback they received over the years as  
3 well. And we will look at student data and trends which we  
4 consider to be a very important indicator as well. And  
5 look at the -- the state data, but look at a range of  
6 factors whether it's a high school, we would consider the  
7 PWR, the high school graduation rates and dropout rates and  
8 the ACT scores as well. And the district proposal, so that  
9 would be, if they do share with us their plan, we will  
10 evaluate that.

11 We have developed a couple of rubrics. If a  
12 school is proposing a management plan or an innovation  
13 plan, we come up with a research based rubric to evaluate  
14 whether we believe that's enough in a turnaround situation  
15 to take that school to the next level. It really improves  
16 student outcomes. So we -- we would have a serious  
17 evaluation of the district's proposal that would be  
18 embedded in the Commissioner's recommendation report. And  
19 finally, we would also react to the state review panel's  
20 recommendations, so that to get to Board Member Goff's  
21 point. If there is for example, a trend that we know that  
22 they went from developing to does not meet, we could also  
23 look at that and react and see maybe we noted something  
24 into -- in the building that happened in the last year, or  
25 our turnaround support managers know what is going on.



1                   We could try to help provide some of that  
2 context as well and that local information. And that is  
3 what we -- we have concluded all of that, those pieces in  
4 the -- in the Aurora Central High School Report that we  
5 delivered to you last year as the Commissioner's  
6 recommendation. So we do have, that is sort of a template  
7 of what we envision the other reports looking like as well,  
8 and if you do have any feedback on that, or if you want us  
9 to resend that to you so that you could look at it, and  
10 that you want us to change anything or add anything, we're  
11 happy to do what makes the most sense for you to have the  
12 information that you need in these recommendation reports.

13                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

14                   MS. SCHROEDER: So in the student data, I  
15 would like to see mobility rates, demographics, and then as  
16 much to the extent that there is some history. It's  
17 available for the -- for the student data?

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Great. That's  
19 good.

20                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You're talking about  
21 growth?

22                   MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I'm talking about  
23 growth.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the trends?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes -- yes, some trend  
2 lines. And especially, for example the mobility issue.  
3 How many of those kids really are continuing? And I don't  
4 know if you can, if -- if you can determine it or not, but  
5 I'm -- I'm always interested in within district mobility  
6 and I don't know if we keep track of that or whether we  
7 only get mobility for kids who actually leave a district.  
8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

10 MS. FLORES: And I'm hoping that, when we do  
11 look at academic growth, we look at more than a test score,  
12 and that we take other things, right. And other measures  
13 as well, other academic measures and not just define test  
14 scores at a certain date, which I don't think it's fair for  
15 any child seriously. Thank you.

16 MS. CORDIAL: We'll have the data that we  
17 have at the state from what the state administers and  
18 collects. If a school or district has gone through the  
19 request to reconsider process and it's submitted additional  
20 data to us, we'll have that information as well. We'll  
21 check with them and make sure it's appropriate to use it  
22 for this context, but when we do our write up some requests  
23 reconsider, we do a thorough analysis of anything the  
24 districts submits and we can provide that. We were  
25 thinking that we would make sure to align those processes.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So even for districts that  
4 did not have a request to reconsider, wouldn't the review  
5 panel have looked at other data that might have been made  
6 available? And if so wouldn't that be available?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this seat review  
8 panel would really only have access to whatever is publicly  
9 available. And the request to reconsider packet may not  
10 have been posted by the point that they were doing their  
11 review. So --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Some districts might not  
13 even -- might -- might even requested that but they would  
14 have the same kind of data.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Maybe -- maybe -- maybe not  
17 to worry about that because if they didn't request it then-  
18 -

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's -- that's  
20 where they -- that's where the panels really relying on  
21 that, the unified improvement plan for some of that, the  
22 data analysis from the district or high school.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. That's right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Great. Thanks.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

2 MS. GOFF: Small trivia maybe. But I think  
3 we need to be clear between requests to review and requests  
4 to reconsider. This was -- are you talking about a second  
5 -- second request for a second visit and review of the  
6 documentation or are you talking about request to  
7 reconsider whatever decision comes out of this entire  
8 process?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I think I'm trying to  
10 address Val's concern that we not just use very narrow  
11 academic achievement data, that we look at whatever the  
12 district has available to us please.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Just  
15 quickly on timings, so again, we're proposing that we  
16 finalize the Commissioner's recommendations after -- when  
17 possible the districts have given a copy of their proposal  
18 or their plan to us, so that in a sense it would allow us  
19 to evaluate or vet that plan, and give our -- our take on  
20 how we feel that stands to our expectations. We understand  
21 that this may not occur in every instance, so if a district  
22 does not choose to share their proposal with us, or if the  
23 timing doesn't work out but that is -- again, based off by  
24 our theory of action of really wanting this to be a  
25 community led, district led approach. This allows us to



1 give them the opportunity to have a plan put in front of  
2 us. And we would share, but we would still share the  
3 Commission's recommendation report, the district's  
4 proposal, and the state review panel reports ahead of the  
5 hearing, so that everyone that is involved, has copies and  
6 ahead of time. If there's any questions on that or we -- I  
7 think that sounds okay.

8                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. This looks  
9 like a good point to take a break before we start the State  
10 Board of Education voting process. So we'll take 10  
11 minutes.

12                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

13                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Or 10 minutes.

14                   (Pause)

15                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're in the final  
16 component of the sequence that we started out with  
17 beginning of the study session. I'm going to skip over  
18 this as you've already seen that slide. So again this is a  
19 picture I showed at the beginning that we're going to dive  
20 into the procedures around how that State Board meetings  
21 will occur. You guys go ahead. We're there, well let me  
22 pause on this. So this again being our preferred approach,  
23 the first hearing will be an opportunity for the State  
24 Board to hear from the Department of Local Board  
25 Representatives to consider the state review panel



1 recommendation, and that at the end of that hearing, to  
2 vote on written determinations.

3                   So going a little bit into more detail on  
4 that, this at the hearing, this is how the procedures were  
5 written. And I have some alternative ideas proposed for  
6 it, but as they're drafted right now they can change is the  
7 department so prior to the hearing the State Board oversee  
8 the state review panel recommendation, the commission  
9 recommendation, and the district report. It is written  
10 that they would receive this at least 30 days in advance.  
11 I did wanna just convey to you all that we've heard from  
12 the field and from district leaders that they would prefer  
13 the minimum be more than at least two weeks in advance, and  
14 that they would have -- essentially they would have more.  
15 So if these hearings kick off in January, following the  
16 request to reconsider process to allow them time to work on  
17 their plans. But that would be following your normal  
18 filing deadlines.

19                   So you normally receive more packets about a  
20 couple of weeks in advance to the meeting, so the  
21 district's proposal could be part of that. We could submit  
22 our recommendation earlier if you wanted more time with it,  
23 but just letting you know what we're hearing as it's  
24 written now is everything needs to be submitted 30 days in  
25 advance of the hearing so you have ample time the review.



1 So just wanted to convey that to you all. We'll take  
2 feedback on any -- any section of the mission procedures  
3 during this section of time. And so as is written now the  
4 department has 15 minutes to present the commission's  
5 recommendation.

6                   The district has 50 minutes to present with  
7 no interruptions through either of that and in the State  
8 Board members, you would all have 30 minutes to do question  
9 and answer for total of an hour. So to extend that a bit,  
10 we could just do 30 minutes for each, no interruptions and  
11 then 30 minutes for discussion, and that would be an hour  
12 and a half total for the hearing. And I'm on Slide 23  
13 right now. That does give more ample opportunity for --  
14 for the district to present, it does -- it does that mean  
15 it's a longer total time, it's so just given the number of  
16 districts and schools you have to hear between January and  
17 June that's just what you have to balance. And given that  
18 you're getting -- you already get it --

19                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And what is your estimate  
20 of that number this time?

21                   MS. CORDIAL: It won't be more than 19  
22 hearings. So there will be -- it will be less than 19  
23 hours. That's what it says.

24                   MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're working on the  
2 preliminary framework. So hopefully, we'll have two  
3 districts later this week, and after that, we can have a  
4 better conversation about what it looks like. And again,  
5 that's preliminary we have the request to reconsider  
6 process, but we'll have a much better sense at the end of  
7 this week and beginning of next week.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: We need to have these rules  
10 for ourselves, are these in law?

11 MS. CORDIAL: So these -- these admission  
12 procedures no. This is something we would like you to vote  
13 on either in October or November. So it doesn't have to be  
14 the next meeting, but by November would be -- would be  
15 preferable so that we can get the admission procedures  
16 voted on before the first district comes forward. So this  
17 is just how you choose to administer the hearings, it's at  
18 your discretion, it's not in law.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm fine -- I'm fine with  
20 the 30 minutes 30 minutes. The last one, I think that  
21 should be in our Board Chair's discretion as to how long,  
22 because there are times when we need more time for people's  
23 questions, especially since we get to ask questions. Each  
24 of the seven of us get to ask questions of you and the of  
25 the school or district. Seems to me that that could



1 potentially -- not all recognizing and I'm a person who  
2 asks a lot of questions. So this is why this is coming  
3 forward but I'm all concerned about everybody having the  
4 opportunity to ask the questions before we vote. But I  
5 don't know how to structure that.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think the reality is  
7 it's going to be very difficult to not allow every Board  
8 member to ask the questions that they think are necessary  
9 in order to accumulate enough information to make a  
10 decision with which they are comfortable. So I think  
11 that's probably going to be an estimated amount. So  
12 presuming they start in January, they must be completed by  
13 what date?

14 MS. CORDIAL: By June 30th.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So that is six meetings  
16 give or take. So 19 that's at least three a meeting or we  
17 have to have an extra day or two. I guess I would suggest  
18 that once we start to plan on that, we will approve the  
19 dates of those meetings. But realistically speaking, there  
20 -- there may be a necessity for additional meeting days in  
21 many of those months. Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. That is  
23 great guidance on that. I'm going to go ahead and skip the  
24 slide. This was -- this was yet another option but I think  
25 we can revise the procedures to indicate that each side of



1 the district and the commissioner's representative have 30  
2 minutes each with discussion time at the discretion of the  
3 chair. We'll go forward -- we'll go forward with that as  
4 well.

5 MS. CORDIAL: At the conclusion of the  
6 hearing -- yeah absolutely, please.

7 MS. GOFF: I'm totally open to a compromise  
8 balanced position on this. I don't know that we should --  
9 we should go into this thinking that if we're -- we  
10 potentially promote any amount of time that it takes. I  
11 don't -- I'm just thinking things through. This is our  
12 procedures. This is our rules and regs basically.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please speak up, Jane.

14 MS. GOFF: I'm so sorry. I'm not sure --  
15 I'm not sure I can be comfortable yet with saying we're  
16 going to leave it to the Board to choose discretion about  
17 how much time for each on a case by case. I'm -- just  
18 putting that in their future thinking, we will have a lot  
19 of information prior to these hearings that should answer  
20 gentle questions. I just I don't know. I think we need to  
21 rely on that which may clear up a lot of the need to be  
22 very, very flexible with every single district that comes  
23 here. I just want to make that known, I'm not -- I'm not  
24 comfortable saying it on a case by case basis so we can  
25 make a discretionary statement. I'm not, I'm just not.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

2 MS. GOFF: I'll think about it. But come to  
3 some kind of a balanced proposal perhaps.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 MS. GOFF: I'm not through.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At the end of that --  
7 of that hearing, you know, how -- how long it goes. I  
8 regardless, we would have at the conclusion of the hearing,  
9 the State Board would direct what's called the written  
10 final determination and you may request proposed written  
11 final determinations from either the district or the  
12 department or both parties, and that would be essentially a  
13 formal written statement of the recommendation so what that  
14 direct action would be. And you would have the opportunity  
15 then between that meeting and then the next state Board  
16 meeting to consider those written determinations.

17 And then that way when you get to the next  
18 board meeting, you would be voting on that written  
19 determination. We were proposing that there wouldn't be  
20 hearing or there wouldn't be any more testimony considered  
21 at that second meeting, but that does give you some leeway  
22 and some time to consider the written determinations in  
23 between Board meetings so that you are not voting at the  
24 end of the first hearing. So it's an information item one  
25 meeting, and it's an action in the next, and that's how



1 it's currently written in the administrative procedures.  
2 Again, we can amend them as you see fit.

3                   And we do also have both -- both of our  
4 attorney general representatives here, our staff Julie and  
5 Tony so they are can speak to us as well, it was at their  
6 advice that we -- we drafted these administrative  
7 procedures. And following the adoption of the written  
8 final determination, the districts will agree to implement  
9 the action. We hope through progress monitoring agreement  
10 which we are proposing we embed in the accreditation  
11 contract as a way to monitor the implementation of the  
12 directed action until that district or school earns its way  
13 off of the accountability clock. So it earns an approval  
14 rating or higher.

15                   We do think we probably need to discuss the  
16 terms of the progress monitoring in more detail and how we  
17 do embed that in the accreditation contract. But that is  
18 where we're at right now. And once again, if the districts  
19 has it if there's a recommendation made that the district  
20 or district on the clock. So right now we have eight  
21 districts that are currently on the clock. That number may  
22 change following the release of the radiance. If any of  
23 those group of districts, if there was a recommendation  
24 made that their accreditation be removed, there is a formal  
25 process where they're allowed to appeal that recommendation



1 to the state Board, and that is already specified in rule.  
2 So because it specified in rule, we are not necessarily  
3 creating a lot of new admission procedures around it that  
4 is already the process that's outlined.

5           So we did want to give just a couple of  
6 examples of how this could potentially come to you all.  
7 There could be a scenario where all of the recommendations  
8 are in alignment. So you would receive an advance a copy  
9 of the state review panel report and the commission  
10 recommendation which both states, for example, innovation  
11 is the recommended pathway, and the district is already  
12 planning to -- to pursue innovation, and that could be a  
13 scenario that occurs. We don't -- we don't envision that  
14 will necessarily happen every single time. So there could  
15 be a scenario where the state review panel report says one  
16 thing, and the commission's recommendation in district says  
17 another.

18           So CDE and the district agree that pursuing  
19 a management partnership is the best path forward but the  
20 state review panel recommendations was charter. So then it  
21 would be at the hearing where you all would engage in  
22 question and answer discussion, review evidence and you  
23 would determine which of the pathways whether it's those or  
24 maybe a different one entirely. That's also within your  
25 authority to recommend something different. It could be



1 that nothing is in alignment, so there's a recommendation  
2 of state the review panel a different one from CDE and a  
3 different one from the district.

4 I'd say this is one of the least likely  
5 scenarios but its potential and then again, you would be  
6 the arbiter of that and the decider of what the  
7 recommendation is. Another scenario could be that the  
8 commissioner and -- the commissioner and -- and the state  
9 review panel alignment, but the district has a different  
10 preferred pathway. And so we wanted to model what that  
11 would look like with you all and based off of a real-life  
12 example, but we've -- we've made up the detail surrounding  
13 it. There's a small rural middle school in southeast  
14 Colorado that's one of three schools in the district, very  
15 small district and it's in year five of priority  
16 improvement. You can tell it's a high poverty rates,  
17 largely Hispanic district, and some English language  
18 learners. So I'm going to go ahead and pass around some  
19 documents. So these are -- what I'm passing around right  
20 now are just really quick. Oh, sure. Absolutely, please.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder. Go ahead  
22 and pass the document.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Going back to the examples  
24 you just had different recommendations. What if we are in  
25 that situation, and the board suggests that it's just



1 necessary for everyone to take a deep breath and look at  
2 this again. In other words, do we have Steve Durham  
3 postponement pass it to the next meeting that sort? Do we  
4 have any kind of an option that will -- no, I can't even --  
5 any kind of a -- do I have it with our administrative rules  
6 any kind of option to, for example, a Board member makes a  
7 suggestion in the process of the discussion that has not  
8 been considered by either the commissioner, or the state  
9 review panel, or the district but might be worthy of a --  
10 of a discussion. What -- what opportunities would exist  
11 that would allow us? I realize we have -- I think we have  
12 a dropped in June, but what can we do if we believe that --  
13 that -- that some additional time, specified additional  
14 time might make things work out between the department and  
15 the district in us?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Are those deadlines  
17 statutory?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are those deadlines  
19 statutory? So really the deadline we have is the -- the  
20 final one of the June 30th, and it's very specific to  
21 schools again so that the -- the statute reads that State  
22 Board directs actual the local Board following that menu of  
23 options for schools. And you know, with the district we've  
24 talked about how there's a little bit more flexibility in  
25 what that recommendation looks like, I think for both the



1 school and district the way the administrative procedures  
2 are written now, at the end of that first hearing, you then  
3 can request proposed written determinations that could be  
4 when you suggest that a different pathway be considered, or  
5 that it be looked at from a different angle, or that the  
6 recommendation encompass some other elements.

7                   As the -- as the procedures are written now,  
8 and Tony can chime in too if -- if he disagrees but as I  
9 read it now it doesn't necessarily have to be the very next  
10 regularly scheduled meeting. I don't believe. We might  
11 have to look up that language though. And that so that  
12 there could be if you have a hearing let's say in January,  
13 and you decide that we need to look at the recommendations  
14 differently, they could come back in April to receive the  
15 vote. I don't know if that is something that as they're  
16 currently written could allow but we can adjust the  
17 language to allow for that.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So being as long as  
19 it's done before the June (inaudible), at least that's how  
20 we were envisioning it.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's not the formal  
22 removal of accreditation --

23                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- that we're talking  
25 about in this process.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm -- I'm not -- I'm not --  
2 I'm not in that one.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think if it's on  
4 the green or yellow road, thinking about it through that  
5 process, it could wait until -- we could take some time.  
6 It's just the June 30th.

7 MR. DILL: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

9 MR. DILL: I just want to clarify, can  
10 everyone hear me? I'm usually, boom, fairly loud, so I'm  
11 hoping that --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: A boomer?

13 MR. DILL: It's important to understand that  
14 although we've crafted a process that could give you  
15 multiple recommendations, that was for your utilities, so  
16 you wouldn't be attempting to start from scratch on one of  
17 these. If you have an idea that hasn't been presented by  
18 either the district or the department, you can vote to a  
19 amend one or the other final written determinations to be  
20 included. Basically, do whatever you want but it seemed to  
21 us that it would be a lot easier for the State Board if you  
22 were working off of some form of draft review verification.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So moving into this  
25 example, just to give you a scenario. The hand out is just



1 a one page overview what samples of review panel  
2 recommendation, a commission recommendation, and then the  
3 innovation place plan for the middle school. And so this  
4 is just for you to -- to scheme through that you can get  
5 the gist of it at a high level which I have on this next  
6 slide. This scenario is that the review panel recommended  
7 management, the commission recommendation with also  
8 managements, but the district really wants to pursue  
9 innovation.

10                   And so given that scenario, we have just a  
11 very quick more caring scenario where we have a district  
12 representative who will share the district's perspective  
13 for just a few minutes, and then I will be sharing the  
14 commission's recommendation for a few minutes, and we also  
15 have Lisa's gonna share the state review panel report, so  
16 we just going to run through this quickly and then you can  
17 all decide how much you want to engage with this. And ask  
18 any question and see how this would play out given these  
19 proposed processes. So we're gonna let the district have  
20 the floor first. So we're gonna pretend that we're in a  
21 state Board meeting where the district superintendent has  
22 arrived from Sunny Middle School which is within the -- the  
23 desert reorganized district. Yeah. We turn it over  
24 Superintendent Sherman.



1 MR. SHERMAN: Great. Good afternoon  
2 everybody. Thanks for having us up here today. As you  
3 know, I'm from Desert School District. I'm representing  
4 Sunny Middle School which is in the year five of parity  
5 improvement. We're a small middle school in rural Colorado  
6 in Southeast Colorado. We have three schools in our  
7 district. So we're a small -- small district. We have as  
8 you know, a high -- a high rate of poverty in our district.  
9 A lot of our families work in -- in farming and in  
10 manufacturing and we have a fairly high mobility rate  
11 within our district.

12 We've been working -- we're in year five, as  
13 you know, and we've been working toward changes at Sunny  
14 Middle School for a number of years. We've made changes in  
15 the staff. We have changed some. We've set some  
16 instructional expectations. We've changed some aspects of  
17 our school culture and climate, and we know that this is a  
18 work in progress. Turnaround takes a while. And so we're  
19 working on this. We know that there are some variations of  
20 the recommendation.

21 What I bring forward to you today is our  
22 proposal is to use the innovation plan and innovation  
23 status as a way to make some of the main changes at our  
24 school. Couple of the reasons behind our proposal around  
25 innovation are that we feel that the leader in the school



1 has a longstanding relationship, is very well regarded in  
2 our community, has been principal for a number of years,  
3 and we believe that this is someone that has a lot of  
4 credibility and a lot of experience. So we -- we believe  
5 that it's important to maintain that leadership and build  
6 off of that.

7                   One of the pathways I know that's in our --  
8 that's on the table is around a management, external  
9 partner with a management. That sounds like that would  
10 cost money, we're a small district, we don't have a dime to  
11 spare. So we just don't have any funds to put toward an  
12 external management organization. So that's one of the  
13 reasons that we would disagree with what the site review  
14 panel and respectfully in what the Commissioner has  
15 recommended. We also think that this innovation status is  
16 really a way for us to restart at our school.

17                   We -- we have a great group of people that  
18 are working in our district and our school, and I think  
19 that we see this as a way to really sort of reset some of  
20 the climate and culture and some of our practices in our  
21 district and our school. We're going to use this  
22 innovation plan to really change up some of our  
23 instructional and educational programming to think about  
24 how we manage and recruit our -- our teachers and our  
25 leaders differently. We'll create more time in our



1 calendar to have professional learning and we've been  
2 bringing parents in on this for this last -- this this last  
3 year, I would say and our community seems to be behind  
4 that. So thank you very much for your consideration.  
5 We've got five minutes?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Sherman.  
7 That was. And we are going to hear from a representative  
8 from the state review panel, who's just gonna run through  
9 the report and the recommendation.

10 MS. ANTHES: Thank you. I am representing  
11 the state review panel and their recommendation. If you  
12 look at the -- the review panelist you might be entertained  
13 to see who the reviewers were. I won't say any more there.  
14 So the final recommendation after doing a site visit and  
15 several document reviews -- the site visit was last spring  
16 -- the state review panel is recommending external  
17 management.

18 The -- the reason for this was because the  
19 school was found to be not effective in all of the six  
20 critical areas including leadership, infrastructure,  
21 investment things like that. Essentially, the reason for  
22 me or the suggestion for management would be to actually  
23 oversee, to some extent, leadership, infrastructure and  
24 personnel. If student progress is not really made within



1 the next couple of years, then the panel could foresee a  
2 needing-to-do closure in this particular situation.

3                   As far as the other options, the reason  
4 innovation was not recommended was because of concerns  
5 around the -- the -- the stronger leadership and  
6 infrastructure that was needed. A conversion to charter  
7 was not recommended because this is a really small  
8 community and it would really disrupt options for the  
9 community and for where to send those children in this  
10 particular district. This is the only middle school in  
11 this district and likewise for closure, this was not  
12 recommended at least at this time, because of the impact on  
13 the community. Thank you.

14                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. And we will  
15 quickly provide an overview of the Commissioner's  
16 recommendation at this time. The Commissioner also  
17 recommends management based upon the belief that the Sunny  
18 Middle School really needs the following conditions to be a  
19 successful school. They need a strong professional  
20 development for their leader that would result in  
21 significantly changing and promoting a school culture of  
22 student achievement that would set clear expectations  
23 through an effective instruction and would use data to  
24 drive progress towards goals. We believe that there needs  
25 to be an external partner that will come in and help the



1 school manage these activities. That school does not have  
2 a capacity to -- to result in- to achieve rapid gains in  
3 student achievement given their current structure.

4                   We do not believe that the -- the current  
5 school systems and the leaderships on their own could  
6 implement a successful innovation plan. We have had a  
7 chance to review Sunny Middle School innovation plan and --  
8 and believe that it is ambitious, but they just don't have  
9 the capacity to implement it at this time. So they need  
10 some external partner to come in and help them with that.  
11 We don't believe that it will be a full takeover of the  
12 school, but rather is a partnership and that'd be a short  
13 term partnership and then the venture partner could help  
14 the school sustain those efforts. And then the school will  
15 be able to run all of their operations within two to four  
16 years. We do not also recommend charter, again, because of  
17 the small community. But we agreed with the state review  
18 panel that closure could be an option. While it is a small  
19 rural community, there are two other higher performing  
20 middle schools within a reasonable driving distance in a 20  
21 mile radius that we believe the students could attend.  
22 That concludes our report.

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At this time we will  
24 take any questions from State Board members and to any



1 guidance on what your recommendation would be for -- for  
2 this middle school.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: Our external management -- you  
5 mean a principal -- a superintendent that has been -- that  
6 has been chosen by CDE?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the department  
8 believes that yes, this management partner could be --  
9 well, it could be -- the partner organization could be a  
10 variety of different options, and that we could work hand  
11 in hand with the school to select that -- that -- that  
12 partner.

13 MS. FLORES: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It doesn't necessarily  
15 have to be a previous superintendent, although that could  
16 be an option, but there are already organizations that are  
17 specifically trained to help support leaders and help  
18 support schools, especially geared around data driven  
19 instruction and in around setting a strong culture of  
20 academics. And so this partner would hopefully specialize  
21 in that area and we would work with the school to contract  
22 with them.

23 MS. FLORES: And what would that look like?  
24 Or like give me two or three examples?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not that I support this  
2 proposal, but -- but what I might say is that a -- is that  
3 a Desert -- was it -- Desert School District. I'm new to  
4 it, sorry, I don't really remember anything. We've been  
5 partnering with a couple of organizations that we believe  
6 have -- have added value. A couple of my folks have gone  
7 through a leadership training offered through CDE with some  
8 organizations. So, we think that there are organizations  
9 out there that have helped us. We just don't need them to  
10 come over and take over our district. But there are --  
11 there are organizations like one or two of my folks have  
12 gone through. The relay training and they've really- that  
13 has helped around some of the instruction within our  
14 classrooms. And some of my staff have peripherally  
15 explored some of the UVA work, which also has helped us  
16 think a little bit differently at our -- at our district  
17 level about some of the systems that we're proposing to --  
18 to work on through innovations plan.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: And to clarify, we  
20 don't -- we don't necessarily recommend that the current  
21 school leader be replaced. Simply that external partner  
22 organization help support the current leader.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Jane.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Lean into your  
25 microphone.



1 MS. GOFF: Thank you. The innovation plan  
2 that you would like to see happen, what is it about the  
3 plan itself that is innovative and promising provides  
4 evidence that it will improve achievement levels? And  
5 particularly, what sounds to be a crucial point and that's  
6 the middle school level. So can you tell me, what is --  
7 how is innovation defined in this plan?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. As you probably  
9 have read in our plan itself which is a big- long document,  
10 there are some changes that we've proposed to our schedule  
11 and the teacher work day which we believe has sort of has  
12 allowed teachers to have more collaboration time. We've --  
13 we're -- we're been working towards having our teachers  
14 have more leadership within our building, so help them,  
15 really empowering them and giving them time to be able to  
16 direct some of our professional learning within our  
17 building.

18 So these are some things that we know are a  
19 lot of the answers for some of the challenges we face or  
20 within our building, within our staff. So part of it is  
21 sort of freeing up the time and -- and some budgets that we  
22 have internally to be able to allow that to happen. But we  
23 also know that we have teachers that -- that have a lot to  
24 learn, and so -- so working with other organizations and



1 within our own district developing greater learning for our  
2 staff is -- is important as well.

3 MS. GOFF: So you're looking at more of the  
4 cooperative arrangement? It's the external partnerships  
5 that aren't necessarily formally defined as leadership or,  
6 I mean, what's -- what's to prevent now from adapting and  
7 modifying schedules that would allow time for staff to be  
8 together?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, and that's a good  
10 question. In a districts that's small like ours, I have a  
11 strong relationship with my board members. And so some of  
12 these -- some of these things that larger districts are  
13 restricted by, they are not as difficult for us to be able  
14 to change. I think what the innovation, sort of the  
15 transition to an innovation school would do, would give  
16 people's new -- I think new ownership and allow people to  
17 think that we're restarting the school and to sort of say  
18 like, we need a fresh start with -- with -- with what we're  
19 doing at our school. So some of the -- I think some of  
20 these pieces around teacher work day, some of those things  
21 are things that we absolutely need our board and our  
22 collective bargaining agreement to -- or our bargaining  
23 parties to agree to and others are a thing -- are policies  
24 that were practiced that we can put in place now.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So Angelika and --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Have you had a vote  
2 regarding the innovation status?

3 MR. SHERMAN: Would we have had a vote?  
4 Yes. We have had a vote. We had 73 percent of our  
5 teachers support this.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know, Peter?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can't remember. I  
8 think we would have had a vote at this point.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, certainly,  
11 certainly. Sorry. Faltering from my role.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: My question probably is to  
13 see you just -- what options for grants are available to  
14 these districts to be able to fund (inaudible).

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oops.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you are  
17 disconnected.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry. Thank you very much.  
19 What -- what options for grants are available to this  
20 district so that they could afford management?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are constantly  
22 assessing that situation, and believe there needs to be  
23 some type of support made to this small community.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a Title I school,  
25 right?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I'm gonna turn  
2 this over to the Associate Commissioner, Pearson.

3 MS. PEARSON: I'd return to that. We have  
4 CDE offers pathway grants to districts which -- what?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They can't implement--

6 MS. PEARSON: They can't implement the  
7 pathway grant. So that's right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is why we do mic  
9 hearings.

10 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that when this  
12 really happens, we can have an answer as you can question.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, the superintendent  
14 is not especially convincing to me that there's going to be  
15 significant change. There might be some change in time,  
16 but without the guidance of how that time needs -- is to be  
17 used and without some more leadership coaching, I worry.  
18 You don't have these kids -- I mean, if I had kids for five  
19 years not an achievement level that we believe you'd like  
20 to see. So a little bit of help from the outside might in  
21 fact be helpful, but we need to look at sources of -- of  
22 opportunities to get that kind of help. How about your  
23 BOCES? What's available through your BOCES?

24 MR. SHERMAN: Yeah, we work with our BOCES  
25 as many small districts do on student services and whatnot.



1 But some of -- and there are -- I think there are  
2 occasional professional learning opportunities for some of  
3 the pieces that we've talked about, but we have found that  
4 they're not sufficient to make the kind of changes that we  
5 want.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible)?

7 MS. GOFF: What about year round schools?  
8 I'm sorry, I'm going off because this could be an answer to  
9 their instead of the management, outside management. Have  
10 they thought about your own schools? Have you guys thought  
11 about year round schools?

12 MR. SHERMAN: Well, as you may know, I am --  
13 in our district about six years ago, we made the change  
14 from a five day to a four day week. And so, I think the --  
15 the -- the idea of working around would represent  
16 challenges for my staff and the community.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 8: Chairman Durham,  
18 it's time to get up there.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other questions? Yes?  
20 No? Question?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I used to see if Pam or Deb  
22 got anything.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Pam or Deb, do you have  
24 anything?

25 MS. MAZANEC: No, I'm good. Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Good.  
2 Any other -- are we finished?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ahead of schedule?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not until you all make  
6 a decision.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we need to talk  
8 about this.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Probably we'll sort it on  
10 the next meetings.

11 MS. FLORES: Excuse me. Could I just go  
12 into curricula?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure. Go ahead.

14 MS. FLORES: Because you may have, you know,  
15 at the end of the day and I know you have four days. But  
16 even so you could still have year round and in such a way  
17 that you could still do the farm work. I mean, curricula  
18 is -- is -- is area -- area. It's not just management.  
19 You might consider curricula, you might consider having a  
20 different kind of -- of high school. You know, I mean,  
21 there's multiple ways to think. I mean, maybe I'm thinking  
22 more urban, but I think that there could be other -- other  
23 ways bringing in trainers, you know, that the district  
24 could choose as opposed to going to outside management.  
25 More money, again, I'd say more money to do these things.



1                   And by the way, marathon -- when I taught at  
2 Finley, Ohio, that was one of the conditions for me to come  
3 on board when I was a teacher many, many, many years ago.  
4 And that was how to get from Finley to Cleveland, so that,  
5 you know, I could travel back to where my family lived. So  
6 you know, marathon was very nice and in providing a service  
7 at very minimum level to -- to get to Cleveland. So the  
8 community could come together in many ways. I think if we  
9 just start thinking about -- and the community might just  
10 say, you know, yes we have this option, we have this, we  
11 have that, where it might work better than going to an  
12 outside management consultant.

13                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion or  
14 question?

15                   MS. GOFF: I will.

16                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Jane.

17                   MS. GOFF: A little hypothetical, but the  
18 idea came out if at some point down the road or through the  
19 course of all the discussions, I'm sorry about my voice,  
20 I've got an attack season on my throat.

21                   Let's just suppose -- suppose the  
22 possibility of closure was more deeply discussed at some  
23 point. And I think you mentioned that there are two other  
24 middle schools, that's where I tuned in and it's a middle  
25 school, primarily of issue at that level, the district put



1 it, two other schools available. How would -- even if that  
2 was a possibility and community was great with it and they  
3 -- they understood it and they were willing to cooperate.  
4 How does that impact what I assumed to be a remaining  
5 elementary and a remaining high school level something in  
6 that district if you have, how do -- how would a district  
7 be, consider that?

8 I'm not assuming that if there is a real  
9 district it's in this same type of situation, that they  
10 haven't already thought of that as part of their innovation  
11 ideas and their acceptance of what new management would  
12 possibly bring in. But I'm just curious about that. How  
13 do -- that one of the sets of questions that we should be  
14 and can be tuned into is literally, it's the community  
15 impact I guess. And how do you PR it, how do you -- how do  
16 you set people up to be treated with all the respect for  
17 their own thoughts and ideas as they could possibly deserve  
18 and yet informed and -- and realizing the consequences of  
19 what they are doing or what they're not doing? You know,  
20 that's a big concern for me.

21 So I -- I would find it curious to know what  
22 would that look like if you could literally close down the  
23 middle -- the middle of your system and then you have to  
24 communicate about the other to the receiver and the sender.



1 That -- that's interesting, innovative, that's what we  
2 call, maybe that's what innovative is.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Maybe we have to think  
4 outside the box.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions? Okay.  
6 Seeing none--

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I was just gonna  
8 say, I mean, we did the mock hearing just as a little -- a  
9 little taste of the things that might come up, so I think  
10 we -- we got some good information from that too, but I  
11 mean, overall based on the work session and what you've  
12 heard today and thoughts, is there anything else you'd like  
13 CDE to go back and sort of, you know, put more specificity  
14 on or give you more direction on or just your -- your  
15 overall thoughts on what you learned today and how we can  
16 improve it?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Angelika and then Mel.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So I -- I would need to know  
19 more about management. Are there very different turnaround  
20 management options for a district to choose from? I would,  
21 when presentations are made, I would want to know, I would  
22 like to know what the discussions have been up to now. If  
23 that's the review panel's recommendation, have you  
24 discussed that with the district? And even if a district  
25 chooses innovation status, I mean, last month we had



1 application for innovation status that had weak to none  
2 replacement plans, you know, frankly, I don't wanna deal  
3 with that.

4                   So if we have folks that are coming to us  
5 suggesting innovation, I hope that they have for whatever  
6 waivers they are planning, they've really fleshed out what  
7 to, in other words, I want someone to tell me why is this  
8 better for the students and their school district. The old  
9 Northstar that we hear about, this is a student specific  
10 effort. So tell us what's gonna be better for students and  
11 why? But I'm really worried about staying at too high a  
12 level and really not knowing what it is that -- that we can  
13 expect the district to do.

14                   MS. MAZANEC: You know we, Dr. Schroeder, I  
15 -- I hear you, and I've thought about this a lot too.  
16 Where does our job, after reading all the information that  
17 these people have been working on and -- and getting into  
18 the schools, where does our job come in and where do we get  
19 to the idea that we're micromanaging? There's -- there's  
20 where the line is, and -- and keeping that high level even  
21 though we may have a lot of questions, I -- I think that's  
22 what our job is. I could be wrong on that.

23                   But this, the state review panel on this  
24 one, it says it does not recommend the closure of Sunny.  
25 If within two -- two years, student outcomes have not made



1 positive growth, the SRP recommends that it should be  
2 closed and there are two middle school. To me, we have to  
3 just make the decision at that point. We don't know what's  
4 gonna happen after that. I mean, we can be up nights on  
5 end trying to determine this, but we have a very specific  
6 charge of those points. Now, I don't know any rural  
7 school, I mean, in my area or in Pam's area that has two  
8 middle schools within 20 miles if there's only an  
9 elementary, middle, and high school. I mean, they're  
10 usually two hours, you know, that's the way it is. So that  
11 right there got into a little more detail than I think is  
12 our job and I -- I think -- I think these questions are  
13 well taken, but I think we're gonna have to dig out some of  
14 our answers in the materials that were provided and that --  
15 that's just a suggestion.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. I don't think we  
17 have any right to micromanage in terms of telling districts  
18 what to do. But I think it's appropriate for us to hear  
19 what they plan to do for us to figure out whether we're  
20 getting a lot of BS or whether we've got folks here --

21 MS. MAZANEC: I don't know how -- how we can  
22 do that.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, we struggle with that.  
24 But I mean, it's our job to try to understand some of that,  
25 but without some specificity, we have no idea what they're



1 gonna do if anything. I mean, you're right, it's a -- it's  
2 a balancing act and we should not be telling them what to  
3 do. Granted -- granted.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No.

5 MS. GOFF: Well, we still don't know -- we  
6 still don't have the last word from -- from the -- from the  
7 feds. And I really do believe that we, you know, this is  
8 just coming out as to the plan. And since we have these  
9 school districts, we should really think about another  
10 year. I really do believe we -- we need another year. And  
11 two, I think that these school districts are -- are  
12 manageable. I mean, and these schools and school districts  
13 are manageable such that there could be a conference for  
14 these school districts where we could even hire people to  
15 come in, thinking outside the box, not that they are not  
16 capable of doing that but sometimes a good conference, a  
17 good conference on -- on a subject could really turn some  
18 wheels around.

19 And that's not, you know, saying that again,  
20 that school districts and the community are not capable of  
21 doing this, but it helps to -- to really, you know, give  
22 some extra help before and taking another year I think. I  
23 -- I don't even know why we're, we should have had five  
24 years seriously, before -- before you make a big change  
25 like this you, I think you need time and in what we just



1 are kind of creating clocks for ourselves that are not  
2 really there, time for ourselves, when we could really be a  
3 little bit more ample and -- and do some things before, you  
4 know, we say, "Hey, we're going to close you got to have an  
5 outside management." And there's lots of other ideas  
6 where, you know, could be possible that a community could  
7 solve these issues.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Mr. Chair I make a motion we  
10 vote on Sunny Middle School.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is that a motion to close  
12 it?

13 MS. FLORES: Well, I don't know.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Go ahead with  
15 agenda two. Just -- just one final comment I would --  
16 would observe that the one thing we know for sure about  
17 these schools and districts that have come to us is that  
18 what they've been doing doesn't work. And I think that's -  
19 - that evidence is stark in that they've failed for five  
20 years. So I think that at Valley, it's actually six now.  
21 Well, I think that seven --.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's actually seven.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- seven, but who's  
24 counting? And so -- so I think that's the one thing we  
25 know for sure and I think the question is; are the proposed



1 changes enough that, if adopted by -- by this Board, do  
2 they represent enough meaningful change so that we have  
3 some confidence that things will get better for the  
4 students? I think that's really the question we have to  
5 resolve as a Board.

6                   And I would just observe that most of the  
7 recommendations that I see are innovation, which I would  
8 submit are the least or at least could be the least change  
9 imaginable with some hope of compliance, and that maybe --  
10 maybe acceptable, maybe not, but it would appear that --  
11 that there is a bias against, significant bias in  
12 recommendations against -- against significant change when  
13 we know that without change they will likely continue to  
14 fail. So I think with that, we probably won't vote on  
15 Sunny School, we have delayed it over the next meeting.  
16 We'll -- we'll come back, we got one, oh yes, sure. I'm  
17 trying to adjourn.

18                   MS. SCHROEDER: So I have a basic, basic,  
19 basic question. We keep talking about turn around schools  
20 and schools on priority improvement. Are we treating two  
21 groups identically? What's the difference between these  
22 two other than their score? And why do we have to?

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want me to --  
24 I'll take it for a stab.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I -- I need some help  
2 with that because it suddenly occurred to me that --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But you, Angelika,  
4 whenever you say and ask a basic question I know it's never  
5 really basic like this has always come with --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: It seems basic to me. I  
7 think I should understand this and I'm not clear at all.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I am. So I mean,  
9 at this point in the game when we're at that clinically end  
10 of the clock, there's not a lot of difference. We're  
11 really treating them priority improvement and turnaround  
12 pretty similarly. I think you guys can start to tease them  
13 apart because priority improvements probably, you know, got  
14 a little bit more percentage of points on the framework.  
15 So you know, maybe they're close, so I mean, you know, it  
16 gives you at least some indication to where they're falling  
17 out in that distribution. Really the difference is leading  
18 up to the clock. So the state review panel --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's in the support that  
20 they've been getting up to now.

21 Speaker 55: It's in the -- it's in the  
22 support from Peter -- from Peter's group, it's in the state  
23 review panel looking a little bit more closely at their  
24 improvement plans, they have, you know, there is the  
25 possibility of doing early action and turnaround. In the



1 improvement plans, they have to specify a turner. I mean,  
2 so there's a few like, you know, extra requirements that  
3 they have to focus on in their planning work, but by the --  
4 by the time they get to that clinical end of the clock,  
5 they're -- they're pretty much the same.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Sometime. I know  
7 there's gonna be the time when you guys are not horribly  
8 busy. Could you reflect on the differences between those  
9 two for us? Just kind of tease it out. What have you been  
10 doing for districts that are on priority improvement versus  
11 what -- what -- what have been the actions for turnaround.  
12 Are there things that we as a board should have been  
13 looking at -- at a sooner point, at an earlier point. I  
14 just would like to get a sense because we've got two  
15 different classifications. Now I feel like they're the  
16 same, and actually I -- I haven't gone back and looked at  
17 the recommendations from the folks but are the  
18 recommendations different between the two for example.  
19 Clearly there's hope of getting off the clock. There's  
20 greater hope for those districts that are scoring higher,  
21 but that doesn't mean that the root causes of their  
22 challenges are significantly different or that the remedies  
23 are significantly different. So I would love to have a  
24 deeper understanding of that to see if actually the way the



1 law is written makes some good sense or doesn't make good  
2 sense. Thank you.

3 MS. GOFF: Sorry, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's okay. Jane.

5 MS. GOFF: Well, I would like to extend that  
6 request after we've finished all this list is to talk about  
7 the -- the improvement category. Now, if our new  
8 accountability system, and definitions addresses such  
9 things as our definitions of various achievement levels,  
10 that's, well, that's one thing, but that improvement  
11 category still has me baffled. What is that? What is the  
12 status and how many schools have just been there for  
13 numerous years? And what does that -- what does that mean  
14 for them? Where is the drive, where's the incentive?  
15 Where's the -- where are the best examples of them? And  
16 there are some I would think, there are some great examples  
17 of really over-excelling something, overcoming some of  
18 their problems. But we don't know that, I am, I've just  
19 always been puzzled by that category and why, what goes on  
20 there. It's like a classroom full of students, what's  
21 going on there in the middle and we spend -- spend a lot of  
22 time on the other ends but what are we missing out on here?  
23 Someday.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Someday.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, if I can just  
2 say like I do think we should not be satisfied with any  
3 rating that's below our highest rating. Like any of these  
4 ratings have significant number of kids that are below  
5 grade level or are not meeting our expectations of them.  
6 So I think to that point, you know, to both of those  
7 questions, there's just a continuum. Those schools that  
8 are in turn around, you know, typically having 10s and 20s  
9 of percent of kids that are -- that are -- that are where  
10 we want them to be and that's -- that's pretty  
11 unacceptable. But a lot of the improving -- improving  
12 schools are, you know, are not a whole lot, don't look a  
13 whole lot different in terms of numbers of kids.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Only different, but  
15 whether -- whether we're not taking advantage of what's  
16 going on in the improvement level schools that could really  
17 be of assistance to the -- to the priority and turnarounds  
18 on a -- on a steady basis because they're not failures by  
19 any short, nobody is but --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's part of  
21 the theory of action with 163 was really around continuous  
22 improvement and that's why we have unified improvement  
23 plans for all schools because we know even schools their  
24 performance like there's always things all of us can do to  
25 get better, right? And so I think that's part of why we



1 have, why the improvement planning process was written and  
2 because we knew that there was going to be ways for  
3 everybody or things for everyone to work on even our  
4 schools at the highest level and districts at the highest.  
5 So I think part of ESSA and the requirements in there will  
6 help bring some of that to life. Like the --

7 MS. GOFF: Thanks. Thanks for helping  
8 though. Thanks for everything you all are doing, it's just  
9 -- it is pretty impressive, it's a good model for the --  
10 for some other states. Nobody has any idea how complex it  
11 is once you do it every day. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, any other business?  
13 I will stand and adjourn till the next week. Thank you  
14 all.

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