



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
December 15, 2016, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on December 15, 2016,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

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



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So -- he is a funny guy, a  
2 smart guy. Don't -- don't die. All right we are good as  
3 long as no one's here. We're waiting for a few staff to  
4 arrive. What are we waiting for?

5                   MS. CORDIAL: We're going to take 6.02.

6                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I know that.

7                   MS. CORDIAL: Okay. Oh, okay.

8                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's -- I got it. I'm on  
9 top of this. We're going to proceed out of order for item  
10 6.02. The item is the Commissioner's presentations and  
11 recommendation concerning district accreditation.  
12 Commissioner, then you have a few staff people you'll need  
13 to ask.

14                   MS. ANTHES: Yes.

15                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And there she is. This is  
16 it -- to her.

17                   MS. ANTHES: Wait a minute.

18                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, Lisa, okay, I'm sorry.  
19 I thought it was -- okay.

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

21                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. So this is the  
22 document you gave yesterday or not? Why can't I just find  
23 it? Yes, I remember it. Could this be it? This is it --  
24 all right.



1 MS. CORDIAL: We're gonna -- we're gonna go  
2 in the right order.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are going in -- on the  
4 right order?

5 MS. ANTHES: I mean, if you really -- if you  
6 wanna do the district piece really fast, we can do that --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure. Go ahead. Are you  
8 saying you wanna go to 6.01?

9 MS. ANTHES: Yeah, lets do that.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We'll do 6.01  
11 which is the Commissioner's decisions concerning district  
12 Accreditations. Commissioner?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I guess.

14 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Mr. Chair --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We really have killed  
16 (inaudible).

17 MS. FLORES: I told you to eat the candy and  
18 this sweet, remember?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, I remember.

20 MS. FLORES: Didn't happen.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The objective was to kill  
22 (inaudible).

23 MS. FLORES: The objective was to  
24 (inaudible).



1 MS. ANTHES: So this is in relation to what  
2 we've been talking about for several weeks around assigning  
3 accreditation ratings for districts. This in statue is  
4 actually a Commissioner decision, we're presenting this to  
5 you for information. If --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

7 MS. ANTHES: -- oh, no problem.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're starting in 01  
9 because we went back to right order.

10 MS. ANTHES: This is an information item  
11 only. These are the Commissioner decisions on district  
12 accreditation ratings, and if any district disagrees with  
13 their rating to the extent that they want to appeal, they  
14 can appeal those ratings and then that would come to you.  
15 So this is the summary of all of those decisions, you'll  
16 see there are quite a lot. So Alyssa's gonna walk us  
17 through the overview and --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's really nice that  
19 you (inaudible).

20 MS. FLORES: Yes, I agree.

21 MS. PEARSON: Sorry, I printed -- so there's  
22 so many years now I just print it like that. If you guys  
23 wanna -- we can try and get it on one more, we go -- I  
24 know.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this what we're  
2 looking at?

3 MS. ANTHES: Yes.

4 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

6 MS. PEARSON: But you'll see at the top  
7 there's different years to (inaudible) --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do. I do. I do.

9 MS. PEARSON: -- that kind of -- what I do  
10 have -- a pretty little summary (inaudible).

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Where -- where at the top?  
12 Oh, I see. (Inaudible) really, 2000. I see, I see. Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

14 MS. PEARSON: I don't know where that came  
15 from. CBS definitely had the color coding in place.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So the terrorist warning -  
17 -

18 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Okay.

20 MS. PEARSON: Okay, sorry we're just waiting  
21 for the PowerPoint to come up. (Inaudible).

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you're -- so in order  
23 to read this, and you start Academy 20 has -- is listed on  
24 five pages or six pages.



1 MS. PEARSON: Yes. So you all have this  
2 electronically in an Excel document, which is much easier I  
3 think to look up things up in. But if there is a way that  
4 you wouldn't like your districts that has congressional  
5 districts and there some can see just yours we can sort it  
6 by that and just give you a copy of your districts if that  
7 would be helpful. Would you like that? Okay. We can  
8 print. Let me write that down. So just your districts and  
9 -- I'll try and see if we can get a way to condense so  
10 you'll have it on one like really long legal page or  
11 something.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you give by  
13 tomorrow?

14 MS. PEARSON: By tomorrow?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) with the  
16 CDE people -- if not, it's okay.

17 MS. PEARSON: No, we'll work on that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

19 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

21 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 MS. PEARSON: Yes, they can see and trigger  
24 it. Okay. Would that work for you all if we do it -- so



1 we can get it on one legal but you wouldn't read the whole  
2 rating but you can see the color bit of it?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where is the Excel  
5 spreadsheet? I don't see in Board docs.

6 MS. PEARSON: We sent those to you over e-  
7 mail. Open it up Board docs after now because we had an  
8 embargo until the presentation just to manage it.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

10 MS. PEARSON: What? Oh yeah, we can put it  
11 on.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you send it over to  
14 us in PDF file? (Inaudible).

15 MS. PEARSON: That's what I would say, let's  
16 go for Excel. And we have the PowerPoint now. Look, we  
17 are all set, see? So what we are gonna do, will do this  
18 really quickly for you all and try and catch up some time  
19 for the afternoon. Just give you a quick background an  
20 overview of accountability, we wanna give you some details  
21 on the request to reconsider process from this year. Talk  
22 about the result and what we saw, and give you a little  
23 preview about the accountability clock because you know all  
24 this leads into who is coming up and who's coming next.



1                   So Jessica Nevels is with me. She led and  
2 organized and made the whole request to reconsider process  
3 work. Luckily we had a whole bunch of volunteers from  
4 across the department that volunteered their time to help  
5 us review because we had so many this year. We're very  
6 grateful to all their help and Brenda is gonna talk about  
7 the accountability clock when we get to those slides. But  
8 we'll be fast.

9                   So you all know the background on the  
10 Education Accountability Act. You know that requires us to  
11 have the same accountability for schools and districts  
12 across the state districts. We give a District Performance  
13 Framework Rating to that determines their accreditation  
14 rating. The commissioner assigns the district performance  
15 framework ratings. Schools get a school plan type. We  
16 will make a recommendation to you all about the school plan  
17 types for the ones, you know the ones that we calculated  
18 and didn't request to reconsider. Those are  
19 straightforward the ones that had to request reconsider the  
20 document you have. Like this for the districts. It's  
21 going to be, I don't know five times as big for the  
22 schools.

23                   So we're going to make sure you have plenty  
24 of time for it because we had so many school requests this  
25 year. So you will make that recommendation to you and then





1 you will vote on it. We're trying to figure out the exact  
2 timing of that to make sure you have enough time with that  
3 big document. To go through and look at it before you need  
4 to vote.

5                   So we're working and maybe seeing if we can  
6 do something at the study session or in the special meeting  
7 on 26th of January so that we can move it and not wait till  
8 February get just time for what you need. So today is just  
9 information we're just presenting you the final decisions  
10 about the districts accreditation types. We'll talk a  
11 little bit later as well but districts that are prior to  
12 improvement or turnaround can appeal those decisions to you  
13 all. So there's a process for that. We may get a few  
14 appeals. We don't know. We've had a few of those in the  
15 past.

16                   Mapleton and Sheridan came twice on an  
17 appeal for their meeting, so we'll see what happens this  
18 year. We've basically talked purpose already again it's  
19 consistent measures, we're looking for being able to look  
20 at the relative areas of strength and those of schools and  
21 districts that are having challenges to that we can support  
22 there. And I think I'll just focus on the frameworks are  
23 really about describing student performance. That's what  
24 we're trying to do with them. To describe what the



1 performance is of the students within the district or the  
2 school.

3                   When we come to talk about whether adults  
4 are working hard enough for what the people are on the  
5 right track or not or what's going on in the day to day,  
6 that's really a conversation we want to have around the  
7 accountability clock and the decisions on the pathway  
8 there. But what we try to do with the frameworks is really  
9 be objective about the student performance that's going on  
10 and describe that. So we know who we need to support and  
11 know who we need to learn from.

12                   We talked a few months ago about the  
13 ratings. Just a reminder we have those insufficient state  
14 data ratings now because some communities either do not  
15 have enough students testing to be able to create a report  
16 because of parent excuse all or other non participation  
17 reasons or upon request to reconsider or submitted data to  
18 show that those students are not represented, either it's  
19 too low to be able to conclude that the performance rating  
20 that came out from the frameworks was conclusive. So we  
21 have some of those this year.

22                   Again, these are the indicators that go into  
23 the frameworks you all have seen this before and you helped  
24 us with this last spring and summer. I could have an  
25 academic achievement. But right now we're looking at the



1 mean scale score, growth, post secondary workforce  
2 readiness, measures and you can see the weightings those  
3 are the weightings you all provided for us last June.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible). We've had  
6 a lot more than what we have here on page six because of  
7 the participation (inaudible). There's the low  
8 participation. I'm confused. Decreased participation and  
9 low participation, can you differentiate that?

10 MS. PEARSON: Sure, sure. So the low  
11 participation -- you may go back to the slide. The low  
12 participation is an interpretation guide like putting it on  
13 the frameworks just so that people when they look at it,  
14 can know to interpret with caution. That -- that the data  
15 that they see in front of them may not represent all of the  
16 students in the district, so it's just to help interpret  
17 it. The decrease due to participation is given. It's  
18 that's the accountability piece of it. If it's other than  
19 parents excuse, thus we remove the parent excuse before  
20 anybody has decreased. If after removing those, you're  
21 below 95 percent participation then the ratings lowered one  
22 level.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you're usually going  
24 for the one in the middle. That you choose strength of  
25 what you're --



1 MS. PEARSON: Yes. When it is, when it's  
2 not -- exactly. Exactly.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. PEARSON: You're welcome. I'm gonna to  
5 have Jessica talk about the request so we can consider  
6 process kind of what we've gone through. We know some of  
7 you were at the Casspi session this weekend, so we'll try  
8 and keep it quick, but please let us know because we know  
9 this is an important process and it will come to bear when  
10 you all assigned the school plan types.

11 MS. JESSICA: Thanks Allyson. Good  
12 afternoon everyone. I'm going to talk briefly about the  
13 Request to Reconsider Process. Ensure that a Request to  
14 Reconsider Process is a process by which a district to  
15 participate and if a different accreditation rating or plan  
16 type assignment better describes district overall rating or  
17 the school's performance. The process begins with the  
18 release of the preliminary performance frameworks which  
19 have already gone out, and then ends with the decision  
20 around the final district accreditation meetings and school  
21 land types.

22 So -- so districts had until 7th of  
23 November. That was the deadline to submit additional  
24 evidence to the commissioner on their district  
25 accreditation rating. CDE supported districts by reviewing



1 drafts and now with the deadline for that was 17th of  
2 October. Beginning and up to the deadline CDE offered  
3 additional support for the districts to receive technical  
4 assistance or any other support associated with the request  
5 to reconsider process.

6                   We received a record-breaking number of  
7 requests this year. There were 41 total requests that were  
8 submitted for the districts and just over 234 are  
9 considered reconsiders that were submitted. That was about  
10 double that we had in 2014. So consideration for requests.  
11 These are the considerations for us to that are submission.  
12 There are a number of them. The large majority of the  
13 considerations that districts submit are recrossed  
14 reconsiders on the first two. So what we call a body of  
15 evidence request, which is submitting additional data to  
16 the department, maybe local assessment data, post secondary  
17 workforce readiness data, growth data and so on. And then  
18 another type of request was around missed coding that may  
19 have happened on the state assessment that may have  
20 affected the overall participation rate, and we'll get into  
21 that a little bit later.

22                   Okay, so to sum it up here of the 41  
23 requests for that we received for the District  
24 accreditation rating. 28 were approved or partially  
25 approved, which was about two thirds of the district



1 requests that were submitted. And then you can see the  
2 breakdown on the side of the types of request that we  
3 received for the Districts again and then the approvals are  
4 partial approvals. So five are based on the impact of the  
5 students on the DPF rating. Two are based on a single  
6 school rating for the District, 17 based on miscoding on  
7 the state assessment. So that would be that participation  
8 consideration, and then four based on body of evidence, and  
9 four based on the request for insufficient data.

10 So those are the requests that we received  
11 that were approved or partial approval. Then the requests  
12 that were not approved, there were 13 of those, so about a  
13 third and nine were based on additional supplemental data  
14 that was submitted to the Department for the District  
15 accreditation rating. Two are based on the fact that the  
16 AC (inaudible) did not meet the requirements of the State  
17 Board rule. Two based on miscoding for the state  
18 assessment and then three based on removal of the low  
19 participation flag. And then talk about appeals.

20 MS. LISA: Yeah.

21 MS. JESSICA: Do you want to get into that?

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So we already discussed  
23 this a little bit, but again, those districts that are  
24 priority improvement are turnaround based on these final  
25 decisions in state board rule. They have a process where



1 they can appeal to you all for their decision. They need  
2 to give 10 days, within the next 10 days, give us  
3 notification that they would like to do that and go through  
4 that process. They'll let Elizabeth know and then we'll  
5 start working on the scheduling of those, if any come  
6 forward. We'll have to if we, if we end up in that  
7 situation, we'll have to figure out how to do that and time  
8 it with accountability hearings. If any of them are on, at  
9 the end of the clock in that piece. So we'll figure it  
10 out.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is (inaudible).

12 MS. PEARSON: I think we, we sent them  
13 letters, Monday or Tuesday, but I think we'll count 10 days  
14 from today because today is like the official published  
15 time. So -- so, we'll let you know where that ends up. So  
16 we'll talk quickly about the results. This slide has  
17 results from 2010 through 2016. Just so you can kind of  
18 see where it's changed over time, although from '14 to '16,  
19 the direction you all gave us in June was to align cut  
20 scores and the distribution with what they were in '14. We  
21 decided not to go back and renew 'em and put more back in  
22 turnaround and priority improvement than were in there  
23 before.

24 So the -- the percentages look very similar  
25 and that was done on purpose based on your direction. What



1 you will see that's different this year than in past years  
2 is that now, we have 13 districts in that insufficient data  
3 category, about seven percent of them. But all together in  
4 distinction are accredited, we have 67 percent of our  
5 districts are there. Here's just a little color rainbow  
6 chart for you to be able to see it visually, if that's  
7 helpful. You can see results are fair. You know, again,  
8 fairly similar from '14 on purpose, but you see that gray  
9 at the bottom, that's the insufficient data. And that's  
10 what we hadn't had before.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So turnaround is very  
12 skinny.

13 MS. PEARSON: Turnaround is very small. We  
14 have one district in turnaround. From 2014 to 20.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One district?

16 MS. PEARSON: There's one district in  
17 turnaround.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible) the clock for  
19 consideration (inaudible).

20 MS. PEARSON: There's (inaudible). It's in,  
21 just a few, if you don't mind.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

23 MS. PEARSON: We have it all laid out. We  
24 looked at the changes between years, we always do this.  
25 There's always movement between years of districts, up and





1 down, but we just wanted to show you. About half of the  
2 districts received the same plan type in '16 as they didn't  
3 in '14. We had about 22 percent that increased a level and  
4 a smaller percent that decreased the level, that 18  
5 percent. And then we, again, we had the seven percent that  
6 moved to insufficient data.

7                   So the participation impact, we wanted to  
8 summarize this for you. We had 11 districts that had  
9 insufficient state data due to low participation ratings.  
10 So that's something new. In the end, we had, only had  
11 three districts whose final ratings were decreased one  
12 level because of the participation rate. Most of the  
13 districts, because the, the preliminary numbers were much  
14 higher, most of them had coding issues or other reasons why  
15 that participation rate data that we had and calculated it  
16 on wasn't accurate in the first place. So we're gonna work  
17 very closely with them to make sure their coding is correct  
18 in the future so we don't need to go through this process  
19 and we can just get, make the calculations accurate in the  
20 first place.

21                   So we will help them with that. And then we  
22 had 84 districts this year that received that low  
23 participation. Description on there, that had  
24 participation rates lower than 95 percent in two or more  
25 content areas. These are 25 districts that are accredited



1 with distinction. We're working on a recognition ceremony.  
2 Some of you probably remember from 2014 and prior, we would  
3 do a big award ceremony for the schools and the districts  
4 in December. We're working to figure out a good time and  
5 location for that in the New Year. Now, I'm gonna pass it  
6 down to Brenda now, who'll talk about the clock and talk  
7 about the districts that are at the end of the clock and  
8 where we're at in those pieces.

9 MS. BRENDA: All right. Thanks, Lisa. This  
10 chart that you have in front of you depicts the districts  
11 that were on the clock in 2010. Whether they're in year  
12 one or two depending on their 2009 rating and how they  
13 progressed since then. So we started with 24 districts on  
14 the clock in 2010. Nineteen districts or about 80 percent  
15 have earned their way off the clock at some point, with a  
16 couple of districts falling back on the clock. And the red  
17 indicates that the districts are accredited with  
18 turnaround, the orange with priority improvement and the  
19 blue boxes indicate that that district came off the clock  
20 that year, so they earned a rating of improvement or  
21 higher.

22 So we just wanted to show this visual to  
23 let, to depict how a great number of the districts that  
24 were originally on the clock in 2010 have earned their way  
25 off the clock at some point in time. And there are five



1 districts that have not earned their way off the clock yet  
2 and have consistently been on the clock since 2010.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I -- can I ask a  
4 question on --

5 MS. BRENDA: Yes, please.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- on the slide 21.  
7 Mountain BOCES. Tell me what that is.

8 MS. PEARSON: Yes. So this is like tricky,  
9 when Mountain BOCES runs an alternative education campus  
10 school and so, the bosses that run schools get  
11 accreditation ratings. In the beginning of the  
12 accountability, we were trying to figure out what was  
13 appropriate for bosses that runs an alternative education  
14 campus. And so, at the beginning of those years on the  
15 clock, they were getting a regular DPF, District  
16 Performance Framework, just based on the traditional  
17 framework but for an AEC and we knew that didn't quite line  
18 up. So what we were able to find is in the board rules  
19 that allows if there's -- if a district runs a single  
20 school, the school rating can become the district rating.  
21 So now, we are able to give mountain bosses accredited with  
22 an AEC performance rating. We're using their school  
23 ratings for the district.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they stand alone  
2 from a district, is that correct? Is every alternative  
3 school a standalone does lower the district or?

4 MS. PEARSON: No, that's part of the request  
5 to reconsider process. So I think you're asking two things  
6 coming back a bit --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, and understand  
8 what I'm asking and I understand the answer now. Thank  
9 you.

10 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you want to explain  
12 it go ahead (OVERLAPPING)

13 MS. PEARSON: Well, if you know, then I'm  
14 good unless you got somebody to go into it. Okay.

15 MS. FLORES: What's the difference between  
16 the orange and the red, I don't know.

17 MS. BRENDA: The red -- the red boxes  
18 indicate turnaround, accredited with turnaround and the  
19 orange indicates they were accredited with priority  
20 improvement.

21 MS. FLORES: Oh, sorry.

22 MS. BRENDA: Yeah. No, no. And -- yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just put in the  
24 shadings (inaudible).

25 MS. PEARSON: It's probably not --



1 MS. BRENDA: Yes, different --

2 MS. PEARSON: -- matching colors. We'll  
3 have to work on that.

4 MS. BRENDA: We'll work on that.

5 MS. PEARSON: We'll work on getting all of  
6 the color for turnaround --

7 MS. BRENDA: Maybe a better color code.

8 MS. FLORES: But they're the same, right?

9 MS. PEARSON: They're very similar. I know  
10 a lot. There was not much difference. There was a few  
11 differences with turnaround. There is a requirement from  
12 the UAP in terms of turnaround strategy that are not and  
13 for priority improvement. And then you all actually, have  
14 the authority for earlier action for districts or schools  
15 that are on turnaround status and not making progress, that  
16 you can direct action earlier than the five years.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just haven't.

18 MS. PEARSON: You haven't done that but you  
19 have the ability to do that where you don't for priority  
20 improvement.

21 MS. BRENDA: That's correct.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does -- sorry, does  
23 turnaround know (inaudible).

24 MS. PEARSON: The early action flexibility?



1 MS. FLORES: Yeah (inaudible) they're not  
2 going either way ever like it looks like on paper. I just  
3 feel curious (inaudible) I find it frustrating, the whole  
4 topic about where's some early intervention that we called  
5 for only with turnaround and that's that, because open to  
6 some other areas that's another thing.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I do apologize, I  
9 apologize.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question -- no, do I  
11 need to repeat it?

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

14 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I knew you would say  
16 that.

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You know, we all do but  
19 the tape my not.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Got you. Okay

21 MS. PEARSON: Statute is specific to  
22 priority improvement and turnaround for state intervention.  
23 But all schools and districts are required to have a  
24 unified improvement plan where they should be looking at  
25 where they're struggling, where they're doing well, doing



1 work there. So speaking of priority improvement and  
2 turnaround.

3 MS. BRENDA: Yes. These are the districts -  
4 - these are the five districts that have progressed  
5 consistently on the clock and have -- are about to enter  
6 year six as of July 1st, 2017. There is one district in  
7 turnaround which is Adam's 14 and then Aguilar, Julesburg,  
8 Montezuma Cortez and Westminster 50 are in -- are  
9 accredited with prior improvement.

10 MS. ANTHES: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

12 MS. ANTHES: I just wanna clarify one thing  
13 just because I think we sometimes interchange these things.  
14 What we're talking about here are the districts that are on  
15 the --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible).

17 MS. ANTHES: Yeah, they're -- they're -- I  
18 don't wanna say many more schools, but there are many more  
19 schools. So when you only see five, it doesn't mean that  
20 you just got off the hook with a lot of work.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, we know. We're aware  
22 of that.

23 (Overlapping)



1 MS. ANTHES: I'm aware that all of a sudden  
2 this process took schools off the clock. It didn't.  
3 That's just the district.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. BRENDA: Thank you for the  
6 clarification. And so, yes. The five districts that are  
7 currently on the clock will have to come for an  
8 accountability hearing before you between February and  
9 June. And Commissioner Anthes, this is right that there  
10 are schools as well and some of those are included in the  
11 districts on this list and some are not. According to  
12 preliminary ratings there are 12 schools that will be  
13 entering year six. This brings the total number of unique  
14 districts to about 10 districts. Again, this is based on  
15 the preliminary rating.

16 And I just wanted to quickly note that there  
17 is one district that's entering year five. So in 2000 --  
18 so, they came on the clock in 2011, which is why they  
19 weren't included on that first chart I showed. But they  
20 came on in 2011 and have been on the clock constantly since  
21 then and that's through our public schools. And so, they  
22 will be entering the fifth year with -- accredited with  
23 priority improvement plan.

24 And so, if they were to remain on the clock  
25 following next year's ratings, then they would come for a





1 hearing in 2018 and of note though, is that because they're  
2 entering this year five, they will receive a state review  
3 panel visit, an evaluation this spring. With the state  
4 review panel visits the year five districts. So they are -  
5 - they will -- they are slated for that review. And that  
6 is all I have. Are there are any other questions in clock?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin.

8 MS. RANKIN: So -- so, accreditation rating  
9 is the only thing that they go to the Commissioner with if  
10 they are a district. But the Board is the one that -- that  
11 says the next step of it's turnaround, whether it's a  
12 district or a school and a school comes just across the  
13 board. Okay, that's a little confusing. What is  
14 accreditation?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you wanna get into  
16 that now?

17 MS. RANKIN: Oh is it -- should I know this?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, I think there's  
19 -- no, you shouldn't know it. It's, I think, it's not  
20 always clearly defined in the state law, what having  
21 accreditation means and what it doesn't mean. But it's our  
22 responsibility to accredit districts as the department. We  
23 have accreditation contracts with them, the commissioner  
24 and the board chair sign every year and it's an agreement  
25 that they will uphold the state law, and follow state law,



1 and serve their students. What it means for a district to  
2 not have accreditation, I think that we have some -- Julie  
3 can weigh in if she wants to, some language about that but  
4 it's not entirely clear in statute what it means if you are  
5 not accredited. So --

6 MS. RANKIN: So it's a good thing that they  
7 go to Commissioner with this, right?

8 MS. PEARSON: Takes it off (inaudible).

9 MS. RANKIN: So how many do we have that are  
10 not accredited?

11 MS. PEARSON: None, right now. We don't  
12 have any districts --

13 MS. RANKIN: In your decision --

14 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

15 MS. RANKIN: -- when we look at these  
16 districts, to determine how do we serve kids, and are they  
17 willing to make changes and if they're not willing to make  
18 changes (inaudible) the status?

19 MS. RANKIN: Then it goes back to the  
20 Commissioner again.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No.

22 MS. PEARSON: No.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Then we take their  
24 accreditation away.

25 MS. RANKIN: We can do that too?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yes. You all -- you all will  
3 make that decision, whether or not you want to remove their  
4 accreditation

5 (Overlapping)

6 MS. ANTHES: Whatever it is.

7 (Overlapping)

8 MS. ANTHES: Yeah, Board member Rankin, this  
9 is just the accreditation rating that we're talking about  
10 today.

11 MS. RANKIN: As opposed to?

12 MS. ANTHES: As opposed to whether they have  
13 it or not. You guys decide whether they have it or not.

14 MS. RANKIN: It just got more complicated,  
15 if you take their accreditation (inaudible).

16 MS. FLORES: Then we take their  
17 accreditation away.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

19 MS. FLORES: We're not sure what the  
20 consequences are. Is it possible for a student to graduate  
21 from a school that's -- or a district that's not accredited  
22 and not get into Harvard or --

23 MS. ANTHES: That was gonna be my thinking.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Harvard's not accredited.

25 So I don't think that would be a problem.



1 MS. RANKIN: I'm really sorry I --

2 MS. PEARSON: It's okay. No, I -- I -- I --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: They shouldn't care about  
4 accreditation.

5 MS. PEARSON: I opened it up with the  
6 answer, I should know.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They can also earn  
8 back, they can -- they can get -- they can get their  
9 accreditation back, right?

10 MS. PEARSON: Yes. And you are -- we -- we  
11 believe that there's two -- we've talked about this in the  
12 campus and TDS. There's two pieces in law and one place it  
13 says, you will remove their accreditation, in other places  
14 it says you may. And so, we are going under that you have  
15 that discretion and it doesn't need to happen automatically  
16 but that's something for you all will have that choice  
17 about whether or not to remove their accreditation, based  
18 on the pathway. The commissioner will provide a  
19 recommendation to you on the pathway. But ultimately,  
20 that's your decision to decide what you wanna do that.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Can I just ask --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

23 MS. MAZANEC: -- a question. What's the  
24 coding error in a district?



1 MS. PEARSON: So districts didn't always  
2 code students as parent excusals, that were parent  
3 excusals. They fill out other things but they didn't fill  
4 out anything or they just -- so, we had them as a  
5 nonparticipant because they didn't have a score but we  
6 didn't know they were a parent excusal. So we're going to  
7 make sure that they have all the extra support possible so  
8 that they get the coding correct this coming year. Because  
9 it's important data to have, I think it's important for us  
10 as a state, to understand students that are parent excusals  
11 versus other reasons for not participating and the students  
12 going on.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores, did you have a  
14 --

15 MS. FLORES: I did.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

17 MS. FLORES: (Inaudible).

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I do that same like a lot.  
19 So please proceed, that's all right.

20 MS. PEARSON: So we just wanted to give you  
21 a heads up on what's coming next. So we'll have school  
22 plan types in January, working on the exact scheduling of  
23 that, and get you all approved the school plan type, so  
24 we'll make sure you have time to have that, to understand  
25 the requests that came in, and dig into it as much as you



1 want. If you would like to talk with us just let us know.  
2 We're working on piloting a parent-friendly report.

3 One of the things that we got back for  
4 feedback and the accountability work group when we were  
5 doing that since January 2015 was how do we take this more  
6 complex detailed information and make it more accessible to  
7 parents and the communities? So we have a team that's been  
8 out doing focus groups with the District Accountability  
9 Committees and Districts and with parents to find out what  
10 kind of information they would want in that parent-friendly  
11 report, community-friendly report. So we're going to try  
12 and pilot that this spring. You always - we talked about  
13 we may have some possible District Appeals for the District  
14 Accreditation Ratings, and then the accountability clock  
15 hearings, so there's a lot of work coming in, sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

17 MS. FLORES: It's not what I was going to  
18 ask but because I started thinking about a school that was  
19 misquoted, was that Gilpin Elementary in Denver? Because I  
20 just have letters and letters, and letters, and letters,  
21 you know, about Gilpin.

22 MS. PEARSON: We can look. I don't have  
23 other schools in my head. My head is full of the  
24 districts, right now but we can go look it up.



1 MS. FLORES: So the District now doesn't  
2 want to take that into account that it was misquoted and  
3 so, you know, the parents are alarmed that they had a big  
4 meeting last night.

5 MS. PEARSON: And everything that's going on  
6 with that Gilpin decision, that's all District that is not  
7 state law, that's not the state process kicking in. Yeah.  
8 So that's our district policy and their Board policy  
9 decisions. That's all we have for you today on this topic.  
10 So thank you all.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. We'll move on  
12 to item 6.2 with any luck.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now (inaudible) I mean.

14 MS. PEARSON: Depends on how many questions  
15 you all have. We have an hour for the next agenda item I  
16 think we can --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 3: So we are back to  
18 three?

19 MS. PEARSON: But then you all have a few  
20 more things afterwards, I think.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, we've got a couple  
22 of things all over (inaudible). So go ahead and proceed  
23 and let's see where we are with 6.03. What was that  
24 (inaudible).



1 MS. PEARSON: So this is another information  
2 item we put on the agenda for you all. In the different  
3 study sessions and the conversations we've had about the  
4 accountability clock, I know there's been a lot of  
5 conversations and questions around what does innovation  
6 mean? Is it really innovative? What's it going to get?  
7 How are we gonna to get? Is it really gonna make a  
8 difference in student performance?

9 So we wanted to spend a little time just  
10 providing some clarification on this pathway and talking  
11 about it. We have a principle that's with us today, to  
12 talk about how they've used innovation in their school just  
13 to give you a little bit of more groundwork or background  
14 on innovation, and how it could be used. Again, this is  
15 just information for you all to help you come February and  
16 on when you're making some recommendations and pathway  
17 decisions. So I'm going to turn it over to Brenda now, and  
18 she, and Kelly, and Sara are going to talk through more of  
19 the details of the innovation pathway.

20 MS. BRENDA: Okay. Thanks, Lisa. I am  
21 going to quickly review the accountability clock process  
22 that you guys are all experts on now, so I will go through  
23 the slides fairly quickly. But we're going to dive into a  
24 little bit deeper on the innovation pathway and review  
25 CDE's rubric that we've developed around that. I'll walk





1 you through that rubric. And then we will hear from Ms.  
2 McGlone. I'm sorry, Ms. Duvall from around McGlone Academy  
3 -- from McGlone Academy as well and she will speak to her  
4 experience of how she has used innovation as a turnaround  
5 strategy.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this is still in?

7 MS. BRENDA: Denver public schools, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So unless the -- the --  
9 the idea of this presentation is to tell us about  
10 innovation which is something we're going to be considering  
11 as potential options.

12 MS. PEARSON: Yes. It's one of this  
13 pathways you can.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And why tell us about this  
15 option as opposed to others.

16 MS. PEARSON: So you all had a lot of  
17 questions when you had these study sessions about the  
18 innovation pathway. You had a lot of questions about  
19 innovation and about management, and what those really look  
20 like so we wanted to talk about innovation this month, and  
21 we'll talk about management in January just to, kind of,  
22 give you that, baseline information about what the pathway  
23 could look like and what that would be. We also had a lot  
24 of State Review Panel recommendations that came back on  
25 either innovation or management, so we felt like it'd be



1 important to kind of give some more grounding on what this  
2 was.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Let me just ask the  
4 presenters and I'd really like to hear how innovation  
5 really changes things. Do you change personnel? Does it  
6 give you more flexibility to get rid of people, that  
7 shouldn't be there, what kind of options does it really  
8 provide other than cosmetics to really make real change.  
9 Okay.

10 MS. PEARSON: Thanks.

11 MS. BRENDA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
12 We will certainly attempt to address that today. Our goal  
13 is to clarify your role in determining the approval of  
14 innovation as a pathway, as opposed to as you previously,  
15 have approved them as an innovation plan. So I was going  
16 to go over the different criteria there, as well as try to  
17 go through both with Kelly with us today and Sara to  
18 explain some of the -- the real world implications of this  
19 and how it has been leveraged for change just as -- as the  
20 context as Ms Pearson said is that we do have these schools  
21 are coming for here in the spring, and the vast majority  
22 were either recommended by the state review panel as  
23 management or innovation. There, of course, are other  
24 pathways that you may consider, but because those are so



1 prominent, we wanted to do a little deeper dive on those  
2 two pathways.

3                   And just as a reminder of the sequencing, we  
4 are doing -- the Commission are working out of commission  
5 recommendations for this group of schools, Right now. You  
6 already receive the state review panel reports, and then  
7 the hearings will occur later this spring. This is also  
8 just a little reminder of the process. What this chart  
9 depicts is that CDE preferably that top rolling green, we  
10 are trying to engage in front with districts to develop  
11 their pathway plan, whether that's a plan for innovation, a  
12 plan for management, a plan for charter, or a plan for  
13 school closure.

14                   CDE is trying to give to those districts to  
15 understand what that plan is that the commissioner when she  
16 issues her recommendation, is able to evaluate whether we  
17 believe that plan is dramatic enough to result in the  
18 school coming off the clock in the next year or two. And  
19 the yellow row is if this district is not as engaged with  
20 us and there are some that fall into that category right  
21 now, though I've seen most are currently very engaged with  
22 us and are in the green. The red indicates that we do --  
23 there is still an option to remove accreditation as was  
24 discussed previously.



1                   Let's go ahead and skip those slides. Just  
2 to review of the pathways and that we're focusing today on  
3 innovation, we would like to come and discuss management  
4 further with -- with the board in January, and we are open  
5 to discussing additional pathways as well. So a brief  
6 overview of the innovation pathway and what is stated under  
7 that Innovation Schools Act, as you are aware, is that  
8 schools can leverage this option to wave from certain  
9 district to state waivers or from certain policies to allow  
10 flexible practices that may better meet their individual  
11 student needs, and the common waivers are in hiring,  
12 scheduling, budgeting, programming, and all the led -- do  
13 you want us to address (inaudible)?

14                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15                   MS. BRENDA: Yeah, that's true. Okay.  
16 We'll pause a little bit and I'll turn it over to -- to  
17 Kelly to speak a little bit about that. So the distinction  
18 with innovation under the Innovation Schools Act versus the  
19 accountability pathway is that that is governed under SB163  
20 or the Education Accountability Act of 2009, and that  
21 dictates that a school may pursue innovation status as a  
22 pathway once they've reached the end of the clock, and so  
23 to evaluate whether or not we believe that innovation would  
24 actually be rigorous, enough to address the significant  
25 needs at that school, we've developed a rubric to help us



1 identify and assess whether or not significant improvements  
2 will result from that plan. And so I'll go over that  
3 rubric in a little bit.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's a different  
5 criteria?

6 MS. BRENDA: Correct. So I'm going to  
7 (inaudible). I can talk about the criteria a little bit  
8 (inaudible). So there are different criteria, I'm going to  
9 skip ahead a little bit in the PowerPoint. There are  
10 different criteria for Innovation Schools Act versus,  
11 innovation pathway. So the slide 10 attempts to get at  
12 just a little bit of that criteria, it's just a snapshot of  
13 it but two kind of big distinctions is that the CDE staff  
14 are under the Innovation Schools Act reviewing innovation  
15 plans to ensure that they are compliant with the criteria  
16 that's outlined in law, under the Innovation Schools Act.  
17 And I did include a copy of those requirements in your  
18 Board -- in your Board packet, whereas for the  
19 accountability pathway, CDE staff are assessing whether or  
20 not this is going to be enough to get the school off the  
21 clock.

22 So knowing we know from research best  
23 practices about what conditions are necessary to turn  
24 around schools, we've come up with a rubric to evaluate  
25 whether that plan really will result in dramatic change, as



1 opposed to as Mr. Chair stated, cosmetic changes. We  
2 really do want to ensure that the rigor is there, and  
3 that's why we've -- we've created this rubric to assess  
4 that. In terms of the criteria for the State Board you're  
5 approving innovation plans through the Innovation Schools  
6 Act to, as the statute reads which I have here, that the  
7 CDE Board shall approve innovation plans unless they are  
8 likely to result in a decrease of academic achievement or  
9 not physically visible. Whereas, your criteria for  
10 evaluating pathways, under SB163 is to consider  
11 recommendations from-

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just to make sure  
13 everybody understands, that's if they have an innovation  
14 plan, that same obligation criteria does not apply to this.

15 MS. BRENDA: Correct, yes.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We don't have to prove an  
17 innovation plan --

18 MS. BRENDA: Yes. You're absolutely right.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Under those loose criteria  
20 for this.

21 MS. BRENDA: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair for  
22 that clarification. You are absolutely correct. This is  
23 trying to -- this is a comparison of the criteria, so I'm  
24 trying to contrast where or how you've previously approved  
25 innovation plans have been under the column on the left on



1 the Innovation Schools Act. But moving forward this  
2 spring, you're going to be looking at the plans  
3 differently.

4                   It'll be under the accountability clock lens  
5 and so there is a higher threshold and that in the lens of  
6 a criteria is different. It's to see whether or not that  
7 plan will result in dramatic enough change, to get the  
8 school off the clock, and following the Education  
9 Accountability Act's guidance, you are to take into  
10 consideration a recommendation from the Commissioner, and  
11 from the State Review Panel, at that accountability hearing  
12 that will take place and so -- and part of the -- Dr.  
13 Schroeder?

14                   MS. SCHROEDER: So what's the effect of  
15 Aurora coming to us and requesting an innovation plan under  
16 the 2008 Act, and just -- who on earth one use the same --  
17 use the same terminology for two very different --

18                   MS. BRENDA: My understanding is that --  
19 well, it's the same terminology, it is innovation status  
20 which is governed under the Innovation Schools Act.  
21 Exactly. It's the circumstances that are different, so you  
22 are -- for the Accountability Pathway hearing you are  
23 assessing whether or not you believe that innovation  
24 pathway, innovation plan is the right avenue for Aurora  
25 whether or not they had it already passed or not, it



1 doesn't necessarily affect your decision there. I mean you  
2 would make -- you should make that decision regardless of  
3 what -- you know, the approval of the plan though that  
4 decision is made separately. So you already approved the  
5 plan, it's in place, you are now deciding is that the  
6 appropriate approach for the school to take.

7                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Excuse me, but I -- I  
8 would have to say -- I would have to say that if any of  
9 these districts or schools on the clock bring us an  
10 innovation plan that's already been approved that's, by  
11 definition inadequate, and at least as far as I'm concerned  
12 they can stay home. They need to bring us some meaningful  
13 change. We didn't approve this innovation plan under that  
14 theory and so I don't think staff should encourage them to  
15 show up with this -- with this innovation plan. They  
16 should be discouraged from -- from that.

17                   MS. BRENDA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chair, to answer  
19 your question before whether an innovation plan would --  
20 would be enough to get off the clock would be dependent on  
21 what is included in the plan, and an innovation plan can be  
22 anywhere on a sliding scale. So this -- this graphic here  
23 shows you that it -- it could have innovations that put it  
24 just a little off from what a regular district school is  
25 doing, that could be because of academic programming, it





1 could because of waivers they've requested, There's a lot  
2 of things that would decide how different it is from its  
3 operation of its district schools. But then there's the  
4 innovation plans that include lots of waivers more similar  
5 to the charter end of the spectrum, where they govern their  
6 own personnel. They have their own budget, oversight  
7 things like that.

8                   Their academic programming and curriculum is  
9 completely different. That would put them on the other end  
10 of the sliding scale more towards an autonomous charter  
11 school. And so you have a varying degree of what is  
12 included in the plan. For example, what you saw today in  
13 the plan you saw is very different from other plans that --  
14 that you've seen in the past, so whether or not it's enough  
15 for that specific circumstance to get them off the clock,  
16 is where your decision comes in and has that different  
17 circumstance applied to it. So it's the same Innovation  
18 Act and same criteria for approval in addition to whether  
19 or not it's enough in your mind to get off the turnaround  
20 clock.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good.

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

23                   MS. RANKIN: Could a -- what are we talking  
24 about here? A school. Could a school, it says districts  
25 may also present their preferred pathway to the state



1 board. So a district, in addition to the school having a  
2 pathway a district could have a preferred pathway which  
3 might be different than the schools is that?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll clarify it. Yeah  
5 thank you Ms. Rankin. Yes, the districts will be  
6 presenting on behalf of the schools, so we engage with the  
7 districts and they are responsible for presenting a plan on  
8 behalf of the schools on the clock. So it will be the  
9 same. It's just -- it's just that we -- we communicate  
10 with the district leadership and the superintendent. Which  
11 means we're with the schools principals on clock.

12 MS. RANKIN: They could be an innovation  
13 school that they came here, so let's say six months ago,  
14 that's great. But when they come again because of their  
15 accountability pathway they could change to do something  
16 different there, right, no?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They could and you  
18 could. You could also say, "We've approved this plan and  
19 now it's no longer adequate." Correct, that's correct.  
20 Okay. So a minute I just flip to the last slides that I  
21 have and then I'll turn it over to Sarah to share a few  
22 remarks.

23 We have -- so given that it is a different  
24 criteria as we've been stating, this is a different lens  
25 through which you're viewing innovation plans. We have



1 created a rubric which I have included your board docket.  
2 And we created this based of -- of what we know from  
3 research works in schools to what needs to be in place in  
4 school to turn around and to have a dramatic change on  
5 student outcomes.

6                   So it's a very detailed rubric, we don't  
7 expect schools to necessarily address every single  
8 component in it, but we do believe it's very important to  
9 address with high quality and with a fair amount of detail  
10 how they well -- why they need innovation, why -- why is it  
11 going to make a difference, the mission vision, and then  
12 the core functions of that academic systems or curriculum  
13 instructions.

14                   School calendar we ask to see a copy of this  
15 school calendar, and the talent management systems around  
16 hiring professional development and of course the functions  
17 of school in terms of budget operations. And then district  
18 systems gets at how the district is going to support that  
19 school in a different manner.

20                   So there are -- we welcome any feedback on  
21 this rubric, this is the lens through which we will try to  
22 evaluate innovation plans and then bring our  
23 recommendations to you through the commission  
24 recommendation in terms of if we believe that the  
25 innovation plan is rigorous enough as -- as an



1 accountability pathway. But given the lack of criteria  
2 that was explicitly laid out in the statute, we believe we  
3 need to develop some extra resources. That's where that  
4 is.

5 MS. RANKIN: So we are the ones who will be  
6 deciding if they should work if they come to us with those  
7 proposals?

8 MS. BRENDA: If they already have innovation  
9 status, have innovation plans.

10 MS. RANKIN: (Inaudible).

11 MS. BRENDA: Correct. Yes we don't  
12 currently in this -- in this group of schools that would be  
13 coming in for the end of the clock. They're only schools  
14 that either don't have innovation yet so they would be  
15 coming with that as the idea or in the case of Aurora they  
16 did already have the ammunition of a plan approved which  
17 they did implement as a turnaround strategy. I'm saying as  
18 the school that was the school's intent for it. I know  
19 that's not how the board evaluate the plan but the school  
20 was attempting to use that as a term strategy. So there's  
21 not a case where the school had previously had innovation  
22 years before for not turn around in this current group of  
23 schools.

24 MS. RANKIN: (Inaudible).



1 MS. PEARSON: (Inaudible). What they want  
2 going for it so that's something we put out there for them  
3 and we'll talk to you all about that optional part for the  
4 district to come forward. So by law the state review panel  
5 needs to have a recommendation, the Commissioner needs to  
6 provide you a recommendation and then you all make a  
7 decision. Thinking through how the change- how we view  
8 change will really happen in those schools and districts,  
9 we thought it would be valuable for a district to have the  
10 opportunity to bring forward their path to really own it,  
11 we've been really asking them to say okay here's the  
12 options in the law, what do you think is going to get you  
13 there?

14 It doesn't hold you all to that decision at  
15 all but we really want to help districts own what goes  
16 forward. So that when you direct an action it will have  
17 the greatest likelihood of resulting in improved student  
18 performance and maybe not in a legal battle over whose  
19 authority is what. Like we would rather spend our energy  
20 and time and money focused on improving student  
21 performance. But you all have absolute authority there you  
22 don't need to take their consideration, you don't need to  
23 take our recommendation, you have the decision making power  
24 there.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin.



1 MS. RANKIN: I'm flashing back to our  
2 meeting eight months ago and talking about all these but  
3 it's making a lot of sense now. But there's one thing that  
4 really I have to ask for more concise definition of. And  
5 on this whole page -- page 12, culture of performance,  
6 culture and climate, stakeholder engagement, and then I  
7 thought engagement was attendance now I'm real confused.  
8 School leadership and governance. All of that is a very  
9 gray area. I would like to have a little more definitive  
10 on what exactly those words are.

11 MS. BRENDA: Sure. We'd be happy to speak  
12 with you more about that.

13 MS. RANKIN: What are the measures that you  
14 talked about, right.

15 MS. BRENDA: Yes and on page seven of the  
16 rubric is where that section starts, grade to this is could  
17 boil to much further and deeper conversation which I'm  
18 happy. We would love to have Sara speak since she came to  
19 speak for about her experiences and happy to go more in-  
20 depth maybe perhaps one on one with you on what those  
21 indicators mean so that you can -- Okay all right I'm going  
22 to put it over and Sara is going to share a few brief  
23 remarks about how McGlone was, with the history of the  
24 school and where it is now in it's current innovation  
25 school.



1 MS. GIPS: But we were. So my name is Sara  
2 Gips Goodall and I'm the Principal at McGlone now Academy.  
3 And so we are in our third innovation plan. And so, six  
4 years ago McGlone was part of the nine school turnaround in  
5 the Montebello area. So we're the direct feeder for what  
6 used to be Montebello High School right off of crown in  
7 Peoria. I came to McGlone the year two of turnaround and  
8 I've been there ever since. And when I arrived and this is  
9 pretty much exactly how it was the first year, it was  
10 around the 500 in enrollment, so if the neighborhood school  
11 and parents would put their kids there starting in  
12 kindergarten, but by the time you hit fifth grade, they  
13 were all opting out. And so we only had two rounds of  
14 fifth grade where we had four rounds at other grades who  
15 went down to three and fourth grade.

16 We are now at almost 800 for enrollment and  
17 because of new community engagement because of I credit a  
18 lot of it to our innovation plan and the way we went about  
19 devising it and then revising it with parent and community  
20 by. And we actually went back for a new innovation plan  
21 this past year to expand our school to become a K eight  
22 because in Montebello currently there are a lot of 6/12s  
23 and hearing from my parents year after year, the 6/12  
24 experience wasn't for all kids. So how did we create a  
25 more inclusive school or family where kids could continue



1 with us in sixth grade? So we're extremely proud and we  
2 have 60 sixth graders with us this year and so hence we are  
3 now McGlone Academy.

4                   So we've gone from a red school a very, very  
5 red school, to a green school. And we're really proud of  
6 that status change. We've gone from a school where kids-  
7 and they can tell you and my sixth graders in particular,  
8 I'm extremely proud of because they're the kids that  
9 achieved those gross scores and they're the same kids that  
10 were rated red kids five years ago. So they always had  
11 that potential, they just didn't always have the support.  
12 They're the same kids that were there when we came in and I  
13 think that's so important to say because they always had  
14 that. And what they tell me and what parents tell me is  
15 that it's no longer a place where I feel unsafe, it's a  
16 place that I call my family. We call ourselves the McGlone  
17 family where kids believe they're part of a family.

18                   And the other thing that has been so  
19 important is McGlone was just a teacher turnaround factory.  
20 It was about 10 percent retention for the two years before  
21 turnaround and the first year of turnaround, we're at 90  
22 percent for the past three years. So our teachers are  
23 staying and what that means for kids, is that I know I'm  
24 gonna have Miss Claire in fourth grade and I've been  
25 waiting for her for four years and my brother had her and I





1 can't wait. And that is something that I just feel like is  
2 -- is into really important for a community school for kids  
3 to have that sense of place, and we can't hit achievement  
4 of gross scores if kids don't feel part of that family and  
5 part of that place.

6 I'm now one of the longest standing school  
7 leaders in Montebello, and that's incredibly important to  
8 me too. So I don't think innovation is the silver bullet.  
9 I think there's so much that's really hard about turning  
10 around a school, but it has been probably the single  
11 greatest change maker for us. And as a school leader, I  
12 have no plans to ever leave McGlone but I -- I don't think  
13 I would ever -- I know I would not consider going to a  
14 school or going to lead a school without innovation status  
15 at this point. And I wanna talk a little bit about why for  
16 you. So I really believe that innovation status gave us  
17 the empowerment and that's just not me, but my teachers.  
18 My teacher leaders, my parents. We created a middle school  
19 because our parents asked for this and they were able to  
20 design it along with our students.

21 So when we wrote our innovation plan and  
22 then when we revised it again, we didn't even start the  
23 drafting till every single member of our community agreed  
24 on our mission and our vision. And that was incredibly  
25 important because that grounded the work for everything



1 else and our vision is grounded in Montebello too. And  
2 that was important because that community had lost a sense  
3 of identity. And so regaining that identity for our kids  
4 and our parents and our teachers and regaining that sense  
5 of place was incredibly important. So we use that as our  
6 why and then we delved deeper to do the how and the what.

7                   So we did a lot of HR changes. We have a  
8 lot of waivers there, but because of that we have the right  
9 positions, we got the right people and they stay. So we're  
10 not bringing in new teachers every year, we're bring in a  
11 couple because that's important and then we bring in  
12 veterans and that's really, really important and people  
13 want to stay and become master teachers in our community.  
14 With our budget having flexibility that was incredibly  
15 important. We brought in technology way before a lot of  
16 other schools which I firmly believe contributed to high  
17 growth scores. So the first year of part we had the  
18 highest growth of all of Denver public schools for literacy  
19 and I really believe that that was because of innovative  
20 practices and blended learning before other people were  
21 starting to do that. It also means that we were able to be  
22 responsive to community requests and take care of our kids.

23                   So we have almost doubled the arts of most  
24 schools in Montebello which is also something really  
25 important to us. We've created our own Montebello drum



1 line which again, sounds small but those little things to  
2 give a community back the sense of place and prioritize  
3 that in our budget is incredibly important. And then I  
4 think also just being really responsive to kids and  
5 community, we've been able to fund a lot more wraparound  
6 services. We serve a severely impacted population, so  
7 saying that we need more than a one day of work social  
8 worker which was what I had when I came in, and I hope that  
9 when you have a crisis that is only on a Friday. We said  
10 we need someone here five days a week. And how are we  
11 doing parent empowerment classes, and really bringing in  
12 our parents as partners, so you don't just change test  
13 scores, but you turn around a community.

14                   And so I think we've really been able to be  
15 responsive to the needs of our community because we have  
16 the flexibility, we can do that immediately and that has  
17 been everything to us. And so, again, I don't think  
18 innovation is the silver bullet but it is something that is  
19 so important to who we are as a school. I hope important  
20 to Montebello as a community at this point because I think  
21 it's really starting to change perceptions and to me as a  
22 leader it's -- it's the way to change the game.

23                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

24                   MS. MAZANEC: What about you've said --  
25 you've said you have 90 percent retention, teachers are



1 staying, they're coming they're staying, committed. What -  
2 - what specifically happened with innovations status that  
3 made that happen.

4 MS. GIPS: I think you would hear from a lot  
5 of our teachers that their voice is very valued at our  
6 school. So a very concrete example might, you'll ask my  
7 Spanish teacher said, the phonics curriculum is not working  
8 for our language learners in Spanish. So because of our  
9 curriculum flexibilities, we're able to go bring in a study  
10 (inaudible) and get them really high quality Spanish  
11 phonics instruction and training before the district had  
12 that figured out and say, I hear you what do you need to be  
13 successful, how do I help you?

14 Creating different types of positions for  
15 people that wanted to stay at the school and said, I don't  
16 see myself being a kindergarten teacher anymore but I'm  
17 committed to this community. Have you considered K2  
18 technology? That's not a position at a lot of schools, but  
19 building positions for strengths and needs of the school  
20 has been really important. I also think the HR process we  
21 can recruit early. All of our teachers are still Denver  
22 public school teachers, but being able to run our HR  
23 process is too, so instead of one personnel team. If  
24 you're interviewed to be a fifth grade teacher and there  
25 was a fifth grader opening, the fifth grade team will all



1 have a say in who that person was on my team, and really  
2 being able to find and gel those teams make those little  
3 families within a big family has been important. Our  
4 students and our parents also have a voice in our interview  
5 process, so you have a student interview without any adults  
6 present, where my students report back to me and say, this  
7 teacher are this potential teacher made good eye contact  
8 with me. They asked me good questions or when you left the  
9 room this could all this person was on their phone, so I  
10 don't think they're very interested in teaching me." And  
11 that's really important that we're able to revamp our HR  
12 processes to make sure we got the best people in front of  
13 our kids. Does that answer your question?

14 MS. MAZANEC: Of course, yes.

15 MS. FLORES: So the waivers are hiring?  
16 What part -- PD? Do you get to do your own PD?

17 MS. GIPS: We do.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So as Denver adds more  
19 and more independence to the school districts, how  
20 different will you look? I'm sure you're listening to that  
21 case.

22 MS. GIPS: Yeah. Again, I think being able  
23 to be context specific is so important. So just saying  
24 that we should look the exact same as a school in Southwest  
25 Denver, you -- you can't do that. Our context is



1 different. And so for curriculum flexibility is as a very  
2 concrete example. We brought in expeditionary learning  
3 last year before the district had brought it in. So there  
4 was no reason to opt into their professional development  
5 because we'd already contracted that we bought the books.  
6 We've networked and worked with their team when appropriate  
7 to say how do we supplement? Do you have any new ideas?  
8 What can we share? When the district brought in EL Achieve  
9 as a curriculum for ELD, we said we absolutely want that.  
10 We're gonna opt into that. But I think being able to have  
11 that flexibility of opt-in and starting fresh and also  
12 saying rather than just do all this at once, how it can be  
13 really strategic about what comes first.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How long do you think  
15 it takes to turn around?

16 MS. GIPS: Again, I think that's context  
17 specific, I think -- I think we took --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, even with the  
19 conversation that we're having.

20 MS. GIPS: Yeah, I think --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is to give  
22 schools an opportunity.

23 MS. GIPS: I think we took longer because of  
24 changes in leadership. And I think that that is so  
25 important and I truly believe in consistent leadership at



1 this point. I think if you have the right leader and a  
2 really strong plan, that has drastic change in some areas  
3 but with that voice from the community and the teachers and  
4 that buy-in, you need that buy-in, I think you can make  
5 drastic change in a year. I think you can make  
6 overwhelming change in three.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions, Ms.  
9 Goff.

10 MS. GOFF: Thank you. A little maybe  
11 philosophical question for our staff right now. I'm struck  
12 by, it's -- it's actually quite beautiful, complexity  
13 around innovation. You know, and I've been hit by that big  
14 time today. Innovation as part of a clock remedy. Step  
15 forward. Would you all say or would it be just something  
16 to think about that innovation as a recommendation for  
17 these five-year clock situations, does the impetus come  
18 from the district? Is it there primarily ideas coming from  
19 the school or the district, or if -- if that's a  
20 recommendation, is there also another column of thinking  
21 that it would be perhaps incumbent upon the department or  
22 in ultimately our decision on this recommendation that the  
23 department have some say in how they meet the criteria to -  
24 - to merit that kind of recommendation?



1 I just, you know, I'm -- I'm concerned about  
2 the -- the word innovation but I'll get past that. It's  
3 just what is it that is uniquely moving? Has the  
4 kinesthetic energy to actually move things to it. And who  
5 should be getting there first? Who's really responsible  
6 for thinking of these ideas, taking on the job, moving it  
7 forward, monitoring if that's the word that applies here.  
8 And you know, Sarah your interpretation of that it sounds  
9 like your school with ideas from other sources was  
10 primarily responsible for your plan. But when we're  
11 getting, and you were on turnaround and came out of  
12 turnaround with your innovation.

13 So that pertains appropriately here. I'm  
14 just, I don't know if you guys have anything if you  
15 understand it. I'm hoping you do. And if you have any  
16 input on that because I'm having a, I'm having a little  
17 difficulty deciding where is the, where should the  
18 challenge be issued? Or who's got this responsibility?  
19 That's -- that's kind of my state today.

20 MS. PEARSON: Okay. I mean, (inaudible) I  
21 mean, I think so much of what I heard from Sara today and  
22 so much the power of it is that it was buy in from the  
23 community. They wanted this. There was people working  
24 together and that's where it came from. So I think there's  
25 a lot of power in that. I think that's a lot of why we





1   wanna have that district recommendation going forward so  
2   there's that ownership there.  But I think there's also  
3   that role for us to share ideas and share information about  
4   what's worked right.  Like for the state to be able to  
5   point Sarah and her school out and say this is an example  
6   it may not work everywhere.  This is what worked for them  
7   and I think that's a role that we can play there.

8                   I think the other really important thing  
9   that we've been trying to think about with innovation is  
10  around what conditions are necessary.  So that one  
11  Commissioner recommendation that you all received said you  
12  know, innovation could work but here's what's really  
13  important in the school.  These are the conditions that  
14  need to be met and they could be met through innovation or  
15  maybe they could be met through another pathway.  But these  
16  are the conditions of you know kind of what's at the root  
17  cause of what needs to be addressed whatever pathway goes  
18  forward.  So I think that's a really important thing for us  
19  to consider is there may be a lot of different ways to get  
20  at meeting those conditions.  But it's at that core of  
21  what's needed to help a school achieve those goals for kids  
22  that we need to get to.  Does that make sense?

23                   MS. GOFF:  Yes, absolutely.  And that's you  
24  know, it doesn't make it any easier.

25                   MS. PEARSON:  No.  This is so complicated.



1 MS. GOFF: It's really that stage in the  
2 process of where I am between, before actually, before a  
3 district says we now know that the key is parental  
4 involvement. Community buy-in, community ownership. It's  
5 before that. Where does that original key of knowledge  
6 come from. Should it be -- should it be something with the  
7 school or district has been studying, analyzing, doing a  
8 little homework on first and then they come to the  
9 conclusion? Or is it something that outside forces for  
10 lack of better words, decided for them needs to be the key  
11 to their innovation plan? And it's just who's got the  
12 original first seed of responsibility here?

13 MS. GIPS: Yes.

14 MS. GOFF: And how did they get -- the  
15 knowledge to even have come up with that idea. That's --  
16 that's right.

17 MS. GIPS: Yeah. Thank you Ms. Goff for  
18 that question. I, one, and this is the six school and on  
19 six-year of the clocks. We've had some conversations with  
20 these schools and districts for several years now and --  
21 and they know what their menu of options was or is. So  
22 they've been exploring the different possibilities. And  
23 also we knew that some districts were struggling with what  
24 is, where did that original idea come from, where do I go.



1                                   And so we issued what we called the pathways  
2 early action grant last year and that awarded funds to the  
3 districts and schools, some of them that are in year four  
4 and five of the clock, to -- to get at your -- your  
5 question there. And so they've been able to do site visits  
6 and visit other schools. They, we brought in some content  
7 experts and -- and arranged some group meetings to talk  
8 about what's the best pathways. Is it innovation, is a  
9 charter, is it management. And then what is their  
10 community going to, what is the best fit for their  
11 community? You know, can they get, what can we get the  
12 community buy-in about and help them start those community  
13 conversations.

14                                   So the -- the grant also funded community  
15 meetings for them to be able to speak with their parents  
16 and to get their staff in front of their parents, talk  
17 about these pathways. And so that's part of where we've  
18 been trying to help them come to that decision. And then  
19 of course you have the state review panel was an external  
20 body that -- that also weighed in on what they thought was  
21 the -- was the right pathway for them too. So a  
22 culmination of those -- of those inputs is sort of leading  
23 to what's the district's report.

24                                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just to add to  
25 that too, the Innovation Act is written in a way that it



1 gives the empowerment to the local school specifically, to  
2 present a plan to their district. So it doesn't have to  
3 come from a district down. It can, but it also comes, can  
4 come from that school community specifically up to the  
5 district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

7 MS. RANKIN: I -- I wanted --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin.

9 MS. RANKIN: Thank you so much for bringing  
10 Sarah. We -- we seldom see such great leadership and I  
11 believe, personally I believe that's where it all starts.  
12 With good leadership, whether it's the community, wherever  
13 it is, that's what makes it successful. And you did  
14 mention it's not a silver bullet, it's not something  
15 everyone can do but it sounds like it's been very  
16 successful at your school. I applaud you and thank you for  
17 shining a spotlight on this success story.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions. Thank  
19 you very much Ms. (inaudible) , we appreciate your input.

20 MS. GIPS: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, very good.

22 We'll move on now to, we have one more business item and  
23 some ministerial duties and we'll move on to, I think we've  
24 completed everything except 14-01 which was before us for  
25 reconsideration. I -- I asked for this item to be



1 reconsidered. So we're now procedurally, we're at a point  
2 where no action has been taken on item from 14-01 from  
3 yesterday. I had a couple of things and I should have  
4 asked more questions yesterday. I see Mr. Sherman here.  
5 In part, this is a roughly \$2 million appropriation. I  
6 think there's a specific line item from the JBC, Mr.  
7 Sherman.

8 MR. SHERMAN: I believe so.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And is the amount subject  
10 to annual appropriations, do you know?

11 MR. SHERMAN: I believe so.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So -- we -- we have a  
13 significant line item. We already have, I don't remember  
14 the exact number from yesterday, eight or nine approved  
15 vendors which would seem to be frankly an adequate number.  
16 And we're gonna spend \$50,000 to fund a start-up to add one  
17 more vendor to what would appear to be a pretty good menu  
18 of providers that's already out there. And -- and -- and I  
19 think you know, I -- I guess if I had my druthers, I would,  
20 I should ask the question you know, would this money be  
21 better spent in literacy, third grade literacy or some  
22 other place than these grants. And if it's subject to  
23 annual appropriation, perhaps we ought to seriously  
24 consider a re-evaluation.



1                   And I -- And I say that because a lot of the  
2 commentary yesterday we don't have enough data to evaluate  
3 this program because it has not -- it has not existed long  
4 enough to provide markers. Secondly, it can never be  
5 evaluated against what I can personally consider the most  
6 important criteria which is can you show any direct  
7 relationship between this expenditure and educational  
8 outcomes. And I do think the answer to that question, I  
9 don't think you, the answer might be yes but you couldn't  
10 prove it, the answer might be no and we couldn't prove  
11 that.

12                   And so we have a lot of these appropriations  
13 now. I mean we -- we prove these grants and a lot of areas  
14 which I kind of generally categorize and feel good. Feels  
15 good but does it get a result? I don't know. But I think  
16 I -- I have concluded after taking a look at his Website  
17 just this week, in my judgment week application and since  
18 we already have a large number of approved vendors, the  
19 reason to add another one at this point at least until we  
20 conduct our evaluation on the eight or nine existing  
21 vendors, and until we have conducted an evaluation and  
22 established criteria, I can't see any point in spending  
23 \$50,000 essentially providing a grant to a Boston company  
24 to gin up something that we obviously already have without,  
25 you know.



1 I really do think the burden in going  
2 forward Mr. Sherman ought to be people bring us a completed  
3 program that you find meritorious and recommend that we can  
4 send people to. I think spending money to start up these  
5 things, I -- I guess I hope we didn't spend money starting  
6 all of them up but maybe we did. So if anyone wants to  
7 make the motion to prove this particular vendor, that's in  
8 order. I will personally vote no on this -- this approval.  
9 So do we wanna -- wanna have the motion and then, you have  
10 a question Ms. Goff.

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah. Boston is one, is that --  
12 is that the founding city? Is that the headquarters? Is  
13 that the --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's apparently the  
15 headquarters.

16 MS. GOFF: Well, we see here there's a  
17 Colorado, something like four States. Colorado, Maryland,  
18 California, maybe. So that, does that mean there is --  
19 there is a function here that's regional or statewide  
20 especially for us because that changes a little bit of the  
21 out -- out and away idea? And maybe I've refresher our  
22 question on our own processes. Are we going to be  
23 approving every single grant recipient from now on?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Every district. Yes.



1 MS. GOFF: Okay. I mean vendors. I should  
2 have said vendors.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, we apparently under  
4 the statute, we do approve them.

5 MS. GOFF: What statute?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Sherman.

7 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair. The statute  
8 requires that the state Board approve both the grants that  
9 might go out to -- to providers or just for them to be  
10 identified. So there is that -- we have a number of the  
11 providers that have been approved, that are on our list,  
12 did not request funds, just to clarify your point.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's good.

14 MR. SHERMAN: But -- but your approval is  
15 necessary for them to be on that identified list. So we --  
16 we -- we also can move forward in the future identifying  
17 organizations that serve the purpose and meet the criteria,  
18 but without issuing design grants.

19 MS. GOFF: This is -- I'm sorry. Was this  
20 in this Leadership Grant Turnaround Grant specific to that  
21 legislation, I do recall that was what? Year -- year one  
22 or two sessions ago there were, this was with, okay.

23 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

24 MS. GOFF: I know we've talked about it, I'm  
25 just --





1 MR. SHERMAN: It was 2014. It was HP 14-  
2 124.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes. Dr. Scheffel

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you say what do you see  
5 as the strength of Teach Plus? You look at their website,  
6 it's just very ambiguous.

7 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. I mean they were --  
8 they -- I think some of the strengths of Teach Plus are  
9 that they're very much a teacher based organization. We  
10 have other providers on that portfolio of live- that serve  
11 aspiring leaders, folks that wanna become principals, that  
12 serve current principals and that serve District staff,  
13 that directly support schools. Teach Plus is, I think the  
14 only one of the organizations that we would have that, very  
15 specifically, is not about moving people into the  
16 principalship but rather, developing teacher leadership  
17 within schools, to support practices that occur there.

18 So you know, I think the -- the presentation  
19 that Sarah made would be a good example of how do you bring  
20 together of a -- a leadership team within a school to be  
21 able to move forward effective practices and build a  
22 cohesive teaching staff. Their program is not without the  
23 principal though, I know that the principals required to  
24 attend and that absolutely makes sense that you wouldn't



1 wanna group of teachers making efforts without the  
2 principal being on Board also.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean as I look at their  
4 website, language like strong evaluation and modern  
5 compensation, next generation unionism, teacher leadership,  
6 roles and structures, sustaining transformative change. I  
7 mean, you know, there might be great practices behind this  
8 language but it's really hard to see how if this language  
9 is definable. What -- what does it mean and would people  
10 be able to really go in and help schools Turnaround. So I,  
11 that would be my thoughts, because the language is very  
12 ambiguous.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin.

14 MS. RANKIN: Did we review all these other  
15 12?

16 MR. SHERMAN: The ones that are identified -  
17 -

18 MS. RANKIN: Yes, that are already  
19 identified --

20 MR. SHERMAN: Of course.

21 MS. RANKIN: Did we do that?

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sometime --

23 MS. RANKIN: Some in more detailed than  
24 others.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: They've been done one at a  
2 time or several at a time.

3                   MS. RANKIN: I see.

4                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So over a course of years.  
5 I -- I think I remember doing one or two earlier.

6                   MS. RANKIN: Would it be possible for us to  
7 see the list of the 12 so we can learn a little more about  
8 them? Because I -- I like results based and I would rather  
9 see students listed as the focus rather than the teachers  
10 even though the teachers are the leaders looking at the  
11 outcomes.

12                  MR. SHERMAN: Certainly.

13                  MS. SCHEFFLER: Remember we talked about  
14 that yesterday, that we're waiting and we'll soon have some  
15 outcome data.

16                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because early in our  
17 third year and the second year.

18                  MS. RANKIN: Right.

19                  MR. SHERMAN: Yeah. Certainly, an important  
20 part of the criteria as we review these provider  
21 organizations, is what impact they have had and what  
22 history of success they've seen in low performing schools.  
23 So every one of the applications that we get or those that  
24 are successful have demonstrated, have provided data to us,  
25 not necessarily in Colorado schools, but have provided data



1 about the improvement in student achievement that they've  
2 seen. That's certainly the -- the ultimate goal.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They've provided that  
4 information, Teach Plus?

5 MR. SHERMAN: In their -- in their --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of them?

7 MR. SHERMAN: -- n their application, they  
8 would have. Again, those -- those are not --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we don't see those.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, how could they have  
11 provided this data for a program that hasn't been designed,  
12 Mr. Sherman?

13 MR. SHERMAN: Their program is in operation  
14 other states and similar work.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Then -- then why do they  
16 need to redesign it for Colorado?

17 MR. SHERMAN: The -- I believe from what's  
18 in their application, there are, they require, they're  
19 requesting funds for staff here in Colorado, as there, they  
20 have -- they have small amount of programs here in  
21 Colorado, it includes materials, again, efforts to recruit  
22 and work with teachers, to speak with schools and districts  
23 around recruiting teacher teams for this program.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are they for profit?

25 Excuse me.



1 MR. SHERMAN: I believe it's nonprofit.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any further  
3 questions? Anybody wanna make a motion for -- for, yes Ms.  
4 Rankin.

5 MS. RANKIN: I -- I don't have a quorum of  
6 motion but I make a motion that we just accept the 12 we  
7 have and not accept the Teach Plus.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That's proper  
9 motion. So second to that motion? Yes Dr. Scheffel.  
10 Could we -- any discussion. We'd call roll on that motion  
11 please.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

13 MS. FLORES: Aye.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Aye.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: Aye.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Chairman Durham.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. That motion's  
2 adopted by vote of seven to nothing. We'll now proceed. I  
3 think Ms. Mazanec, did you, do we have a --

4 MS. MAZANEC: No, I did have it scripted for  
5 (inaudible).

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Are you first though?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Pardon me.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Are you supposed to speak  
10 first?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh. (Inaudible).

12 MS. MAZANEC: I'd scripted that.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I probably lost my script  
14 but well, let me -- let me introduce it.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let me introduce it.

17 MS. MAZANEC: I didn't wanna cheat you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Don't mind me, it has been  
19 a long day. But let me say that for the two years that  
20 I've been privileged to serve as a member of this Board, I  
21 have very much appreciated Dr. Scheffel's expertise and it  
22 is really an honor to serve with somebody who understands  
23 these issues at the level that she does. And her  
24 participation has been extraordinarily helpful to me and I  
25 am personally very thankful for your service on this Board,



1 both before and I arrived and the fact that I was able to  
2 take advantage of it for the last two years. And I hope I  
3 learned some things will help me carry it forward as a  
4 better member. And we do -- do we have a resolution and  
5 then we have a presentation?

6 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you. Resolution  
7 recognizing the contribution of Dr. Deborah L. -- Deborah  
8 L. Scheffel has made to the education of children in  
9 Colorado.

10 Whereas Dr. Deborah Scheffel has served on  
11 the state Board of Education since January 2011, and  
12 whereas during her term of service, she served on the  
13 Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee as a strong  
14 advocate for children with cognitive learning disabilities  
15 and whereas during her term of service, she served as the  
16 Republican legislative liaison.

17 And whereas, as the dean of the School of  
18 Education, Colorado Christian University, Dr. Scheffel's  
19 ability to link higher education in K12 issues, in  
20 education has been a tremendous asset in Educator  
21 Preparation.

22 And whereas Dr. Scheffel's expertise in  
23 literacy and firsthand knowledge of CDE, from having led  
24 the Reading First Unit has been a tremendous advantage in  
25 developing the READ Act. And whereas, Dr. Scheffel's



1 expertise in assessments and academic standards continually  
2 provided thought provoking conversations on how to best  
3 serve the needs of Colorado children.

4                   And whereas, Dr. Scheffel has worked  
5 tirelessly, to protect privacy rights of children and  
6 parents. And whereas, Dr. Scheffel has afforded many  
7 choice in educational programs in order for parents to  
8 select the best option for their child.

9                   And whereas, over the course of her service,  
10 the state of Colorado has undergone tremendous education  
11 reforms, including the Licensed Personnel Performance  
12 Evaluation Act, The Colorado Reading to Ensure Act and  
13 student data privacy. She, along with the Board as a  
14 whole, supported the department's ongoing efforts to  
15 implement Colorado's education reform agenda.

16                   Be it resolved. The Colorado State Board of  
17 Education formally recognizes Dr. Deborah L. Scheffel for  
18 her six years dedication to the children of Colorado  
19 through her service on the Colorado State Board of  
20 Education. Dated this 15th day of December, 2016.

21                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. Thank you, very  
22 kind, very generous. Thank you. That is very lovely.  
23 Thank you. What a great keepsake. I really appreciate it.  
24 Very well.





1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Dr. Scheffel and  
2 we'll let the record show that the resolution was adopted  
3 unanimously. Okay. Now, proceeding to, let's see. Is  
4 there any other business?

5                   MS. CORDIAL: Just cake.

6                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just, oh yes, we do have -  
7 - we do have cake. Just what we all need is a little cake.  
8 But Dr. Scheffel, we do a cake as soon as we've adjourned  
9 in the -- in our little breakroom.

10                  MS. SCHEFFEL: Do I have time for a quick --

11                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Absolutely. You may --  
12 you -- the floor is all yours.

13                  MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. First thank you for  
14 that very kind resolution and also for the wonderful gifts,  
15 this great keepsake is very meaningful to me. I really  
16 appreciate it. I just wanted to thank the Board and CDE  
17 for the opportunity to serve these past six years. Public  
18 service is such a privilege and each of us feels so  
19 committed to what we do on behalf of our constituents.

20                         I've especially appreciated the opportunity  
21 to meet with teachers and students and parents around  
22 central issues of importance to them. That's meant the  
23 world to me, to be able to talk to people about their  
24 personal needs, see what I could do to help. Every  
25 opportunity is finite and it allows us to move into other



1 challenges which I intend to do in the arena of education  
2 and related areas and education is just so important  
3 because it contributes to defining humankind. That's why I  
4 do it at the higher ed level and at this level as well.  
5 Our identity, who are we? Our significance, why are we  
6 here? And our destiny, where are we going?

7 All of those three questions and they have  
8 traditionally formed the central piece of a quality  
9 education and have huge implications for the future of our  
10 nation. There's a great song, I don't know if you've heard  
11 it titled The Dream Isaiah Songs by Thomas Troger written  
12 to commemorate 911 and the last stanza connects the  
13 concepts of knowledge, wisdom, and worship. A culture is  
14 defined in part, by what it teaches its children that's the  
15 knowledge piece, and the context of that knowledge that  
16 leads to wisdom and ultimately what one believes and cares  
17 about. That's what we care about in education, the meaning  
18 peace, the Metaphysics, the way to connect the dots.

19 In the coming months, the Board will be  
20 considering academic standards and state assessments and  
21 other important issues. I know Rebecca McClellan will be a  
22 strong voice for students and I pray the wisdom of God and  
23 blessings on her work and on the rest of the Board as you  
24 consider these important decisions. I wanted to give you a  
25 book from my library to yours because that represents the



1 central importance of literacy in education and why I do  
2 this work. And a paperweight with a schoolhouse etched in  
3 the middle, because it represents a sense of place where  
4 students go to master the tools for accessing truth veritas  
5 which is Harvard's motto.

6                   One of my favorite quotes and I'm almost  
7 ready to conclude, is by Lee Sharp. Isn't it strange that  
8 princes and kings and clowns the Kapre and Sauda strings  
9 and common people like you and me are builders for  
10 eternity? Each is given a list of rules, a shapeless mass,  
11 a bag of tools and each must fashion air life has flown, a  
12 stumbling block or a stepping stone. And that's why we do  
13 this work on this Board, to create the conditions for  
14 education, to be a stepping stone for life for Colorado  
15 students. Thank you again, for the opportunity to serve  
16 with you and I just ask God's blessing on your continued  
17 work. Thank you.

18                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Thank you Dr.  
19 Scheffel and -- and members of Board for -- for the  
20 opportunity. So we do have some holiday and Christmas  
21 gifts. There are gift certificates in here, with the  
22 exception of Katie, she has a gift stick too, but this is,  
23 these are gifts from the Board and you'll all get your bill  
24 here in a little bit.



1                   But we did include one thing for Katie that  
2 I want to mention which is, we were able to find a DVD of  
3 the movie Fargo. So -- so -- so we thought she would  
4 probably need that in addition to the good stuff and then  
5 you betcha. And then Elizabeth, thank you and -- and Merry  
6 Christmas and Denise hiding over there, thank you and Merry  
7 Christmas. I'll bring these over. I would like to -- to  
8 close with one thing that I appreciate, personally, the  
9 opportunity to serve as your chairman for the past 15  
10 months. It's been a great opportunity and a great honor.  
11 And I wanna say that I've enjoyed working with each and  
12 every one of you, personally.

13                   I hope that -- I hope that I have shown you  
14 as, the respect which you deserve. I know at times I slip  
15 into fits of temperament and temper and I apologize for  
16 that because I think all of you that I've served with  
17 deserve the best. And I think you've contributed the best  
18 and I'm personally, very appreciative of the -- of the  
19 opportunity to work with all of you. So thank you very  
20 much. And we will stand adjourned until --

21                   MS. CORDIAL: January 11th.

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- 9 a.m. Wednesday,  
23 January 11th. Thank you.

24                   (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright  
Kimberly C. McCright  
Certified Vendor and Notary Public  
  
Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC  
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165  
Houston, Texas 77058  
281.724.8600