COLORADO
Department of Education

Public School Finance Task Force Meeting Minutes
September 12th, 2023   11:00 AM - 1:00 PM
[Link to Live Stream Meeting](#) | [SB23-287](#)

Task Force Members Present: Alex Magaña, Brenda Dickhoner, Carrie Zimmerman,Craig Harper, Chuck Carpenter, Dan Snowberger, Deborah Hendrix, Jennifer Okes, Kathy Gebhardt, Kermit Snyder, Leslie Nichols, Lisa Weil, Marc Carey,Marty Gutierrez, Nick Plantan, Riley Kitts, Sarah Siegel, Sarah Swanson, Steven Bartholomew, Terry Croy Lewis
Task Force Members Absent: None
Guest Observers: Amanda Bickel -Chief Legislative Analyst, Andrea Uhl - Legislative Analyst
Facilitator & Support: Nick Stellitano – Dillinger Research & Applied Data, Patrick Gibson - CT School State Finance Project, Ashley Robles - CT School State Finance Project, Amy Carman - Executive Director of School Finance & Grants, Shelbie Konkel - Senior Legislative Advisor, Melissa Bloom - Principal Policy Advisor, Andrea Uhl, JBC Staff, Rich Hull School Finance Analyst, Tim Kahle School Finance Program director, Gene Fornecker - School Finance Senior Analyst, Corey Kispert - Network Admin, Annette Severson - Manager of Data Services

Welcome and Norms Review
1. The Task Force Facilitator, Nick Stellitano, started the meeting at 11:00am. There were initially some technical issues around the public live stream and whether members of the public were able to access the meeting through the main link. The meeting link was reset, task force members communicated and tested out the link and the meeting proceeded. (Slide 1)
2. The Task Force reviewed Microsoft Team's Etiquette as well as Guidelines for Interaction, Deliberation, and Collaboration. The set of guidelines were recommended by the Task Force in the first Task Force meeting and were organized and arranged for this meeting. (Slides 4-5)

Common Questions
1. Nick Stellitano reviewed a set of common questions that have been asked through email and surveys (Slide 7)
   a. **Why are we meeting just virtually?** Based on the legislation and lack of funding for in-person meetings, the intent was for meetings to be virtual.
   b. **Why are we meeting for only 3 hours?** There is no reason why meetings only have to be 3 hours. Riley Kitts expressed that it would make more sense to have longer meetings especially when we needed time to review models and dive deep into numbers. Other members also expressed a desire to be responsive and adaptive to the needs of the topics discussed. It was agreed that meetings would be changed to at least 4 hours per meeting.
   c. **Is there a complete list of participants?** Yes, it has been shared out and is a part of the minutes.
   d. **Can 2 Task Force Members talk about the Task Force?** Technically 2 or more members that meet with the intent to talk about the work of their task force is considered to be a public meeting and should be treated as such: ""All meetings of two or more members of any state public body at which public business is discussed or at which any formal action may be taken are declared to be public meetings open to the public at all

times." Section 23-6-402, C.R.S.

    e. **Shouldn't we wait for the Adequacy Studies to be completed?** Due to legislative timelines set forth in the bill we cannot.

Vision Setting

1. Chuck Carpenter, Task Force Chair, took a few minutes to discuss and explain his vision around what he hopes the Task Force will accomplish. He detailed three principles (Slide 9):
   a. Let the Task Force be a Task Force
   b. Do our best at accomplishing the job we were asked to do
   c. Role of the Chair, Facilitator, CDE, & Staff

Project Plan Buildout

1. The Task Force members took 5 mins to review the results of a Task Force Input Survey regarding topics, agenda setting, and meeting dates. Following individual reflections, various Task Force members shared the following takeaways (Slide 11):
   a. Alex Magaña felt it was important to ensure we define the problem clearly
   b. Sarah Siegel and Lisa Weil think the adequacy studies need to go first
   c. Kermit Snyder was surprised that size factor was ranked the lowest priority
   d. Sarah Swanson thinks a lot of learning is needed, there are a lot of time constraints but want to be able to provide reflections and ask for additional materials
2. Nick Stellitano reviewed the draft project plan and discussed the need and importance of utilizing data to refine proposals that will ultimately be used to make recommendations. Many Task Force members stressed the importance of looking at the recommendations holistically and ensuring that we understand how each component builds on one another. Alex Magaña reminded the Task Force that our goal is to make a funding formula that is "SIMPLER, LESS REGRESSIVE, AND MORE ADEQUATE, UNDERSTANDABLE, TRANSPARENT, EQUITABLE, AND STUDENT-CENTERED". (Slide 12)

Review Robert's Rules of Order

1. Nick Stellitano reviewed various methods in which Task Forces can develop recommendations. They range from majority rule, to consensus building, to unilateral decision making. Given the nature of the Task Force's work, and the time constraints Dillinger Research and Applied Data (Facilitator), recommended the following approach:
   a. Review the content through pre-reads, presentations, and discussion
   b. Identify, develop, and align on 2 proposals to model
   c. Model & review data discussing impact, unintended effects, and potential outcomes
   d. Revise and finalize a draft recommendation
   e. Utilizing aspects of Robert's Rules a member of the Task Force makes a motion to accept the proposed recommendation
   f. Another Task Force member must 2nd it
   g. The Task Force is given the opportunity to discuss
   h. Once points of discussion have been raised the facilitator will move to take a vote on whether to accept or reject the proposed recommendation
   i. If a majority vote to accept the proposal, it will be incorporated into the final report, if not, the proposal must be revised and finalized again (Step 4)
2. Task Force Members were generally supportive of the approach. It was expressed that it is important slides are sent out to Task Force Members at least 24 hours in advance. Due to the nature of majority rules, some Task Force members want to ensure that the minority voice is not

left out of the report; Dan Snowberger suggested we have a minority report for the recommendations that have large numbers of task force members in the minority.

Adequacy Parameters Study Development
1. Patrick Gibson reviewed major components of the preread providing a grounding around what components are found in the adequacy study (Slides 20-30).
2. Originally, the plan was for the Task Force to break out into 2 groups each focusing on one of the studies but given the technological issues, the group stayed together to discuss the various parameters. The following inputs and thoughts were discussed when developing 2 sets of Adequacy Parameters:
   a. It is important one report is focused on Inputs and one is focused on Outputs. Because of that, each report could utilize a different set of methods with one combining Professional Judgement and Evidence Based, while the other uses Cost Function and Successful Schools.
   b. Concerns within each method was expressed:
      i. With successful schools, what criteria would we use to determine what's a successful school? We don't want to just focus on primarily white and wealthy districts. Could we maybe look at growth rather than score performance?
      ii. With successful schools, can we utilize a system already developed? There is another task force on school accountability that is currently meeting.
      iii. We would want to make sure we ask educators. We need to include those who do the actual work of educating students
   c. Adequacy study should look at compounding impact of BS factor (projects have been put off)
   d. Include considerations of high need students (ELL, sped, at risk, gifted)
   e. Need to make sure it has a student centric components

Next Steps
1. Nick covered the next steps for the Task Force. Priority would be for Nick and his team to develop materials for the next Task Force meeting and try and get feedback around current discussions.