BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 10, 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)
CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Now, we're going to proceed to -- let's see, I'm confused, notice of rulemaking. An Item 14.01 --

MS. CORDIAL: Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

MS. CORDIAL: Would you -- would you mind if we switched the notice of rulemaking, and this Kindergarten School Readiness --

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

MS. CORDIAL: -- here are outside participants that are here.

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: For the School Readiness?

MS. CORDIAL: Mm-hmm, 14.02.

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, 14.02.

MS. CORDIAL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Certainly no problem with changing that to 14.02. So let's see. All right. Okay. All right. Commissioner, let me ask Dr. Colsman to -- and Mr. Ross.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You (inaudible).

MS. COLSMAN: Just me.

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just Dr. Colsman, okay.

Dr. Colsman, please proceed.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Colsman.
CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Colsman, I'm sorry. Don't mind me.

MS. COLSMAN: It's all -- it's all good.

Well, yeah, members of the Board, Mr. Chair, and Mr. Commissioner, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I'll be at times using the word "we" during the presentation today. I wanted to just acknowledge the staff members that have been doing behind the scenes work with the Kindergarten School Readiness works. First of all, as our Director of the Office of Early Learning School Readiness, Nancie Linville, she can raise your hand right now. And also Daryl Trujillo, who is our Kindergarten Readiness Program Manager. I think she's right over -- somewhere here, so she can raise her hand. Just wanted to acknowledge the staff members. I wanted to assure you, since -- since September as we've been talking about this, we really endeavor to answer the questions that State Board members have had and provide recommendations for this reporting system that comports with the law. It's also what is -- what we believe to be the minimal requirements of that, and what would also be approved by EDAC.

So we want to highlight just a few key points along the way a -- around those areas. So first, we've been in continuous consultation with our counsel, Mr. Tony Dill from the Attorney General's Office, throughout
this process. We've also had monthly conversations with the Education Data Advisory Committee, or EDAC. As you know, EDAC was created to review data demands placed on Colorado School Districts. Each year, all data collections are reviewed, and approved by this committee, and we actually have a member of EDAC with us today, on Superintendent Nikki Johnson from the Campus School District, who is a -- yeah -- school district of less than 50 students here with us today. She'll be providing some very brief comments around EDAC's perspective on the recommendation.

We've also had ongoing communication with the Early Childhood Leadership Commission. The Early Childhood Leadership Commission is the state's advisory council for early childhood, as set forth in statute. It's a high-level interagency public-private leadership commission that is purposed with identifying opportunities for, and addressing barriers to coordination of early childhood policies, and procedures. The commission has continued to express it's interest in the Kindergarten School Readiness reporting system, so that it may have information it needs to fulfill its legislative purpose of using data to improve decision-making alignment, and coordination among services, and programs for young children, and their families. I believe that you've
received some letters, and some testimony from the Early Childhood Leadership Commission of the past few months, and I believe that you've received one, just this last week as well.

Specifically, the commission has expressed the need for a reporting system that can inform improvement planning, and accountability for early childhood programs. And we also have Susan Steele, who's from the Early Childhood Leadership Commission, provides some very brief comments as well today. So our purpose is to provide you with two options for the Kindergarten School Readiness reporting system. In our last meeting, we presented an option, and there was a number of questions to that. What we wanted to do was provide some alternatives for the Board to consider, and our recommended action as a result of today's presentation is that the Board would vote on a reporting system. We've talked a lot about reporting systems, and legislative requirements. What I wanted to do is just take a brief two minutes of time to kind of go to the why. Why is this important?

We know that early childhood is really a critical time in human growth, and development. In fact, 90 percent of the child's brain develops in the first five years of life. Achievement gaps start early, and tend to persist through school, and research demonstrates that
achievement gaps can be identified long before children enter kindergarten. Initiative supporting school readiness have emerged across the country, and in -- in Colorado because a few interesting statistics. By age two, children from poverty are already behind their peers, and listening, counting, and other skills necessary for literacy. A child's vocabulary, as early as age three, can predict their third grade reading achievement. By age five, children from poverty have an estimated 30 million cumulative word gap. Meaning the number of words that they have heard over their five years of life compared with their more affluent peers. And by age five, the typical middle-class child recognizes 22 letters of the alphabet compared to nine for a child from a low-income family.

So for -- for years, there have been a lot of discussion about how do we improve school readiness for kids because we know that these achievement gaps, if addressed early, can either be minimized, or eliminated altogether, and return on investment for high quality. Early learning experiences for kids ranges anywhere from $7 to $16 for every dollar invested. So because of this, there have been a number of initiatives within the state to look at school readiness, and the design of a reporting system that will help provide information on how well are we doing as a state is -- is very important. That
information can be used to enable the state to answer these important return on investment questions. Today, the recommendations that we're making meets the highest data privacy, and security standards by utilizing the state's data system while enabling the collection of the right information for the State Board, and other policymakers to determine return on investment for early childhood programs while maintaining the highest measures of data privacy for young children.

So we'll briefly go back to some of the things that we've talked about for since September, just around some requirements, around Kindergarten School Readiness. The State Board has some requirements around adopting a definition of school readiness, adopting a reporting system, and then revisiting that by July of 2017, and local education providers are required to have an individual school readiness plan for each kindergarten child that would be informed by the School Readiness Assessment, and to provide information to families about the growth, and preparedness of their children. You'll notice that there's an asterisk next to 2013 because we've had some delays in implementation of this in relation to being able to provide districts options with appropriate assessments.
To the purpose of today, which is around school readiness reporting requirements, the State Board has the requirement to adopt this system that could report School Readiness information. The department has a responsibility to produce an annual -- an annual report, looking at the aggregate of all kindergartners, as well as disaggregated by the particular subgroups that are here. Also, CAP4k indicates that School Readiness includes the different domains that we've have identified. Since we've had these discussions, the Board has raised really good questions, and we've had some -- some very robust discussions around this, and the issues fall within two categories, I believe. One is around data privacy, and security, the other is around not exceeding statutory minimums.

And so what we have done in relation to those we've highlighted here on this slide is that the department has had ongoing review, and revisions of our data privacy, and security policy. So this is a fit -- fit within a larger discussion within the department, and the School Readiness work fits exactly in that discussion. We've also had conducted a thorough review of the data privacy, and security policies if each of the approved assessment tools that the State Board has approved. We've looked at ways to limit the amount of personally
identifying -- personally identifiable data that's collected, and we've approved a memorandum of understanding with teaching strategies that's resulted in even greater data privacy from that particular publisher, and inclusion of an active parent opt out to some particular pieces that parents have been concerned about. We've also been working on the Board's desire to not exceed state statutory requirements.

So we had continue counsel from the Attorney General's Office to make sure that we're not exceeding beyond there. And again, we've had an ongoing dialogue with the -- with EDAC around this so that we can determine the minimum data elements necessary to meet the legislative requirement. And the main question that we've brought forward is around whether, or not we would ask districts to submit individual child data, or is it possible to submit aggregate information to the department. And that seems to be where the -- the main discussion comes down to around some options.

So we're going to kind of dig into each of those options, and talk a little bit about the benefits, what you would get from having a system that would fall within that particular option, and what you -- and what would be a limitation of that particular. The -- again, the -- the idea of -- of the two options would be around
whether, or not the state receive -- receives individual child level data, or whether would districts would submit aggregated data. So let's dig into option one. Option one is similar to what we presented in January with some changes based on your feedback. Option one would be that districts would submit student level Kindergarten School Readiness information for CDE to aggregate, and disaggregate, in accordance with the legislative requirements, through our secure submission, and data storage process. There are some benefits to this we want you to be aware of. There's also some limitations. I'm actually gonna ask for a couple of folks to testify at the microphone for one, or two minutes on -- on two points. The first point I'll make on my own, which is that this -- this option would allow us to track, and report overall school readiness for every cohort of kindergarteners. This is also true of -- if districts were to submit aggregate information. So either option allows that to happen.

The additional benefit for this option is there's an ease of submission on the part of school districts, and there's a lower administrative burden for districts. At this point, I would like to ask Superintendent Nikki Johnson to come up, and talk a little bit about the what -- how EDAC has responded in relation to this. Again, we've been going to EDAC monthly since
September to talk about this collection, and get their feedback so that every time we come to you, we would be able to bring the voice of districts to you. But we wanted to make sure that you'd hear directly from EDAC on this around the ease of submission for -- which is their role around data burdens. So thank you. Superintendent.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. And as Melissa said, I'm Nikki Johnson, and I present -- represent one of the smallest districts of the state on EDAC, but we also have representatives on EDAC that represent very large districts. And so we've spent a lot of time talking about this collection as our role in trying to think about the challenges, and the burdens that -- that a new submission would make for those districts. So that is -- we -- we appreciate Melissa's time in informing us of the -- the regulations around, and what we're really getting -- what we're trying to -- to get to. And then, we've spent a lot of time in talking about what that looks like in different districts. We all have different data collection systems, and different processes within our districts. And from the smallest district to the largest district, it seems that this option really care -- keeps that burden down -- lower, as far as collecting that on a district level, and -- and that not having that extra layer of data analysis. And so EDAC felt very strongly that this was an option that we
would like to recommend that -- that would recognize those challenges of collecting that data from schools, and in that district level to submit to the state.

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

MS. SCHROEDER: Did you talk about whether there would be any benefit to the district if they had to do the aggregating? In other words, as a burden, I -- I understand -- I understand what you're talking about, but I'm wondering if the process of aggregating at the district level would provide important information to the district itself, and whether they value that enough to go through the -- hassle is not a good word, but you know what I mean, the work.

MS. JOHNSON: And Melissa can correct me if I'm wrong, but I -- we did talk about that, and it was my understanding that that process would be taking care of that CDE, so districts that want that information would be able to -- to access that. It would -- wouldn't be that they would have to create it themselves.

MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So they could get the information, it's just that you wouldn't actually have to do it yourselves?

MS. JOHNSON: Exactly.

MS. SCHROEDER: My other question maybe -- I don't know if you're the right person to answer, or if
there's anyone here that can answer, is there a program, or something that can make this relatively simple as opposed to being clumsy, and cumbersome?

MS. COLSMAN: So many school districts have a student information system that they use to manage all of the different programs that they have, and that's the primary mechanism that they use to send information to the state. If -- if districts were to submit aggregated data, they would have to go outside of that program. And so that -- that's an additional kind of --

MS. SCHROEDER: And there's no way to get a modification, or --

MS. COLSMAN: You know, I think that's just the way that the systems are designed. They're designed to kind of -- not by my student, yeah, by student, say, said number to kind of submit that to the state. One -- and you'll see, one of the things that we -- we can do is we can provide districts with a -- with a spreadsheet that would provide, you know, them the analysis that they would need, or at least some help with having a uniform way of -- of providing that information to the department.

MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And is it a hassle to the school district to remove the name?

MS. SCHROEDER: So actually, and -- and Nikki can expand on this. Districts actually were saying
that -- that on there, and having the name, and the students SASED number is actually necessary to make sure that they are matching the right student with the right SASED. What we would be able to do is have an intermediary kind of system that would kind of, decouple that once it's submitted to the state. So we can -- we can do the behind the scenes piece to take -- to separate out that name which I know is an area that the -- the school board has asked for. So we're going to take that burden on.

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder? Yeah. Go on. I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe you can come up with a name (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Schreffler.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry.

MS. MAZANEC: It's all right. No worries. You know this is all about PII data questions. Parents don't want PII data reported to the state. They want aggregated data reported to the state only. Can we talk about that option? Is that option two?

MS. SCHROEDER: Yes that's option two. Yep absolutely.

MS. MAZANEC: 'Cause I think that this slide is like we've seen before. I mean, I think you're trying
to frame it such that you know, I mean it could be helpful to some, but really, this is about children who are quite young and their parents who are concerned about privacy. So I -- I mean, we've said that no PII data gets reported to the state. Right? I mean, does PII data need to get reported to the state based on statute for this initiative? The answers no. Correct?

MS. SCHROEDER: I think that's not something that I can that I can point to. I think we'll have to ask Mr. Dill. I don't know if --

MS. MAZANEC: We're supposed to have aggregate data?

MR. DILL: If I understand the -- the -- the question correctly is whether, or not it is within the statutory authority to have the school district report out of their data, and I believe that is the case. Yes.

MS. MAZANEC: But don't we -- does this district have to do it? Do -- does the district have to report personally identified information for preschool children to the state?

CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No it does not. It says you shall adopt the system for reporting population level results.

MS. SCHROEDER: Correct. Right. So I'm just pointing out that we can talk about these options but
we don't have to report PII data to the state from schools, and districts. So I just, as we try to think through how we're landing on this, I hope that we'll have time to consider that option because we've already considered the other option at (inaudible).

MS. MAZANEC: So maybe we should (inaudible) option too.

MS. SCHROEDER: I guess, yeah. I mean it's fine you want you summarize it, yeah, but I'm just saying. I just wanna make sure that we have time to look at that option which is what -- I -- I haven't heard any parents, I haven't heard any parents saying, I wanna be able to look for personally identified information to the state, and I'm cool with the fact that they're tracking all that. I've never heard that. It's just we don't have to do it. I wanna make sure that we're not landing on this as our most obvious option. It is, okay, I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Except that it's an extra burden. The school districts don't have to recognize that that's what this means. We're adding work at this district level which is also one of our concerns.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we have to prioritize the students who.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I get that. We should do that but there's not a perfect solution there.
MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what school district do you represent?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Campus school district, and we have less than 50 students.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

MS. SCHROEDER: So we'll briefly go for the final point about what the benefit would be for having the individual student information, and that is related to the ability for you as state board members, and other policy makers to answer questions related to return on investment. I'll ask Susan Steele from The Early Childhood Leadership Commission to expand on this point a bit. But one -- one point that I would like to make is around right now there are students funded through the Colorado Preschool Program to the amount of about $103 million a year. One policy question that you could answer related to, if we were to have individual student information would be to compare the results of the kindergarten school readiness information for students who were funded for the Colorado Preschool Program, and those students who are not. Right now there's no way to answer that question, and to see what return on investment that we're getting for that -- for that $103 million. So Susan Steele, is just gonna briefly talk about
what the Early Childhood Leadership Commission's
perspective is on this question.

MS. STEELE: Thank you very much, again,
Susan Steele. I am co-chair of The Data Committee with The
Early Childhood Leadership Commission. I also have, for 20
plus years been the Executive Director of the Buhl
Foundation that concentrates 95 percent in early childhood
development throughout the state with a close relationship
to many rural, and city districts. I simply wanna point
out that on the data committee we're very interested in
learning about, from all the departments, and all credible
data sources, what we can learn about kids as much as we
can learn about kids. There's data, and then there's
meaningful data, and you can give us a single figure, or
you can give us a general number, and then you can give us
data that will allow us to look at what's working, what's
not working, who it's working for, who it's not working
for.

It's a lot like talking about Colorado as
being the slimmest state in the union. But when we get
down to it, there are some real challenges especially with
kids by the way, in those statistics. We would like to
have real statistics, and you are a primary source of that.
Not the only source, but certainly a considerably large
source to us when we help to champion best practices, those
things that will make a difference for kids. So I would suggest to you that we not do the least that we can do, but what we can -- you all can do to make our decisions meaningful along with yours. Thank you very much.

MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. One of the challenges for this, I think is something now that Dr. Scheffel continues to bring up and I think it's a really important point which is, there will be a high need to communicate the data privacy and security measures to families and communities if -- if the -- the Board were to go in this direction. Very quickly some of the mitigation strategies that we could use around the challenges that are here is if The State Board could ask the department to destroy data after a given time period. So for instance after third grade to maybe ask a particular question of how does school readiness relate to third grade achievement? We would not be able to answer that question without having individual child data. And then -- or you could ask us to annually destroy that information once we are able to look at some, at least minimal return on investment questions. We can continue to limit some data points.

And again we've brought this up earlier which is the elimination of student names. And we could provide instead of scores, which is what we asked, we presented last month. We could have a performance
category, which would mitigate against the -- the concern that the board had of a score going to the department. We could have a performance category that would say not meeting, meeting, or exceeding their expectations in that particular area. So these would be the data elements that would be part of option one that districts would present. Very -- you may notice that literacy isn't red. That's actually been added since January in relation to House Bill 1323 that indicated that students who are assessed by redact assessment within the first 60 days would not need to do the literacy portion on the school readiness piece. We would still need to ask districts to report that piece in -- in either option, because we don't have a mechanism to get that information otherwise. So they're not required to use that portion of the assessment, but we will still need to ask for that. Because we've spent so much time talking about different variations of option one, we'll go ahead, and move on to option two, which is that districts would aggregate the kindergarten school readiness information prior to submission to CDE. So we would ask districts to aggregate, and disaggregate that school reading this information along those different categories that are within statute.

You'll actually see, if -- if you wanna get a sense of what that would look like, the next slide, Slide
11 would be the actual data that districts would need to submit. So they would need to submit aggregate kindergarten school readiness, so all of their kids combined in each of those six areas. They would also then need to take that same information, and disaggregate it along each of those different categories, and they would need to do the same thing for it at the school level. The aggregate school information as well as the disaggregated school. The benefits for that would be the ability to track, and report overall school readiness, and there would also be that greater perception of data privacy that we know is important. The challenge would be, as -- as you know, this is it would be a greater burden on districts. There would be an increased complexity for data submission 'cause we'd have to come up with a different process. There would also be a limited ability to understand kindergarten school readiness.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) ask questions (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you wanna interrupt --

MS. MAZANEC: Sorry, I wanna interrupt.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.
MS. MAZANEC: When you talk about the -- the greater burden on districts removing the child's name what is?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is (inaudible).

MS. MAZANEC: Well, she was just saying this. Right?

MS. STEELE: Right. So this -- so option two is like districts would aggregate all of that data, and disaggregate it according to the --

MS. MAZANEC: You said that was a burden.

MS. STEELE: Right. EDAC has told us that that's a greater burden on the part of districts.

MS. MAZANEC: Well, and I should have asked. But I don't understand what the -- the burden, what -- what does that burden look like?

MS. STEELE: Right. So -- so that's a good question because without understanding how this all works it can be a mystery. So currently what districts tend to do is they use the student information system that kind of -- kind of, helps them manage all the multiple programs that they have. So it's like a -- a single system. And they have their different, whether it's their report card system, or whatever kind of hooked to that process. So
that student information system is also how they send any
required data submissions to the state. So it's kind of
their -- their main way of managing all of their
information. So that system's already in place, and
working in districts. By having a separate system, they
would need to do all of the -- all of the data analysis
outside of that, and all of the calculations, and submit
that through a separate process than what's currently, that
-- that -- that they currently do for the state
submissions.

So what that would mean is that they would
have to pull all of the -- the data from the kindergarten
school readiness information, do all of the calculations to
aggregate that to say all kids in kindergarten, this is how
they're doing across each of the six categories. Then
they'd need to do how kids in each of the subcategories are
doing. So free, and reduced lunch. How were they doing in
each of the categories? What about by gender, how are they
doing? What about by ethnicity, how were they doing? So --
-- so it's just this reiteration of multiple calculations.
And EDAC has indicated that that's more burdensome for
districts, it requires more --

MS. MAZANEC: And so without removing the
child's name this would all be a breeze?

MS. STEELE: So -- so there's -- there's --
MS. MAZANEC: This will all be really easy for districts?

MS. STEELE: Yeah. So with option one, what we can with option one go ahead, and have them use their student information system, and not do any calculations, but we can -- we can remove the child's name, and -- and you know, take that piece out of the data collection, but still have individual child data. So that would be an option under option one, would be to not have the student name associated with the files that we have. We would only be a -- we would use simply the SASED. There are --

MS. MAZANEC: Just help me understand more about how these districts systems work.

MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. Melissa could you -- could -- do you gather information if a district has 30 elementary schools with each of which has two, or three kindergarten classes.

MS. STEELE: Right.

MS. SCHROEDER: The district has 10, or a district just has a thing. I mean I think it's a dramatic difference, and certainly in the larger districts you're talking about using staff unless there's some way to generate a program that does this, you're talking about how much -- how much time. So that's what I'm trying to figure.
MS. MAZANEC: I -- appreciate that, I mean --

MS. STEELE: Yeah. It's a burden.

MS. MAZANEC: -- children's privacy has to be the most important consideration. I'm just trying to figure out why this seems to be presented as awfully difficult, and that's probably a type of conversation I need to have offline. But I -- I -- I need to understand that but keep going with that.

MS. SCHROEDER: Absolutely. Yeah. Absolutely. And that has been something that we've had continued discussions with the EDAC around -- around -- and that's their role is to provide the department with advice on how this would work in districts.

MS. STEELE: Okay. We have talked a lot about the differences that you talk about and -- and the size of district, and the time commitment. When you're talking about a school my size, that's -- that reporting is going to be either my secretary, or myself, and we're going to enter our kids manually because we've got so few kids. So it's gonna be a -- a different process for us. But when we listen to those districts that have 30 schools, and they describe the process of collecting that data, and then how they -- they have to go about aggregating that in the data analysis, the time commitment, the challenge, it -- it
really is a time, and -- and a people resource challenge for those districts.

And it -- it would be interesting to see the difference when -- when you're looking at 30 schools, or 10 schools, and when you're looking at a school my size but there is a tremendous burden. And we do have people that actually do those reports on EDAC. And so they're not hearing -- they're hearing from their colleagues as well, but they are personally familiar with those processes, and their vendors, their student collection systems. So they know intimately about the requests they're gonna have to make, and what that process looks like to make all those calculations, and get that ready to submit to the state.

MS. SCHROEDER: So even for your school district would you say it's a couple hours on a Sunday afternoon for you to aggregate that data?

MS. STEELE: For us. Yes. That -- that's -- that's all it will take for us but we're also talking about less than five kindergarteners.

MS. SCHROEDER: Oh.

MS. STEELE: So --

MS. SCHROEDER: Looks like balancing my checks.

MS. STEELE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The question are --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) please.

Sorry.

MS. STEELE: So -- so we're talking now been like what would happen if they were to aggregate that here. So -- so what you -- we've heard again, it's just about data burden on districts. There would also be a limited ability to understand achievement of kids across categories. Let me give you an example. If we only get aggregated data by, for instance, we'll know like how -- how we can separate out boys, and girls, or by free, and reduced lunch, or by ethnicity. But we wouldn't be able to know what about kids who are, you know, obviously boys are also either free, or reduced lunch eligible, why not, so kids are in different categories. So we wouldn't be able to answer questions about -- so for instance what about male students who are eligible for free, and reduced lunch. Is there a difference in any of the readiness, and any of the categories?

We couldn't answer that question. We could only answer what about boys overall. We wouldn't be able to ask questions about the readiness of, for instance, female readiness in mathematics by ethnicity. We wouldn't know if there's differences across ethnicity. So by having
the individual data, we can answer -- we can get -- we can ask more questions that could inform more programs for the -- for the state, and for locals. You'd have a limited ability to ask, answer, return of investment questions, and there would be a difficulty with accuracy -- accuracy of data, and fixing mistakes with 179 different districts submitting, that's a 179 mistakes that could happen, or multiple mistakes within a district. We would -- our data quality would suffer because we would have instead of a uniform system we'd have a 179 different ones. We could mitigate that by having kind of an excel file.

MS. FLORES: Melissa.

MS. STEELE: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. FLORES: Melisa, but -- you did say that -- oh, excuse me. You did say that people -- that parents could opt out. I mean, they had the option to opt out.

MS. STEELE: Right.

MS. FLORES: Wouldn't that be if they can opt out -- let's think about, I don't know how many people would want to do that but that would leave a lot of people that would want to -- that wouldn't care about that.

MS. STEELE: Can you --

MS. FLORES: If -- if -- if you had -- if -- if they could scramble the name, and if also parents opted
out, wouldn't that just kind of leave it so that everybody
would be happy? I think people could be happy with that.

MS. STEELE: Could you clarify the opt out —

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- is the opt out of
the assessment.

MS. STEELE: Right. So we actually had to
asked Tony Dill about this question. I think we actually
might have had an official -- a formal attorney general's
opinion about opting out of assessments --

MS. FLORES: Opting out of portions.

MS. STEELE: Right. And -- and one of the
ones that we believe is -- is with no consequence would be
to opt out of the school readiness assessment because it's
not tied to funding, it's not tied to accountability. So
that is -- is something that parents can -- can do if
they're not -- if they're not comfortable with this
assessment, or don't find the value of it for knowing their
children.

MS. FLORES: Well, there's still that
dilemma that a parent might want to know but not want the
data to be shared. Although I think if a parent understood
the purpose of the sharing, the answer might be very, very
different which is what we're learning as we have
conversations with our citizens.

MS. STEELE: Right. And -- and from what I
understand that would not at all be an issue. There is --
that would be something that could be worked out at the
local level to make sure that parents have that opportunity
to opt out of any submission.

MS. SCHEFFEL: May I ask you a question.

MS. STEELE: Let's see. I forgot, what was
your name?

MS. SCHEFFEL: Doctor Scheffel.

MS. STEELE: Scheffel. Scheffel? Doctor

Scheffel.

MS. FLORES: Scheffel. I like it Scheffel.

MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you -- are we voting on
this today or we're just discussing?

MS. STEELE: You know, we have a choice we
probably should, but what's our time line?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In -- in terms of like
statutory requirements?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we're three four
years behind. I know.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --
MS. SCHEFFEL: And wait one more question.
And then, what time does our comment or what kind of a timeline are we on with respect to that discussion? Okay. I mean, is this ending at 3:00, and -- or is the public gonna testify, or not testify?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we having testimony? No.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This isn't -- this isn't a hearing like a rulemaking hearing.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not hearing.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.
MS. SCHEFFEL: Are we finished at 3:00 with are we trying to be finished at 3:00 with this discussion?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're trying to get through our agenda, and we're kind of off the clock a little bit. So what's the reason what you --
MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, because I'm just trying to find out when this presentation is over so that we could get the questions out, and maybe, I don't know, appreciate the slides I just --
MS. FLORES: Can we vote? Is it possible to vote?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Somebody makes a motion but are you finished?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah so we just end
with -- with our recommendation. You'll find it on slide
12 which is that we would go with option one, that we would
destroy the data after third grade, eliminate collection of
student name, and use performance categories rather than
scores. So that's our -- that's our recommendation but the
board is -- is free to vote as they please.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So do you have a
motion, Debora?

MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I was going to make a
comment.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please go ahead.

MS. SCHEFFEL: So my -- my thought is that
this -- this option one doesn't address any of the concerns
of the folks that I've talked to in the public. And so
option two is much better but there are still issues within
that so I would look to others for their comments.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do I have motion? Do
you want me to make a motion? What's the story?

MS. SCHEFFEL: I would rather have Steve be
here if we going to vote. I mean I don't really wanna vote
on this if he has --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He has -- he knows
where he's relinquished his he has said he's fine with us
moving on with this. I've -- I've asked him if there were any specific items that he did not want us to vote on, or address today, and he has not identified -- well he's identified the one that he wants to -- tomorrow.

MS. SCHEFFEL: So he won't be back for his vote if we vote today?

MS. FLORES: You voted without me at one time.

MS. SCHEFFEL: Then I don't want to vote today.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So let me just suggest a motion to use the department's existing state reporting system to have districts report the statutory required minimum information regarding kindergarten school readiness as outlined in option one. Is there a second to that, or is there somebody who wants to bring that motion?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You just brought it forward. Thank you. Is there a second for that option one?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you're not -- you're not the leader of the motion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm chairing. So I made the motion. I offered the motion for someone to make. Would be great if we had a second.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will second so we can talk that.


MS. RANKIN: I have a naive question. What format is the information on at the school level when the school fills it out? Is it a template, or do they just write it down, and send it to you?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- yeah -- so typically, you know, there -- there's a program that districts will use. It might be infinite campus that's a common program.

MS. RANKIN: Okay. So everybody uses that program, so when they send it up to you it's already all out there so that you can cut it up any way you want depending on what you're looking for -- for you information, correct?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. And you know, according to those areas that we've been statutorily allowed to do right.

MS. RANKIN: So would it be possible. I think of it as an Excel spreadsheet. Where you could just delete the column with the name. You'd still have to grade that -- and you could do whatever you want with that without any name attached. A 178 districts times how many
well 880,000 kids I don't know that any would've been able
to pinpoint a child. I mean, in my opt here to simplify it
like this?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so you're right.
That's actually proposing an option one which would be that
that name piece would be removed from that data, and that
we would have that other information kind of in an Excel
spreadsheet for the whole state.

MS. RANKIN: So you kind of have it at that
-- at the level where you can aggregate, disaggregate, do
whatever you want with it, and there's no name attached?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And report it back to
the district.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The difference is that
-- that it has to be provided to the state, and then
removed. The argument that they're making is that they can
take that PII out but the district, if they -- the district
still has to report it, or it's a huge burden to the
district to not report that PII to them. So yes they can
still --

MS. RANKIN: The school -- Can the school --
school do it there, or does that mess up your numbers? I
don't understand how --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We actually talked
about this. We -- it gives -- there's -- a there's kind of
a process that we can use, and I'll try to explain it simply because I'm -- I simply understand it as well, which is imagine here comes the info -- here's -- I'm a district that uses infinite campus. There's others use Alpine or different programs. What they usually do is just send data you know from that to the state according to requirements. What we would do is create an -- an intermediate process before we kind of uptake it into, you know, the data warehouse where we remove that name.

MS. RANKIN: I understand that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They -- the districts need to be able to have that name associated with that child when they're submitting because otherwise they don't know if they're duplicating, or whatever so it's a kind of a complicated --

MS. RANKIN: As opposed to the district, not providing you the name.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. So what we would do is kind of --

MS. RANKIN: That's where the hardship is where -- that's the argument may use -- the hardship would be for the districts to not provide that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No it's not the hardship. That's (inaudible).
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no that's not the hardship. The hardship is having to take all the data and aggregating it. So there aren't -- there's just a number that comes in each category and that's maybe one or two hours for a very, very small district on a Sunday afternoon. But that is --

MS. RANKIN: (Inaudible) feeding it all. (Inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so essentially what would happen is with, you know, we -- we can -- we can get rid of the -- the name piece kind of just through that like intermediate thing before we uptake it into kind of the day assistant.

MS. RANKIN: So you still have it until we told you to destroy it?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the name gets dropped out so here's the district, here's -- here's the state system. We do an intermediate thing where we delete the name, and then we uptake it into our system, and then we have kind of this only by (inaudible) student number, and then it's part of our data system. We would say that it makes sense to keep that information for until third grade, so that we can say how does -- how a child does in kindergarten on the school readiness assessment. How does it relate to third grade achievement? We can answer that
question if we can keep it that long. Then what would
happen is after that point that data would be kind of
purged from the system. Because I know that there's just
concern about that -- that somehow would follow a child
beyond through college, and that they are -- that parents
would be comfortable with, and so we think that there's a
good possibility of answering some policy questions up
through third grade but then remove it from our system.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Joyce, let me go back
to my questioning.

MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why can't the school
take the name off before it's censorship? Where's the
problem with that? I'm missing something here.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I can ask that of
-- I think that's a technical piece that we can work
through with EDAC I'm not quite sure how that's --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) if they
just sort of that column, and delete it. It wouldn't be
several hours on a Sunday afternoon for anybody. And I
understand 50 students -- yours works out well.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know a comment that
is made from one of the people on EDAC that -- that would
be responsible for this. It's not -- not that the name is
burdensome as far as the collection, it's about accuracy
and it felt like it if they remove that name, that -- that
takes a lot of their ability to keep that information
accurate. It's not -- the name itself was not the time
consuming part. It was aggregating that data that was the
time consuming part. So if the name has to come out there
would be a process. I don't think it would be that hard.
It would just be making sure that that data is still as
accurate as possible at the district level before that name
is dropped off.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Joyce for example,
if we forced the district to drop the name, then they might
not have that name anymore before they send it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, they would have it.
They would have the name. They would have that on file.
They would have everything there and then they would just
delete that column but that doesn't delete any information.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I guess we need
I guess we need to see whether infinite campus let's you do
that with a copy. And maybe you can make a copy of the
file, and drop it.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think that in EDAC
have -- actually have this discussion but I don't know
about you but sometimes when it gets really data E, I just
-- I don't know what your talking about. But essentially
what they say is, there is just a process that would occur
that would allow us to drop the name. Once they do, once
they have all of their data ready to go, we would have like
this intermediate kind of transfer where we would be able
to drop the name. So it would just --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Well thank you
for being patient as I tried to figure out.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: More questions? Let's
call -- would you call the (inaudible) HOPE.

MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

MS. FLORES: Aye.

MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.

MS. GOFF: Aye.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Motion one.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which was option one?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

MS. MAZANEC: No.

MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

MS. RANKIN: No.

MS. CORDIAL: Board member Scheffel.

MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

MS. CORDIAL: And Vice Chairman Schroeder.

MS. SCHROEDER: Aye. That did not pass.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Somebody want to make motion to, or do you want to just forget or lay it over? I know I'm going to vote on that too. So we're not going to get this done. I think we need to have some conversations with staff on what it -- what the heck is it that? You want to do here. We have an obligation to provide the information, to provide the reports. We should direct --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We should direct all the districts that get ticked off if they have to aggregate the data to those who feel this is the most important. We need to maybe hear from some parents on what is the solution. I get the no's but I'd like to get to yes somehow.

MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, Pam.

MS. MAZANEC: I think I would like to get to yes too, but I have to say I'm really disappointed at the feeling I'm getting here is that it's just too hard not to get personal identifiable information to the state. So Commissioner can you help us with this? Can we get some movement on this? Because I certainly, am not wishing to put -- to put more burden on local districts particularly rural, and small districts. I have no interest in that, but I think there's got to be a way that we can get to yes to parents. No, we don't have to provide your
kindergarteners' personally identifiable information to the state for them to house even for three years. I might be willing to consider that, but right now I want to get to yes, and I know it feels like --

MR. ASP: No.

MS. MAZANEC: -- that just can't happen, and I -- an Excel spreadsheet is manipulable, particularly, you know, I've seen some amazing things done with Excel spreadsheet.

MR. ASP: And to point, definitely we'll -- we will bring options to you, or have a -- deeper conversations. This is as much a political ideology for good -- good, you know, I'm not -- I'm not saying that in any way our discussion has everything else, and the Board has very strongly divided opinions on this topic. So whether we ever get to a 7-0 vote, and I remember this is something that's been done for many, many, many years, if I understand correctly. Have we collected data -- oh this just with the brand name. How many years we collected the individual data?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We haven't collected any information-

MR. ASP: So.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- for kindergarten school readiness yet.
MR. ASP: So any of our outside stakeholders have never had access to this data before?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

MR. ASP: Okay. That changes the conversation.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They have other -- they've had other data but not this.

MR. ASP: We'll have -- we'll have an immediate conversation about this tomorrow. Maybe not tomorrow because we'll get through this over again, but if -- we need to be focused on the outcomes, and the use of -- what are we trying to get? And I appreciate the experts that are in the room that have done this for two three decades. There have to be additional ways. Understanding where -- I was on the strong opinions of six women on this Board and one guy. Steve left me alone. But -- but it's important to us also. So we'll come back to you quickly while I await for the next Board meeting but we'll have an email to you shortly. And I do want to visit with the experts in the room on this topic, and see what is their biggest name.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Scheffel.

MS. SCHEFFEL: You know, I think the linchpin issue is that districts, and schools do not have to report PII data to the state. And you notice there's
hardly any parents here. We don't have a lot of parent advocacy groups that represent their voices. It's their students data that gets reported, if it gets reported, and I want to find a solution that allows us to meet their needs. I -- I don't want to be saluting the needs of stakeholder groups. I want to be saluting the needs of parents, and their children. And I don't want a sales job from the Department of Education. Though I appreciate the work, and I appreciate the -- the thoughtful slides and such, but we've seen this before. We've gone through this before. I apologize that it keeps surfacing again, but we're not getting any good solutions to the problem, which is we do not need to report PPI data to the state.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But there might be.

MS. SCHEFFEL: And we can surface issues of it's too hard for the schools, the databases. All those things are handle-able, and we know it. So I'd like to have a clear discussion, and solutions for parents who stand to lose the most from exposing these data.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There may be some more PII data that we can remove from this, and still allow for the research, so that the kids, we've already taken up the name. There may be some other things to take off, but still share the data in a way that the kind of research that we want to see whether we're making improvement for
kids can be generated. I mean, I think that's there's no
body that has any ill intent here.

MS. SCHEFFEL: But let me make a point on research. To say that shining a flashlight on this is going to create gains hasn't been a great strategy in the past. I mean, it sounds intuitively good if we only have data. We can show the problems, we can fix them. We have the longest longitudinal database, one of the longest, and most robust in the nation. And just having that database has not resulted in raising student achievement. So now we're pushing it down to younger more vulnerable kids. Now we're raising the stakes on the nature of the data across multiple categories: social, emotional. I mean, very sensitive information. I've seen the rubrics on this. And

--

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What your solution?

MS. SCHEFFEL: -- I'm not.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's your solution then?

MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't want to support people. I don't want to report PII data to the state.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's the solution here?

MS. SCHEFFEL: The aggregate data percent of students ready. Period. I'm -- I'm sorry that entities
can't do research. I care more about the parents rights, and the protection of the child's privacy. And I think that's what the parents want, and we keep looking at these solutions to meet the needs of the state. I don't think that's our first priority.

MR. ASP: Ma'am chair, I'm gonna have to say something. I need a perspective just a little bit on this in that, and this comes from my years as a lawmaker. There are -- we spend billions of dollars in this area of taxpayer money. I -- I -- I don't agree with the concept that there has been no evidence come from a long term marginal database.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's true.

MR. ASP: You know, there has been some significant research. There have been findings, there have been -- there are people doing good work around this. I respect greatly the opinions of all of you on this Board. And I always will. But there is a duty, and obligation as elected officials to make sure that taxpayer dollars are spent where they deliver the greatest bang. And if we do no research, if we do no fact finding, then it's hard for us to connect those dots. And I think it can be done in a way that satisfies most. But there are certain parents, and I am one of them, who do not have a problem with my
child's data being reported at a -- at a level where I --
we can make smart decisions about my tax payer dollars go.

MS. SCHEFFEL: May I -- may I respond?

MR. ASP: Of course you can.

MS. SCHEFFEL: And so I think that as a
parent in your local district, you'll see that data. I'm --
- I'm raising the issue of reporting it to the state. And
I also know that you can have that data as a parent, but it
doesn't need to be held at the state level as PII data.
There's just no reason for it.

MR. ASP: I -- I'd have to I'd have had
prospect Madam Chair just, the taxpayer money is at the
state level. The majority of it. There's -- there's a
local component, but we're making decisions at a macro
level.

MS. SCHEFFEL: Let me respond. And the
state can -- the state can get -- can get data based on
percent of kids ready for kindergarten. That is enough to
drive policy. We do not need individual metrics on kids.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we do this time?

MR. ASP: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because I'm going to
start getting nervous now. Pardon.

MR. ASP: We have two hours.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have two hours. We may have a public too. That's going to really get mad at us. Fourteen point zero one Maybe we could really note this one out in a hurry. This is about notice of rule making. We do not need to make decisions today. Fourteen zero one. Page 23 for us. So a motion that one of you might want to make is a move to approve the notice of rule making for the school Bullying Prevention, and Education Grant Program pursuant to Section 29-93-102 CRS. Please remember folks, I hope one of you is willing to own that motion. Please remember that this does not mean that we have solved all the concerns that we had the last time about what is the definition of bullying, et cetera. But is there anyone willing to make that motion? So we can -- so we can move.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have to make a motion before we can talk about it?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. That's what I'm asking for.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, I'll make a motion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: By second.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fantastic. Go ahead with pass.
MS. MAZANEC: Okay, so I just a few questions on this. One of them is that, you know, bullying is -- and prevention has been a big concern, right? But so we have this legislation that creates a grant and districts can apply for it. You can spend funds to try to educate students, educate parents and then they report back to the state how they think they -- you know, this has made a difference. Improved diminished bullying, whatever. How many districts still have zero tolerance policies? And for those that do, how can any anti bullying really make a difference when the victim is ultimately found to be as guilty as the perpetrator through zero tolerance policies? They say, you know, if you get involved in an altercation with another child, it doesn't matter who -- who started it. Both of you are in trouble.

MR. ASP: Yes, that's -- it's a terrific question. Let me break it up a little bit. The first is zero tolerance. How many districts are still doing that across the country frankly, not just in districts, and it's actually been, I don't know if want to work this way, but almost Albany to do zero tolerance because zero tolerance policies have actually demonstrated increased vandalism, increased truancy, increased dropout, and increased problem behavior. So even at the -- even at the federal level,
zero tolerance is being pushed out as an option for schools.

MS. SCHEFFEL: So do we know, in Colorado most districts aren't -- aren't --

MR. ASP: I don't think.

MS. SCHEFFEL: -- exercising zero tolerance anymore.

MR. ASP: I don't think any district can argue that they are -- would say that are doing it anymore. Now, there will, you will find schools here, and there who still exercise strategies that look very similar to a zero tolerance policy. Does that -- does that make sense? So there's -- there's -- there's the policy where we are a zero tolerance district. That is no longer allowed. However, you do see some schools exercising strategies that look similar to zero tolerance.

MS. SCHEFFEL: You were going to say something.

MS. MAZANECC: So one thing we can do is actually come back, and answer that question for you, and one of the things that we have provided in your materials is actually just what we have in terms of information around, the data the districts are required to submit in relation to suspension, and expulsion. And within there, there's information about, you'll see that there's a
category that's called detrimental behavior. And so there's not a lot of -- there's not a lot of information that the department collects, or that we ask of districts to say what's happening around, specifically around bullying because it's within this larger category. So there's some -- there's some questions and some information that we just won't be able to necessarily answer for you.

MS. SCHEFFEL: Follow up to that which was in my notes. That's one of the other questions I have is that with the Safe Schools report and if -- if -- if I remember correctly schools are actually, I hate to say punished, but counted against for reporting of certain incidents, correct? So I think that -- that's another issue is what -- what are we seeing there when, how anxious are schools to report incidents like this, and they put it into the safe category of other detrimental behavior. What effect?

MR. ASP: It's a tough question to answer.

MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, actually it was a very bad question.

MR. ASP: But I think I touch on it. So here's what.

MS. MAZANEC: I mean, mostly is was wondering about how they report and the effect on that which is sort of a side issue to this bullying.
MR. ASP: So the effect of having to report on their own behavior. And we've looked at their records both before, and after they had to report detrimental behavior, and there isn't a major shift. There isn't a major change.

MS. MAZANEC: Like four categories there at the bond, the three of the last four categories are kind of fuzzy.

MR. ASP: There are a lot -- there's a lot of fuzzy, and it's very.

MS. MAZANEC: They can choose how, so if they have 20 bad incidences, they don't specifically fit into the really detrimental areas. They can split them up into those three.

MR. ASP: There are a lot of challenges related to that. And you hit the nail on the head with regards to there is just naturally as somebody who has to report problematic problems in the school, there is an incentive to not do that especially when the definition of detrimental behavior can include so many things. And that's actually in one of the great questions that was raised last time. There were a few really good questions that were raised last time as well. If you would give me a couple of moments, we've started to try to address those questions, and -- and as we're moving forward, and this is
just a notice for hearing, and I hope I look forward to the
opportunity to really delve into this. Because the -- the
things you brought up last time when we spoke, our major
concern is not just for you there. I've been doing
research in this area for over a decade, and there are
major concerns for me as well. So I'd love to touch on
that just a few of those specific items, but I do want to
just remember to come back to the fact this is notice of
hearing.

   MS. MAZANEC: Right.

   MR. ASP: And it's not actually delving into
   all these details.

   MS. MAZANEC: Right. Which is what we
   wanted to accomplish, and I am glad to. I'm sorry I didn't
   say this. If you have a presentation just please note that
   we're feeling a little pressed.

   MS. SCHEFFEL: So how -- what time frame
   would make sense for you?

   MS. MAZANEC: Go for -- to the best you can
   to make.

   MR. ASP: Okay.

   MS. MAZANEC: Is that fair?

   MR. ASP: Speed talk. Here we go. All
   right. Question number one that you had last time we spoke
   was around the definition of bullying. The definition of
bullying is known to be subjective in general. Can you
move through this slide. Thank you. The definition of
bullying is known to be subjective. We've met with legal
counsel to try to make some modifications, and by the way
we do have some say over the definition of bullying for
this grant program. For this grant program, we have some
say in what the definition is. We've made some slight
modifications, very slight but we're hoping to get out of
subjectivity that you've brought up as a concern.

MS. MAZANEC: The one -- the one caveat, and
I'll have to that is keep in mind that any program rules
that the state Board adopts has to pass the kind of review
process of the Office of Legal Legislative Services, and
they -- they compare rule against statute. So -- so what
you'll see is a very slight modification of bullying as it
exists in Colorado statute. And so I just wanted to make
sure that there's not a lot of water from the air like
subject, and there will -- it will be subject, any change
that you make will be subject to that review. So it's
probably best not to make wholesale change.

MS. SCHEFFEL: So the rules that you sent us
this time are they, have you guys started your
modifications?

MR. ASP: We have made some basic
modifications especially to this definition. We don't
bring your attention to because I'm talking is the underlying component of the definition. Those are the only components that have changed based on our conversation, and really what it brings up is a reasonable person would believe, and I'm not a lawyer, I would have Tony speak to the value of adding that component to the definition.

MR. DILL: One of the concerns raised by the Board was that the definition of bullying was inherently subjective and -- and could -- could be implemented in a way that would -- that would identify actions as bully had no intention to bully.

MR. DILL: It seemed to me that one way to -- to change that would be to make the definition an objective standard. To give you a concrete example, let's say there is an extremely friendly person who goes up, and talks to the new kid and unfortunately, the -- the new kid has severe problems with anxiety, and -- and sincerely, and honestly believes that they have just in some way been attacked. Well, this would, yeah, this -- this would be the definition of bullying would not be based on the student's subjective experiences, but would be an objective standard. It could be, it could be implemented by school staff. So that's one of the major -- major shifts. It is -- it is not a big change and again, we -- we can delve into this definition even more as we go through this
process and I look forward to doing that with you. The only -- only other small change we made was rather than, underlined here in denied, we changed that from infringe upon and the purpose of that is that the definition, and -- and to make it very clear that the definition is not intended to deny any right guaranteed to any person by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, and shall not be used to prevent expression of religious, political and philosophical views.

So the purpose again, is simply to make it slightly more objective. All right. If there's no question, I'm gonna move to the next point which we actually already somewhat discussed, which was how it is currently reported? And Pam Mazanec, you asked a great question, and -- and I hope we at least started to touch you on an answer to how we are currently reporting bullying in the state. And the fact that we don't know the specific number of incidents that are currently happening, we have this detrimental behavior. So it's very difficult for us to really understand how many incidents of bullying happened this month through this year, over, and so forth. Okay. I'm gonna to move to the next one. Now, what I, yes, please.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, can you just say where the definition came from, or comes from?
MR. DILL: The definition was developed here in Colorado through a vetting process.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's in statute.

MR. DILL: It's in statute.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the exact language on the previous slide is in statute. Is that right?

MR. DILL: The -- the -- everything but the underlying component is what is in statute.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where is the underlying component?

MR. DILL: Can you go back? Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Look at your (inaudible) here.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know, I'm looking at

MR. DILL: So the --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So how many lines are the underlying components?

MR. DILL: The underlying component is a reasonable person would believe that part is not in statute.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

MR. DILL: And then deny is not in statute. Instead, in statute is infringe upon, is the wording in statute. So I think we made --
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How can -- how can you change language in statute? Just adding --

MR. DILL: Withholding the -- from the -- from my understanding, within the Bullying Prevention Program itself, we do have some room for making modifications to the definitions.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can we further adjust this definition?

MR. DILL: Yes, I believe so. And -- and that's one of the goals once we get into a hearing, to -- to really get into it, because there's a lot of -- a lot of concern on both sides about what is in this definition (inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, there are guidelines around how we can adjust this definition.

MR. DILL: Oh, is that --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you think that we could probably defer to Mr. Dill on that question just because this would have to pass from a review process. So there's -- there's probably gonna be some type parameters on how far.

MR. DILL: Well, I -- I think that is correct and the -- the short -- the short answer is you -- you have as much leeway as the General Assembly allows you to have, in the form of its Legislative Legal Services
Committee, when -- when they've reviewed these rules. I --
I --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it might be that
even with this additional language that's underlined, they
may reject it?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's entirely possible,
but I think with the additional language, we can go in and
make a strong -- strong argument about why this -- this
would be an important addition to the regulations, and in
fact to clarify the extent of -- of -- of this program.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

MR. DILL: Okay. I'm gonna keep going. And
we talked a little bit about how it is reported currently.
I'm gonna move very quickly through some of the statistics,
because there has been -- was indicated a concern that
bullying actually isn't really an issue in the state. And
I wanna to make sure that we're all on the same page that
it is a real problem, and it's not just boys will be boys.
And so what I've done here is I've listed numerous studies
demonstrating just how big of a problem bullying actually
is across the country. Nearly 30 percent of kids
indicating that they're involved, and that number actually
ranges from about 12.5 percent up to 80 percent depending
on how I ask the question.
That is one of the things that I'm looking forward to getting into. A lot of kids are indicating that they are missing school everyday because of issues, we have lower rates of involvement in school, we have less academically-engaged kids, so -- and -- and we're getting lower academic scores because of kids experiencing bullying, we get into longer term anxiety externalizing behavior, we get more drop out, et cetera. We actually found that kids who are just bystanders, not the victims, not necessarily the bullies, but even the bystanders are being severely impacted by this. So the point of all of these data, the point of all this finding is simply that bullying is a real issue. And it is not just part of growing up, and it does have a major impact in the long term outcomes of students across the country. Okay, I'm gonna keep going.

One -- one more major thing. My work in this area actually began about eight -- nine years ago when we ran one of the first meta-analysis on Bullying Prevention Programs. What we were trying to do is figure out, do Bullying Prevention Programs work? Do they not work? When do they not work? Why don't they work? Here's what we found. And this was actually the first meta-analysis demonstrating that it can have negative effects. It was -- it was in 2008 we've discovered that Bullying
Prevention Programs only have a positive impact to around 30.66 percent of variables. So in a lot of cases, it wasn't working. A lot of cases, bullying prevention was not working, all right? And in fact, when we looked at when does it work, we found that most of the time, Bullying Prevention Programs really only have an effect on kids thinking they know what they're supposed to do, right? I tell a kid, when you're bullied, this is what I want you to do, and then after the study, I'm gonna ask you again, do you know what you're supposed to do? And the kid says, "Oh yeah, I know what I'm supposed to do now." Does that make sense so far?

However, when I actually go into the playground and I watch, you know, the number of incidents don't actually change very much, all right? So that's why we -- we started to question, the value of Bullying Prevention Research, by the end, if it can be effective and if it cannot. Now, what we found, was there are five major reasons and I keep looking back at the slide. Five major reasons that -- that we get these negative effects or these non-effects, all right? But I do wanna bring -- bring light to it can work and it does work in many cases. I have -- have had experience with over a thousand schools doing it very effectively. So let me just point out these problems very briefly. Feel free to ask questions about
them. Number one, the biggest problem one of the biggest
problems in Bullying Prevention Programs is they do a zero-
tolerance thing, right? They blame the bully. I'm gonna
catch you being the bully, and then I'm gonna get you in
trouble. And those have, across the Board, demonstrated
non-effects. Right?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I mean, my
understanding of zero-tolerance is exactly the opposite.
You could never just punish the bully, you have to punish
the victim.

MR. DILL: You end -- you end up punishing
the victim as well? Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was -- it was always
a two-way street. Yes, you know.

MR. DILL: So it has that dual effect.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry if the bully hit
you first but because you're involved in altercation,
you're in trouble too.

MR. DILL: Yeah, absolutely. And that zero-
tolerance has both of those effects. One, we blame the
bully. But you're absolutely right. The victim becomes
victimized if you will. So it's actually both -- both --
two problems related to that same issue. Two, we actually
have -- there's so many -- so many, many programs of such
an emphasis on teaching bullying, that they may actually
giving -- be giving kids more ideas, right, on what they can try. Number three, there tends to be an -- an -- an inadvertent reinforcement of the bullying, which means this. If -- if Johnny, and Sally, Johnny is picking on Sally, and I say, "Johnny, you better shake her hand, right? And say you're sorry." That actually gives more attention to the issue.

And so many studies have indicated that, or give -- give me another example. I'm gonna take all the bullies in the school, and I'm gonna put them in a classroom and I'm gonna tell them, and talk to them about what they did, right? And they're gonna talk about being a bully. You're in actually giving attention to the problem resulting in what's called pure deviance training where kids are actually learning from each other what they can try. You -- you follow them, it's very easy to do this wrong, which is why it is so important that we ensure that it's done right.

And then quickly, number four, oftentimes, programs disregard, or don't recognize just how powerful bystanders are. If there is one thing that I would ask that you would understand about bullying is that fundamentally, it is driven by the attention of other kids. Laughing, joining in, cheering it on fight, fight, fight, that sort of thing. It is fundamentally driven by the
other kids in the school. And then lastly, many Bullying Prevention Programs have been done through grants, and that they don't last. And that they don't take specific steps to ensure it's done sustainably in the school. So once the grant money goes away, everything goes away, and it doesn't work anymore. So those are the big problems.

Now, there are solutions. Bullying prevention can be very effective. And not to toot my own program's horn, but we've had demonstrations of 72 percent reductions in actual incidents of bullying in hundreds of schools. So it can be done right. And here -- and that's -- this is one of the reasons we wanna -- when we do this Grant Program, it's going to be essential, that we are very specific about what components need to be in there, and what components don't need to be in there. And here's what we find, there are four things. One, we're actually going to fit bullying prevention within what's called a tiered framework. What I mean by that, is that we have tiers of support at the lowest level.

Tier one are things we do for all the kids in the school. What are simple, simple, and efficient strategies that we can do in the school that don't take a lot of effort for teachers but have a significant reduction in the number of kids needing lots of support around bullying? Then you move up a tier, for some kids who are
still needing extra help. Sometimes it's kids who are picked on a lot, sometimes it's kids who are starting to exhibit lots of problem behavior. We go into what we call tier two, or targeted support where we add a little bit of extra help. And then we always have one to five percent of kids in schools needing that highest level of need. And those are the kids we've considered getting tier three support. So we're gonna fit bullying prevention within a tiered framework. And we've -- we've seen major effects from doing that, especially around the idea of sustainability.

Two, we actually come up with strategies in bullying prevention that gets that bullying before it would reach this high criteria of -- of a major incident of bullying. So we actually want kids to prevent it before they would ever call it bullying. Three, we're gonna address that bystander attention that tends to fuel the problem behavior. Peer tension is the -- the basis of this, peer tension is fundamentally fueling bullying behaviors. So we're gonna come up with strategies that target that, not target-blaming the bully, or victimizing the victim, we're gonna focus efforts, or we have focused efforts on getting peers to no longer join in, cheer it on, fight back, that sort of thing, all right. And that's where we're finding the effects. And then lastly, of
course, we need schools to be doing things that can actually be sustainable beyond the life of a grant period. Are there any questions about any of those? I know that was a lot of content, a lot of information.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any quick questions?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Quick question. So as I understand, the grant only will be used for research-based, what's the terminology? You always use that.

MR. DILL: Evidence-based practices.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Proven, tried, and true. So --

MR. DILL: Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So how many are there of those? And -- and what kind of -- what kind of time, and I mean, you were sort of talking about what works, and I assume that there are --

MR. DILL: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- some of those --

MR. DILL: There are -- there are tried, and true, and there are evidence-based practices around bullying. We have a list of about five, or six that we currently have on the website, that we at CDE are recommending folks do because they have the most research supporting their effectiveness over long periods of time, and -- and using different criteria for evidence-based.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this grant is for -

MR. DILL: One to three years. Schools will apply for the money for any of those periods.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about the statute? Is the grant -- is the grant money on going into infinity?

MR. DILL: That's a great question. As far as we know.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is an ongoing appropriation.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the Marijuana money, right?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, this is the proposition BB.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's going into infinity.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Keep buying that stuff.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Keep doing my part.

MR. DILL: Yes, absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think what we just, could -- could Jane ask the question? (Inaudible) thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

MS. GOFF: He would always has to say it's related. Is there a -- a particular grade level, or does I
-- I tried to find it in here. I didn't wanna ask what's already been said, but elementary, geared, focused?

MR. DILL: It's that grant elementary gear? Or are you --

MS. GOFF: Grade -- grade level, or level. It's just an elementary -- focused idea, or anything?

MR. DILL: So let me -- let me rephrase. I'm not quite understanding. Are -- are you asking is the grant targeted at a certain grade only?

MS. GOFF: Yeah. Well not -- not -- well actually, more of a program.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any program?

MS. GOFF: The kind -- a good evidence-based program is this -- are we thinking of possibilities at all levels?

MR. DILL: Yes.

MS. GOFF: Including early childhood --

MR. DILL: Well there are --

MS. GOFF: -- which could be something.

MR. DILL: Yeah, yeah, absolutely. There isn't a lot of demonstrated effective programs at the early childhood level 'cause frankly, we often see bullying really start to take root in third grade. So most programs either target elementary, middle, or high school. Several
programs have been demonstrated to be effective in multiple.

MS. GOFF: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The other -- Well, we tied in, I guess, a little bit. Are you aware, or have you seen any proven programs, where part of -- one the components that is drawn into it, is more counselors, is actually counselors. One thing Colorado doesn't have is counselors at the elementary level.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there's been a lot of wonder about why we don't have certain incidents.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think it's a great -- I think it's a great question. You know what it comes back to? Is it comes back to that tiered model support. So again, when you think of tiered, we think of initially universal things we can do with the whole school, right? Simple, efficient things that we can get to have a big effect. Let me just give you an example. I'm going to tell every kid in the school, if somebody is disrespectful towards you, or somebody else, everybody in the schools is going to use this stop word. It can be stop, enough, quit it, over the line, school comes up with what they think works best.
Simple, simple strategy. Every kid in the school uses this language, and has a hand signal. Very simple, big effects. If we got to a second tier, it's things like working on social skills with a kid who's struggling. That's where the counselors really come into play. Yes, there have been studies demonstrating the effectiveness of programs specifically for those kids. But it's that -- but that's why it's important to think of it in this tiered framework, because there are strategies here that are effective, there are strategies here that are effective, and then there are strategies there that are effective.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanna -- I just wanna be able to -- as we get this going, making great use of money, we never think we have, but that people are aware of, there are a lot of ways that you can find -- there are lots of ways that can be called best practice, evidence-based practices, and that -- that we don't have to say to people, this doesn't include any personnel. This is just program, but it's giving everyone permission to think in terms of experts, we trained educators who can be a part of this, this particular role. So you know, we're not just talking off the shelf possibilities here, and stuff. So --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, and I -- I -- I -- to -- to personally answer your question, in statute
there's a definition of what we mean by evidence-based practice. And so that's clearly delineated there. I think to your second point about having educators involved in the process, it is not just, let's go on Google, and buy the program, and then plug it in, because that does not result in sustained practice. Which is one of the reasons that it's so important for us to have the rules that ensure that they're actually going to, not just buy a program, that they're actually going to go to work and ensure that -- that they're there making -- ensuring that it's actually being implemented for a long period of time. They have infrastructure to do so.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it works with their local school culture --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. It has got it fit their local content --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The community, and culture that they have?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it's got to have what we call contextual fit. It's got to fit the -- the context that they're in.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Melissa, I did cut you off, sorry.

MS. STEELE: So now, I was just going to say, I -- I -- I recognize we're on a time crunch. I'm --
I'm glad you had an opportunity to hear, because as you know -- as you can tell, this is an area passion for staff.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He doesn't care at all.

MS. STEELE: Not at all?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

MS. STEELE: And you can also tell that he -- that he really is a national expert on bullying.

So as we are designing the rules for the grant program, what we want to be able to do, is make sure that -- that you're feeling really comfortable with what's in there, so that the best use of funds to benefit kids is the outcome of this. I'm just really quickly, a few things that were questions that kind of came up in -- in the past. I know that the -- the board is always concerned with wanting to make sure that the rules are in close alignment with statutes, so we provided a crosswalk for you, between the statute, and the rules to show the relationship between those. So that's part of your materials, and part of your deliberative process. Mr. Durham had asked about the use of student surveys, and wanted to see some examples of what might be available. We've put in the -- within the grant programs that we would provide examples of high quality surveys to use.

We've given just two examples within your materials because Mr. Durham wanted to see those. There
was a question about ongoing funding of the grant program. And again, that just came up, so there -- it is an ongoing appropriation. Mr. Durham had asked about the eligibility for grant funds, and the statute does indicate that this is for public schools, and facilities schools or groups of public schools. So those are the only recipients of this grant program. And he had asked a little bit about the -- the size, and number of grants. Depending on the size of the grant. Obviously the bigger the grant, the fewer that we can offer. But if we were to go with a $50,000 to $75,000 grant, we could potentially find somewhere from 25 to 35 grant programs. But again, we would kind of get into that level of detail, as we start to look at some of the factors of, how do we make sure that we're going to be able to make a difference.

We could give every school in the state a couple of dollars, it's not going to do much, but everybody would get something. But we would instead want to make sure that we are going to be able to fund programs that we know are going to get results in a wide variety of -- of schools across the state. So that is just very briefly, and hopefully answering some of the questions that you have. And as Dr. Schroeder indicated today is a notice of rulemaking, we're asking you that you would notice rulemaking. This would allow, if you would like, if
there's any information that you would like us to bring
back to the March meeting we can do so. But that would
mean rulemaking would happen in April. And if the vote is
unanimous, they could be adopted in April. Otherwise we
would go until May. We do need to indicate that the -- the
State Board is required to promulgate rules within 90 days
of receiving funds, which happened on January 1st. So
we're going be slightly out of compliance with state
statute. But I think we're making good effort to meet that
statutory requirement.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I suggest that maybe
if folks have questions that we give them directly to -- to
you Melissa before the next Board meeting?

MS. STEELE: And between now, and then there
will be public comment.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Will there be a hearing
--

MS. STEELE: Provided?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- in April. Right?

MS. STEELE: Or will it be after -- That
will -- sorry to always ask us about rulemaking.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So as soon as
rulemaking is noticed, that's when the official public
comment period start. So the public as soon as you vote,
the public can start submitting.
MS. STEELE: Can starts sending?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. And again we don't need to come back in March. We can come back in March. But --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Let's see if you all have questions, and let Steve, and me know if you want it back in March to talk about it, or whether the hearing in April is sufficient. I guess my question is, is this unanimous, the call for the rulemaking? Anybody object. Done. So I realize we've not had a break.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As soon as we are seven, we'll vote

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, six hours.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You spoke a little too soon.

MS. STEELE: Guys, I realize we really do need a break. However, we also, I believe, have a superintendent, or a principal.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, if you give us 15.01, it will be very clear.

MS. STEELE: Which one's -- well, I have 15.02, I have somebody here for, I think. Am I wrong?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No you are correct.

But I think what Board Member Mazanec was -- is she kind of got clarification on the -- on.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 15.01?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Sorry, we need a quick vote.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was that the JeffCo one?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And I -- and I mentioned this. If I may make a comment on that. I thought it was a really good idea that JeffCo had.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I did too.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I wondered whether we shouldn't at some point talk about that. I think it's in -- I think the schedule is in legislation, but maybe we should ask the Legislature to give districts a different schedule, so they have more time. Because I've heard from other charter schools that it is such a compressed time period. But then they're scurrying around. So that might be a discussion that we'd like to have.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we doing 15.01 now?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Do you have a motion?
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I would just move to approve this. My only concern about this, which I think Gretchen; she's not here, is she?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's on her way up.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To Gretchen, we can ask her about. But my -- my concern about the waiver request, I think it is, I agree, I think it is a very good idea to move the charter application window to the spring, gives them more time. My only concern about the waiver right now is that any -- any charter school applications currently in process in JeffCo be allowed to use that fall application process this year. So they're not stopped until --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. There's actually something -- no, there's actually something in there that allows the board --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I know.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- to give them more time, and I'm assuming --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If they -- if they agree on waivers. But I just want to make sure that -- that no charter, that's in the works right now will be denied the ability to make an application in August.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can. Yeah, hi.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hi. Welcome.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Tim meant from the district also has come. He is at the back there. And so in talking to Tim earlier, he said that, yes, it is the intention of the district to make sure that anyone in the pipeline now who wants that fall window does have access to that window.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great, great, because we wouldn't wanna stop any -- any forward movement until next February. But I think the spring meeting is great.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Pam made -- Pam made a motion, do I have a second?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five second.


UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: See fast how that was?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was wonderful.

Thank you. So 15.02, do we have someone here. This is another waiver?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the innovation plan.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Innovation, sorry. Innovation. You know, I have so lost my papers.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is 15.02.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I know.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just find the paper that 15.02.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I go from 14 to 16. I don't know what happened. Here it is. Whoa, fantastic. So thank you for coming. And do you want to speak to my -- question, sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A little recollection that will help.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, that will probably help.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair. So this group is here to present to you a plan for an Innovation School. As you probably recall, the first time a district seeks innovation status for a school, they need to come and present to you as a board because they also earned the designation of a District of Innovation upon their first school being designated that way. So this is the process.

MS. STEELE: That's a surprise to me. I did not know that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we'll see.

MS. STEELE: Wow, you know, District of Innovation.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if this is the future were to seek an innovation plan for an additional
school, you may all put that on a consent agenda, if you choose to do so. But the first time you need to actually hear from them. And there was a question raised by Vice Chair Schroeder, prior to the meeting about one of your waivers. I think you are prepared to speak to that and maybe forward if you would like to. So I know you are ready to have that conversation.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for coming.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just had a little trouble understanding it. So if you'll clarify it, that'll be wonderful.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would say make your opening remarks and then address that.

MS. VSETECKA: Well, thanks for having us. My name is Tracy Vsetecka, and I'm the principal at Talbott. This is Michelle Gloria, the Assistant Principal in Scott Campbell is our superintendent. So when we reflect back on considering innovation status, it has been an exciting event for us. Talbott really wanted to provide choice for our families, for the whole community, for our parents, and Talbott has been the science focus school for the district for 11 years. But what we realized coming in was we needed something different to make some additional changes. And so we gathered together of teachers, and
formed a strategic school design team, and that began in July.

We both are new to the school this year. So it was adventure from the get go. So that began in July, and then through the entire fall, we were visiting schools, we were researching, and what we fell upon at the end was that STEAM was gonna best fit our needs. And so throughout the fall, the teachers on the team communicated with staff, and with parents during open house, during parent teacher conferences, during community meetings, during STEM evening events, really to let them know where we were in the process, and to get feedback. And that was kind of an exciting thing because I -- I think oftentimes families feel like change has happened and it's like, oh, I didn't know, and this -- so it was a fun event for all of us.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you explain what STEAM is in case there is somebody who hasn't heard that terminology.

MS. VSETECKA: Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math. So we wanted to add that artistic element.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good. Thanks. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're seeking several waivers. From the state waivers, we're looking for scheduling counter, educational programming, and choice of
programs in the schools within districts. And then the district waivers are also a school calendar instructional time, selection of instructional materials, grading, and assessment systems, student wellness, naming of the school, professional development, and inter-district -- district choice and open enrollment. And that's the one that there was a concern about. So we'll address that briefly.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not at the district level.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, at the state level.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I had no -- I had -- that's up to your district. Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Perfect.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Several others got confused about the state one because we -- we were confused.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So overall --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, you are confused about what?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: State, and district levels.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You want to share it?

It's also on Page 12.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we actually wrote an addendum to clarify our intent.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What did they receive?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you say you receive the addendum?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bizy, did they get addendum? Kelly just got it yesterday.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So I think --

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to be sure, that's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, perfect. So what we're looking for with the waiving the state statute 22-36-101(5) was considering the students choice into our building. We want them to be held accountable for their appropriate behavior and attendance. So currently, when a student choices in, the district practice is to keep the student until the age out of our building. What we would like to do is, if they dropped below 90 percent, or their behaviors are negatively impacting the learning, that we can revoke their choice enrollment before they age out. So within that year, preferably at the end of the year, is what we were looking for. And this is the intent, is to create a school partnership between the students who are choosing in, and their families.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But is that actually in -- in state statute?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think that's -- that's where we may have had some misunderstanding. It's our district policy, and practice to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Right. So it makes sense -- it makes sense later on.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Perfect.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so then we just need to drop the state statute one, correct?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you would.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If that's -- if that's the only thing you are referring to, because it suggests to the novice reader, and I'll -- I'll bear that label, that the state requires 95 percent attendance, and you only require 90 percent. It just misled a few of us. And so if you're fine with that, I am certainly fine with that, and I congratulate you on your efforts. I think this is very exciting.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It has been exciting.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's been so exciting.
UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A break from motion.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Vice Chair, just if I may, just procedurally, when you all make promotion if you make the note that it is the amended plan. And if you all would just provide us with an updated waiver, and replace the plan document so we can just upload that in the (inaudible), that would be great.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do I have somebody who will make the motion? Pam, thank you.

MS. MAZANECE: I move that we approve the innovation plan, the amended innovation plan, it will be provided.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Second.

Deb, thanks. Any objection? Go forth. Thank you. Thanks for waiting.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

MS. MAZANECE: You can come back tomorrow. We'll be here.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's happening again.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Guys, five minute break. Yes, I know. I'm sorry.

(Meeting adjourned)
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