



Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

**January 11, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2**

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on January 11, 2017,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

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

1 MR. DURHAM: You have to learn  
2 to share. Okay.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So, first item would be item  
4 17.01.

5 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: This is disciplinary  
7 proceedings concerning EOC case number ED2015-0003. Is there  
8 a motion?

9 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

11 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move to  
12 remand item 17.01 to the administrative law judge for  
13 further proceedings and instruct the administrative law  
14 judge to hold a hearing on the merits of the case.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Proper motion; is  
16 there a second?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

18 UNKNOWN VOICE: Everybody seconds.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I think we should call the  
20 vote please instead.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham.

22 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores.

24 MS. FLORES: Yes.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.

1 MS. GOFF: Yes.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan.

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin.

7 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: And Board member Schroeder.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Next item, I hope, is  
10 13.01.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, this is, okay.

13 Commissioner, let me turn this over to you please.

14 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you Madam Chair. I'd  
15 like to invite Melissa Kollsman and Carol Gates to the  
16 table. This is our standards review and revision process  
17 update and we've been continually giving you all sort of how  
18 we're going to go about this and seeking your feedback on  
19 the process. And so with this, I'm going to turn it over to  
20 Melissa Kollsman and Carol Gates.

21 MS. KOLLSMAN: Good afternoon and thank you.  
22 So for our agenda item today I'm -- I will introduce myself.  
23 My name is Melissa Kollsman. I oversee the division of  
24 student learning and joining me today is Carol Gates who  
25 oversees our standards and instructional support office.

1                   Our purpose today is to provide an update on  
2 the standards review and revision process for you. You  
3 should have some materials as part of your package. One is a  
4 copy of that presentation. You should also have a copy of  
5 the kind of the overview proposal for the standards review  
6 and revision process.

7                   In November, we looked at a couple of pieces  
8 of this where our intention is to bring forward different  
9 components of this to you over the next few months for your  
10 feedback and for your guidance. You should also have a copy  
11 of the results of our standards perception survey and I  
12 believe you may also have a copy of the actual survey tool  
13 itself.

14                   So those will be referenced throughout our  
15 presentation today. Our purpose for you- for our time  
16 together today is first of all, to orient state board  
17 members to the standards review and revision plan. We  
18 haven't been to the- before the board since November on this  
19 and we also have welcomed a new board member today.

20                   We will also provide an update on our  
21 stakeholder engagement that we've been working through these  
22 last few months. First of all, is the stammerers perception  
23 survey. We'll be able to go through some of the results of  
24 that. We'll also be able talk a little bit about the online  
25 standards review system and how the participation on that

1 has been and the type of information that we're able to gain  
2 from that.

3                   And finally, we would like to solicit your  
4 feedback on the upcoming committee application process. So  
5 we'll start with an overview of the standards review and  
6 revision process. At this point, if there's- the best  
7 document to reference at this point would be the proposal  
8 for the Colorado Academic Standards Review and Revision.

9                   Plan that you have as part of your materials.  
10 We'll be looking to the state board to guide on each stage  
11 of the standards review and revision process and I am  
12 pleased to continue that today.

13                   So, just as a- a grounding and orientation of  
14 the rationale for this, really comes from Senate bill 212  
15 which passed in 2008; Colorado's achievement plan for kids,  
16 cap for K. It requires a regular review of the Colorado  
17 academic standards and that is to occur every six years with  
18 the first review occurring on or before July 1, 2018.

19                   Just as a quick reminder, this is not related  
20 to our ESSA state plan development process. This is a  
21 completely state driven process. At our November meeting, we  
22 had an opportunity to go over the guiding principles for the  
23 standard to review and revision process.

24                   You'll find those both on the slide and on  
25 the first page of the proposal for the review plan. The

1 guiding principles that we have proposed are that the  
2 process be transparent, that the department make every  
3 effort to ensure that decisions for the processes for the  
4 review and the revision are public.

5           That it be inclusive, that we would strive to  
6 engage key stakeholders in each phase of the review and  
7 revision process, and there would be opportunity for  
8 substantial and frequent opport- opportunities for the  
9 public to weigh in. There will be research informed that  
10 throughout the process, we would base any recommendations we  
11 bring before you or our committees that they be based on  
12 research, lessons learned from other states and objective  
13 third party reviews, that the process be consistent with  
14 statutory requirements, that it be substantive, that it  
15 would focus on the substance of- of the actual standards  
16 themselves, and that they be improvement oriented.

17           On- on Page 18, you don't necessarily have to  
18 turn there if you don't want to at this moment. I will just  
19 let you know that one of the questions that we asked during  
20 our standards perception survey was related to these guiding  
21 principles.

22           And I'll just give you a sneak peek, it's  
23 actually slide 18 and Page 18 of your- your report on the  
24 survey outcomes. The respondents- 90 percent of the  
25 respondents to our survey believe that it was extremely

1 important or very important to incorporate educator's input  
2 to the revision process.

3                   We believe that relates to the principal  
4 about this being an inclusive process. 84 percent believe  
5 that it was extremely or very important that the process be  
6 open and transparent. That goes with guiding principle on  
7 transparency.

8                   78 percent believe that it's extremely or  
9 very important that this review focus on the content of the  
10 standards themselves, which goes to the idea that the  
11 process focus on substance.

12                   76 percent believe that it's extremely or  
13 very important to have diverse representation on the  
14 committees, which goes to an inclusive process.

15                   66 percent believe that it's extremely or  
16 very important to improve on the existing Colorado  
17 academic standards rather than start from scratch. And that  
18 goes to the notion of improvement oriented.

19                   An interesting point was that 30 percent  
20 believe that it was extremely or very important to  
21 incorporate public opinion into the revision process. As  
22 with any survey, when we look through those, we always need  
23 to kind of unpack those a bit and try to understand them to  
24 the best of our ability. But I wanted you to be aware of  
25 the- the public feedback on these guiding principles that

1 we've brought forward for you.

2 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

4 MR. DURHAM: Could you describe the sort of  
5 demographic or not demographic but from an interest group,  
6 purpose exactly who responded to the survey?

7 MS. KOLLSMAN: Absolutely. We'll get it- we'll  
8 get into this a little bit more but I'll- I'll preview that  
9 right here. Of the respondents, we had 65 percent of our  
10 respondents were educators in the K12 system so those would  
11 be administrators, teachers, district administrators. 10  
12 percent were parents, 7 percent were educators at an  
13 institution for higher education, 5 percent were students  
14 currently enrolled in high school. All of the other  
15 demographics were anywhere 3 percent and below. From our-  
16 specifically, we had se-

17 MR. DURHAM: Could you repeat that just- those  
18 top groups, please? I'm sorry.

19 MS. KOLLSMAN: Yes. Top at 65 percent  
20 educators, next at 10 percent parents, next at 7 percent  
21 institutions of Higher Education and 5 percent students. All  
22 of the other constituency groups were less than 5 percent.  
23 And just to give you a sense, I think you asked specifically  
24 about education policy advocates.

25 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

1 MS. KOLLSMAN: There were a total of 17  
2 respondents out of close to 3,000 that were education policy  
3 advocates.

4 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

5 MS. KOLLSMAN: You're welcome. So what we'll  
6 do right now is, both for the benefit of- of time since  
7 we've been before the board as well as for the benefit of  
8 our new state board member, we're going to spend just a  
9 couple of minutes looking over some of the big picture  
10 process issues.

11 I'm going to hand this off now to my  
12 colleague, Carol Gates.

13 MS. GATES: Thank you. So, I'm going to share  
14 the next three slides which are a quick review of the review  
15 and revision draft plan.

16 We presented these at our November meeting.  
17 This slide will illustrate the key roles and  
18 responsibilities for this review and revision process. At  
19 the center of the process is the state board, as you are the  
20 decision makers for the process and you have the authority  
21 to adopt any proposed revisions.

22 The role of stakeholders, which would be  
23 situated at the 12 O'clock placement of the diagram, is to  
24 provide feedback on the standards, proposed revisions, and  
25 the review process itself. The role of the review

1 committees, which would be situated there on the four  
2 o'clock placement of the diagram, is use stakeholder  
3 feedback to make recommendations for standard revision to  
4 the state board.

5                   And then the role of CDE staff, which would  
6 be led by the standards and instructional support team of  
7 content specialists, which is situated there at the eight  
8 o'clock portion of the diagram, will be to act as  
9 facilitative leadership and support role to the review and  
10 revision committees.

11                   This next slide outlines the four main phases  
12 of the standards revision process itself. We're currently in  
13 the first phase which involves gathering research and  
14 feedback through the use of surveys, online feedback  
15 systems, and benchmarking reports in all content areas.

16                   The second phase will be the formation of  
17 committees to use the research and feedback to develop the  
18 initial revision recommendations. The third phase is  
19 providing the initial recommendations to the state board and  
20 stakeholders for feedback.

21                   The final phase will involve the committees  
22 using feedback to develop final recommendations to the state  
23 board for consideration. This slide is just a brief overview  
24 of the timeline for the entire process. The previous slide  
25 outlined the activities really planned for that 2016, 2017,

1 and then 2018 by July process.

2                   Once new standards are adopted, schools and  
3 districts will then have two years to transition their local  
4 systems to adopt local standards that meet or exceed state  
5 standards and local curricula, as required through CAP for K  
6 with implementation of new standards expected in the 2000-  
7 2021 school year.

8                   MS. KOLLSMAN: So, with that basic overview,  
9 we thought we would move into the next portion of our  
10 presentation today, which is to look at some of the key  
11 findings of our standards perception survey.

12                   Please note that we've only had these, these  
13 results for a short period of time, and we're still looking  
14 and trying to understand them, especially around looking at  
15 how different groups responded on different questions. So,  
16 there may be some, some questions that you have that we also  
17 share and cannot yet answer, but we'll be looking at some of  
18 the results to see if there are some ways that we can dig a  
19 little bit deeper.

20                   I also want to say- remind the board that  
21 before we began this process, we had done a scan of all 50  
22 states to look at which states had done a standard review  
23 and revision process, and we looked specifically at states  
24 that have conducted this within the last few years and have  
25 used different stakeholder engagement processes.

1                   So, one of the tools that some of these  
2 states use was this type of survey and so that's where we  
3 use- that's where we determine that this could be useful. We  
4 also noticed that some other states used what, we'll talk  
5 about in a little while, which is an online standards  
6 feedback system, which is very specific, which is going in  
7 on each and every standard of being able to provide direct  
8 feedback on the actual content of the standards.

9                   We thought that taken together an overall  
10 perception survey and that online standards review system  
11 could provide us both a high-level understanding of the  
12 perceptions of the standards, as well as give us that very  
13 specific fine grain feedback. So, we thought it was  
14 important to do both, and we see this as a way of kind of  
15 triangulating some of our information so that we can  
16 understand what each of those different systems are telling  
17 us.

18                   So, we'll first start off with the standard  
19 perception survey which was open from October 19th through,  
20 through November 13. We had close to 3,000 responses, and  
21 responses came from all counties except three: Custer,  
22 Dolores, and Hinsdale, and respondents came from a 146  
23 through- of the 178 school districts.

24                   The roles of the respondents, which you'll  
25 see here, is, is what I- I answered a question from Mr.

1 Durham a few minutes ago. You'll see that the vast majority  
2 of respondents were educators at 65 percent, parents at 10  
3 percent, institutions of higher education at 7 percent  
4 percent, and students enrolled in the elementary, middle or  
5 high school at 5 percent. We are actually quite pleased to  
6 see the number of students who actually participated in the  
7 survey as well.

8                   If we look a little closer at the educators  
9 who responded to this survey, so of the 65 percent of  
10 educators, you can see the breakdown on slide 12 of who  
11 those educators were. Sixty-seven percent of those educators  
12 who responded were teachers, eight percent school  
13 administrators, seven percent district administrators, seven  
14 percent specialized service professionals, such as  
15 counselors, social workers, nurse, psychologists, speech  
16 language, pathologist, librarian.

17                   Five percent district non-administrator  
18 staff, three percent school level, not administrator staff,  
19 and two percent paraprofessionals. If we then break those  
20 down by level, and those response who could break down  
21 there, there, there- could pinpoint one specific level, you  
22 will see that we had a, a, a pretty even split across the K-  
23 12 band and a, a nice portion of early childhood educators  
24 who participated in the survey.

25                   MR. DURHAM: On page 12, going back one, when

1 is that some on the right-hand column more than a hundred  
2 percent?

3 MS. KOLLSMAN: Because some of the- that's a  
4 very good question. Some of the educators might span across,  
5 so there might be a teacher who teaches case six. There  
6 might be some teachers who teach 6-12, so they maybe- maybe  
7 counted twice.

8 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

9 MS. KOLLSMAN: Yes, that's a good question.  
10 Because our teachers teach more- our teachers give more than  
11 100 percent, Mr. Durham, that's why.

12 FEMALE\_1: Exactly.

13 MS. KOLLSMAN: All right. So, so, as we start  
14 to look at their impressions of the standards, so, so there  
15 are questions that were related to the impressions of the  
16 standards, then there are questions related to the process  
17 for the standards development.

18 So, I shared with you a little bit about the  
19 process, which is a spoiler alert, because there's another  
20 slide related to that in a moment, but we're look- going to  
21 delve into some of the impressions. What you'll see is that  
22 overall, about half of the survey respondents' view, the  
23 Colorado Academic Standards, positively.

24 Our education policy advocates and K-12  
25 educators are more supportive of the cast than other

1 respondent groups. And K-12, this is a very interesting  
2 finding, and we'll dig into this in a moment, because K-12  
3 teachers who have received higher levels of training and  
4 support have a more favorable opinion of the Colorado  
5 Academic Standards than those who do not.

6                   So, we'll look a little bit more and break  
7 down these- these categories and look at the individual  
8 categories of, of a positive impression by role. What you'll  
9 be able to see in the left-hand column, next to the  
10 respondent roll category, you'll also be able to see the end  
11 size. You'll get a sense of how many of that particular role  
12 responded in that question.

13                   So, what you'll see here again is that 49  
14 percent, the average positive. And again, you'll see that  
15 the education policy advocates have a, a much higher  
16 positive impression than the other groups. You'll also see  
17 that as we noted earlier, their end size was 17.

18                   You, you will see the end size for each of  
19 the other respondent groups, and I will apologize that  
20 because of the font size and shrink, and trying to get that  
21 large enough, we- the end size for the general public ended  
22 up being cut off, but you have the full findings in the  
23 packet that I've provided for you. So, the- all of the  
24 graphs that I've provided for you in this presentation are  
25 included in the actual survey results.

1                   So now, if we look a little bit more at the  
2 degree of familiarity of the standards and training and  
3 support, so if you look at this graph, if you look at the  
4 all of the respondents, again there's that 49 percent about  
5 that an average 49 percent positive impression of the  
6 standards. If you look at the first third of the risk bars  
7 below that response category for degree of familiarity which  
8 you'll see is that of the respondents who indicated that  
9 they were extremely or very familiar with the standard, you  
10 see that their perception was higher than the average.

11                   And you'll notice that as the familiarity  
12 decreases, so does the positive impression of the standards.  
13 We found that interesting. We also found interesting the  
14 level of support received. So, by support, we define that  
15 as, for instance, coaching and ongoing professional  
16 development.

17                   And you'll see that same trend, the higher  
18 the level of support that an educator receives, the higher  
19 their impression of the standards is, the lower the level of  
20 support the lower the level of impression of the standards.  
21 Same- same pattern with training.

22                   MS. MAZANEC: The education policy advocates.  
23 Did I miss it? Did you tell us what percentage were-

24                   MS. KOLLSMAN: Right. So, there were-

25                   MS. MAZANEC: Was that all within the- is that

1 included in teachers and higher ed?

2 MS. KOLLSMAN: So education policy advocates,  
3 we def- define those as belonging to- that's their primary  
4 role.

5 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

6 MS. KOLLSMAN: And 17 of the 3,000 respondents  
7 were education policy advocates.

8 MS. MAZANEC: So, okay. But you didn't- you  
9 didn't include that when you said there were 65 percent was  
10 teachers.

11 MS. KOLLSMAN: Correct.

12 MS. MAZANEC: So, they were not in there.

13 MS. KOLLSMAN: They would not be included-  
14 they wouldn't be included in that category. Those were exc-  
15 exclusive categories.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Seventeen?

17 MS. KOLLSMAN: Right. So, we asked some  
18 questions about the perceived level of rigor of the  
19 standards as well. So, the top bar represents all  
20 respondents.

21 So, what you'll see there is that  
22 approximately 48 percent of the respondents believe that the  
23 standards are high or too high. About 32 percent believe  
24 that they are just right. If we look at early childhood, we  
25 see that that percent is- is similar with a greater percent

1 believing that they are just right.

2                   The K2 band, you'll see that there is a  
3 greater than average perception that the standards are high  
4 versus too high. Same with grades three through five, you  
5 see it's a even greater proportion of teachers who think  
6 that they are high or too high as well as it starts to back  
7 off a bit in the middle grades and high school.

8                   In your report, you'll see that there's a  
9 similar question that we asked about whether their grade  
10 level appropriate because we thought that that was an  
11 important question to answer as well. And again, these are-  
12 these are some just perceptions that teachers hold about  
13 them.

14                   This- this next question was one that we  
15 think our online standards feedback system is probably going  
16 to be very, very useful in understanding even more because  
17 this is where we ask the question, what is the perceived  
18 level of revision that you think there ought to be for these  
19 different subject areas?

20                   We actually have this broken out in- in two  
21 ways and this is for all of the content areas regardless of-  
22 of what subject area that they teach. When you look through  
23 with report you will notice the end size changes on some of  
24 the questions because there are some questions that people  
25 didn't respond to. And so, you'll notice that there's some

1 variation there.

2                   But in this question, we asked from the- a  
3 scale from no revision to complete revision, what degree of  
4 revision do they think the different standards ought to  
5 undergo. So, what you'll see here is at the very highest  
6 which, to be honest, surprised us was our English language  
7 proficiency standards.

8                   We've actually just received approval from  
9 EDAC to dig deeper into that particular question from our  
10 teachers of English language development to get more of a  
11 sense of what's happening there because we think that that  
12 would be very useful for us to unpack that a bit more. But-  
13 and then what you'll see in- in kind of decreasing order the  
14 level of revision that our respondents believe is  
15 appropriate.

16                   This last result slide is actually something  
17 I referred to when we talked earlier about the guiding  
18 principles because we did ask some questions regarding the  
19 process and so we wanted to ask our respondents a little bit  
20 about what principles they believe ought to guide this  
21 process and you'll see those results there for your  
22 reference as well. So, as I noted these these results are  
23 new for us. We've just received them.

24                   We are continuing to impact them. We do have  
25 not just the the survey results and analysis as well as

1 some- some narrative of some of those findings. We also have  
2 the actual data so that if there are some particular  
3 questions that we have that gen- that this survey generates,  
4 we might be able to see if we can garner those answers from  
5 the results that we have.

6                   Again, the survey- a survey like this is- can  
7 be helpful. It's a high-level view of impressions but what  
8 we think is- is going to be much more useful and practical  
9 in terms of being able to apply is our online standards  
10 feedback system. At our November meeting, we showed you a  
11 few screenshots of that which is essentially it's an online  
12 system where any Coloradan can go online and create an  
13 account to provide feedback on the existing standards.

14                   They can go to each and every component of  
15 any grade level standards and provide feedback. We've  
16 extended the timeline or the window for this feedback  
17 because we think this is incredibly important.

18                   Our intention would be to provide all of this  
19 feedback that is gathered through this system directly to  
20 our committees so that they see exactly what are- what's  
21 being recommended by the field and by Coloradans.

22                   So, we extended the window through February  
23 17th. If we find that we could- that it would be valuable to  
24 keep that window open, there's nothing to prevent us from  
25 keeping it open further.

1                   The number of unique users that we have so  
2 far is 136. The reason I call them unique users is because  
3 there's not a one to one correspondence between the number  
4 of comments and the number of users. So, there's 136 users  
5 to date.

6                   There are a total of 453 comments so far and  
7 I'll give you a sense of the type of comments that are  
8 received. In eighth grade social studies, there was a  
9 comment left on one of the- evidence outcomes that it  
10 basically just said this evidence outcome is very vague and  
11 broad, more clarity is needed for teachers to design  
12 learning outcomes and measurements.

13                   That provides the committee an idea of like,  
14 "Oh, so how can we make this much more specific? What is it  
15 that is about this?" Th- the only other one that I'll share  
16 with you is one that kindergarten science, there was a  
17 recommendation to add an evidence outcome that would ensure  
18 that kindergartners could explain that the sun is an energy  
19 source for food and all living things.

20                   So, the- the feedback that we're sieving on  
21 there is very actionable. It's not- it's not perception,  
22 it's not opinion, it's this could improve this particular  
23 standard. And just to give you a sense of the distribution  
24 of commerce that we've received so far, there are across  
25 these different subject areas.

1                   What you'll see is that we have a large  
2 number of comments and social studies. One of the things  
3 that we're able to do is using de-identified information we  
4 can- and a number that's assigned to the different  
5 respondents to the survey, we're able to see how many- how  
6 many people have- how many unique individuals have resulted  
7 in those 231 comments.

8                   So, this, you know, are- this will give us a  
9 sense of is this a content area that needs a lot of revision  
10 or was this someone who is very, very helpful for us in  
11 pointing out because they've spent a lot of time digging  
12 through the standards and they've spend a lot of time  
13 providing us that feedback.

14                   So, we wanted to just give you that update on  
15 some of our stakeholder engagement to date. And finally,  
16 what we wanted to do is get from you some feedback on the  
17 portion of our proposal that relates to our committee  
18 selection.

19                   As Carol noted, our intention would be to  
20 engage committees for each subject area that would take the  
21 comments that are received through the online public  
22 feedback system as well as some of our benchmarking reports  
23 that we have commissioned, that we will be sharing with you  
24 in the very near future that will provide the committees  
25 with some objective information about the quality of the

1 standards.

2                   So, our intention would be to have 13 content  
3 area committees that would include educators, parents,  
4 community members, representatives from higher education,  
5 and business leaders, that we would solicit committee  
6 participation through an online application process for each  
7 of those 13 areas.

8                   That applicants would require- be required to  
9 demonstrate some content area expertise and a willingness to  
10 serve. And we would suggest that the applications would be  
11 considered through an- a blind review process, what that  
12 would mean is that as those applications come in that their-  
13 the names of the applicants would be stripped from the  
14 application, so that the applications could be reviewed on  
15 their merits not based on an individual being known by a  
16 reviewer.

17                   And that we would ensure that they utilize  
18 the feedback from the stakeholders in the research to inform  
19 any of their recommended revisions to the board. So, we're  
20 bringing this proposal forward to you for your feedback and  
21 to guide us- as- in- as we consider the design of this  
22 process.

23                   MS. SCHROEDER: Questions, comments,  
24 statements?

25                   MR. DURHAM: Thank you, madam chair. I think-

1 I think Ms. Kollsman and you, I think you've done a good job  
2 given the limitations that- that you face. But I would just  
3 caution the board and I think in going forward have some  
4 serious concerns about- about.

5                   First of all, any survey that's self-  
6 selecting you had 290 parents out of roughly 1.8 million  
7 parents in the state all of whom were self-selected. I have  
8 a hard time imagining the average parent getting home from  
9 work and saying, "You know, I have to get online and respond  
10 to this survey.".

11                   My guess is that those are largely contrived  
12 and generated by interest groups or perhaps educators who  
13 want to back up their- their position. Further, when you get  
14 to the teachers, you have 1,845 teachers and educators who  
15 responded.

16                   My quick maths is that something less than 5  
17 percent of all of the teachers in the state which once  
18 again, you- you face the- the problem that they're self-  
19 selecting. And I think any- any researcher will tell you  
20 that when you have a self-selecting pool from which to  
21 derive conclusions, you can't derive any valid conclusions  
22 particularly when you have five percent, I've got 50  
23 percent, even if they were self-selected, it would tell you  
24 something.

25                   So, I think that- I think what we're faced

1 with as a board is to whether where we find some way to  
2 ensure that you can actually get average people with, in  
3 terms parents, with average viewpoints whether those that  
4 are self-selected probably with the encouragement of the  
5 education reform community.

6 Or, where we'll find a way to go out and  
7 actually get some honest independent opinion. And I think  
8 that's probably true of teachers well- as well that we don't  
9 let them self-select. That if we really want to know what  
10 they think, we're going to have to find a different way to  
11 go at it.

12 And I'm not convinced that there is any other  
13 way to do this. But I think- I think I will- I will conclude  
14 that you're going to get in the review of these standards a  
15 very biased result not reflective of parents or teachers.  
16 And I think if I wanted to do my grade- if I had an  
17 envelope, I do my GradeConnect invitation, I can predict the  
18 result. I think I know what the result is.

19 And I don't think I personally agree with  
20 that result. So, the question is whether this board will  
21 find a way to represent parents and those who perhaps have a  
22 significantly different view of the standards or whether we  
23 will allow the professionals in their best judgment to self-  
24 select and feed us some answers that they would like to  
25 have.

1                   And I think that's the problem that we're  
2 going to be facing when we- when we do the standards review.  
3 We can't forget that we still have for all intents purposes  
4 common core standards, they are questioned by a large number  
5 of people and I know my guess is in a self-selecting group.  
6 You're not going to get that appropriate questioning of  
7 those standards.

8                   So, I think there, I'm not criticizing your  
9 work, I think you did exactly what you were supposed to do.  
10 You did as- as good a job as you could under the limitations  
11 that you faced. Question is can we remove some of those  
12 limitations and see if we can get a pool of respondents that  
13 is not self-selecting? Thank you.

14                   MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions or  
15 comments?

16                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Along those lines, do we  
17 have any ideas of how to do that? Are there any better ways  
18 to gather that information?

19                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, so when we  
20 looked at what other States have done, you know, we've --  
21 we've looked at -- some States have conducted some kind of  
22 community meetings and having, you know, bringing in folks  
23 and asking them some feedback, that could be something that  
24 we could do, that would be something we'd need to kind of  
25 look at our budget and kind of, you know, shifts things

1 around in order to do that.

2                   Again, there- there are limitations, I think  
3 as to Mr. Durham's point, there are limitations to every-  
4 every way that you gather feedback in terms of who's  
5 available to come to that, who would be interested in coming  
6 to those. How do you get folks who may not sit down to do a  
7 survey, will they actually go in and go to a community  
8 meeting as well.

9                   But those are some things that we can  
10 explore. I think Mr. Durhams has suggested the idea of some  
11 focus groups of being able to have focus groups of  
12 educators, which would be again something that would be  
13 objectively conducted and not necessarily self-selecting  
14 kind of piece. We're also looking into that.

15                   We do recognize that there are limitations to  
16 any- any survey. We think that's why it's important to  
17 triangulate this with some other information and  
18 specifically, we think that online standards feedback system  
19 is helpful.

20                   MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I think -- Ms.  
21 Mazenic, I think unfortunately, the only -- the only way to  
22 get around self selection is to do a completely random  
23 survey, which A; can be expensive, and unfortunately, I  
24 think I could do the Great Karnak act again and predict that  
25 the vast majority of those respondents will have to say they

1 don't know. If- if you get an honest response, you're going  
2 to get an, I don't know response unfortunately.

3           The next best, is the use of focus groups and  
4 there are firms that- there are firms that conduct focus  
5 groups, they are extraordinarily expensive, if they're done  
6 properly because you pay participants and you try hard to  
7 randomly select those participants disciplines. And so, you  
8 have to get somebody who's willing to accept a \$100 to give  
9 you a few hours.

10           So, even that has its limitations. But I  
11 would suggest that a good randomly selected focus group of  
12 parents off the streets as close as you could get to that,  
13 where the seven member board sat behind the glass and  
14 watched a professional conduct that focus group, would give  
15 you a much better idea of how parents and teachers, who are  
16 randomly selected, and they shouldn't be paired together.

17           They should be separate groups really view  
18 the standards. And I have no idea whether there is a kind of  
19 budget necessary for that, but- but as I said, if we don't  
20 do something like that, then so over the next few days  
21 dictate a memo, put it in a sealed envelope and give it to  
22 one of you to open when we get the final report from the  
23 groups what standards should be and we'll see how close it's  
24 going to be.

25           MS. SCHROEDER: Dr. Flores.

1 MS. FLORES: Sorry. I'm looking at page 12,  
2 which is in, you know, where you get the statistics. And you  
3 know I -- I just don't think that- that the response -- the  
4 responses are that different than what I thought they would  
5 be. I mean, look at -- look at the officials policy makers.  
6 Is that us?

7 MS. MAZANEC: That would be yes.

8 MS. FLORES: So you have five people, I don't  
9 remember being in the sample but you have 80percent, you  
10 know, I wish you had included me probably would be to the  
11 other end slightly not at all. But even so, that is, you  
12 know, that is not in the category of extremely very  
13 effective and I wish you know you had had all of us on  
14 there.

15 If you look at business owners, you know,  
16 they're moderately but most of them don't think that they're  
17 effective. When you look at parents 62percent, don't think  
18 they're effective.

19 The general public 55percent of the public,  
20 doesn't think it's effective and I think that's kind of what  
21 I hear when I go out to the grocery store and people stop me  
22 about you know the testing, too much testing or we don't  
23 think or open when, I see teachers, you know, that's what  
24 they think.

25 One of my biggest concerns, I mean, I just

1 don't think that's very- that's very positive. But one of  
2 the things that I think and I know I market down here and it  
3 has to do with, I think it's small school districts, some of  
4 the same size agreed with but there were questions too  
5 small.

6 Well, the sample maybe was, the ESL, I mean  
7 caving the ESL, I have some ideas about that because just  
8 given some of the people at higher education that I speak  
9 with and they're very different on how they approach ESL.  
10 So, there's just not kind of a common idea of what that  
11 would entail and some people are still teaching things that  
12 were years ago and not really, you know, kind of up to snuff  
13 about how to get kids really to be grade level.

14 In fact, there's a lot of people out there, a  
15 lot of ESL teachers and teachers, who think that most of  
16 these ESL kids will never, you know be at the- at the target  
17 level to graduate and that's kind of sad. But then, I think  
18 we need- we need to bring people to the State from other  
19 places too.

20 And we need to even train those university  
21 people to, you know, kind of see them and let them know what  
22 can be done and maybe even some other school districts you  
23 know that do do it. That do get kids up to grade level and  
24 that it is possible. So, my two cents.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Dr. Flores, just as a point of

1 clarification, we did send the same survey out to all of  
2 you. So it was open. You were able to take it, if you wanted  
3 and the more specific feedback that you can do, it's still  
4 open.

5                   So we can make sure we resend you that link  
6 but just want to be sure that, though we don't know the  
7 identifiers of who responded, everyone did receive it. Thank  
8 you.

9                   MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Doctor. I think -- I  
10 think when you look at page 12 and then Dr. Flores's.

11                   MS. SCHROEDER: Which page 12 are you on the-

12                   MR. DURHAM: It's in the -- no, it's in the --

13                   MS. SCHROEDER: It's -- it's report, okay.

14                   MR. DURHAM: In this academic standard  
15 stakeholder survey analysis document. Dr. Flores's graphs on  
16 covered the most important page which is how effective are  
17 the standards in promoting higher student performance which  
18 is really the objective standards, I presume only exist for  
19 that purpose.

20                   And when you look at the, when you look at  
21 the breakdown of this, the people have been driving the bus  
22 in education since 2002 which is the reform community who  
23 were paid to believe and promote these standards, is the  
24 only group that has a majority, and they have an almost  
25 overwhelming majority in believing these standards promote

1 outcomes.

2                   The problem is they have no evidence to  
3 demonstrate that. The student outcomes have not improved  
4 materially if at all since the implementation of these  
5 standards. Now, when I meet with these groups over and over,  
6 they contend they were right on the cusp of progress and  
7 that's predicting the future so we might be on the cusp, we  
8 might not be the cusp.

9                   But when you start to look then down at other  
10 groups who deal with the outcomes of this educator, the  
11 institutions for higher education which, you know, tell us  
12 that 30 some percent or more of students entering college  
13 require remediation, 46percent says are in, I mean they are  
14 slightly effective or not effective at all.

15                   When you look at business owners and there's  
16 way too small groups there to draw our conclusions from, but  
17 almost by a margin of two to one say they are not getting a  
18 better result. But again, that's, that's entirely too, too  
19 small a group for that matter so is the parent, and 191 you  
20 don't know what that means.

21                   So, if we're going to have a serious analysis  
22 on board of whether or not these are, a, higher standards,  
23 and b, whether these standards have any chance of yielding a  
24 positive result for the purpose which they have at least in  
25 theory been adopted, and that theory being to improve the

1 performance of students, then we're going to have to  
2 approach this from a dramatically different viewpoint and  
3 we're not, and not let the education policy advocates  
4 continue to drive the bus.

5                   It's not impossible that sport could reach  
6 the same conclusion that they've reached. But I think it  
7 requires, if going to reach that conclusion, a lot more  
8 evidence than they've been able to provide that what we've  
9 done in the past has worked, and or some reason to believe  
10 that continuing this direction will work.

11                   And absent that, then I think we ought to  
12 take a serious look at changing course and taking a look at  
13 changing standards in a way that we believe could drive the  
14 result we all said we wanted which is to improve student  
15 performance.

16                   MS. FLORES: And I would have one thing to  
17 add. I think it's very difficult for small districts, even  
18 medium sized districts to really get a curriculum, you know,  
19 to formulate a curriculum. I know there are great teachers  
20 out there who do a fabulous job of getting content in their  
21 area and maybe do a fabulous job with a book.

22                   But I, I really do believe that for the most,  
23 for, we need, we need textbooks. We need somebody who has  
24 really looked at what we should know and, and we should be  
25 doing that instead of having these swaps over, over e-mails.

1 Well, these are really great. I mean, this idea, I have some  
2 great lesson plans here and there's some great lesson plans  
3 here.

4 And, you know, that's not the way school  
5 districts used to do that. I remember summers with a large  
6 school district and during summers, we would, teachers would  
7 get together and --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Pick the books.

9 MS. FLORES: Not pick the books. We would  
10 actually add to what was already there, lessons for the  
11 curricula that we should be teaching and great lessons for  
12 that area. I'm thinking of a small school district.

13 Can they afford a curricula, curriculum and  
14 instruc- and instruction person? And maybe they could. But I  
15 think we need to do, we need to do more. I think the survey  
16 actually supports exactly what you're saying in the sense  
17 that the teachers who feel supported, who have had training  
18 are much more comfortable with that.

19 And I think it has been --

20 MS. FLORES: And then who have textbooks  
21 maybe.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And who have textbooks. The  
23 textbooks have simply, not from what I've learned in a few  
24 of my districts, they haven't been available or textbooks  
25 were purchased that were said to be (indiscernible) aligned

1 or whatever they really are not.

2                   And that has been a huge challenge. That  
3 does, if that's the case, then it's not so much the  
4 standards. It's the support system.

5                   MS. FLORES: That's right. And, or look at,  
6 look at Denver, who two years ago said, "We're not going to  
7 buy books, we're just going to buy some books and we're  
8 going to try them out," two years ago and here we have a  
9 full blown, I mean, we're, we're actually evaluating and  
10 testing kids on what they should know.

11                   But yet the teachers don't have the tools to,  
12 to really teach them. So, I mean, this should have taken, it  
13 should have taken at least 10 years, seven years to do.

14                   MS. SCHROEDER: It is going to take 10 years.

15                   MS. FLORES: It is?

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: The districts or the states  
17 that engaged --

18                   MS. FLORES: But -- but think about what we're  
19 doing to these kids right now who are in school who don't  
20 have the tools and where we have teachers, especially in  
21 math who have not been trained, you know, in how to teach.

22                   MS. SCHROEDER: How does -- how does this  
23 address now what we need to do -- do for --

24                   MS. FLORES: I mean, you're getting -- you're  
25 getting the truth here, but they don't think that the

1 standards are working.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane?

3 MS. GOFF: Forgive me and please feel free to  
4 say we'll talk about that another day or whatever.

5 I remember like a couple of times over in the  
6 last year, it's come up with the board, it's come up in  
7 other places about what is the practicality. Is there  
8 something that would allow us to take these in a cycle so  
9 that all 10 would not be, have to be done at the same time?

10 If that, if that is possible, well, I'm  
11 hoping at some point, even aft -- even though survey,  
12 whenever all the survey information is back, there's time to  
13 check into this whole conversation, not the process. What  
14 kind of conversations are we having?

15 This one today is fascinating. What -- what  
16 content areas, now we can all probably presume correctly and  
17 accurately that language, arts, math some of the maybe the  
18 major core areas are definitely where we want to focus on.  
19 But kind of concurrent with that conversation is, why is it  
20 appear to be -- why am I picking up that it is such a worry  
21 to have people randomly responding to music -- the music  
22 standards, and those are even leveled in some ways.

23 And why, why would it be threatening or  
24 overbearing or unbelievable or implausible or impossible to  
25 understand someone's reaction to some of fine arts in

1 general, but I'm thinking of even PE or things that aren't,  
2 where is the focus if there is one in people's minds no  
3 matter who's filling out that survey?

4                   And the other -- the other thought right now  
5 is that, standards are not, they are not the thing that  
6 produces results. If there's confusion about ta -- meaning  
7 that that's not how they're designed, that's not what they  
8 are. They are not made to produce results.

9                   What's made to produce results is what gets  
10 taught. The standards are like resolutions. They're like  
11 beliefs statements. They are aspirational. They are -- they  
12 are not the performance. They represent performance but they  
13 are not the measure by which.

14                   You know, we -- we have to decide whether  
15 we're talking about the aspiration or we're talking about  
16 the measurement of, or the after impact of, or the  
17 curriculum, or the books. I'm just -- we all apparently we  
18 have a different interpretation of meanings of words. But I  
19 would just, I'll say it as much as I have to.

20                   I've been saying that for about 40 years now.  
21 Standards are not the performance standards are what you aim  
22 to have children know and be able to do. It is, there's no  
23 measurement attached to those standards by themselves, it's  
24 the tests.

25                   MS. FLORES: But Colorado has had these

1 standards for --

2 MS. GOFF: Since 2009, not forever. This set  
3 of standards we're operating on right now was born, adopted,  
4 come about in 2009. These standards, current standards. We  
5 had standards since 1995-ish, I think somewhere in there.  
6 Though that is what was completely revamped and redone in  
7 2009.

8 MS. FLORES: So -- so we'll have a miracle in  
9 2019, that's 10 years from 2009. Do you think that?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, there is a time --

11 MS. GOFF: I understand, I'm just saying this  
12 is not a brand new concept. It's not an old concept that we  
13 are examining whether or not we're going to live with  
14 standards or not. Are we going to even have standards? You  
15 know?

16 Down there at that end of the table today?  
17 Are you -- are you promoting the idea that we have no  
18 standards, rather than try to sit down and get some good  
19 survey information and a read on where the public is.

20 MS. FLORES: We've always had standards. In  
21 fact, I brought a book what 19 whatever, 1935 that I found,  
22 that was standards then which I would say are not too  
23 different than what we have now, input somebody should --  
24 should know.

25 MS. GOFF: Steve. Go ahead.

1 MR. DURHAM: I think --

2 MS. FLORES: And it was a Colorado standard.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I'll like a free flowing  
4 conversation, but we need to make sure everybody gets a pass  
5 please.

6 MR. DURHAM: And in response Ms Goff, I think  
7 the answer is that the National Governors Association, and  
8 others who promoted the federalization of standards, I think  
9 they have said the high standards raised performance. Thus  
10 far that has not proven to be true, thus far.

11 MS. FLORES: In Colorado.

12 MR. DURHAM: In Colorado or anywhere.

13 MS. FLORES: Massachusetts definitely has.

14 MR. DURHAM: Well --

15 MS. FLORES: Florida has. There are states  
16 that have been doing it longer that have seen results.

17 MR. DURHAM: I think I would question that but  
18 that's a debate probably for another time. But -- but that's  
19 the premise under which, under which we've been operating.  
20 And if there's getting back to, getting back to -- to the --  
21 the survey, that those groups that have been most  
22 responsible for successfully promoting and having adopted as  
23 a matter of public policy these standards are the only ones  
24 who believe they are extremely or very effective.

25 Every other group believes that they are

1 either not very effective at all, or at best only moderately  
2 effective. So -- and -- and I can guarantee you out of  
3 reading down this list here, about the only group that is  
4 going to talk to us and lobby us about this issue is going  
5 to be that group that believes that they're effective or  
6 extremely effective, very effective or extremely effective.

7                   So the question is how do we receive  
8 adequate, and, and let me get to one other thing. It could  
9 be perceived that those who believe they're working are the  
10 real experts and all these other people don't know anything,  
11 which is attempted to be evidenced by the chart on the next  
12 page, which shows you know less training you have more  
13 likely you are to think standards don't work, which I kind  
14 of view as a pejorative chart.

15                   But so, the question really becomes are we  
16 going to find a way to effectively evaluate the claims of  
17 those who have promoted these specific standards. And if we  
18 find that they cannot make a case that these specific kinds  
19 of standards have achieved the stated result, then I don't  
20 think that any of us are advocating we don't have standards,  
21 but perhaps we have a significant change in these standards,  
22 or perhaps we allow more local flexibility and the adoption  
23 of standards.

24                   Which might make a lot of sense to Ignatius  
25 if they have a set of standards that they believe serves

1 their community, perhaps it ought not to be against the law  
2 for them to try those standards. And that's- that's a  
3 decision we're ultimately going to make here, is when we,  
4 when we in at 2018 adopt these standards and there's a lot  
5 between here and there.

6                   And most of what's between here and there is  
7 to receive input that is self selected, and is going to be  
8 largely driven by education policy advocates. And so, how  
9 are we going to evaluate that and what we're going to do  
10 about it.

11                   MS. SCHROEDER: Rebecca.

12                   MS. MCCLELLAN: I just wanted to share that,  
13 although we all want to see student achievement rising I  
14 think part of what these standards help us do is get a  
15 snapshot of where we're having a problem, so that we can try  
16 to address the issue of equity.

17                   I know with our state's budget constraints  
18 it's incredibly difficult once we know where students are  
19 struggling consistently, to help get the resources into  
20 those classrooms to make sure that we can solve the problem.  
21 But I think part of the purpose of these standards is, is to  
22 show us where we have the biggest problems and then solving  
23 it with our state's budget constraints is perhaps a somewhat  
24 different puzzle piece.

25                   One question that I would have is, do we have

1 any data about parent and student familiarity with the  
2 standards, or data about how schools are going about  
3 educating parents and students about the standards so that  
4 they can understand.

5 MS. KOLLSMAN: So -- so from this survey we  
6 can answer the first question, which is we can break down by  
7 familiarity just that particular student group and parent  
8 group of, of respondents. But to your larger question, we  
9 the -- the role of the State Education Agency has typically  
10 been to serve district leaders and to help them do their  
11 work in supporting their parent communities.

12 We work very hard to develop parent resources  
13 and so on. But we haven't directly been involved in that  
14 type of work. So we don't typically know exactly what's  
15 going on there, yeah. But -- but you are very right that  
16 that's important, yeah.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So two things. One, we need to  
18 respond to your question as to the process going forward. I  
19 am wondering if we are getting a little confused between  
20 what's the standard and what is curriculum and teaching  
21 strategies et cetera. I don't know whether Ignatio cares any  
22 less about whether their kids learn how to add, subtract and  
23 multiply and divide, and that's what the standards address.

24 And as a state we have said we want all kids  
25 to learn how to add, subtract multiply and divide. Well,

1 there are lots of other things, reading as well and writing  
2 and speaking and spelling. But the curriculum and the way  
3 you teach them is a local issue. I don't disagree with Dr.  
4 Flores, which is that our districts often are very resource  
5 poor in terms of getting the kind of curriculum that they wa  
6 -- that, that is really effective for their kids.

7                   But that's not what this is about. There is  
8 no way when people say we can't have Common Core. States  
9 that tried to get away from Common Core have discovered that  
10 there isn't anything to get totally away from.

11                   There may be some slight differences and  
12 there probably will be some more slight differences in our  
13 standards, but it's still going to be about whether our kids  
14 learn to add, subtract and multiply and divide. And whether  
15 all kids in the state learn that.

16                   We need to kind of try to keep separate, and  
17 maybe pretty soon it's time for us to look at those specific  
18 standards that you're talking about, so that we get a better  
19 sense of what that discussion is versus all the different  
20 ways that all the different districts address those outcomes  
21 that we want. But we do need to go back and give staff some  
22 feedback on the process.

23                   They've asked us to -- can't see that far.  
24 For 13 content areas to create review committees et cetera,  
25 et cetera. What do we agree with here, what do we not agree

1 with, is that what you we're trying to get me?

2 MS. KOLLSMAN: No.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: That's good.

4 MS. KOLLSMAN: But that was a good place to  
5 get anyway.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you have another comment?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My only other comment was  
8 just a clarification that we haven't brought up a lot. But  
9 in the law, I will just say that, districts are allowed to  
10 actually have their own standards as long as they meet or  
11 exceed the state standards. So, I mean, that's just one  
12 point.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Douglas County do that if I'm  
14 not mistaken.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The state decides whether  
16 they need a CDE.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Go head.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just as a point of  
19 clarification, the state is not involved in that. Th -- this  
20 is an assurance that districts provide the state, kind of  
21 the, the catch that we have in our system is that our  
22 accountability system is based on the performance of schools  
23 and districts on our state assessment, which measures the  
24 degree to which students are mastering those standards.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. But you -- you had

1 to tell Douglas County whether their --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. We weren't involved.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, they can just say,  
4 any district can say "Our, our standards meet or exceed."

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. The --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's all there is  
7 to it?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. The state does  
9 not, there's -- there's no -- there's no -- there's no  
10 record keeping around that, there's no monitoring of that.  
11 The -- again, that's sort of an assurance that districts  
12 provide the state.

13 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

16 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I think we're now down  
17 to the rub, which is test, which I think, the way we select  
18 tests, one of the criterion on the bid is that they measure  
19 the standards. If I'm not mistaken, that's the bid criteria.  
20 So, we have tests that are set to the standards that have  
21 been adopted and no district is allowed to deviate and give  
22 a different test.

23 And that's the way -- that's the way the  
24 standards are enforced. In theory, state law might allow  
25 Douglas County to do anything they want, except they have to

1 take the state test. So, if they want to perform well, they  
2 will teach to that standard and that drives curriculum.

3                   And that then really gets to the heart of the  
4 issue, it should, these federally imposed standards, and I  
5 know Jane is going to tell me the state adopted those  
6 standards, but the reality is, try and change them without  
7 federal approval and you'll find out whose standards they  
8 are. So -- so, as long as we have -- as long as we have a  
9 test that reflects those imposed standards, it will drive a  
10 curriculum that is essentially a nationally imposed  
11 curriculum, which drives out innovation, drives out  
12 creativity, leads to, as, as I was approached over the  
13 weekend at -- when I was working out by a parent, that, you  
14 know, the, the school which his daughter attended, spent  
15 three months teaching to the test and he was not happy about  
16 that.

17                   So, I think if you really want to, if you  
18 don't want to get to the problem, these are all intertwined.  
19 But, but resetting the standards and then, if we could  
20 actually have meaningful standards, that are our own  
21 standards, that are not driven by the National Governors  
22 Association or any or the interest groups that have worked  
23 with the National Governors Association to impose these  
24 standards, we might be actually able to get back and if we  
25 can especially eliminate and allow some districts the

1 flexibility of coming up with tests that are different. Then  
2 we can see, then they can set their own curricula, they can  
3 drive the result they want to drive and that gives us a  
4 chance to eventually see what works and what doesn't work.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I just wanted to add,  
6 if you turn to page 14 which is, how effective are the  
7 Colorado assessment and standards in addressing the needs of  
8 students. I think students tell the truth. And if you look  
9 at that, that bar, you see that academically there is a bar  
10 for academically advanced students. Can you -- can you  
11 project that on the --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we can put that up.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. And first, this is  
14 not part of our slide deck.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just to, to clarify  
17 on that, this is -- these aren't student responses. These  
18 are the res -- all, of all of the respondents they were re -  
19 - were replying to how well they believe that these  
20 standards meet the needs of the different student  
21 subcategories.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if, if you look at  
23 it, you have academically advanced students saying that "Yes  
24 they're great." These standards are great. Seven percent of  
25 them say they're extremely effective.

1                   And when you get to English learners, it's  
2 not even one percent or students with disability, you know,  
3 as far as extremely effective. But yet when you go to the  
4 other side, you have academically advanced kids who say  
5 well, " They're not effective." That's 16percent.

6                   MS. SCHROEDER: It's not the kids that are  
7 responding here. It's not the, the res -- I'm I correct? The  
8 responses --

9                   MS. FLORES: Oh I thought these were from --

10                  MS. SCHROEDER: No. The responses are from the  
11 almost 3000 people.

12                  MS. FLORES: Well, but they're petty much  
13 telling you the truth as to how, you know, when you go out  
14 there, that's, that for dis- students with disabilities  
15 33percent says, you know, they are not good all or for  
16 26percent of English learners. And, I don't know, I think  
17 that's, that's kind of telling you about the test. Most of  
18 these, I think, is not telling you about the standards. It's  
19 telling you about the test.

20                  MS. SCHROEDER: There is something to that.

21                  MS. GOFF: When, I can find it but I don't  
22 have my good glasses with. What's the date, when is the --  
23 the -- end point for the specific input into each and every  
24 standard? So that right now that's where I-

25                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Like online system.

1 MS. GOFF: -- my teacher head tells me that's  
2 where I'm going to learn something about what people are  
3 thinking about each standard, which may answer a lot of  
4 these questions.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The online system will be  
6 open through February 17.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Again, we can extend that  
9 timeline because essentially our intention is to take all of  
10 that feedback and give those to the committees. The  
11 committees will, will likely not be meeting until, you know,  
12 we're anticipating till over the summer, so we could extend  
13 that timeline.

14 MS. GOFF: Well, just as -- just my own  
15 personal offering. I -- I'm looking toward that kind of  
16 information to get a little bit better insight, that the  
17 general questions were, I do think they were, they are and  
18 had been constructed and handled the best we can. Sur --  
19 surveys are really a nebulous, I -- I -- I don't like them.  
20 I never have liked them. I -- I have never liked composing  
21 them.

22 I think there's a lot of ground for whatever,  
23 whoever you're talking to and how they interpret the meaning  
24 of the word is interesting. And it's beyond the word  
25 standard. It's just the whole idea of asking a broad range

1 of people at the same time they, they're a little bit  
2 randomly taking part in nothing else and to know how  
3 effective a standard is, if -- I don't -- I won't go on.  
4 You, I think you know what I'm talking about. I just -- I  
5 just think that specific info is going to to be a lot more  
6 helpful to me.

7 MR. DURHAM: Yes. Madam Chairman. I do have a  
8 couple of specific questions and respo -- and specific  
9 suggestions. I'm not sure they're financial practical. But  
10 there are, let -- let's take the existing Colorado on Common  
11 Core Math Standards.

12 There're Nationally recognized people like,  
13 one whose name in this case is a professor at University of  
14 Wisconsin in Madison, who are highly critical of these  
15 standards and promote different standards. I think it's  
16 important to find a way to bring a different voice or other  
17 voices into these standards because if we allow the message  
18 to or, I mean, what, what's going to happen I think is what  
19 always happens to this board, is that if nature takes its  
20 course, couple of months before we're obligated by law to  
21 make a decision, we'll have something put in front of us,  
22 which is likely to reflect the process and the process  
23 there's nothing wrong with that except I believe it yields a  
24 very predictable result.

25 So, if we're going to have at least options,

1 we're going to have to bring in some of those people who are  
2 openly critical and have other ideas, and have an  
3 opportunity for this board to consider those other ideas and  
4 those other standards. If we're going -- and, and so the  
5 suggestion I would make is, I don't think there's any way to  
6 necessarily avoid nor should you avoid the process you've  
7 outlined here, but it should be augmented with other points  
8 of view and it should be -- and it should be augmented if  
9 possible, and I just happen to price this for another reason  
10 like, if my memory serves me correct, a single session focus  
11 group costs you about 17,000 dollars a session. That may be  
12 well beyond our budget.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

14 MR. DURHAM: But I think there's a way to  
15 squeeze it in. If we could actually get one. It would be  
16 highly instructive. So, but --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seventeen thousand or  
18 hundred?

19 MR. DURHAM: Seventeen thousand.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A focus group?

21 MR. DURHAM: I wish it were hundred, but --  
22 because I'm pricing it for someone but, but at any rate, I  
23 think that -- I think if we're, if we're going to have an  
24 option to -- to consider anything except that which the  
25 experts and the experts that participate regularly want us

1 to have in front of us, then if we want to have anything  
2 else in front of us, we've gotta start now, bring in these  
3 other points of view, try and evaluate them effectively, and  
4 then be in a position to see whether we can come to  
5 consensus or to come by a majority vote, to whether or not  
6 we agree with the standard that's being presented.  
7 Otherwise, we're going to get set of standards that are  
8 going to be remarkably similar to what we have and we're  
9 going to have under the press of time no choice but to  
10 accept them.

11                   And I think every member of this board has  
12 been in exactly that position where deadlines are  
13 approaching, we now have to make a decision, none of us have  
14 the expertise to say, "Well, I have this 50 page document  
15 here there's a better choice." So, we get to pick from a  
16 very limited menu -- menu if any menu at all, that has been  
17 created by the interest groups then advocated by the staff  
18 as a product of those interest groups.

19                   Nothing wrong with that, and then we, we then  
20 get to vote "Yes" and if we're going to avoid that, then you  
21 going to have to bring in a lot of other expertise, you  
22 going to have to bring in different points of views, even  
23 though you may, some people may find that painful and you  
24 going to have to find a way to see those points of view  
25 receive at least some attention and from this board.

1 MS. SCHROEDER: Other responses?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Good.

4 MS. GOFF: I'm looking over what we're  
5 supposed to evaluate here and it doesn't sound much like  
6 what I see going on here at the board. But I do, and I know  
7 we're not voting, but I do agree with board member Durham  
8 about getting experts in some of these fields.

9 I don't know if we need all of the fields.  
10 But some of the ones that have the most questions about the  
11 standards. If we have the -- the expertise of even a few  
12 people giving their input, I think we'll be much further  
13 ahead as a board to vote on something than -- than we are  
14 with the survey.

15 But I do appreciate the work you've done. I  
16 don't know if we should stop that. It would be interesting  
17 to compare that to -- to what we get from other people, but  
18 other states that are using experts in the field I think  
19 would be on the path that I would like to take, too. So, my  
20 recommendation would be that we get some input about the  
21 other side of the issue at the next board meeting.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane.

23 MS. GOFF: Have we in the past and at the  
24 current time considered part of the groups that have been  
25 working on this to be our higher ed and K-12 educators? I

1 guess the question is more for my colleagues. Are they  
2 considered experts in your, in your minds? Teachers,  
3 instructors, teachers.

4 Are they an -- interest groups that's taking  
5 part in this survey or and contributing for since 2007 when  
6 we started this last color of a standards work. Are they  
7 expert enough or not?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

9 MS. GOFF: No. I mean teachers. Teachers both  
10 higher ed and K-12.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Participated you mean?

12 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

13 MR. DURHAM: Let me go. I'll take a stab at  
14 that. I think some are, some aren't. But the mere fact you  
15 respond to a survey doesn't put you in either category, so  
16 you don't know whether they are experts or participants.

17 MS. GOFF: True.

18 MR. DURHAM: And I would say --

19 MS. GOFF: That's -- I agree

20 MR. DURHAM: I would say you -- you evaluate  
21 that -- that point of view but there need -- there needs to  
22 be available to us other points of view to be evaluated.  
23 And I think the answer is I don't think you stop what you're  
24 doing. I don't think you have any choice but to do what  
25 you're doing. Question is, can you adequately augment it to

1 bring us some additional information.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a very very good  
3 suggestions Mr. Durham.

4 MS. GOFF: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair I'll also  
6 just so we'll -- we will take that feedback to heart  
7 absolutely. Just two little points. I would encourage you  
8 all to be in to be asking your districts and schools, you  
9 know what because you're a part of the feedback process too.  
10 You represent districts.

11 And -- and so I'd be encouraging you to be  
12 checking in with them about how they feel too, because I  
13 will augment your opinions of just the surveys. And then  
14 the last piece to board member Rankin's, requests to have  
15 this by the next board meeting that might be challenging  
16 because I think our materials are due next week.

17 It's amazing how quick the cycle moves. I  
18 just want you to know we will absolutely take that to heart  
19 and -- and get you something soon.

20 MS. SCHOEDER: Okay. Okay, moving on to  
21 14.01. Madam Commissioner.

22 MS. ANTHES: Yes, Madam Chair, thank you. The  
23 next item on the agenda is actually a request from you all  
24 from several months ago, wanting to have a little more  
25 information about the supports that CDE gives to low

1 performing districts and schools.

2                   So this is, this comes to you as an  
3 information item as a request from you. And so I will turn  
4 it over to Alyssa Pearson, and Peter Sherman, and Nazzy. I  
5 can't say your last name Nazzy. Thank you.

6                   MS. PEARSON: Thank you all. I know you all  
7 have just been, your brains are full in have you from that  
8 conversation right now. We just want to take a little time,  
9 this is and you can sit back and listen. Just give you an  
10 overview based on some the questions and conversations we've  
11 had over the past few months about what the support that CDE  
12 is providing for our low performing systems, specifically  
13 our schools on priority and districts on priority  
14 improvement and turnaround.

15                   So I want to give you an overview of -- of  
16 what those supports are and share with you some of the  
17 preliminary data we're seeing on them. This is initial  
18 data, it's kind of a blunt review of it. We have a lot more  
19 to learn, but we want to show you what the initial outcomes  
20 are starting to look like, and just kind of share with you  
21 where -- where we are seeing some successes, or some initial  
22 success.

23                   So, thank you for taking the time to listen  
24 to this day today. We really appreciate it. I'll turn it  
25 over to Peter and Nazzy who will talk through the details.

1 MR. SHERMAN: Thanks, Alyssa and Madam Chair.  
2 Good afternoon. Thanks -- and again thanks for taking time  
3 to work with us today. I'm Peter Sherman, I'm the Executive  
4 Director of school and district performance unit here at  
5 CDE. My colleague Nazzy Marjorie Nelson is the Director of  
6 Data Program Evaluation and Reporting and she's got a lot of  
7 other things. So, we're glad to be able to share with you  
8 some of the information that we've seen over the past few  
9 years.

10 CDE has created a number of different support  
11 structures that we have created and developed to really try  
12 to target supports for low performing schools and districts.  
13 So, today we just want to begin the conversation with you,  
14 sharing some background information about those supports,  
15 but also to share some of the initial impacts that we've  
16 seen.

17 As we transition to ESSA, we also see this as  
18 a great opportunity to reflect on and to refine and to think  
19 about the supports that we offer, and hopefully determine  
20 what's working really well and to build on that. Our goals  
21 for today are, there are three goals, really to provide you  
22 with an overview of some of the intensive, the more  
23 intensive support structures that we offer to these low  
24 performing systems.

25 To share some of the initial impacts

1 specifically of the turnaround network and Connect for  
2 Success, and to provide some context for future  
3 conversations and decisions around these support structures.  
4 Specifically this will come up again in the ESSA con -- ESSA  
5 conversations.

6                   So, this slide will provide an overview of  
7 some of the major intensive supports that we offer. As --  
8 as I talked down through the slide, just take note that the  
9 supports sort of transition from district level supports to  
10 school level supports to supports for individual people.  
11 Eligibility for these supports varies somewhat, but is  
12 generally available for districts and schools with priority  
13 improvement or turnaround ratings on our state performance  
14 accountability system.

15                   Each of these supports also include funding,  
16 most of them are with federal funds some with state funds,  
17 and eligibility tends to be around the rating as well as  
18 Title 1 status. So, we'll go into more details about most  
19 of these supports, but I'll give you a quick overview around  
20 what's on the slide. Around district support, we're engaged  
21 with about 22 different districts. Some of those districts  
22 are on the clock. Some of them have schools that are on the  
23 clock.

24                   Many of those are -- many of those districts  
25 are engaged in multiple supports here. Our goals are really

1 to build upon the district capacity, to help them have the  
2 ability internally to build support the schools that are  
3 currently on the clock, or perhaps others that may fall on  
4 the clock. So, our district supports our range from being  
5 quite informal to being more formal such as our Turnaround  
6 Learning Academy that was initiated last year.

7                   That work with districts also includes some  
8 of the work that we're doing with districts around the  
9 accountability pathway development. Our turnaround network  
10 is probably our most intensive support. That really  
11 utilizes a performance management model, which I'll talk  
12 about more in a few minutes.

13                   Where our staff engage with principals, and  
14 with principal supervisors in the districts to really go  
15 through a process, an ongoing process of planning, strategic  
16 action planning, and reflecting on what's working or not.  
17 The Connect for Success Grant is a grant that's in its first  
18 year here, and it's a grant that works specifically with  
19 schools, with 20 schools this year. And the Connect for  
20 Success Grant really tries to work with those schools to  
21 look toward activities that are identified in our high  
22 achieving school study, something that's on our website that  
23 I believe you've seen.

24                   The Tiered Intervention Grant or the TIG  
25 grant, or also known by the school, School Intervention

1 Grant, or the SIG grant is a large federal grant that's been  
2 in existence since 2010, and 10 -- require a certain  
3 turnaround models, and generally tends to have larger grant  
4 sizes. That, TIG Grant is not going to continue under ESSA,  
5 but it will, we will run out the funding that we have over  
6 the next few years.

7                   The School Turnaround Leaders Development  
8 grant, we've spoken about a number of times recently. This  
9 is our state program that's really designed to build the  
10 capacity within Colorado to support leadership, and we know  
11 how, we all know how important that piece is. And then one  
12 of the -- another Grant that's not listed on this is our  
13 Pathways Grant.

14                   This is a grant that we initiated last year  
15 to support districts in planning for the different pathways  
16 that they would explore the schools that are on the clock  
17 that may reach the end of the clock as they work toward that  
18 process that you all may direct actions if they reach the  
19 end of the clock. We're also currently working on a grant  
20 that would support districts with the implementation of  
21 those pathways as well.

22                   So we can produce a handout that gives you  
23 more specifically. You've asked which schools and districts  
24 are engaged in which of these. We have that information for  
25 you. We've broken it down by congressional district as

1 you've asked, so we'll share that with you as well.

2           A couple of dense slides here, so forgive me  
3 with all the information. Last month we heard questions  
4 from you about how many schools apply for grants. How many  
5 are accepted. What the participation is.

6           This slide illustrates those that information  
7 for these following supports. The number of eligible  
8 schools, the number of schools that have applied, number of  
9 schools that are acceptance, the acce -- acceptance rates,  
10 the average award amount per year per school, and the  
11 funding source. Eligibility as I said earlier generally  
12 aligns with the school plan types of perform -- priority  
13 improvement and turn around, and it also has to do with some  
14 federal designations of priority or focus schools.

15           And it may have to do with their title status  
16 as well. Schools that are not designated as Title 1 schools  
17 are generally not eligible for the federal funding, but in  
18 many cases we are able to invite them in to participate in  
19 the support structures themselves.

20           So, as you can see about 75percent to  
21 80percent of applicants are accepted into the turnaround  
22 network, the Connect for Success, and the TIG grants. For  
23 the leaders grants, the percentages of acceptance are much  
24 lower. That's really a result of us having quite a lot of  
25 applications, and a lit -- more limited amount of funding.

1                   So we tend to have more demand than, than  
2 supply there. We've also included in the slide the average  
3 amount of the award per school per year. We'll come back to  
4 that a little bit later in the presentation. I will pause  
5 if there are any questions otherwise I'll keep moving. Yes.

6                   MS. SCHROEDER: Is it the case that the number  
7 of acceptances that we see represent about the capacity for  
8 our resources and our ability to help these schools, or  
9 okay, so that kind of answers a follow up question, I might  
10 have which is I was wondering if it was the case that if we  
11 could get more of these eligible schools to go ahead and  
12 apply, could we help more schools or are we saying that  
13 these acceptance numbers are representing right about where  
14 our resources are in terms of how many we're able to help  
15 with these programs?

16                   MR. SHERMAN: I think that's -- Madam Chair.  
17 I think that's a great question and and I think the answer  
18 is there's a little bit on both sides of the answer.  
19 Certainly our goal is to sort of have the greatest return on  
20 investment of what we do.

21                   Whether it's money that's distributed,  
22 whether it's money that supports our staff or other ways  
23 that we're that we're using the financial and the personal  
24 resources that we have. So, I mean I would say that our  
25 staff are stretched fairly thin and some of these some of

1 these support structures require less staff time because  
2 they're more about granting money out and districts do most  
3 of that work and there are others such as the network that  
4 are much more intensive and require more staff time.

5                   So, I think we're, this is part of our  
6 reflection on as we present this information to you is  
7 reflecting on what -- what -- what is having the most impact  
8 given our time and our energy and these dollars that we have  
9 available.

10                   MS. NAZZY: May I add, Madam Chair?

11                   MS. SCHROEDER: Sure.

12                   MS. NAZZY: In the situations where the funds  
13 exceed the number of applicants that we receive, especially  
14 qualified applicants that meet approval ratings and get the  
15 grants, then what we do, we tend to run a second iteration  
16 of the application to try to get more applicants and get the  
17 word out more and work with applicants than writing their  
18 applications, so that we do try to use up the funds that are  
19 available.

20                   MR. SHERMAN: I would just also add that the -  
21 - the Federal funds that we have are certainly limited in  
22 most of the supports that we're talking about today, these  
23 intensive supports are driven by Federal funds. There is  
24 very a little state funding that supports a lot of this  
25 work.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we have the excess  
2 money in those accounts, do we return it? I mean, what  
3 happens to that if we do it for these programs?

4 MR. SHERMAN: My understanding is a feel free  
5 and the the the Federal funding, we -- we certainly strive  
6 to use all of those funds and I think that there are times  
7 where those funds can roll over. Typically, we don't have  
8 to return it right away.

9 There's usually an expiration date of, I  
10 think around a three year period, on funds, so we're able to  
11 -- we're able to -- to use those funds over time.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If it's a Federal fund,  
13 can it be used for another program within a Federal fund  
14 area or must it stay in that and we're just trying to find  
15 more participants to take advantage of it?

16 MR. SHERMAN: Al -- all of the funding sources  
17 have different criteria and different parameters, of course.  
18 For example, the TIG funds is what we call our Tenno 3G  
19 funds. Those are much more constricted and prescribe. The  
20 10-0-3(a) three funds allow us more flexibility than  
21 others.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Sherman do you have  
23 an idea of how much money we've returned to the federal  
24 government because we haven't used all the grant money that  
25 was allocated in any one year, just an idea of that?

1 MR. SHERMAN: I -- I don't.

2 MS. PEARSON: Madam chair, I don't believe  
3 that we have returned any money. I think we are able  
4 because the Federal grants tend to have a longer roll over  
5 life than the State grants, usually those have to be used  
6 within the year, as Nazzy talked about.

7 We've been able to find ways to get people  
8 qualified and ready for the grant or find other grant  
9 opportunities. Some of the Federal funds are more flexible  
10 on the school improvement dollars the TIG money has been  
11 very narrowly focused but Brett indicated that we haven't  
12 returned any money to the Federal Government.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

14 MS. PEARSON: Thanks.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What does qualified mean?  
16 How do you decide qualified?

17 MR. SHERMAN: Qualifications for -- for  
18 grants?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20 MR. SHERMAN: Each of these -- each of these  
21 different support structures have different eligibility  
22 criteria that are -- those -- that are communicated out. Is  
23 that -- is that -- am I answering your question?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The reason I'm as -- you  
25 said that sometimes you go looking for qualified applicants

1 or try to get them qualified.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Eligible, for eligibility.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I guess I'm sort of  
4 thinking, you know, that's sort of the same thing; eligible.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you have an example?

6 MS. PEARSON: Yes. So, for example, for the  
7 connect for success grant that we've been talking about,  
8 eligibility criteria includes having been title nine for the  
9 current year and the prior year and having had an SPF rating  
10 of prior to improvement or turnaround and being on the State  
11 clock for up in years one two or three and therefore from  
12 those criteria, we identify a list of schools that are  
13 eligible for the grant and that there is an RFP process that  
14 they have to follow to submit an application that is  
15 evaluated and if the application meets the criteria that's  
16 established for the application part then the schools  
17 receive the award.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That you have sometimes  
19 found that you have money available for those that -- those  
20 schools are not applying for?

21 MS. PEARSON: That we have money for. I'm  
22 sorry could you repeat your question.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have funds for those  
24 turnaround programs that schools are not applying for?

25 MS. PEARSON: Yes. There are times, often

1 times, where schools will be on an eligibility list and they  
2 and their district opt not to submit an application. And  
3 there are various reasons why they might not feel that --  
4 that particular grant opportunity might be the right fit for  
5 them or sometimes it's because they haven't heard of the  
6 grant opportunity or they heard of it too late and couldn't  
7 put together what they needed to for the application.

8                   So, by rerunning the application process, we  
9 provide them an opportunity to gear up and prepare for  
10 applying.

11                   MR. SHERMAN: Madam Chair, I think just to  
12 conclude that slide, I mean it's certainly our goal and our  
13 ongoing goal is to think very strategically about those  
14 funds that we have, and to think about what's having the  
15 most impact, and to think about sort of what -- what are the  
16 levers money and other resources that are helping districts  
17 make the changes that they need to make for improvement.

18                   So, we'll -- we'll dig into a couple of the  
19 different supports now. I'd like to speak a little bit more  
20 about the turnaround network and give you some background on  
21 that.

22                   The turnaround network was established in  
23 2014 and has steadily increased in our participation. We  
24 began the network in our first year with nine schools in  
25 five different districts and this year, we have 34 schools

1 in nine different, excuse me, I just say my numbers are  
2 confusing.

3                   We started with nine schools in five  
4 districts. We're up to 34 schools in nine different  
5 districts and we see those network schools serve over 12000  
6 students across the State. The network continues to grow  
7 each year and all of the districts that have participated  
8 thus far, have requested to increase the school  
9 participation each year.

10                   The network is built on, what we call, a  
11 performance management model in which CDE staff work really  
12 closely side by side with principals and with principals  
13 supervisors. They meet every six to eight weeks at the  
14 school. They prioritize, they plan, they monitor, they  
15 collect information and they reflect on how things are going  
16 in those schools.

17                   That's a process that's very unique and  
18 individualized to each school. For this reason, this model  
19 requires a lot of -- a lot of CDEs staff time and it's more  
20 intensive than other supports. This really, I would say,  
21 reflects, represents our most intensive support. It spans  
22 for three years and at beginning the process, we thought  
23 well this will be a one year process.

24                   In the second year, we thought well maybe we  
25 do too. We're we're finding that three years is about the

1 sweet spot for the network. The goal of the network really  
2 is to catalyze quick and sustaining changes at the school  
3 level, but also to work with the district and have them at  
4 the table so that we can support their capacity, as I  
5 mentioned earlier.

6                   Network schools also convene three to five  
7 times a year to engage in professional learning experiences.  
8 That's with CDE and with external partners. Topics there  
9 include school culture, aca -- academic assessments,  
10 instruction, human capital and talent management and those  
11 sorts of things.

12                   For example, on February 1st, we are holding  
13 an event, we'll have about school district leaders that will  
14 come in the whole day is -- is all around recruiting and  
15 retaining and hiring teachers and leaders for low performing  
16 schools.

17                   We expect to exit nine schools from the  
18 network this year and we believe we have the capacity to  
19 your question earlier for about 17 more schools in the  
20 network. Grants are awarded from about 30 to \$50,000 per  
21 school per year for those three years. These are supported  
22 by Federal funds.

23                   Schools can exit from the network by earning  
24 their way off of the accountability clock and demonstrating  
25 that they have really shown sustained growth and

1 improvement. And as districts exit, we do a diagnostic  
2 process where we capture some of the improvements that they  
3 have made and we continue to welcome them to other learning  
4 events. We just stop them keeping them in the -- in the  
5 network formally.

6                   So, a couple of data slides to share with  
7 you. Finally, as what we're seeing as some of the initial  
8 impacts of the network. So, based on the preliminary school  
9 performance frameworks, we have some promising data to  
10 share.

11                   The left box and graph on this graph pertain  
12 to the first cohort of nine schools which entered the  
13 network in 2014. Seven out of those nine or 78percent of  
14 those schools came off of the accountability clock, after  
15 two years in the network. According to the -- from the 2013  
16 SPF to the preliminary 2016 FDA study.

17                   Similarly, on the right hand side that  
18 represents the second cohort of 15 schools which entered the  
19 network in the spring of 2015. Seven out of those 15  
20 schools or 47percent, came off the clock after one year  
21 working in the network.

22                   And then that orange line indicates when  
23 network services begin for those falls. We're excited about  
24 these and we also recognize that it's complicated, it's not,  
25 there's not just a single point of intervention with

1 schools. Couple more data slides.

2           This slide shows a comparison of schools that  
3 had priority improvement or turnaround ratings in 2013. Of  
4 those that were in the network, 63percent have earned the  
5 highest rating of performance in 2016. And of those not in  
6 the network, 38percent of those are in the highest rating of  
7 performance in 2016.

8           It's a small in size because this is our  
9 first -- this is our first cohort. So, it's nine schools  
10 but we see that that's a comparison is a nice thing to be  
11 able to have. It's difficult to find a comparable group and  
12 I think as we have more data as the years go on, we'll be  
13 able to have more that we can share with you.

14           And then in this slide, we display some TCAP  
15 and Park Data in language, arts, and math data from the  
16 years that they were participating in the network. Again,  
17 this is from cohort one from nine schools. The red line  
18 represents a percentile rank of Cohort one students on  
19 English Language, Arts.

20           The blue line represents that percentile rank  
21 in math. There were nine schools about 3200 students in  
22 those schools. Most of those schools eight out of nine,  
23 were elementary schools, so they had some K-2 student, so  
24 signi -- probably a third of those students were not  
25 represented because they were not taking these assessments.

1                   So, this probably represents 1500 to 2000  
2 students. And then -- that again, that orange line  
3 indicates where the services began and the green line at the  
4 top represents the state average. So, whereas these  
5 achievement rates are still quite low, this were not and  
6 certainly not where we want to see them, we are certainly  
7 seeing a trend in the right direction.

8                   And then finally for the network, we  
9 certainly want to understand the causality of the  
10 improvements that we are seeing. We know that these are  
11 products of a lot of different factors.

12                   These slides look at some of the common  
13 practices of network schools to say what's happening in  
14 those schools. We believe that the support that's provided  
15 by CDE, that intensive support along with some external  
16 partners, that are paired up with schools through the grants  
17 are having an impact.

18                   So, some of the factors that we know are  
19 really having impact, an active focus on school culture and  
20 climate. So really, changes resetting the, the expectations  
21 for students by all the adults in the buildings to have high  
22 academic expectations, a sense of shared accountability  
23 throughout the building that we're all here for all of these  
24 students.

25                   Really remodeling as necessary learning

1 environments, so creating learning environments that are  
2 bright and active and really student centered. And then  
3 creating and increasing their- those meaningful connections  
4 with families. Performance management tools and practices,  
5 we believe really help staff work and to prioritize their  
6 resources and really focus on what they need to do.

7           There's increased regular and supportive  
8 observation of instruction by principals for teachers and  
9 that's a requirement that we have in our network. And then  
10 there's also increased observation by principal supervisors.

11           We strongly suggest that those principal  
12 supervisors are in network schools every week, observing and  
13 giving feedback to principals and that's a practice that,  
14 that often is not in place. The use of relevant data and  
15 then really rethinking recruiting and hiring practices in  
16 schools specific to the needs of the school.

17           So, key to the network is that we've exposed  
18 schools and district leaders to excellent schools and  
19 experts, who've approached schooling in different ways. Our  
20 network principals have learned quite a bit and I think have  
21 created quite a community of learners.

22           On the slide, we've also included some quotes  
23 and anecdotes from some of our participants. The  
24 Comprehensive Center in West said conducted a program review  
25 last year, which you've been provided with that information

1 and that includes survey information that's been taken from  
2 participants and some anecdotal feedback as well.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Questions?

4 MR. SHERMAN: Okay. We'll shift to connect for  
5 success and Nazzy is going to speak to that and to the two  
6 grants.

7 MS. NAZZY: The Connect for Success Grant is a  
8 two phase model that was begin in 13-14. We identified high  
9 achieving schools that had had success with the achievement  
10 of their disaggregated groups.

11 We conducted a study within the 14/15 school  
12 year of the effect of practices that were being implemented  
13 by those schools. We focused in on strategies and practices  
14 that they were implementing that the school leadership and  
15 teachers felt were contributing to their success.

16 We created a grant, which is called the  
17 Connect for Success Grant, wherein grantees receive an  
18 opportunity to network with and learn from and replicate the  
19 practices that were implemented by the high achieving  
20 schools. The reports that we've written in regards to our  
21 findings from the high achieving school study are provided  
22 through the link on your PowerPoint.

23 If you click on that, that will take you to  
24 several reports that we've written in regards to the  
25 practices that we saw in those schools. Soaring Eagles is

1 one of the high achieving schools that the board recognized  
2 last month as a blue ribbon winner.

3           This is the second time that school's won the  
4 blue ribbon because of the high performance of their -- the  
5 segregated groups. They're high poverty school that  
6 continues to exceed expectations and the board recognized  
7 then honored them last year -- last month for the second  
8 time as a blue ribbon winner.

9           Connect for Success brainteaser provided  
10 several different opportunities including, starting the  
11 grant off with a kickoff meeting, where they get -- they  
12 hear a presentation from a panel of school leaders from the  
13 high achieving schools, they get an opportunity to engage  
14 with and learn from those principals and school leaders.  
15 Then they make a site visit to the school.

16           They hire an implementation coach or a mentor  
17 who is an experienced educator that meets specific  
18 qualifications including having implemented Title one  
19 programs and having had a history with working with low  
20 performing schools. And then, that implementation coach  
21 helps them design a replication plan or an implementation  
22 plan to replicate the strategies and practices that they've  
23 learned by networking with the high achieving schools and  
24 from our study findings.

25           After their site visit, they create that

1 implementation plan. The implementation coach also helps  
2 with progress monitoring and reporting to CDE how the  
3 implementation is going. We currently have 20 schools in  
4 Cohort one of the Grant who are in their second year of  
5 implementation and we are also running an application to add  
6 some new grantees as a second cohort.

7                   The first year of the grant, grantees  
8 received \$20,000, that's their planning year and they use  
9 those funds for paying for networking with and making site  
10 visits to the high achieving schools. Second and third year  
11 are full implementation years, a lot of our grantees begin  
12 implementing strategies in that first year because what they  
13 learn by visiting the high achieving schools are strategies  
14 that can help them and be implemented right away with little  
15 or no dollars.

16                   So, they start those implementation  
17 strategies right away and then the second year take on the  
18 larger projects that might require more money. Based on  
19 preliminary 2016 SBF results, we've also seen very good  
20 trends for the Connect for success grantees. Just like in  
21 Mr. Sherman's slides, the orange line represents where their  
22 grantees started implementation of their program.

23                   In 2014, all 20 of our schools were  
24 identified as being priority improvement or turnaround and  
25 were on years one, two or three of the clock. In 2016

1 preliminary results, we see that over 55percent of our  
2 schools have come off of the clock and we will continue to  
3 monitor these schools and look forward to seeing how they do  
4 with a couple of more years of implementation and whether  
5 they can sustain this performance.

6                   We've also looked and dug deeper into the  
7 ones that have come off of the clock to see. We've learned  
8 that 25percent of them are actually rated at the performance  
9 level, which is the high SSP of reading this schools can  
10 earn.

11                   In comparison, schools that were eligible for  
12 the grant who did not apply or were not awarded the grant,  
13 17percent of those schools also perform that the performance  
14 rate -- were rated at the performance levels. So, again,  
15 we're going to continue to monitor these schools and  
16 watching their performance over the years to see if they can  
17 sustain this -- this effect.

18                   The Tiered Intervention Grant, as Mr. Sherman  
19 mentioned earlier, this is a grant that funding -- there  
20 will not be new funding for tiered intervention grants under  
21 ESSA. Locally, in the Colorado, we call this grant a tiered  
22 intervention grant.

23                   Nationally, it's called a school improvement  
24 grant. You may have heard of -- refer to it as both. For  
25 numerous years now, we've been supporting schools with

1 federal funds under the tenure G funds for receiving take or  
2 SIG grants.

3                   This grant has always been made available to  
4 our lowest performing schools, primarily the Title 1 or  
5 Title 1 eligible schools that are performing in the lowest  
6 five percent. Most recently, the criteria has been --  
7 they've been performing in the lowest five percent or have  
8 been Title 1 or Title 1 eligible high schools that have had  
9 extremely low graduation rates.

10                   The primary goal of the grant is to see  
11 dramatic and sustained improvements in schools. The grant  
12 it does require has some very prescriptive requirements  
13 including that one of four SIG models needs to be  
14 implemented. The turnaround transformation, restart or  
15 closure models, various nationally identified strategies are  
16 implemented by grantees.

17                   For example, some of the models require that  
18 the principal and some or all of the staff are replaced.  
19 Schools have to select the new instructional model. All  
20 models require an increased learning time for students  
21 except for the closure model and a new governance structure  
22 has to be put in place as per all part of that take grant.

23                   We have funded approximately 50 schools for  
24 three to five years each over the years. The impact of the  
25 grant has varied significantly across grantees. We've had

1 some very successful grantees in Colorado, others that  
2 continue to struggle with low performance. That is a trend  
3 that holds in national evaluations of SIG grants as well.

4           The grants range between \$275,000 to \$600,000  
5 for the three models, other than closure. Closure models  
6 are funded at much lower rate and they're funded with  
7 federal tenure 3G funds. And like I mentioned earlier,  
8 there will be no new funding under this grant for this type  
9 of intervention under ESSA. Any questions?

10           MR. SHERMAN: I will roll on. Back to me, the  
11 school turnaround leaders development grant, as most of you  
12 know, was a state program that began, excuse me, in 2014.  
13 I'm sorry. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

14           For -- I'm on the tail end of a cold so I  
15 apologize for my coughing. The goal of the program, as you  
16 know, is to develop a capacity of leadership training for  
17 our low probing schools and districts. It does that in two  
18 ways by identifying leadership development providers of  
19 which you all have approved a number of them. We have six  
20 today, over the years.

21           And then it also funds grants -- a lot of  
22 funds to districts and schools to send individuals to those  
23 identified programs. So to date, 120 individuals from 78  
24 different schools have participated over the past two years.  
25 Grants range significantly given the different providers

1 that we have. But those are state fund -- that's a state  
2 funded program.

3                   This slide shows which programs districts  
4 have selected to participate in over the two years. To  
5 remind you, districts choose the provider program that they  
6 apply for, that they think best fits their needs. The pie  
7 chart describes the percentage of participation of each of  
8 the identified programs, more detailed information about who  
9 participated and which program is available and can be  
10 shared with you.

11                   We're tracking participation and their  
12 experiences to ensure that -- that each of these provider  
13 programs offers a lot of value and helps those leaders be  
14 able to -- to effect student -- improvement with their  
15 students.

16                   And -- so, we are in the process of gathering  
17 information from about this program as we've discussed a  
18 couple of times in the past. Despite that, it's definitely  
19 proven to be difficult to be able to make the connection  
20 from a leadership training program to student achievement.

21                   There's quite a lag time. Some of the  
22 challenges there are around that lag time in training  
23 especially if some of the folks that are being trained are  
24 not necessarily at the helm at schools right away.

25                   There are lots of factors, as we know, in

---

1 school improvement and the unique context of different  
2 schools varies quite a bit. But this slide illustrates what  
3 we're looking for in leadership development for low  
4 performing schools and districts. All of the identified  
5 programs are expected to teach and lead towards the Colorado  
6 principal standards which are identified here.

7                   So around strategic leadership, instructional  
8 leadership, the idea of really influencing for results with  
9 students, developing community and external partnerships,  
10 and human resources management. So, we're working on ways  
11 to develop our evaluation process to be able to connect  
12 those dots across- from the program providers to the  
13 outcomes that we're seeking. Okay.

14                   So, I'll return to the same slide that we  
15 shared with you before. We wanted to revisit this and just  
16 focus a little bit on the funds and their sources. There  
17 were some questions earlier and perhaps we could dig into it  
18 if you have more questions.

19                   The return on investment is important to all  
20 of us. As you can see in that last column, most of the  
21 funding we have for sports comes from federal funds. That  
22 means that there are some limitations in the use of these  
23 funds.

24                   Typically, it's around eligibility for the  
25 Title 1 status or other designations. The amounts on this

1 table are averages per school per year. The full costs are  
2 not clear in all cases.

3           So these are the funds that are distributed  
4 through grants but there are also costs by our staff and  
5 that are involved in being able to support these programs as  
6 well. So generally, there's about \$10 million a year that's  
7 distributed in federal funds through these- through what we  
8 call the tenure 3A and tenure 3G funds that support all of  
9 these programs as well as some others.

10           So, this is what we want to give you an idea  
11 of what some of these costs are. As you can see, also that  
12 take grant as, Nazzy was explaining, is a program that was  
13 designed to have very large grants, but you can see in some  
14 of the other grants we believe that we're able to make a  
15 fairly -- fairly significant impact on some schools with  
16 much smaller grants anywhere from 30 to \$80,000 per year.

17           So we'll talk more on January 26. We -- at  
18 one of your special board meetings. Our ESSA committee will  
19 come and work with you again on that date. But we hope that  
20 this information will lay some context- some foundation for  
21 that conversation.

22           One more slide, but any questions about the  
23 funding? Okay. So finally, where -- we are in this to  
24 learn about what's working and what's not working and to  
25 really focus on what is. We've drawn out some of our key

1 learnings so far.

2                   We know that turnaround is hard work. We all  
3 know that but we do believe and have seen that there -- we  
4 can make some -- we can support districts and schools to  
5 make some quick gains early in the timeframe of months and  
6 years, in short time periods.

7                   We also know that, as I was just saying,  
8 strategic use of much smaller grants can really leverage  
9 partnerships, can leverage gains, changes that need to  
10 happen in schools and districts. A performance management  
11 helps to really prioritize some of the str -- some of the --  
12 the strategic decision making, that ongoing trusting  
13 relationships between the state, the school and the  
14 districts.

15                   We have found to be very effective. We can  
16 support districts to really think about their systems of  
17 support and help them with those pieces. Leadership is  
18 paramount and we know that we have more to learn but we are  
19 drawing from this what we can. So thank you so much for your  
20 time today. We really appreciate your attention.

21                   MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. That's a very  
22 optimistic report if ever we've had one. Comments,  
23 questions folks? Joyce.

24                   MS. RANKIN: How did the turnaround in  
25 priority improvement schools -- how many do you have in that

1 category? And over time, how many have you had? Can you  
2 just give me an estimate that haven't been interested in  
3 taking your services?

4 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. There are -- I'm not sure  
5 the current number, but we have about 160, 170 schools that  
6 have been in priority improvement and turnaround status.  
7 That number has changed. And I think as you see, the  
8 preliminary frameworks, you know, soon, I believe in the  
9 next couple of weeks, you'll get to see the exact numbers of  
10 that.

11 You can see the numbers of folks that have  
12 participated in these different activities. So out of about  
13 170 or so, it's a -- it's a percentage. It's not a --  
14 certainly not everybody that's been there. I think as both  
15 Nazy and I have said, we've made strong efforts to  
16 communicate these grants and encourage folks to come in and  
17 -- and be -- be involved in these and participate. I know  
18 right now we have several RFPs out, my staff's been actively  
19 recruiting. I was on the phone earlier with a district  
20 talking about the network and helping them think about which  
21 schools might be the right fit for it.

22 MS. RANKIN: So, how many have you -- have not  
23 accepted, you know, your help? In other words, you've gone  
24 to them, they are getting close to the end of clock and they  
25 still refuse -- for whatever reason, you know, they do not

1 want to be a part of this.

2 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. We -- so this slide has --  
3 has numbers per grant in each year that have applied versus  
4 those that have been accepted. So we can -- we can do the  
5 math there and we're happy to articulate that better for  
6 you.

7 In terms of other districts that maybe we've  
8 spoken with or that have learned about these grants that I  
9 have just said we're not interested, we don't necessarily --  
10 I mean, we -- we -- we -- again, we can back that out but we  
11 don't necessarily have records of sort of everyone that  
12 we've discussed that with.

13 MS. RANKIN: Can you just give me the  
14 approximate. Are we talking 40percent or are we talking  
15 5percent?

16 MR. SHERMAN: I'm sorry. I don't mean to be  
17 dodging your question, Ms. Rankin. I would say that, in  
18 terms of like the turnaround network, I would say that, of  
19 the districts that we've spoken with and schools that we've  
20 spoken with about that, I would say probably 75percent have  
21 applied and then we have probably about a 75percent  
22 acceptance rate.

23 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

24 MR. SHERMAN: Sorry to get -- take so long to  
25 get your answer.

1 MS. SCHROEDER: So I guess I have a couple of  
2 questions. Do you find districts coming forward as they're  
3 approaching the clock or do we have districts that are in  
4 turnaround or priority improvement and they immediately care  
5 about turning that around?

6 MR. SHERMAN: Yeah. I mean, that's a great  
7 question. I certainly, in my -- my experiences, talking to  
8 folks out in the field that -- that everyone cares about  
9 their school and I think when -- when -- if -- when -- when  
10 schools dip into turnaround or priority improvement for the  
11 first year, I think it certainly catches their attention.  
12 Some of them, I think, will say "Hey we had, we think  
13 there's something under control that we can adjust. We're  
14 good for now. We're going to- we're going to see how it  
15 goes.".

16 So I think for some schools, it takes them a  
17 year or two into the clock to say "Well, maybe this is a  
18 persistent problem that we need support with." And I think  
19 as now as you were saying, the connect for success for  
20 example is targeted more towards the beginning of the  
21 accountability clock, the network we tend to have people  
22 more in years two, three and four on the clock, because I  
23 think that they, again, they -- they may be the schools that  
24 say "Well, it seems like we're in this to stay on this  
25 clock. We -- we want some help and we'll more -- more open

1 to accepting that."

2 MS. SCHROEDER: So, I asked this partly  
3 because I think we -- there have been some discussions about  
4 whether five years isn't too damn long for us to allow  
5 schools and districts to be where they are for kids.

6 MR. SHERMAN: Yup.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: But I don't know whether we're  
8 -- we have the capacity to respond sooner. I mean, I think  
9 by shortening it to three years we would create a greater  
10 sense of urgency for school districts, but then do -- do we  
11 have the capacity or where else can we go to get the  
12 resources to help those folks to turnaround sooner?

13 MR. SHERMAN: I think that's -- I think that's  
14 a good question and I think it varies. I mean, we've  
15 certainly seen as you've seen in some of the starter. We've  
16 seen the schools that have made significant changes in one  
17 and two years.

18 That, you know, but typically those schools  
19 that have come off the clock they are not -- a number of  
20 them are in performance but some of them are not well under  
21 performance. You know, some of them are barely there.

22 And so, we -- they do have to sustain those  
23 changes. And so I think some ongoing support in that  
24 improvement category, performance category, is -- is  
25 critical.

1 MS. SCHROEDER: So that raises my second  
2 question which is, how do we sustain? Is there -- definitely  
3 there's sense of urgency, then there's the building of  
4 capacity. How do you main -- how do we maintain that  
5 capacity and have those habits become permanent for those  
6 districts?

7 MR. SHERMAN: And -- and my first response to  
8 that question is really about the district. We -- there're  
9 -- however, a number of schools, there are 180 schools, I  
10 don't know, that I believe it's the state's role to one off,  
11 you know, or consult with every one of those schools and no  
12 we don't have a capacity to do that over time.

13 But I think our -- with that goal that I  
14 mentioned a number of times today have are really helping  
15 districts build up their capacity, and I think what we've  
16 seen, and certainly through the network and through a number  
17 of these other grants, is districts thinking differently  
18 about saying, "Hey, you know, this is not just a single  
19 school problem, but we might have eight or 12 schools that  
20 are on the accountability clock."

21 How do we structure -- restructure things,  
22 and that might lead deeply into their human resources  
23 practices and saying, "Our low performing schools need to  
24 get first dibs on teachers or they need to have an extended  
25 timeline for hiring where they might need support or

1 different tools for recruiting teachers to those schools."  
2 Or it maybe around- around the, the supervision.

3                   There are some districts that have -- where  
4 principal supervisors have 15 to 18 schools that they  
5 supervise. We recommend that they have four to five and  
6 obviously that's not feasible in some districts, but in  
7 order to give them the kind of support that they need, the  
8 districts may need to rethink that kind of -- that kind of  
9 thing. How they distribute resources within districts is  
10 critical whether or not principals are required to come to  
11 professional development or if they have the leadership and  
12 the capacity to make site based decisions.

13                   I mean, this -- there's no right or wrong  
14 answer here but these are all ways that we're trying to push  
15 districts to think differently about how they manage on a  
16 daily basis. And so our -- our hope and our goal is to, to  
17 build up their capacity for districts so that they may have  
18 these schools come off the clock, but if they have others  
19 that depend, we want them to be much more agile and ready to  
20 be able to address the needs of those schools.

21                   MS. NAZZY: If I may add, Madam Chair, we also  
22 incorporate into the application process. Sustainability  
23 plans is a requirement in many of our grants. So the --  
24 even prior to getting the grant, schools and districts are  
25 being requested to put in place a plan for how they're going

1 to sustain any kind of improvements that they achieve as a  
2 result of the funds knowing that the funds have a limited  
3 life term.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: That's great. Thank you.

5 MS. FLORES: We also have issues that may be -  
6 - that may be, you know, out of the district's control or  
7 out of the school's control. I see a very big issue with  
8 teachers. (Indiscernible). Or it may be distance. And so  
9 (indiscernible) get this done in three years, we'll get this  
10 done in four years (indiscernible) and I'm hoping  
11 (indiscernible) teachers more so that (indiscernible).

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Pam?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you ever turn down  
14 applications from schools who want this help?

15 MR. SHERMAN: We -- we do and we have. Yes. I  
16 think again to that eligibility or to the acceptance rate  
17 that we've listed on some of the slides, there are schools  
18 that apply that are not accepted.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why?

20 MR. SHERMAN: For different reasons, for the  
21 different grants. But I can speak to- to the network in  
22 particular. We know that the engagement that I described is  
23 pretty intensive and requires a leader that -- that has  
24 certain capabilities, and in some cases we have we've gone  
25 to where there are schools that were -- their leaders are

1 not quite ready for that sort of level of engagement.

2                   It could be that the district is not ready to  
3 support side by side and that's -- that's a critical element  
4 of that. Sometimes these -- sometimes frankly applications  
5 are not -- are not written in a way that -- that makes a lot  
6 of sense or that gives us the sense that they have that they  
7 have acknowledged that there are challenges that they need  
8 to work toward, and -- and so -- so sometimes it's an  
9 application question as well. But I think I don't know if  
10 you want to speak to any of the other grants.

11                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12                   MS. NAZZY: When we write applications we do  
13 tend to include questions around the readiness and the  
14 capacity to implement the grant requirements. Particularly  
15 with federal dollars, there are a lot of requirements that  
16 schools have to meet in order to benefit from those grant  
17 dollars, and the application quality is definitely a factor  
18 that is considered a lot of times.

19                   It also is a matter of not having enough  
20 funds to support all of the applicants. Just like we were  
21 talking about earlier, sometimes we don't -- we get too few  
22 applicants. There are definitely a lot of times where we  
23 have a pot of money that we can make available to eligible  
24 schools, and the number of eligible schools that apply far  
25 exceed the amount of dollars that are available and then we

1 have to prioritize who receives the funds based on the  
2 greatest need.

3                   And so then we do end up turning down schools  
4 that are found eligible and have written a -- an acceptable  
5 and provable application, but there's just not enough money  
6 to fund everyone.

7                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I can see here that  
8 it shows the number of schools eligible, the number of  
9 schools applied and the number of schools accepted. Can we  
10 get more information on that?

11                   MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely. What other  
12 information would you --

13                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably we might want to  
14 know what schools in our districts might have applied and  
15 not gotten the help.

16                   MS. SHERMAN: Yes, we can do that. And then I  
17 think sorry, to the -- to the question earlier around  
18 capacity, that's another factor for us as well. Some of our  
19 supports requiring staff engagement and we have certain  
20 limitations there given the staff that we have, the number  
21 of staff we have.

22                   MS. PEARSON: Are there any particular grants  
23 that you would like that information on or just all of those  
24 same grants?

25                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably all of them.

1 What I'm getting now is if we have schools that are  
2 struggling and they're on the clock and they're in  
3 turnaround or priority improvement, I guess I want to make  
4 sure that Joyce is pointing out -- there may be schools and  
5 districts who aren't interested. But if we have schools and  
6 districts who are reaching out for help, I guess I'd like to  
7 see a good reason why they're not getting it.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: And I'm -- I'm definitely  
9 intrigued by the match. We have long talked about matching  
10 schools, with similar demographics but different results.  
11 It would seem to me that those are opportunities for a lot -  
12 - for more long term relationships simply because you guys  
13 are kind of essentially out of the picture after a while but  
14 those relationships have been established. So I'd be real  
15 curious how as we move forward how those work because then  
16 they are a great idea.

17 MS. NAZZY: Yeah. And that is one of the  
18 founding principles for the Connect for Success. We  
19 oftentimes hear from low performing schools, for examples of  
20 schools that have their similar demographics but have had  
21 really good success and by establishing those relationships  
22 and those networking opportunities, the hope is that then  
23 they will continue to seek out support and have the -- their  
24 own colleagues able to support them in the long run as part  
25 of that sustainability plan as opposed to --

1 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. Even when they bring  
2 in some new people. I mean you've got -- you've got also to  
3 worry about mobility of your staff, teachers and  
4 administrators etc and if you can't bring them along then  
5 you've lo -- then we've lost some of that capacity that  
6 we've known.

7 MR. SHERMAN: I think there are elements to  
8 that piece. I appreciate the comment. I think there are  
9 elements of that piece and most and -- and probably all of  
10 these supports, in ways that we encourage folks to visit, to  
11 get to know, to engage with districts and schools that are  
12 higher performing as well. I think it's a great thing.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: It's great, thank you. This is  
14 one of the more positive reports that I can remember, I'm  
15 really pleased. Remember we waited for this for a long  
16 time. I was asked for it --

17 MR. SHERMAN: We have, too.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- ages ago I believe, a year  
19 ago at least. So thank you very very much.

20 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, if I may I'd like to  
22 suggest a 10 minute break at least, we've been sitting,  
23 thinking hard but sitting, we need to move.

24 (Off record)

25 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. I can't stand that

1 gavel. It always scares me. So we're coming back to order.  
2 We would like to have a conversation right now about our  
3 legislative priorities.

4 I think we came to the conclusion that  
5 there's more work to be done, but to the extent that board  
6 members would like to provide some suggestions or input to  
7 the couple of versions that we have to look at, I think Val,  
8 and Joyce, and Jane would appreciate the help.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Here's my way and I -- I really  
10 liked Joyce's one page -- one pager, you know, it's and it's  
11 -- it's my feeling that when it comes to legislative  
12 priorities, we want to be as broad as possible so as not to  
13 first of all we may have different ideas on this board about  
14 how to go about the goal that the -- the objective sets out,  
15 but we all agree that we like that objective. Otherwise, if  
16 we get into the weeds on -- on how to go about that, then it  
17 boxes us in or it bo -- it may box some of us in and others  
18 not. So, I like the idea of a broad and- and not get into  
19 the weeds about it.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce?

21 MS. RANKIN: I just wanted to explain the  
22 rewrite that I did of the legislative priorities. I -- I  
23 started out by going back to 2005 actually on board  
24 documents and reading all of the legislative priorities from  
25 the beginning and the first thing that I noticed that I have

1 to agree with what Board member Mazanec said. We've got to  
2 take a higher level, look at the legislative priorities.

3 I think it's easy sometimes to get further  
4 into the weeds and micromanage what we're doing and I -- I  
5 don't think that's quite what our job is. I also found  
6 every year, every step of the way, first thing they talk  
7 about in our legislative priorities is finance and I know  
8 finance is always an issue. But I think we have to change  
9 that conversation to students.

10 I think students should always come first. I  
11 think we should have students first and that's where my  
12 legislative priorities began. Then I went to parents,  
13 citizens, districts, finance and federal.

14 Federal meaning flexibility because we may at  
15 any time change on a dime and we have to be ready to do  
16 that. So flexibility is built in all the way. Those were my  
17 main issues and my bullet points underneath those I think  
18 are very high level and general, and general enough but  
19 specific enough to talk about what our job is as far as  
20 legislative priorities go. So I -- I really did give it a  
21 lot of thought. I rewrote it in a very care- careful way. I  
22 -- I don't know if these, are these on board docs?

23 MS. CORDIAL: We've not posted them on board  
24 docs.

25 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Then I will not go into any

1 more details because it's just not fair but, but that's why  
2 I -- I rewrote everything, then we had one meeting and we  
3 did some edits and -- and now they're -- it's kind of gone  
4 back to what it was before. So I think I agree with board  
5 member Goff that earlier when she said we need to take  
6 another look at it, maybe rewrite it again and I -- I would  
7 agree with that, but that the students first, was my first  
8 thought of -- of all of this.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Steve, Val, any comments?

10 MS. FLORES: (Indiscernible -- sorry, I didn't  
11 -- I didn't. I really meant to include individual ones. I  
12 meant to include rural -- rural kids because I think they  
13 are in need. I also think that a big issue in trying to get  
14 that gap- to fill that gap is that we really do need to have  
15 early childhood education.

16 Not everybody will want to, but I think that  
17 we have a large number of economically distressed families  
18 where that is the only option. And there's a special  
19 program, I guess a PBS special program, this week. This is  
20 the second time I've seen it. It's fairly new. And it's on  
21 the merits of early childhood education and it does speak to  
22 every dollar you put in, you know, you'll you'll get back  
23 for -- four to seven dollars back.

24 And -- and, you know, thinking about young  
25 parents and where are they going to take their kids? I mean

1 if you look at other countries, even Mexico has early  
2 childhood education and this is our neighbor to the south.  
3 And so does Canada. But we just don't think --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Are you suggesting that goes  
5 under students? He -- help me out.

6 MS. FLORES: No, I'm just kind of pushing --  
7 pushing my agenda here on the page. And it should -- and it  
8 should be a kind of a big thing. It should kind of stand  
9 alone. But again, it -- it will take money. There's just no  
10 and's and but's about it. All the research says that if we  
11 do want our kids to get ahead for our poor kids, our needy  
12 kids, our rural kids. We need to, you know, spend that  
13 money in that -- in that area.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Which is not something we have  
15 much control over, unfortunately.

16 MS. FLORES: Well --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Steve, did you have some-

18 MS. FLORES: That's why we don't have control  
19 over it but because of we are policy people and we know that  
20 it's important, we need to get it right and it needs to be  
21 big.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Steve, did you have any input  
23 that you wanted to provide? You don't have to. You don't  
24 have to, it's just --

25 MR. DURHAM: I just to -- perhaps an

1 observation that we do have to separate our long term broad  
2 objectives from how we'll react specifically to introduce  
3 legislation and what kind of legislation will allow us to  
4 have introduced. And I think those are two separate things  
5 and so we've- we've had some basic things in the past we've  
6 looked at like local control, things like that we probably  
7 ought to emphasize in the long term legislative priorities,  
8 but there won't be a lot of specificity because they won't  
9 be associated with specific legislation unless we include  
10 something we want this year. We decided and that's almost  
11 the addendum, your -- your legislative priorities for the  
12 most part of how to how -- how to outlive a single session.

13 MS. FLORES: And you don't -- early childhood  
14 will. Quality early childhood.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane.

16 MS. GOFF: I don't -- I don't really have a  
17 lot more to add other than what I said this morning. As far  
18 as rationale, I -- what I tried to do real briefly is I took  
19 the other two people's basic comments and I tried to meld  
20 them together. Some of Joyce's for example, there's more  
21 than one thought in that part and I just -- that's how I  
22 reacted as well.

23 MS. FLORES: And I liked the change.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I think in the context  
25 financially that the state is in and believes we all are.

1 It's a different kind of year in that there just is no extra  
2 bucks -- piles of buckets of money lying around out there.  
3 So, how we present things it is a choice between what's  
4 realistic, what's still important, what's broad enough that  
5 it can outlive one year at time and make good decisions.

6                   At the same time, I think, you know, yes, I  
7 do hope and I think that our main thrust is what's the --  
8 what's for the best interests of kids and -- and how do our  
9 parent communities and -- and districts, what's everybody's  
10 role and contributions? I -- I liked every single concept  
11 presented under Joyce's version of that.

12                   I just find it hard to identify if we -- if  
13 we do have a bill that comes up. You know, on the one hand  
14 it matters, on the other hand it really doesn't matter. So  
15 it's like, you know, you're not going to lose. It's really  
16 a pretty good win win situation all the way around. I just  
17 kind of tended to go toward that specific categories because  
18 maybe -- maybe I'm presumptive but I don't think so.

19                   I'm trying to think like a legislator does or  
20 they could -- they would go to a cert -- I know, I know. Go  
21 to a certain place and find it would. So, I don't think  
22 that this is a big battle. We're getting into too much.

23                   I just think we can come to some sort of a  
24 format that is comfortable and we think it's going to serve  
25 our purpose and it's still going to communicate to

1 legislators that may or may not have time, energy,  
2 motivation, time to really delve into what we've sent over  
3 there. But we do want to have them to pay attention. It's  
4 just, you know, it's one of those you don't know what's  
5 going to happen to it. And I appreciate that we're not  
6 actually voting on some final product today because I don't  
7 -- I don't know that it's necessary.

8 I don't think we have the same -- we don't  
9 have a real sense of urgency. Everybody's a little bit in  
10 limbo land right now and until and unless we get some  
11 specific bills to work with, I think we -- we can slow down  
12 just a tad and do good work with that simultaneously.  
13 That's kind of where I am right now.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Rebecca, do you have any  
15 comments right now?

16 MS. FLORES: I just thought of a category, but  
17 this might be adding more and that would be -- and that  
18 would be the -- the gap -- the achievement gap. And --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: It's in there already.

20 MS. FLORES: And that, you know, that should  
21 be priority and early childhood should be under there--

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So, can we ask you guys to  
23 table that for today, ask you guys to spend some time on it  
24 and maybe have Jennifer. Please provide some feedback or  
25 some help. Since you're over there pretending like every one

1 of the legislators is actually going to read it.

2 MS. FLORES: Plus there is one question we had  
3 for our attorney as far as, if there's anything in there  
4 specifically about the waiver language. We're not done,  
5 we're not ready to do anything right now.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So we'll table that for next  
7 time, please. Okay?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there going to be a  
9 formal motion or are you --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I don't think so. Do you  
11 need a formal motion to table? Table's table?

12 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Table's table.

14 MS. CORDIAL: I think we're okay.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Great. Yes, we're okay. So I  
16 guess we'll go down the line. What I did on my Christmas  
17 vacation . Steve. I meant board reports. I was just going  
18 to ask.

19 MR. DURHAM: Board reports.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Thank you.

21 MR. DURHAM: Well, let me see. I think the  
22 one thing I learned is they still have the cutest three-year  
23 old granddaughter around. So, that was my Christmas  
24 vacation.

25 On the business side, the only thing I had

1 planned was, last week I was supposed to visit Addison 44J  
2 School District which was the top performing school district  
3 in the state located in El Paso County. It did snow that  
4 day, so it got canceled and it's now rescheduled for  
5 February 1st.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Give us a report next month.  
7 Dr. Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: I have been kind of listening to  
9 Gilpin Montessori people, the community and in fact I -- I  
10 visited Gilpin yesterday where parents and board got  
11 together and discussed really in a big way as to measures  
12 that were into. And I did say that I, you know, we -- we  
13 can't get involved. We cannot get involved --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank God; we can't get  
15 involved.

16 MS. FLORES: -- in their matters. But, you  
17 know, Gilpin is an old school. I remember being -- I was  
18 telling Steve that I worked on the DAC -- the district  
19 group, the SIAC, School Improvement and Accountability  
20 Council. And I remembered and went back to 2012 when SIAC  
21 made the recommendation that we like the Expe --  
22 Expeditionary Learning School, but maybe they shouldn't have  
23 placed it, you know, where they -- where they did because  
24 that was going to take kids away from the neighboring  
25 schools that were -- one of them which was Gilpin.

1                   And so, I mean, that has happened. And so  
2 I'm -- I'm sorry and I'm hoping that Denver makes -- the  
3 Denver Board, they're -- they're away from one point. In  
4 fact, they probably do have that point. Alyssa, do they  
5 have -- was Gilpin one of the schools where the mistake was  
6 made?

7                   MS. PEARSON: No. Madam Chair, we went back  
8 and looked and talked to the district. There was no  
9 conversation that we could find about, any concern about  
10 calculations from the state data with that school.

11                  MS. FLORES: Right.

12                  MS. PEARSON: So, I -- there is nothing we  
13 have record on there.

14                  MS. FLORES: And -- well, it's one point and I  
15 think they reduced it to -- to -- from two points to one  
16 point which made a big difference because that would have  
17 got them into, you know, really up there where they were  
18 hoping and they still had, I think, a couple of views. They  
19 failed.

20                  But now Denver Public Schools wants to turn  
21 them into -- wants to turn that into an office for  
22 administrators. So, it just doesn't seem fair where an  
23 older school with a community that's set in a focus area and  
24 is the school, the central community. And so, I mean, we  
25 can look forward to --

1 MS. SCHROEDER: I totally empathize. I've  
2 served on the board and had to go through that process  
3 twice. It is very painful. It's very hard. The one lesson  
4 I learned ultimately is that the kids were just fine. It  
5 was very hard on the adults but the kids ended up being  
6 fine.

7 MS. FLORES: That's not what the research  
8 says.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, it depends. High school  
10 is a little bit different, anyway. Pam, are you ready?

11 MS. MAZANEC: I really don't have anything,  
12 but I have the cutest 11 month old grandson.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: We can start.

14 MS. MAZANEC: And I survived my first  
15 overnight with him very well. He slept 11 hours. I didn't  
16 sleep. I woke up every hour to look at the monitor.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Rebecca, you get a pass if you  
18 wish.

19 MS. MCCLELLAN: Oh, that's all right. So, I  
20 spent my holiday break enjoying our college students' first  
21 break home from the University of Alabama and it was  
22 wonderful to have her home for a little over a month. Just  
23 delightful. So, I spent that time kind of recovering from  
24 the 14 month election process.

25 But during those 14 months, I had a chance to

1 meet with a lot of school board members, superintendents,  
2 teachers, parents and students. I toured Aurora Central with  
3 Superintendent Rick Munn and also met with community members  
4 at -- in Northeast Aurora at Fletcher Elementary School and  
5 that same group has asked to meet with me again and I  
6 certainly will.

7                   And I met with school board members, and  
8 stakeholders, parents, and students across the six  
9 congressional district from Douglas County up into Adams  
10 County and across Arapahoe. And of course, in my own home  
11 district where my children have gone to school, where my son  
12 still lives in school at Cherry Creek and so I've had  
13 interactions with stakeholders there as well -- as well as  
14 board members from Littleton School Board.

15                   So, kind of a cross-section across the  
16 district and looking forward to more meetings and diving in  
17 and thank you to everyone who has helped me to kind of begin  
18 to get up to speed as a new board member and especially to  
19 Alyssa Pearson who met with me recently for a briefing.  
20 Thanks for your patience with all my questions that I  
21 peppered you with and thank you for -- Dr. Anthes, for  
22 meeting with me as well and helping me kind of get up to  
23 speed. I really appreciate the staff time and patience and  
24 effort to help answer all my questions and- and help me be  
25 effective. So, thank you so much.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, it hasn't been  
2 that long since we met, but it seems like -- and the -- the  
3 holiday break. You know, I spent -- I had my three great  
4 nieces and the nephews ages, you guys are one generation.

5 MS. FLORES: We're going to get there.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they're all four  
7 years old and under. So, that was -- that was exciting,  
8 youthening, enlightening and it was very fun in the  
9 mountains, in Steamboat Springs so the Western Slope was  
10 easier to get to than it is today apparently.

11 And I have been spending the bulk of my fall  
12 months, when I can, with various kinds of groups in Adams  
13 County, particularly, of course, followed JeffCo as well.  
14 Adams 14 is -- has instituted a new parent forum. So, they  
15 gather on a regular basis and they get some topics presented  
16 much like a -- much like a workshop session where they --  
17 they sit down and they discuss.

18 This last one was really on how  
19 accountability works some sort of not the beginning but --  
20 but a follow up session about the fine points of  
21 accountability. And they're working through understanding  
22 more and better and trying to keep up with the new things  
23 that go on. That's basically it.

24 Jefferson County is -- has -- they had a  
25 different schedule of break so they were out until just this

1 past Monday. They were on a holiday break. So, things are  
2 a little bit differently. So, not a lot of activity there,  
3 but I enjoyed it. Madam Vice Chair.

4 MS. RANKIN: Thank you Madam Chair. I met  
5 with Steve Turner, the Denver History Museum director, in  
6 December and I heard about interesting things happening  
7 there and upcoming exhibits. And there was a dialogue about  
8 linking the History Museum and the small museums out in our  
9 rural areas to educational opportunities.

10 Going to a museum is like a field trip. But  
11 if there is some continuity between the small district  
12 museums, and we do have some very interesting ones in the  
13 western part of Colorado, maybe linked with what they're  
14 doing here the Denver History Museum in an educational way.

15 We had kind of a light conversation about  
16 that until I heard that they have someone in Pueblo at their  
17 museum actually writing some curriculum that will be used in  
18 the classroom. So when the students go to the museum, it's  
19 not just a field trip but it's an educational experience.

20 And they've also been able to get some  
21 funding for some buses in order to take the kids to the  
22 museum. So I thought that was pretty exciting. I also  
23 spoke with him about maybe working with Gene Hainer here in  
24 our library area. He's the director of libraries in the  
25 state and Gene and I had a conversation, Mr. Hainer and I

1 had a conversation about the possible follow up linkage  
2 between libraries, schools, and history museums.

3                   So getting that dialogue going in the  
4 conversation, I thought was really interesting and I believe  
5 Mr. Hainer will be meeting soon if he hasn't already with  
6 Mr. Turner. And I had an interesting telephone conference  
7 with Peter Sherman and Brenda Bosch here from CDE.

8                   It was on Dec 27th, so, that's how dedicated  
9 our staff is. It has to do with the question I asked at the  
10 last board meeting, the culture of performance. That's a  
11 phrase that I had no idea what it was, and I understand what  
12 changing culture is in a business setting. It's not only  
13 difficult but in order to be successful, many factors have  
14 to be working together.

15                   And in the business world, usually people  
16 that work in the business after they understand what this  
17 culture change is going to entail, they have the opportunity  
18 to lead and many of them do in order for culture to change  
19 to take place, and it takes years sometimes to change a  
20 culture. I had a difficult time understanding how that fits  
21 in with our school districts.

22                   Can teachers and students opt out away from  
23 dramatic culture change? And that's where our discussion  
24 began. That's very interesting, there was follow up with  
25 some reading materials that were very very helpful, and I

1 really appreciate Peter and Brenda for reaching out to help  
2 me with this understanding.

3           December board meeting, we also talked about  
4 rewriting the priorities and now Dr. Flores and I met and  
5 board member Goff was with us and we did discuss this as we  
6 talked. Yesterday, I went to the Smart Act Hearing, the CDE  
7 did an outstanding job actually of describing it to the  
8 legislature, the Education Committees, and I'm not just  
9 saying that, I had a couple of legislators come up and  
10 mention it. So that was nice.

11           And one more thing I'd like to share, I talk  
12 a lot about shining a spotlight on successful districts and  
13 successful schools. And one in particular in my district,  
14 SD school district 51, Mesa County Valley is one of those  
15 that has an interesting program on competent -- competency-  
16 based education, and under the incredible leadership of  
17 Superintendent Steve Schultz.

18           He is totally changing what is going on in  
19 that district and he has brought in parents, everyone has  
20 bought into this competency-based education. If you don't  
21 understand what that is, you can go to the website, the CDE  
22 website, and it's a system where a student is evaluated  
23 based on his or her ability to master individual skills or  
24 body of knowledge and they do not move on until that  
25 particular skill or body of knowledge is -- is accomplished.

1 And there's a two minute very short video that I would like  
2 to share with you that is on the CDE website that shines  
3 that spotlight on CD 51.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the education in  
5 the United States is in a very (indiscernible) And you have  
6 to be bold when you attempt to do something different. It  
7 has made me who I am today, they have made me more  
8 successful than anybody else has.

9 Moving to performance-based learning also  
10 known as competency-based education, is really a cultural  
11 shift that has been extremely (indiscernible) for all of our  
12 (indiscernible). Because of that engagement, they know  
13 where they are and what they need to go next.

14 In competence-based education, students have  
15 to demonstrate mastery of learning units before they are  
16 allowed to move on. And so over time, we won't have  
17 traditional grade levels, students will move at their own  
18 pace based on their level of mastery.

19 In learning about things that really matter  
20 where kind of effects humans have on the Colorado National  
21 Monument, for example. We're just doing things that are  
22 super interactive and super fun for everything.

23 (Indiscernible) side of the face like this. So we're really  
24 interested in preparing our kids for the kind of world  
25 they're going to have to enter as they leave high school or

1 college or wherever post-secondary education.

2                   They taught me things that I had never even  
3 thought of. We really want the students to understand the  
4 (indiscernible) world mindset, and that they can learn  
5 anything they want to if they put their mind to it.

6                   I would like to, actually see what it relates  
7 to and how I can use it in my real life. I'm passionate  
8 about this because I believe that this really is a model  
9 that will truly match more demand that the students must  
10 have in order to compete in the global economy as we  
11 continue on this journey that people are going to look back  
12 and recognize how this was really a turning point and they  
13 will celebrate the fact that this was a turning point in the  
14 community economically, as well as educationally.

15                   MS. RANKIN: I just want to congratulate Steve  
16 Schultz in School district 51, Mesa County.

17                   MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. So I just want to  
18 make sure that we're all aware of some of the stuff that's  
19 coming up very soon. Next week we have a hub meeting on  
20 January 19th, I know a number of you have been either  
21 attending or listening in. The 26th, we have another board  
22 meeting. February 1st through 3rd is the case conference  
23 coming up, and on February 2nd, the NASBE is having a  
24 regional meeting in Denver, and I believe it is mostly  
25 around ESSA issues. So I wanted to bring that to your

1 attention.

2                   On a personal level, I can't say that I've  
3 visited any schools. I spent time with my family. Yes, we  
4 had little people. They make the holidays delightful if  
5 you're lucky enough to be around them. I am going to be  
6 meeting I think next week with another one of my school  
7 districts, the school board and the legislators, that will  
8 be the third or fourth that I have. And I encourage you  
9 that if you represent a district that has that policy of  
10 bringing everybody together to talk about the legislative  
11 session, to talk about what does the school board want to  
12 see and to have the board members listen to the proposed  
13 legislation and provide feedback.

14                   It's a -- it turns out to be a very rich  
15 conversation, and at the same time particularly when we've  
16 got -- when I've had the opportunity to be there, it seems  
17 like there's always a question that they have, that they  
18 have really no understand -- that there's just information  
19 that they don't have that is very, very helpful. So to the  
20 extent that you might have that opportunity -- I really  
21 appreciate it.

22                   And as I said, I have a number of districts  
23 that do do that. Plus, I get to know the legislators a  
24 little bit better that represent them. So, thank you.

25                   Do you -- do we have any speakers? Let's go

1 check that out. I think that's our next -- yes, public  
2 comment.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) next  
4 week?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: We're meeting on the 19th.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: That is -- is that Thursday or  
8 Wednesday?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: January 19th is Thursday.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. It's Thursday and  
11 it's from noon to 4:00.

12 MS. FLORES: I thought it was from 10:00 to --

13 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

14 MS. FLORES: -- from 10:00 to 2:00.

15 MR. DURHAM: I have it -- I have it from 10:00  
16 to 2:00.

17 MS. FLORES: That's what I thought.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Uh-oh.

19 MR. DURHAM: I hope that's the case because th  
20 -- that afternoon I have work.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One second. Let's see  
22 where in my calendar --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I came late because I  
24 thought it was --

25 MS. SCHROEDER: I have noon also. So, we --

1 we had best to get that one straightened out. Find out  
2 exactly when it is.

3 MS. CORDIAL: I have -- I have the answer  
4 somewhere in my e-mail, but now I'm --

5 MS. FLORES: I think it was announced from  
6 10:00 to 2:00 with all those people, and so we --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: I -- I don't -- I don't know,  
8 Val, but we'll -- we'll work on it.

9 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: And Bizzy, please be sure to  
11 send us all an e-mail since we have two different times.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. I will.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. I'd like to welcome  
14 back Mr. Walker. We've missed your input and despite the  
15 fact that you wrote down a whole bunch of stuff here, I have  
16 a hunch you want to say it rather than just have me read it.

17 MR. WALKER: If you read it into the record it  
18 has more gravitas.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: No. I don't think so. Please  
20 come forward. Talk to us. You have three minutes and we'd  
21 like your time.

22 MR. WALKER: I'm back, hopefully. And last  
23 night President Obama said to all of us, "Don't give up.  
24 Keep trying. You don't always win. And I'm not a good  
25 loser.

1                    Anyhow, with Mr. Board Member Durham's  
2 permission, I'd like to pick on him for a little bit. Is  
3 that okay, Steve?

4                    MR. DURHAM: That's fine.

5                    MR. WALKER: Okay. I halfway agree what you  
6 said about experts and I for one wonder with all the talk  
7 about false news and all of our pundits and editorial  
8 pages, the National Public Radio, Colorado Public Radio.  
9 Hillary Rodham Cli -- Clinton was supposed to win. She  
10 didn't win. Did our experts misinform us?

11                   Regarding the report, when you're talking  
12 about the experts. Who are the experts? If you're in the  
13 military, the expert is the General. If you're in a medical  
14 institution, the expert is the MD. If you're in -- if you're  
15 in sports, it's the coach. In law, it's a lawyer. But if  
16 you're an educator and our schools of education and you're  
17 looking for CEOs, what is a doctorate in Education or Ph.D.  
18 worth? And sometimes it makes you wonder.

19                   I mean, we all taught. Everybody teaches.  
20 Everybody evaluates. I'm evaluating you and you're  
21 evaluating me. But, what do the tests say?

22                   When I was in med school, University of  
23 Minnesota, Paul Neal, President of the American  
24 Psychological Association said, "IQ is what the IQ test  
25 measures." Your operation definition of curriculum and

1 standards is what the standardized tests tell us. But what  
2 does a person of Color think when we listen to Colorado  
3 Public Radio for the last month talking about we're down  
4 1500 teachers in this State.

5                   There's been a significant loss of teachers  
6 in the last 10 years. I think 20percent. What do teachers  
7 think? Board member, Durham, when you -- when you question  
8 the expertise of the staff here and the teachers, what do  
9 they think? What do people of Color think when they hear  
10 that you're going to have a new standardized test in June  
11 when every test, no matter what you call it for the at least  
12 the last 20 years, people of Color score significantly lower  
13 than Anglos. Mixed race people are in between. What do  
14 people of Color think and how much do they trust the experts  
15 when all of a sudden, now we're going to come out with a new  
16 test in June.

17                   Is the results going to be any different?  
18 Are Anglos going to school -- score significantly lower than  
19 people of Color in June? I don't think so.

20                   I mean, we're cynical. We have some  
21 privileges. What do people who depend upon the experts  
22 really think? I don't know of any doctor who's been out in  
23 the field who think they're gods. Some of the medical school  
24 do. But part of being an expert knows you're not a god,  
25 you're wrong. And that goes with teachers in education and

1 they have to be given the respect.

2                   And in Colorado, when were last per capital  
3 funding of higher education, 40th in the United States about  
4 funding K through 12, seventh in the nation per cap income  
5 and we look at the salaries of CEOs, billionaires, the  
6 Broncos and other. How do teachers feel when their  
7 expertise is questioned, like you did, sir? And I agree  
8 with half of what you're saying. Like, "Who are the --

9                   MS. SCHROEDER: George.

10                  MR. WALKER: -- experts? Who do we look to?"

11                  MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

12                  MR. WALKER: The editorial pages and the  
13 journalists on the next presidential election? I don't  
14 think so. Thank you for your time.

15                  MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

16                  MR. WALKER: And thanks, Steve for taking it.  
17 I appreciate it.

18                  MS. CORDIAL: Madam -- Madam Chair?

19                  MS. SCHROEDER: We are -- we are -- we're not  
20 adjourned. What's the right word? I keep forgetting. We'll  
21 recess. We'll recess until tomorrow. I should remember  
22 that word. That was my favorite subject. That was my  
23 first.

24                  MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair.

25                  MS. SCHROEDER: 9:00 tomorrow morning.

1 MS. CORDIAL: The -- the ESSA hub meeting on  
2 the 19th, is from noon to 4:00. And the ESSA hub meeting on  
3 February 6th is from 10:00 to 2:00.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MS. CORDIAL: So the new --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you have that, Val? Steve?

7 MS. CORDIAL: The one next week is from noon  
8 to 4:00.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: It's from noon to 4:00.

10 MR. DURHAM: That's Thursday?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

12 MR. DURHAM: Not good. Elizabeth, can I ask  
13 you a question about the -- all right. Which one of these  
14 do I want --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

16 MR. DURHAM: So it should remember --

17 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah. It should -- if you -- if  
18 you're gone for a few days it'll -- it will pop back up and  
19 it'll ask you to retype your password.

20 MR. DURHAM: Okay. All right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: By the way, my  
22 (indiscernible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. All right.

24 (Meeting adjourned)

25

---

1

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25