



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
June 11, 2014, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 11, 2014, the  
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman  
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman  
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Pam Mazanec (R)  
Debora Scheffel (R)  
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come  
2 back to order. My little device here just gave me a  
3 reminder. It's a reminder from Lumosity, which is a  
4 brain training thing. It says: Time to exercise your  
5 brain. And I can think of nothing that would exercise  
6 your brain better than to, in fact, bring this board back  
7 to order. With that, I'll ask the staff to call the  
8 roll.

9                   MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman. Jane  
10 Goff.

11                  MS. GOFF: Here.

12                  MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

13                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

14                  MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

15                  MS. MAZANEC: Here.

16                  MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

17                  MS. NEAL: Here.

18                  MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

19                  MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

20                  MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

21                  MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

22                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: At the risk of putting  
23 someone on the spot... can I put someone on the spot to do  
24 the Pledge of Allegiance? Would that be appropriate?

25                  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And who might that  
2 someone be?

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess I don't know.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll let mom lead the  
5 Pledge of Allegiance then.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think she takes  
7 after her mother.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Robert, you are  
9 cruising today.

10 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the  
11 United State of America and to the Republic for which it  
12 stands. One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty  
13 and justice for all.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Is there a  
15 motion to approve the agenda?

16 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, I move to approve the  
17 agenda as published.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Second? There is a  
19 second. Without objection it shall be so. I am now  
20 requesting a motion to put items on the consent agenda.

21 MS. NEAL: And just for those of you in the  
22 audience who want to take a 10-minute nap, this would be  
23 a good time to do that.

24 I move to place the following matters on the  
25 consent agenda:



1                   14.01, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
2                   concerning an application charge number 2007ec50,  
3                   instruct department staff to issue a notice of denial and  
4                   appeal rights to the applicant pursuant to 24-4-104  
5                   C.R.S.

6                   14.02, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
7                   concerning an application charge number 2011ec750,  
8                   instruct department staff to issue a notice of denial and  
9                   appeal rights pursuant to 24-4-104 C.R.S.

10                  14.03, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
11                  concerning the license charge number 2012ec335, instruct  
12                  the commissioner to sign the settlement agreement.

13                  14.04, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
14                  concerning a license charge number 2013ec78, instruct  
15                  department staff and the state attorney general's office  
16                  to prepare the documents necessary to request a formal  
17                  hearing for the revocation of the license holder's  
18                  license pursuant to 24-4-104 C.R.S.

19                  14.06, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
20                  concerning a licensed charge number 2013ec2752, instruct  
21                  department staff and the state attorney general's office  
22                  to prepare the documents necessary to request a formal  
23                  hearing for the revocation of the license holder's  
24                  license pursuant to 24-4-104 C.R.S.

25                  14.08, approve Douglas County District RE1's



1 request for reauthorization as a designated agency for  
2 alternative teacher preparation as set forth in the  
3 published agenda.

4 14.09, approve University of Denver's  
5 request for authorization to offer the school librarian  
6 and teacher librarian endorsement programs as set forth  
7 in the published agenda.

8 14.10, approve the request for Mountain  
9 BOCES for reauthorization as a designated agency for  
10 alternative teacher preparation as set forth in the  
11 published agenda.

12 14.11, approve the request from Northeast  
13 BOCES for reauthorization as a designated agency for  
14 alternative teacher preparation as set forth in the  
15 published agenda.

16 14.12, approve Regis University's request to  
17 offer an undergraduate level special education generalist  
18 endorsement program as set forth in the published agenda.

19 16.03, approve the recommendations for the  
20 2014 expelled and at-risk student service grant  
21 recipients and amount of grant rewards as set forth in  
22 the published agenda.

23 16.04, approve the waivers from specific  
24 statutes as set forth in the published agenda in addition  
25 to the waivers automatically granted, requested by



1 Colorado Springs School District 11. On behalf of academy  
2 of advanced and creative learning.

3 16.05, approve the waver from specific  
4 statutes as set forth in the published agenda requested  
5 by Delta County 50J on behalf of Delta Academy of Applied  
6 Learning pursuant to 22-2-117 C.R.S.

7 16.06, approve the wavers pro specific  
8 statutes as set forth in the published agenda in addition  
9 to the wavers automatically granted requested by Denver  
10 County School District, one, on behalf of DSST Green  
11 Valley Ranch High School.

12 16.07, approve the renewal of wavers from  
13 specific statutes as set forth in the published agenda in  
14 addition to the wavers automatically granted requested by  
15 Denver public schools on behalf of DSST Cole Middle  
16 School.

17 16.08, approve the renewal of wavers from  
18 specific statutes as set forth in the published agenda.  
19 In addition to the wavers automatically granted requested  
20 by Brighton School District 27J on behalf of Eagle Ridge  
21 Academy.

22 16.09, approve the renewal of wavers from  
23 specific statues as set froth in the published agenda in  
24 addition to the wavers automatically granted requested by  
25 Denver Public Schools on behalf of Pioneer Charter



1 School.

2 16.10, approve the wavers from specific  
3 statutes as set forth in the published agenda in addition  
4 to the wavers automatically granted requested by Colorado  
5 Springs School District 11 on behalf of Roosevelt Edison  
6 Charter School.

7 16.11, approve the wavers from specific  
8 statutes as set forth in the published agenda in addition  
9 to the wavers automatically granted requested by Denver  
10 County School District 1 on behalf of Ridgeview Academy.

11 16.12, approve the waver from specific  
12 statutes as set forth in the published agenda in addition  
13 to the wavers automatically granted requested by the  
14 Charter School Institute on behalf of Colorado Early  
15 Colleges-Douglas County.

16 16.13, approve the waver from specific  
17 statutes as set forth in the published agenda requested by  
18 the Charter School Institute on behalf of the New  
19 American School-Denver.

20 16.14, affirm Denver public schools'  
21 designation as a district of innovation pursuant to  
22 section 22-32.5-108(3)(a) C.R.S. and approve the request  
23 for a waver from state statutes for the benefit of  
24 Isabella Bird Community School.

25 16.15, approve the application for



1 certification of a multi-district online school submitted  
2 by Rocky Mountain Digital Academy.

3 16.16, approve the application for  
4 certification and amendment of existing certification of  
5 multi-district online schools submitted by Byers School  
6 District on behalf of Colva Inc (ph) New Elementary  
7 School Inc, New Middle School Inc, and Elevate Academy.

8 20.02, improves the following nominees to  
9 serve on the Gifted Education State Advisory Committee  
10 for a three-year term District 3 educator Courtney Child  
11 (ph), District 4 educator Melanie Patterson, District 5  
12 community Crystal Ross (ph), District 5 educator Lynn  
13 Lane (ph), District 6 parent community Nancy Lee (ph),  
14 and District 7 parent community Vicky Ray (ph).

15 20.03, approve further assistance  
16 allocations to the boards of cooperative education  
17 services in implementing and meeting state educational  
18 priorities (1 CCR 301-89) as set forth in the published  
19 agenda. This is the end of the consent agenda.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well done. That is a  
21 proper motion, but before seeking a second, I would like  
22 to request that he motion be modified and that item  
23 16.16, 16.16, be removed from the consent agenda. With  
24 that modification then I would ask for a second, unless  
25 there are other questions of specific.





1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 16.16?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 16.16, just put it back  
3 and we'll, you know, we'll get --

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: For a vote.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. We'll pull it back  
6 for a vote, and then I've got a couple staff questions.  
7 We'll take those later in the day. Pam has seconded it.  
8 We have a motion, consent agenda motion, and a second.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Wait a minute, first  
10 (indiscernible) a second to remove --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think an individual  
12 member can pull an item. We don't need to have a vote on  
13 that.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. But Jane's got  
15 a question.

16 MS. GOFF: 16.15 or 16.16?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 1-6-1-6. Okay, so it has  
18 been moved and seconded. If there's no objection the  
19 consent agenda shall be adopted.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You want me to repeat  
21 it?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Can we please have your  
23 motion from the top again. Let me make a general  
24 comment. We've got a very full agenda today, a number of  
25 reports, a number of items. I would ask that as we move



1 through the reports that everyone hold all questions.  
2 You know, normally I allow for clarifying questions. If  
3 it's an incredibly pressing clarifying question, please  
4 go ahead. But otherwise, please hold them to the end of  
5 the presentation. We'll take questions at the ends of  
6 presentations and try and move through and stay on track  
7 on time today if we possibly can.

8 Good morning, Elaine. I would like to point  
9 out for the record that Ms. Gantz Berman was here almost  
10 immediately after we called the roll.

11 And with that, Carrie, would you please  
12 report to the board.

13 MS. MARKEL: Yes, good morning Mr. Chair,  
14 members of the board, commissioner. You have in your  
15 fact -- in your packets two new fact sheets. One is  
16 entitled supporting pair implementation of Senate Bill  
17 191 and that's in Section 1 of your notebooks.

18 The other is support for school district  
19 accountability (indiscernible) the 2015 assessment  
20 transition, Section 4 of your notebooks.

21 And I would like to note that since we are  
22 kind of coming to the end of this school year or have  
23 come to the end of the school year, and won't be meeting  
24 again until August unless there's a special meeting  
25 unforeseen at this time called.



1                   If anyone would like help in organizing  
2 their notebooks with all of the fact sheets that have  
3 been put in, we're happy to do that, so don't be  
4 embarrassed to ask. We are here to help and would be  
5 happy to update your notebooks with the current fact  
6 sheet, so that when you start in the fall you have a good  
7 working set of resources.

8                   Moving on to what you have in your packets  
9 for the board meeting in Section 7.01, you have a  
10 document prepared by these mellow and staff relating to -  
11 - it's actually the legislative implementation. It  
12 relates to all the legislation that came out of this  
13 session that impacts CDE or education, K-12 education,  
14 and the duties that will fall upon staff in implementing  
15 that legislation.

16                   In section 17.02, you have a PowerPoint  
17 regarding regrading GELP and Next Generation Learning in  
18 Colorado.

19                   In Sections 8.01 of your packet you have  
20 Fiscal Year 2015-16 budget request. You were briefed on  
21 that, it was an information item in Grand Junction, and  
22 today those items will be before you for decision this  
23 morning.

24                   In Section 9.01 you have a PowerPoint of the  
25 Colorado Measures of Academic Success setting the cut



1 scores for science and social studies.

2 In Section 10.01 you have a review of the  
3 Praxis score for English Language Arts and mathematics.

4 In Section 12.01 you have the proposed  
5 (indiscernible) endorsements rules as you will be  
6 conducting a rule-making hearing on that this afternoon.

7 For the Counselor Corps Grant discussion  
8 that will -- this afternoon. There is one PowerPoint  
9 that addresses all of the items in 15.01, 16.01 and  
10 16.02.

11 Additionally, you have a copy of the 2014  
12 Legislative Report concerning School Counselor Corps  
13 Grant Program, a copy of the proposed Counselor Corps  
14 Grant recommendations for the coming year, and finally, a  
15 copy of the proposed Counselor Corps rules you'll be  
16 asked to initiate a notice of rule-making for those rules  
17 this afternoon.

18 In Section 16.03 you have a copy of the  
19 2014-15 Expelled and At-Risk Grant recommendations.

20 In 16.04 you have the material -- you have a  
21 number of materials in Section 16, and these were  
22 materials submitted by Colorado Springs in support of its  
23 application for the academy for Advanced Creative  
24 Learning.

25 In 16.05 you have materials submitted by



1 Delta on behalf of their waver sought on behalf of Delta  
2 Academy of Applied Learning.

3 16.06, you have the materials submitted by  
4 DPS on behalf of DSST Green Valley Branch.

5 In 16.07 you have materials submitted by DPS  
6 on behalf of DSST Cole Campus.

7 In 16.08 you have the materials submitted by  
8 school District 27J on behalf of the wavers requested by  
9 Eagle Ridge Academy Charter School.

10 In 16.09 you have the materials submitted by  
11 DPS on behalf of Pioneer Charter School.

12 And 16.10 you have the materials submitted  
13 by Colorado Springs District 11 on behalf of Roosevelt  
14 Edison Charter School.

15 16.11, materials submitted by DPS on behalf  
16 of Ridgeview Academy.

17 16.12, you have the materials submitted by  
18 charter school -- the Charter School Institute on behalf  
19 of Colorado Springs for Early Colleges, Douglas County  
20 Charter School.

21 In 16.13 you have the materials submitted by  
22 DPS on behalf of New America School.

23 16.15, you have the materials submitted by  
24 DPS on behalf of Isabella Bird Community School.

25 In 17.01 you have the Draft Polls Rules for



1 the Read Act, and that will be for discussion this  
2 afternoon. That is no longer a notice of rulemaking, but  
3 it is a discussion item, and there will be comment from  
4 the public, but that item is -- has been revised to be a  
5 discussion item, and members of the public will be here  
6 to participate in that discussion.

7 In 18.02 you have the prioritized fiscal --  
8 Fiscal Year 2014-15 recommended best grant -- best cash  
9 grant recommendations.

10 In 20.01, for the title, you have -- for the  
11 discussion concerning Title I, Part A funding pilot you  
12 have a fact sheet along with this PowerPoint, and that  
13 will be up for your decision this afternoon, and action.

14 In 20.02 you have a copy of all the CVs that  
15 were submitted on behalf of the applicants to the Gifted  
16 Education Advisory Committee. And for Thursday in your  
17 materials, you have the supporting materials for the  
18 turnaround priority improvement district presentations.  
19 You will hear from the last four districts, and those are  
20 Sheridan, Apilar (ph), Julesburg and Rocky Ford.

21 And that ends my report, unless anyone has  
22 any questions.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No. And I would just  
24 note if we lop over on time today, we -- not that I'm  
25 enthused about doing it, but we're scheduled to conclude



1 about 3:00-3:30 tomorrow afternoon. We can always move  
2 items to tomorrow afternoon, late, if in fact we need to  
3 do that, if we need to do that. If we run out of time  
4 today. I prefer not to do that, but just we have some  
5 space tomorrow if we need to take it.

6 MS. MARKEL: Mr. Chair, actually, I believe  
7 we're scheduled to -- based on what's set right now we  
8 could conclude by 2:00 tomorrow.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, that's even better.  
10 So, there we go. Okay.

11 MS. MARKEL: Yeah. I was going to note the  
12 same thing regarding today.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yep.

14 MS. MARKEL: Because I would imagine the  
15 last item will generate a fair amount of discussion.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, and so we want to  
17 give these items time to elucidate to challenge the  
18 question, to walk through it. So, if necessary, we might  
19 push some things over to tomorrow. So, thank you much  
20 for that. Thanks for the report.

21 My next item on the agenda is the  
22 commissioner's report. I think you've got a couple  
23 things embedded. You might have other comments or other  
24 items you want to bring up, but please go ahead, Mr.  
25 Commissioner.



1                   COMM. HAMMOND: Well, the first item on the  
2 list we want to talk to you about the legislative wrap-  
3 up. I'll have Ms. Jennifer Mellow come forward. The  
4 document that you have, really compliments to Jennifer  
5 and staff. This is the earliest we've ever been able to  
6 pull this together. It really details the impacts of the  
7 legislation and what we need to do. So, Jennifer, you go  
8 through, and given the time briefly, just appreciate  
9 that.

10                   MS. MELLOW: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner and  
11 Mr. Chair. It's nice to see you all. Thank you for --  
12 working moms whose kids wake up with sore throats  
13 sometimes have to make adjustments. So --  
14 (indiscernible) this morning.

15                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well welcome.

16                   MS. MELLOW: So just in -- you know, I know  
17 you all have seen this document, it was distributed to  
18 you last week. To do some summary of it, the total  
19 appropriations to the Department as a result of  
20 legislation passed in the session is about \$6.6-million.  
21 Now 82 percent of that goes into two bills: one is the  
22 fiscal transparency component of the Student Success Act,  
23 that's a \$3-million allocation to the department. The  
24 expectation is that those dollars aren't -- that's not to  
25 support new work in the department, that's to give to a





1 contractor to do the work specified in that bill, so most  
2 of that money will flow right back out.

3 The other big component of it is \$2.5-  
4 million for the newly created School Health Professional  
5 Grant Program that is coming from Marijuana money.  
6 Again, most of that money will flow back out the door.  
7 So, it's not that the department itself is growing by \$6-  
8 million, it is growing to some extent, but it's also  
9 administering some new programs, so some significant  
10 dollars.

11 The total FTE increase is 6.2. I went  
12 through -- I was kind of curious to see how that -- where  
13 those FTE were in the department. You've got 2.7 of them  
14 over in the Accountability, Performance and Support  
15 Division, Dr. Owen's office. 2.6 in the Innovation  
16 Choice and Engagement Office, Rebecca Holmes. 0.7 in  
17 School Finance, and 0.2 -- over here, my friend Jill's  
18 only got 0.2 FTE. That's all. She's got a lot of work  
19 to do and 0.2 FTE to do it with. So that's just some  
20 summary information.

21 As I was looking through this document  
22 trying to think about, like, what is the most relevant  
23 information for you all, what do you care about the most.  
24 I thought what I would do is highlight the bills that  
25 create kind of the most work for the department, right.



1 Now I'm happy to answer any questions about anything  
2 that's in here, but when you really look at it, the bills  
3 that end to create the most work for the department are  
4 ones that create new programs, or that significantly  
5 alter or change or add on to existing programs.

6 So, I'll start with House Bill 1102, which  
7 was the gifted and Talented Bill, it happens to be the  
8 first bill in you packet. These are organized by bill  
9 number, so that's the reason why that one shows up first.

10 Some of the things driving the work for the  
11 department under GT, now there's a specific duty to  
12 review district's plans for gifted and talented  
13 education. That was not something that statutorily the  
14 department was required to do previously. There is a new  
15 screening grant program and anew grant program for  
16 districts who hire a qualified person.

17 Now both of those grant programs are  
18 voluntary, that's not how the legislation started out.  
19 The legislation started out mandating those things with  
20 the school districts. As part of the process those  
21 became voluntary grant programs, but from a department  
22 perspective we still have to administer them, right? So,  
23 some school districts will choose to apply for those  
24 grants, and so a process has to be set upright. You have  
25 to have an application, you have to have a way to review



1 those applications, you have to have a way to distribute  
2 the money.

3 And then, in addition, that one will require  
4 a rule-making process, so as you'll see under your  
5 section where it talks about SBE duties you'll -- you  
6 guys will get to kind of take a more careful look at that  
7 when a rulemaking process comes up.

8 1292 was the Student Success Act. You -- so  
9 1292, Student Success, and 1298 which is School Finance,  
10 both had a whole bunch of things in them, right. Those  
11 are kind of like these big bills that they dump a bunch  
12 of stuff in. I'm focusing on the things I think, again,  
13 generate the most work for the department. Within 1292  
14 that is the Fiscal Transparency piece.

15 So as the negotiations played out very close  
16 to the end of session kind of the major piece of reform  
17 that stayed in the Student Success act was a requirement  
18 -- some requirements around fiscal transparency, in  
19 particular, that tax payer, citizens, parents be able to  
20 see data at the school level.

21 Now it's going to take some time to get  
22 there, right. This is not the kind of thing you snap  
23 your fingers and it happens overnight, and the department  
24 has some steps to do in terms of working with exist --  
25 through existing mechanisms they have for working with



1 districts about data and how data gets transferred, and  
2 all of that.

3 They have some work to do around setting  
4 some standards and maybe changing some definitions, maybe  
5 not, but to do that -- and then the department is  
6 specifically tasked in the legislation with administering  
7 the contract. So, the anticipation is there's some sort  
8 of -- so I'm not a tech knowledgeable person.

9 Some web company -- I don't really know what  
10 these people are, but some company that has the capacity  
11 to take this data from the school districts, do whatever  
12 they have to do with it, and then establish a web portal  
13 that is easy for people to use.

14 Again, that's not the department that does  
15 that work, but it is the department that's tasked with  
16 administering that contract. Under the school finance  
17 act, 1298, I think the component of that, that's  
18 generating the most work for the department, is kind of a  
19 revision of how we do the English Language Proficiency  
20 Act, the ELPA program.

21 You all will be faced with two rulemakings  
22 under that particular part, one, is to update the rules  
23 of the program per the new legislation, there was also a  
24 specific thing created called the Excellence Awards Grant  
25 Program. The intention there being it's not a huge



1 amount of money going into that, but it's some money to  
2 be able to really highlight best practices so that  
3 districts can learn from each other and then say: Oh,  
4 that worked really well over there. Maybe we should give  
5 that a shot. So, you'll have to do a separate rulemaking  
6 on that.

7                   There's a lot of changes as a result of  
8 that, that the department has to make in terms of data  
9 collection, data reporting, how you get stuff, how you  
10 send it back out. There's a new formula for distributing  
11 dollars that's -- now the formula is specified in the  
12 law, but, you know, laws are only so specific, so your  
13 staff will have to kind of look at that, figure that out,  
14 and then distribute the dollars accordingly.

15                   I feel like I'm just normally you let  
16 questions go, and so I feel like I'm just blathering on  
17 at you.

18                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

19                   MS. MELLOW: This is a little -- feel  
20 strange. I have three more bills I want to highlight for  
21 you, and then I'm happy to take any questions.

22                   House Bill 1382 is an online education bill.  
23 Again, this one started much broader than it ended,  
24 that's a trend that you see quite often. In its final  
25 form essentially, it creates a task force that is



1 appointed by the commissioner to focus on these multi-  
2 district online schools. And what is the appropriate way  
3 to authorize them? Is that something the department  
4 should do? Is that something districts should do? Is  
5 there another method?

6 And to really look into some of those  
7 issues, you know, this is -- there are two legislators in  
8 particular, Senator Andy Kerr and Representative Dave  
9 Young who are very passionate about online education.  
10 They both work in online education, and they, for the  
11 last couple of years, have been really trying to, quote,  
12 unquote, do something to improve the situation for online  
13 education.

14 It's challenging, because there's a lot of  
15 kind of competing stakeholders in that world, right. I  
16 mean, you have, obviously, have a district perspective,  
17 you have a BOCES perspective, you have a for profit  
18 online education provider perspective, you have a non-  
19 profit online education provider perspective, and they  
20 haven't, so far, been able to develop any consensus  
21 amongst those different groups that would allow for, you  
22 know, truly substantive legislation to pass.

23 So, I think this is an attempt to really  
24 empower or use the great skill sets you guys have over  
25 here at the department in your staff and your -- the



1 expertise here to pull some folks together and see if the  
2 -- any consensus can be developed. And, you know, that  
3 we'll see is the work as the taskforce proceeds, but I  
4 wanted to highlight that for you.

5 Senate Bill 124, we talked about this a  
6 little bit a couple of different times in our legislative  
7 contact meetings and then with the full board. This  
8 creates the School Turnaround Leaders Development  
9 Program, so what this is trying to do is say: okay, we  
10 have schools in districts that are nearing the end of the  
11 clock. Nobody wants to see that happen, because that's  
12 not the best way to serve our kids, right.

13 So, what -- I think the sentiment was: What  
14 could we do to help those districts and schools that find  
15 themselves in this situation, that are really struggling  
16 to do better by their kids. And this is a response, not  
17 to say it's the only possible response, or a total  
18 response, but it is a response that the legislature has  
19 chosen to adopt. It's a \$2-million program, and it  
20 really has two different components. One focuses on  
21 curriculum development for leader -- to train leaders,  
22 turn around leaders in these schools and districts.

23 So -- and it doesn't just have to be a  
24 principal. It can be a principal, it can be a teacher,  
25 you know, it can be, I don't know that it could be



1 anyone, but it's -- it's -- it's somewhat broadly  
2 defined, but the point is let's get curriculum that is  
3 very specifically targeted at teaching people how to  
4 manage these situations and how to take a school that's  
5 been having challenges and turn it around.

6 The department -- and, obviously, I'm not  
7 the expert on this, but to some extent has done some of  
8 this work in working with some of their districts and  
9 sending them through a program at the University of  
10 Virginia. I think it's just -- sounds like it's a great  
11 program, but it's in Virginia, and it's a long ways away,  
12 and it's kind of expensive, and the legislature thought:  
13 Hm, maybe we actually have people who are smart enough in  
14 Colorado to figure this out.

15 So there -- part of the grant program is to  
16 develop local curriculums that train these leaders. The  
17 second part of the grant program is to pay for people to  
18 go through those programs, right. So, again, from a  
19 department perspective, that's a fair -- that's a fairly  
20 big lift, right. So now you essentially have two  
21 components that you've got to decide what -- how you're  
22 going to run it, you know, put an RFP out there, assess  
23 those applications as they come in, monitor progress as  
24 you're going forward, right?

25 So, let's say there's a curriculum program





1 that gets approved for a grant, gets developed, but it's  
2 not working very well. I mean, the staff is charged  
3 specifically by this bill to kind of monitor that and  
4 stay on top of it and really pay attention to what works  
5 and what doesn't work.

6 There is annual reporting to the  
7 legislature, there's a rule-making process, again, that  
8 the staff will engage with you on, so that one'll be -- I  
9 think you'll be hearing more about that.

10 And then the final one I wanted to mention  
11 as a -- again as a, you know, kind of -- it's a new  
12 program, so it's a lift for the department to create from  
13 whole cloth, is under Senate Bill 215, which is the bill  
14 that distributed the marijuana revenues. It's the  
15 creation of the School Health Professionals Grant  
16 Program. This is another one that in the last weeks of  
17 session was back and forth and was at 5-million, and then  
18 it was 3-million, and then it was zero, and at the end it  
19 was \$2.5-million for the Department of Education to  
20 create this program, hire staff, rulemaking, administer  
21 the grant, monitor and provide technical assistance, data  
22 collection, many of the things that I've already talked  
23 about in some of these other bills. But all of that will  
24 have to go into getting this up and running.

25 What I will say about that is the



1 legislature took a fairly conservative approach with the  
2 marijuana dollars, and only allocated about half of what  
3 they expect to come in.

4           This is -- expectations are -- nobody knows,  
5 right. It's not like we can go to another state and say:  
6 Hey, when you guys legalized marijuana for recreational  
7 use, how much money did you raise? We are the test case,  
8 so what we anticipate is that next year there'll be  
9 additional legislation to spend whatever additional  
10 dollars turn out to be created through the tax revenues.

11           I think conversations are really now just  
12 starting about whether -- do you take the programs that  
13 were created this year and simply add on to them? Right.  
14 Just put more money into the programs you've already  
15 created? Or do you do something else with the money? Do  
16 you create a bunch of additional programs? Or do you,  
17 again, maybe just use it -- I mean, there are some  
18 constitutional restrictions about how the dollars can be  
19 used, but, you know, health is a fairly broad category.

20           So that's what I wanted to highlight. I  
21 guess I will just close all of that by saying I want you  
22 to know that the department, I think were -- we were  
23 active participants in all of these bills. So, it's not  
24 all like any of this passed and we went: Oh, hey, look at  
25 that. Oh, there's a bill that tells us to do something?



1 I mean, we're engaged in this typically at  
2 the request of a legislator who will say: Hey, I'm  
3 working on this. You know, how do we do this in a way  
4 that makes sense? I mean, I think that your staff has  
5 looked at for policy questions, right. What's the best  
6 way to do this in your opinion? But also, just for  
7 purely logistical, like, can you do this? Is this  
8 doable? How would this work?

9 And we do see a lot of changes happen to  
10 bills as a result of those conversations. So, you know,  
11 we are not just sitting by the sidelines waiting to see  
12 what happens. We're in there working on it.

13 The other thing I wanted to highlight is the  
14 number of conversations we end up having about fiscal  
15 notes on bills. Fiscal notes are a challenging process at  
16 the capital, right. I mean, depending on the budget  
17 climate there're years where if you have any fiscal note  
18 your bill will not pass, period, end of story. This was  
19 not one of those. It doesn't mean that's just, you know,  
20 you can put anything out there, but, you know, if I'm a  
21 legislator, my perfect world is I write a bill and  
22 there's no fiscal impact, right. Because that's going to  
23 make it easier for me to get it through the legislature.  
24 There's fewer committees I have to deal with, it doesn't  
25 cost money, all of that.



1                   That doesn't necessary mesh really well  
2 with, from a department perspective, it's like: Yeah, but  
3 you're telling us to do more work. Like, you're giving  
4 us a bunch more things to do.

5                   So, we have those conversations. I think  
6 they are productive. Again, they aren't always easy, but  
7 we get in there and we talk to people and we help them  
8 understand why it takes what it will take to implement  
9 their bill.

10                  Again, often we see changes, and what we  
11 have kind of taken a very consistent approach, and I'm  
12 proud of this, is look, we're not going to change our  
13 fiscal note unless you reduce the amount of work, you're  
14 asking us to do, right. And that happens sometimes.  
15 They'll say: Oh, we really don't want it this fiscal  
16 note, or this high of a fiscal note. So, okay, let's  
17 change this around and let's -- the best example is the  
18 financial transparency. In some versions of that bill  
19 the department was in charge of running that website and  
20 doing all of that. The political dynamics were such that  
21 they didn't want that kind of fiscal note from the  
22 department, so we had a conversation about how they could  
23 get what they wanted on that front and not put the  
24 department in a bad position.

25                  And I'm getting multiple signals that my



1 time is short, so I'm going to stop talking right now.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions? Start right  
3 here in the middle. Angelika, please.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So, having done a lot of  
5 research over time as a parent in the allocation of  
6 dollars within a school district, my own school district  
7 at the time, I'm a little flummoxed by the Fiscal  
8 Transparency Act.

9 I'm wondering the level of detail, and I'm -  
10 - as this contract is released, I'd like to have a tax  
11 payers' version of what is this going to tell parents and  
12 what not -- what can't it tell. Because there are a lot  
13 of -- or at least there always were a lot of central  
14 administration costs that were direct services to schools  
15 and to kids, but the act of allocating those costs was  
16 inexact, to say the very least. Simply because you  
17 allocated that time and those personnel based on the  
18 immediate needs.

19 So it wasn't that there was ever a time when  
20 there was a central administration administrator who was  
21 sitting around doing nothing; they're going from place to  
22 place to help schools. But to allocate it is are -- is  
23 arbitrary and somewhat artificial. And so, I'd like to  
24 be able to say to a parent what some of these costs are  
25 that are not allocated, and about the costs that are



1 allocated. What's required in the legislation? Is that  
2 -- Leanne, is that a clear question? I don't want to  
3 confuse people, but I know there's so much that's not  
4 directed to a particular school.

5 MS. EMM: Yes, absolutely you are very  
6 correct. And in the legislation the original version of  
7 the bill had that costs would be allocated out to school  
8 sites, and that is no longer language within the bill,  
9 and that would have been pretty problematic from a  
10 district standpoint to take -- I'll use special education  
11 is a perfect example.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: It's the best one, yes.

13 MS. EMM: Normally teachers are budgeted  
14 centrally, or paid for centrally, and yet they provide  
15 services to multiple schools. So, for a district to take  
16 that salary and allocate it down to each individual  
17 school does tend to be problematic.

18 The transparency bill as it is written now,  
19 we will gather -- well, we will continue to gather the  
20 actual information from the school districts, but the  
21 requirement now is that districts will have to report and  
22 post on their websites by July 2017 site-level financial  
23 data. And then the contractor will go out and gather  
24 that information at the site level from each individual  
25 district specific to sites, and then consolidate this up



1 on their big website.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So, then we still  
3 have the dilemma of taxpayers seeing central  
4 administration costs and assuming that this is all folks  
5 sitting in an office at a particular location, as opposed  
6 to, in fact, providing services out. So that problem of  
7 perception, which is that the administrative costs are  
8 not direct services to schools and kids, will remain  
9 unless we find some other way to share that information,  
10 to know, you know, what folks really just are simply the  
11 administration of the district process and what folks at  
12 central are in fact providing direct services.

13 We're going to have -- continue to have that  
14 problem. That challenge, I should say.

15 MS. EMM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's  
16 possible, however, I think that's one of the things that  
17 we can also look at through this request for proposal  
18 process, because the financial policies and procedures  
19 committee will be helping to develop the information that  
20 will go to this contractor that's displayed. And I think  
21 that's a very good discussion that they need to have  
22 within the group to say: How do we deal with these --  
23 some of these central-type costs, and do we want to maybe  
24 report them centrally, but then also have an allocation  
25 method that's maybe a different view that would have



1 everything allocated down to a school level. But I think  
2 that's a very good conversation that could be had.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. If you'll keep us  
4 informed, and if you can also give us some kind of a  
5 cheat sheet to explain to parents sort of the breakout of  
6 what are direct costs that go directly to the school,  
7 what are the kind of in-between costs that are allocated  
8 in some way. And unless you allocate them after you've  
9 provided the service it's an artificial effort.

10 MS. EMM: Yes.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: And then what does it really  
12 take to run a system of 50 buildings, et cetera, et  
13 cetera.

14 MS. EMM: Okay.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

16 MS. EMM: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine had a question or  
18 comment.

19 MS. BERMAN: Well that was my first  
20 question, so I think it was covered. I just wanted to  
21 know more about how the contract was going to be issued,  
22 what was going to be in the contract. So, I think you  
23 partially answered that. Is there anything else you want  
24 to add on that?

25 MS. EMM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not at this





1 point. We will be going into the development of the RFP  
2 process. Dan Domagala's area will be spearheading that,  
3 the writing of that RFP along with my shop, and also the  
4 financial policies and procedures committee.

5 MS. BERMAN: And what type of organization,  
6 or company, would respond to it?

7 MS. EMM: It's, I think, somebody that can  
8 process a lot of data and have the capability of somehow  
9 gathering that information. So, I don't know specific  
10 companies at this point.

11 MS. BERMAN: Okay. No, no, no. I wasn't  
12 looking for names, I was looking for descriptions, yeah.  
13 Yeah.

14 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Somebody really good with  
16 ones and zeros.

17 MS. MELLOW: And what I would add, is that,  
18 I mean, I think that was, again, part of the legislative  
19 conversation. To some extent, again, Colorado is  
20 breaking ground. And when you're out in front, you know,  
21 nobody's got the whole problem figured out for you, so  
22 there are some lessons to learn from -- if there's a  
23 handful of other states who've looked at this, but it's a  
24 work in progress.

25 I mean, you guys have a great team to wade



1 through all of this, but it is -- it's real work for your  
2 folks here to figure that out.

3 MS. EMM: So, it sounds like actually  
4 writing the RFP is going to be quite difficult and so --  
5 I don't want to say tedious, but it's going to be -- take  
6 a lot of work.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane had a question.

8 MS. GOFF: (indiscernible)

9 MS. BERMAN: Oh, and I don't have --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Did I cut you off? All  
11 right, please.

12 MS. BERMAN: But if it -- is it on the same  
13 topic?

14 MS. GOFF: Nope, so let her -- I'm --

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well I've got one quick  
16 one on this, and I'm just going to say searchability,  
17 usability of data (indiscernible) the product. That's a  
18 key component, so that people can actually not have to  
19 wade too -- through 10-billion PDFs and not have useable  
20 information, but to have useable information. So that  
21 just as this process moves forward make the data useable.  
22 Please, go ahead, Elaine.

23 MS. BERMAN: Thanks, Leanne. So, my two  
24 other questions -- excuse me. Is on the -- I was going  
25 to say tobacco, but it is a form of tobacco, the



1 marijuana money, and the 2½-million. I'd be interested  
2 in a little bit more detail. WE don't have to do it  
3 today. Someone can follow up with me just in terms of  
4 how that money's going to be used, how the grants are  
5 going to be issued, et cetera. So, at some point staff  
6 can follow up with me on that.

7 MS. MELLOW: Okay. Yeah. I mean, I think  
8 that that's being worked through kind of as we speak, so  
9 I think you -- and you will have to do rulemaking around  
10 that, so, I mean, there will be a conclusion part where  
11 you see it, too.

12 MS. BERMAN: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right. Health is a very  
14 broad topic. It'll get clarified as it moves forward.

15 MS. BERMAN: But even at this front end I  
16 would like a little bit more information.

17 MS. MELLOW: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Was that it? You had one  
19 more.

20 MS. BERMAN: Okay, and the third one --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

22 MS. NEAL: You weren't here when we talked  
23 about keeping it brief.

24 MS. BERMAN: (indiscernible) Paul.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, yeah. I'm trying to



1 keep it moving, and I'm trying to be polite.

2 MS. BERMAN: The third one -- the third one  
3 has to do -- and I don't think you touched on this, but  
4 we have the Assessment Taskforce, and I don't know when  
5 the appointments are due, but I know that the chair has  
6 the ability to appoint three people. So, I know you have  
7 not consulted with the board on who those appointments  
8 are going to be, but it would be my expectation that one  
9 of the three would be a democrat, since we are a 4:3  
10 board and four republicans and three democrats, and since  
11 that usually is the way we operate I would anticipate  
12 that.

13 Since you haven't consulted any of the Dems,  
14 or you haven't consulted me, I can't speak for jane or  
15 Angelika, I guess I'd like to hear what your thinking is  
16 and when you would like our input.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely, so I'll  
18 respond to that. I would just characterize the process  
19 based on -- the way it's coming to us from across the  
20 street, as early in the process, even though an  
21 appointment by the end of the month is imminent.

22 I would further commit to you that I'll  
23 communicate with you as we move forward in the process.  
24 There's been a process established whereby communications  
25 are coming in to the speaker's office, and that is very



1 broad.

2 To the question of Rs and Ds, the way the  
3 law is drafted it's drafted and constrained in many ways  
4 to kind of, I would describe it as, control the political  
5 environment. So, your concerns that you're raising about  
6 making sure that Rs and Ds make sense; that's already  
7 been created in such a way in the law, that's a foregone  
8 conclusion, that it will be Ds and Rs, seems to be the  
9 way that it's coming to us as formed by the law itself.

10 But my commitment to you is we'll  
11 communicate before I actually make any final  
12 appointments. Fair enough?

13 MS. BERMAN: Well, I would say that I know  
14 that there's a balance outside of the state board. I  
15 know that there is no -- there is nothing in the  
16 legislation that requires you to appoint any particular  
17 party, but it would seem that the way we operate is to be  
18 a little bit balanced, so my hope and expectation would  
19 be that you would appoint at least one D of the three  
20 appointments that you make.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Noted. So -- these  
22 fingers were wagging earlier. Further comments on this  
23 topic, or we're going to move on.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (indiscernible) a  
25 follow up on this one.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead then.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: My question is in the  
3 language with respect to who's point it -- is it an  
4 oversight that parents aren't listed, or was that  
5 purposeful?

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, they're listed.  
7 There's two parent choices, I believe, the minority  
8 leader of the senate has one parents, and -- help me out  
9 on (indiscernible) the others.

10 MS. MELLOW: I -- sorry, I don't have it in  
11 front of me, but there are two parents that are supposed  
12 to be on the task force.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There are two parents  
14 that are identified, yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And just to the -- I've  
17 had applications with these behind their name cross my  
18 desk as the -- as stuff is starting to come in. So,  
19 believe it or not, it's actually part of the  
20 conversation.

21 MS. BERMAN: Well I'm available if you'd  
22 like to discuss any names.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I appreciate that.  
24 Nothing further on this? Okay, Vice Chair, and then  
25 we'll come back over here. Jane had a question. I think



1 it might have been on a different issue.

2 MS. NEAL: And I too am on a different  
3 subject. And it's a much more general subject that I  
4 have wondered beforehand. If the legislature on either  
5 side, if they have a plan when they go into the session,  
6 because sometimes it seems like everybody's little pet  
7 project gets -- becomes legislation. And the result of  
8 that is when we look at all of these little fiscal notes,  
9 if you added them all up, I'm sure the school districts  
10 would be very pleased to see a bigger reduction in the  
11 negative factor. That's what they're looking at.

12 And I know you have no control over that,  
13 but I just want to make that comment that -- and the  
14 department does -- I really have gained an appreciation  
15 for the immense amount of time they spend during the  
16 legislation session. They're spending time very -- a lot  
17 of time working on this, and everybody has their little,  
18 you know, oh, only 15-million thing. And yet I -- the  
19 school districts, one and all, talk about the negative  
20 factor. So, I would just -- that's just a general  
21 editorial comment. I don't expect you to take care of  
22 it, Jennifer, but just in case anybody's listening today,  
23 they might want to hear my editorial comment.

24 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair, can I just say --  
25 express my gratitude for your not expecting me to solve



1 that particular problem.

2 MS. NEAL: You're not a magician.

3 MS. MELLOW: I try.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, Jane.

5 MS. GOFF: My question's about the  
6 Turnaround Leader Development Bill and process. There  
7 was mention -- I did hear part of the testimony on that  
8 at the time and keyed in on a couple of points of that.  
9 One is the -- where are we as a state in the availability  
10 of programs currently already in place? Do we have  
11 exemplars? Do we have models? That was tied in as far  
12 as I recall to certain specific examples of schools, or  
13 school campus situations where that is underway.

14 And then the -- some of the conversation  
15 around the University of Virginia program, and I know  
16 that we do have some pretty good accounts of both local  
17 leaders and our state leaders who have taken advantage of  
18 that program. And I know there's concern about the cost,  
19 but that said, both of those points made how urgent do we  
20 need to deal with this?

21 I found it a little bit -- not frustrating  
22 so much as a fact, that we are in the middle of having  
23 these conversations with our turnaround and priority  
24 districts, and we -- one of the things that has not come  
25 up yet, and perhaps it has in your conversations, is how





1 is -- are there conversations in your district? Are you  
2 talking about this? And what are some possibilities for  
3 reaching out? And just their gauge on what kind of need  
4 exists for that.

5 And then down next question is: How urgent  
6 is it? Would it be something that would, if implemented  
7 ASAP, or -- and well done, would be beneficial to those  
8 efforts considering they are still on the clock? And  
9 there are some urgent concerns around some of these.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Keith.

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah, sorry, I took too long.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's okay.

13 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. So that -- I think  
14 that's a great question. I think how we're approaching  
15 it, is we know that there's good programs that we've seen  
16 good results with that -- and the University of Virginia  
17 I think's a great example of that. So, we are continuing  
18 to put different school districts and administrators  
19 through these programs. I think the hope of this grant,  
20 or this, you know, legislation, is that we also start to  
21 look at how do we let districts develop leadership, and  
22 how do we -- how do we fund that. Also, how do we let,  
23 maybe, local colleges, universities here, different  
24 programs that have shown success on small scale build up  
25 and be able to be providers here in the state, too, for



1 the future.

2 And so, I think there's a two-prong approach  
3 here. We're going to continue to support putting  
4 districts -- and they're going to be able to put staff  
5 and people through the programs that currently exist and  
6 will continue to monitor that success. But this allows  
7 us to also start looking at a variety of different  
8 options that we might want to have available. A menu of  
9 choices that districts can choose from and really match  
10 up what their needs are and provide the support that they  
11 need to the -- their administrators.

12 And so, I -- and that also includes, for  
13 example, like the school district like DPS that wants to  
14 develop its own and kind of put its own administrators  
15 through it. That really matches closely their values. I  
16 think it gives a great opportunity for them to do things  
17 like that. So, it's a great question. I think that's  
18 how we're looking at it is short-term, long-term, but we  
19 definitely know there's short-term needs, and we're  
20 continuing to support those across the state.

21 MS. GOFF: Okay, thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb, for questions down  
23 this way? Okay. We good to go here. So, I'll make one  
24 final comment and then we'll wrap up. With regard to the  
25 question of fiscal notes and, you know, the absence of



1 presence and the reality of whether they define an  
2 economic impact in education or not. We, as a  
3 department, have an opportunity because we're in -- very  
4 closely involved in the conversation, kinda know what's  
5 going on.

6 I know that the districts through their  
7 various representatives try and do the same thing, but I  
8 see situations like the park assessment, the law  
9 associated with that, that it has an enormous inherent  
10 unfunded mandate that comes with that driving and  
11 demanding technology. I think there'll always be a  
12 tension. There's always a desire to know what's going to  
13 be and to root out the unintended consequences and the  
14 unintended costs, and that will be a struggle that I  
15 think we live with forever as long as we're creating  
16 regulations and trying to manage through the tone and  
17 effort of regulation.

18 So, I guess that was an editorial comment  
19 more than anything.

20 MS. MELLOW: Well, and I wasn't necessarily  
21 going to respond to that, but I did want to just --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, feel free to  
23 respond.

24 MS. MELLOW: I wanted to put one more final  
25 thing out there, because you all may continue to hear



1 these rumors of a potential special session. I just  
2 wanted to make sure that everyone's clear that the way  
3 that special sessions work: So, the governor gets to call  
4 a special session and he or she maybe someday, but for  
5 the time being and in our past just he, gets to limit  
6 what that special session is about.

7 So, if there is a special session around oil  
8 and gas it will be limited to oil and gas, and so I don't  
9 think we have anything we need to worry about or think:  
10 Oh my god, they're going back in there and they're going  
11 to do a bunch of stuff with education.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, not like a  
13 constitutional convention. It's a very specific call.

14 MS. MELLOW: Absolutely.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you very  
16 much.

17 MS. NEAL: Thank you, Jennifer.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Commissioner, next  
19 item.

20 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd  
21 like to call up Ms. Rebecca Holmes to give a brief update  
22 on our recent Global Education Leadership Program, and  
23 kind of lessons learned from that. We'll keep this very  
24 short, but it does behoove us to relate to you the  
25 lessons learned and where are we taking some of this in



1 light of the program and where it's kind of ending up at  
2 this time. Rebecca?

3 MS. HOLMES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

5 MS. HOLMES: Good morning. I don't know  
6 about you all, but after that I feel like I need a big,  
7 deep breath. And we're now going to take you on a  
8 rollercoaster of that level of weeds to back up to the  
9 30,000-foot view of thinking about innovating an entire  
10 system. So just kind of ground ourselves in that -- in  
11 that rollercoaster.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The air is clear up here.

13 MS HOLMES: I'm excited to hopefully bring  
14 briefly, and now maybe even more briefly, share with you  
15 all just where we are with GELP, the way that that  
16 learning experience has informed our work, and ground  
17 that a little bit specifically in what we did in the week  
18 that we were able to spend in San Francisco.

19 But as you might imagine, a week in San  
20 Francisco doesn't lead to quite as much sharing out as  
21 time visiting schools and thinking about education in  
22 India or Brazil or Sydney, so we have a little less to  
23 share on that front and a little bit more to ground you  
24 in, in terms of how this has informed our work.

25 The nature of innovation, I think, is that



1 we raise more questions than we have answers when we talk  
2 about this work, and I think that's okay. That it --  
3 that it allows us to question some of the things that  
4 we've done in this space for a long time, but it also  
5 means that 30 minutes, or probably now the 7 minutes that  
6 we have allotted, ideally, is just not enough to answer  
7 all the questions you would naturally have about this  
8 work.

9 I'm certainly open to whatever questions we  
10 have time for this morning, but I also want to offer that  
11 my team and I have thought that something we could offer  
12 you this summer is sort of a next-generation learning 101  
13 set of readings, and then we could engage with you all  
14 about which of those readings really triggered your  
15 individual questions, because I think this session today  
16 certainly won't be enough time to get into the level of  
17 questioning I know you all are starting to have about  
18 this work.

19 So, know that that's coming, and if there  
20 are topics that are teed up today that you'd like me to  
21 be sure that we include readings on, that might be a  
22 great way to help you go deeper on some of the things  
23 we're just going to skim the surface on this morning.

24 So first I will start with a brief reminder,  
25 you've seen this slide before, so we, through some



1 generous philanthropic funding, have been able to  
2 participate in the GELP Program, this is just a reminder  
3 of what that is. It's a community of leaders from 13  
4 jurisdictions, 3 in the U.S., 10 globally, coming  
5 together to share thinking with each other to think about  
6 how we transform the system, largely around creating  
7 students who are ready to survive and thrive in the 21st  
8 century.

9           You'll see here a reminder of which  
10 countries and which U.S. jurisdictions have been involved  
11 in that work. The group itself has now met for 5 years  
12 with 10 convenings. Colorado has only participate for  
13 about 18 months, and so just 4 convenings. But it still,  
14 as you'll see this morning, really pushed our thinking in  
15 some important ways.

16           That said, this is sort of a moment of  
17 reflection for the funders of GELP, and I think we're  
18 waiting to see, but we do know that that work will be  
19 going in a bit of a different direction, that there will  
20 not be global 6-month meetings anymore, there might be an  
21 annual convening, and that the work is really going to  
22 focus on ways that individual jurisdictions who are up to  
23 the same work in similar contexts can go deeper.

24           And so even for us, just in the last 18  
25 months, we've been able to identify certain jurisdictions



1 that are doing similar things in similar contexts where  
2 it's really more appropriate at this stage for us to go  
3 deeper in shared learning than just continue to stay at a  
4 sort of almost overwhelming level of shared international  
5 learning.

6 I have said, though, that this work so far  
7 has played a really key role in advancing our vision.  
8 And you'll see that in a second.

9 There were four major themes of our time in  
10 San Francisco. You'll see -- hear what those were. The  
11 first was Student Voice and Engagement. This is, I think  
12 a piece of this work that we're all really excited about,  
13 the fact that students can have a deep level of ownership  
14 over their learning. But it's a tough place for the  
15 state to figure out how do we engage in advancing that  
16 work. There's certainly a role for thought leadership in  
17 that space, but it's not necessarily the level at which  
18 we engage.

19 We did see across the group that  
20 participated about seven or eight schools in the Bay  
21 Area, all of them charter schools. I'd say the  
22 international reaction to those schools was that in this  
23 area many visitors didn't feel like they saw the most  
24 innovative practices, and that they'd seen deeper levels  
25 of student ownership and student voice in other countries





1 than they saw. And admittedly this was seven schools,  
2 it's a very short snapshot. That's not necessarily a  
3 definitive statement on our schools in the U.S., but it  
4 was a strong reaction from our international peers.

5 That said, we did see some really compelling  
6 practices where students were deeply engaged. One of  
7 these in particular was a school called P-Tech, which  
8 also runs a campus in fairly rural Indiana where students  
9 engage -- it's a high school and students engage in a way  
10 that they're almost running small businesses inside their  
11 project-based learning where they may have to fire their  
12 peers and really reflect on what does that mean if you  
13 fire someone from a project.

14 We talked to one young man who said: I used  
15 to just fire everybody, and then nobody wanted to be on  
16 my team anymore. And you really were able to see  
17 students engaging in deep academic work in a way that  
18 really was helping them self-reflect and prepare for the  
19 world that they will live in, both in higher education  
20 and beyond.

21 The second theme was around New Players.  
22 Obviously being so close to Silicon Valley, New Players  
23 has a very different meaning and an intense opportunity  
24 for schools in the Bay Area.

25 Mr. Chair, you mentioned Lumosity this



1 morning. Obviously, they are many ed-tech startups like  
2 that who, whether they're aiming at adults, K-12 or pre-  
3 K, are thinking about how you use gaming, how you use  
4 technology, to advance the idea of ubiquitous or constant  
5 assessment, right.

6 So, in Lumosity, or games like that, where  
7 you're cognitively engaging differently, and the software  
8 is able to play a role in constant assessment.  
9 Obviously, that's something we all opt into as adults, so  
10 how do you put that in the context of a teacher and a  
11 student and a parent and think about the ways we can use  
12 technology to enhance all of those experiences that have  
13 always gone on in learning.

14 The other, I think, big aha for us, being so  
15 close to schools, that we're so close to Silicon Valley,  
16 there was a visit to Google, for example, and Khan  
17 Academy. Thinking about scale. That in education so  
18 often what we're up to is creating one great school, or  
19 one great district, but these are companies that would  
20 never have that approach, that everything they do is  
21 about this is, you know, about system shift and about 10x  
22 the size that they start at.

23 It's very different than the way I think  
24 we've ever thought about the collective effort that we  
25 are up to in creating schools, and so it's an



1 interesting, I think, lens for us to think about systems  
2 engagement through.

3 The third theme here was Teacher Preparation  
4 and Professional Development. Two very significant areas  
5 of ongoing learning where we want to continue to engage,  
6 and hopefully we'll be able to come back over the next  
7 six months or so and share more about these two pieces of  
8 work with you.

9 The first is Kentucky's vanguard initiative,  
10 and this is looking just at the front end of teacher  
11 preparation. You know that Kentucky has been a  
12 participant in GELP through much of their learning. In  
13 particular some of their learning from Finland. Their  
14 Department of Higher Education has now rolled out a  
15 program that really is intended for universities who want  
16 to opt in to significantly raise the bar for demonstrated  
17 academic rigor for teachers who are -- or want --  
18 aspiring teachers to opt in to their higher ed programs.

19 Then deep I think the real professional  
20 development in terms of real classroom work that those  
21 teachers are exposed to, and then on the next end raise  
22 the bar for what it takes to be a teacher licensure  
23 program and get out of a teacher licensure program.

24 So, it's an opt-in program, it's a very new  
25 model, but it's really close to us geographically in a



1 very similar context, and so we're watching it closely as  
2 they roll that out.

3 The second, much further away, is  
4 Australia's model for effective professional learning.  
5 So, this is on the ongoing end of developing teachers in  
6 the middle of their careers.

7 Australia is doing some really compelling  
8 work looking at how you do just in time teacher  
9 development that's very customized to a teacher's needs  
10 and context. How you can set up an outside agency that  
11 is the most trusted source of professional learning for  
12 teachers, and how much of that learning can be peer-to-  
13 peer. And that's, I think, been really compelling and  
14 we're watching that closely.

15 The fourth and biggest area to get your head  
16 around that was the theme for this convening was new  
17 measures, so new ways of assessing, new ways of having  
18 accountability systems set up to look at what's working  
19 in a system. Couple pieces here, so one is around the  
20 evolution of assessment. So I think there's starting to  
21 be a conversation within GELP and more broadly that our  
22 next wave of assessments give us some very important new  
23 developments, but they're not a terminal landing place,  
24 right, that people are excited about the demonstration  
25 work that will go on and the higher bar of rigor, but



1 there's more that needs to be done in getting assessment  
2 to where most teachers and parents and kids can really  
3 benefit from that work.

4           The second -- this is big one, I'll talk  
5 more about it briefly, is around the role of  
6 accountability when you think about multiple users of a  
7 system. So, if you think about a current accountability  
8 system, it largely serves the needs of us, right, when  
9 we're looking in at a system to figure out weak spots, to  
10 get transparency into issues of quality and equity.

11           But what does accountability system look  
12 like if it's designed for parents who are making choices  
13 in that system? Or kids who are experiencing school day-  
14 to-day? So, thinking about the multiple users of a  
15 system and designing accountability from that standpoint.

16           And then, finally, thinking about a wide-  
17 range of student outcomes. We know that right now we  
18 test and measure a small but important range of things  
19 that are not exhaustive for what a student needs to be  
20 able to do and are probably less exhaustive now than they  
21 used to be given the complex economy that students will  
22 go into.

23           I'll go very quickly here through the ways  
24 that this work has informed our work here in Colorado.  
25 You've seen this before. This is the idea, and many GELP



1 regions have started to, I think, think about this  
2 approach as helpful in their own space, too.

3           When we started this work, we used to talk  
4 about all of this heady teacher language that most people  
5 couldn't understand, so we'd say: Learning needs to be  
6 personalized, or it needs to be competency based, or it  
7 needs to be technology enabled. And when we've gone out  
8 to help create this work we've talked to hundreds of  
9 teachers and now parents and workforce and that wasn't  
10 engaging for them at all. They didn't understand what  
11 any of us meant.

12           And so, we've backed up. Again, you've seen  
13 this before, it's about student outcomes, and that's a  
14 really helpful starting place. What do we all want for  
15 students when they exit our system? What do they need as  
16 students in higher education, as -- and maybe more  
17 importantly, lifelong adults in a society and a  
18 workforce? So we granted them these five learning  
19 outcomes, again, that students need academic  
20 competencies, that is absolutely still the work of  
21 school, that they need those entrepreneurial competencies  
22 that used to only be limited to a small group of folks,  
23 and professional competencies, that they need to think  
24 about those 21st century skills that allow them to manage  
25 time and projects and collaborate.



1                   Set against, as we've talked about before, a  
2 self-knowledge, and then in the feat of this little --  
3 this little visual, a drive to contribute. The idea that  
4 we do want to produce folks who can go into the community  
5 of their choosing and be positive contributors.

6                   We've now, in this work, been co-creating  
7 along with lots of teachers and other folks these five  
8 examples of what classrooms might look like that would be  
9 best suited to create those kinds of outcomes for kids.  
10 And I've talked about this before, this can be the bulk  
11 of what we share with you this summer. These kinds of  
12 learning environments are starting to take hold, and  
13 we're looking at a number of districts in Colorado who  
14 are finding ways to explore what competency-based might  
15 look like, or really thinking differently about how they  
16 use technology.

17                   And then finally in that -- oh. Sorry, that  
18 was a little too much animation to go this fast. There  
19 we go. So then finally the next part of the vision  
20 that's been really informed by our two years with this  
21 learning opportunity that GELP has provided is: What does  
22 the system need to look like to allow for classroom  
23 environments that drive those student outcomes?

24                   Let me do a quick time check here. So very  
25 briefly, we've come up talking to workforce, higher ed,



1 parents, students. So far, with these five suggestions  
2 of what the system used to look like, or maybe looks like  
3 now and was designed to do, toward where we would all  
4 hope it would go.

5

6 So, you'll see here it's around going from  
7 risk averse not to just blatantly risk or experimental,  
8 but to using a learning agenda to manage risk. That's --  
9 I think that's a key part of how we move school systems  
10 not just to prepare for the 21st century, because if we  
11 do that then 100 years from now we'll be having this  
12 exact, same conversation, but to become learning systems  
13 that are continually able to adapt.

14 Currently a system that's accountable for a  
15 very small range of outcomes to one that's, perhaps,  
16 accountable for a broader range of student outcomes.  
17 Centralized decisions to co-created decision, where  
18 students, parents and teachers truly are decision-makers  
19 at the table. Organized by cohorts, so this is about how  
20 students move through the system. We've talked about  
21 competency-based learning before to organized in a way  
22 that's responsive to students, where students move based  
23 on mastery and based on interest.

24 And then finally driven by structures. This  
25 is one of our favorites when we talk to school leaders





1 who say: Gosh, you know, we've put together this whole  
2 new system, but we just can't move the bus schedule, and  
3 so we can't -- we can't make the new system work.

4 That's not an excuse. That's a very real  
5 structural constraint. Similarly: Gosh, we've got this  
6 really great new idea, but we can only serve lunch  
7 between 11:15 and 11:47.

8 And so how do we think about those  
9 organizing structural constraints and instead say: We all  
10 want this to be driven by learning and instruction, and  
11 so what does it take to really release some of those  
12 structural constraints that are just the nature of a  
13 system that is as large as many of the systems that we're  
14 running?

15 We, like I said, have identified some areas  
16 through our two years in GELP that are really  
17 intellectually interesting, like Student Voice, for  
18 example. But I think the most we can do right now is  
19 perhaps be thought leaders in that space. We have  
20 another body of areas where we really do have a statutory  
21 demands that carry out some work that is a nod toward all  
22 of these next gen learning outcomes that people have  
23 gotten so excited about, so I want to briefly share what  
24 those -- what two of those areas are.

25 The first is, as you all have been doing a



1 lot of thinking about since May of 2013, the new  
2 graduation guidelines that were adopted. There are  
3 opportunities inside of graduation guidelines that may  
4 districts are now identifying to get at a lot of this, to  
5 create multiple personalized pathways for students in, at  
6 least high school and often in 6 through 12, where they  
7 can navigate that experience. Still at a high bar of  
8 rigor in all areas, but in a way that is much more  
9 personalized.

10 There's -- There's obviously opportunity by  
11 giving the nod to career and technical education and  
12 industry certificates to have learning via the mandate of  
13 graduation guidelines become much more career-focused and  
14 career inspired and infused.

15 And then finally the simple nature that  
16 students would not move based on Carnegie Units and seat  
17 time and four years in English whether you mastered  
18 anything or not, but instead would move based on  
19 demonstrated mastery, is a really solid opening for  
20 districts that are interested in competency-based  
21 learning.

22 The second area that we've identified is  
23 around accountability, so we know that that is a huge  
24 lever that you all have, and that we have, toward where  
25 we give signals around what matters. And if what matters



1 are our next generation learning outcomes for all  
2 students, then how we signal that through accountability  
3 is something we're really doing some thinking about.

4 This next slide should probably have draft  
5 and for illustrative purposes only written all over it.  
6 But we're starting to think about some accountability  
7 shifts in that system that you all will be, I think,  
8 asked to think and talk and lead us in quite a bit more  
9 over the next year.

10 The first is that we know our current  
11 accountability system certainly needs some tweaks. And  
12 when you talk to Dr. Owen, tweaks is probably not strong  
13 enough a word. But that it was, you know, an important  
14 effort that demonstrated a statewide concern for a number  
15 of things. For getting transparency and clarity to  
16 places of inequity, to shine bright spots where people  
17 were doing great work, and to value growth.

18 But there's some more work there, and so  
19 you'll see that what we've signaled here is that over the  
20 next three years there's some advancement to go on in  
21 that current system.

22 What that advancement probably doesn't  
23 signal, though, is looking at what would account -- like  
24 I teed up, what would accountability look like if it were  
25 designed for parents, or for students, or for teachers.



1 And that's what we're proposing potentially in this  
2 second bar, is that side-by-side to that work over the  
3 next three years, there'd be about a five-year effort to  
4 really engage leaders across the state in thinking about  
5 that work very differently and getting clear, like I  
6 said, more questions than answers in this work.

7           Getting clear on what is it that we value  
8 about an accountability system and how do we design for  
9 that. Is there a way to do it that is not intrusive to  
10 the good work of teaching and learning, but instead  
11 allows the state to perhaps play that important validator  
12 role that we play in a different way.

13           So, I know I've teed up lots of questions  
14 there. I will leave you with just, I think, a helpful  
15 visual that reminds us what we're up to. Classroom of  
16 the 19<sup>th</sup> century, students in rooms, teacher at the front  
17 of the room. I'm sure some lovely and important graphics  
18 posted on the wall where no students can see them.

19           MS. NEAL: Do you have on a robe?

20           MS. MELLOW: Well, the next one -- and  
21 you'll see, and this is no indictment, because I will  
22 tell you the classrooms I built in the schools I started  
23 looked exactly like this; teachers in rows -- or, I'm  
24 sorry, students in rows, teachers at the front, some  
25 probably interesting graphics that no student can see,



1 the kids look different, the structures don't, and so we  
2 know that right now we have great teachers in schools  
3 swimming upstream in a structure that was built for a  
4 very different time.

5 And I think it's easy to get really  
6 concerned and confused and engaged in the granular level  
7 of this work, but these two demonstrations, I think,  
8 remind us that there's really heavy lifts to go on, I  
9 think, to get us past the constraints that are just  
10 natural in a system that was built for a very different  
11 time, and was built to serve kids who went into a very  
12 different workforce.

13 And then, finally, and we lifted the slides  
14 from our friend in British Columbia who we've met through  
15 GELP that this is, I think, a primary goal of all of us,  
16 of everyone who goes into teaching, but certainly into  
17 the next generation of learning space that there's much  
18 to be debated, but if what we were really up to is  
19 creating schools that did this, leaving every student as  
20 curious when they leave us as when they come, this is  
21 also a nod to how much there is to be learned from the  
22 early childhood space around this work.

23 This, I think, ultimately is our goal in  
24 this work. So, let me pause there. Like I said, happy to  
25 be creating a document this summer that can engage you



1 more deeply and the many questions we know this raises.

2 MS. NEAL: Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, go ahead, Marcia.

4 MS. NEAL: Quick comment. You are so right.  
5 For a while on the local board we had a new  
6 superintendent, and we really, really worked on making  
7 some changes. And you're -- everything's within the box.  
8 The bus time box, the weekly box, the yearly -- we tried  
9 to change nine weeks on to three weeks off, and the  
10 parents just came out of the woodwork: No, we have to  
11 have the summers off. So, I don't know how we'd break  
12 out of that box, because that's where we've been for a  
13 long time. And you just get resistance. People are very  
14 -- most people are very traditional, they want it the  
15 same way they had it. And I just, you know, it -- great  
16 things. But I don't know where -- how we get there.

17 MS. HOLMES: Mr. Chair, just one thing I'll  
18 offer up, is that we've started to talk about this work  
19 in terms of all great, large-scale change initiatives  
20 need to think about how you change practice, how you  
21 change policy to accommodate for the practice, and how  
22 you really work intensely on public engagement to  
23 understand those concerns. And I think we can all look  
24 at a history of education reform movements where maybe  
25 one or two of those three have been attended to, or



1 they've perhaps been done in the wrong sequences.

2 And so instead of just thinking about  
3 wouldn't it be great if we watered 1000 flowers and had  
4 great pilots of this work, which we're starting to, I  
5 think we're also thinking about it in terms of those  
6 things.

7 MS. NEAL: And bring people in to see, you  
8 know --

9 MS. HOLMES: Yeah.

10 MS. NEAL: It's one of those you have to  
11 produce results before you can do the change and you have  
12 to --can't change until you produce the results. Right?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for the presentation,  
15 appreciate it. I would just say this is a pretty big  
16 discussion --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mic.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Pretty intense discussion  
19 that I'd love to see the board have another study  
20 session, or perhaps, but I would say that to the extent  
21 that we do top-down box addressing, that we would create  
22 different boxes. And I think that a bottom-up approach  
23 is really important with lots of parental input and lots  
24 of student input ensuring that policy makers from the top  
25 down are creating new boxes based on the premise that the



1 old boxes don't work very well. And, so anyway, I just  
2 think it's important that we think about not just new,  
3 not just different, not just technology driven, but where  
4 the change is coming from.

5           Secondly, I'd like to know how the document  
6 is developed and where it goes and what impact it has.  
7 Because it just seems like -- and I don't know if the  
8 rest of the board feels -- if you look at language,  
9 Colorado's emerging model, GELP has played a key role in  
10 refining the business strategy for an external  
11 (indiscernible) learning in Colorado.

12           I mean, who's making the document and to  
13 what extent is the board driving this document and the  
14 board driving the nature of the categories, or the way  
15 the change is being depicted.

16           So anyway, I appreciate the work of the  
17 group, I just think that I haven't had any input on this  
18 document. I don't know, that I know what the words even  
19 mean when we think about a drive to contribute to self-  
20 knowledge, safe and healthy when we're thinking about  
21 possible implementation 2017.

22           But I think is probably good to really get  
23 inside this document. If this is really driving our  
24 vision and the board is elected to create that vision  
25 using the CDE staff to implement that vision, I haven't





1 had any input on the document, so even though I  
2 appreciate the work and I understand what --

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I know you covered that  
4 in your conversation. Rebecca, if you could address that  
5 real quickly.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I think we know you've  
7 been going to the GELP meetings, and we've seen  
8 presentations. I'm just saying I've never sat down and  
9 drafted any language, or thought about what the words  
10 mean, and maybe that's not our role.

11 But anyway, I thought I'd just --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, no. I think that's  
13 very good. Where -- this is interesting where does it go  
14 from here. How does this board engage in shaping what  
15 feels like, at this point, many members of the board of  
16 (indiscernible), because they haven't had the opportunity  
17 to be engaged in. Go ahead, please.

18 MS. HOLMES: So, Mr. Chair, I would just  
19 offer that I think to your first point, you're absolutely  
20 right. How do we think about this being very co-created  
21 and having students and parents who have a deep voice in  
22 eh redesign of their particular learning experience. And  
23 thinking about how the state plays a facilitative role in  
24 that, so that that learning isn't just in one community,  
25 but perhaps can inform communities nearby and further



1 away. So absolutely agree.

2 To the second point, I think we did early on  
3 the GELP work have the chair involved in the vision, and  
4 I would say we're right at a point this summer to revisit  
5 that in a really engaging way with you all and think  
6 about how do we balance that. Your first point about  
7 student level and kind of bottom-up engagement with the  
8 role of CDE staff and the board is a perfect topic that  
9 we need to re-engage in this summer.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

11 MS. GOFF: Well I'm going to try real hard  
12 not to be redundant, because I will -- I guess I could  
13 use a little more detailed thinking from you. I'm  
14 looking at this one, what is -- where we -- where we are,  
15 where we're looking at. Which -- Rebecca, just your  
16 opinion and, Commissioner, of course, chime in. Those of  
17 you that have been a part of this conversation  
18 consistently with GELP, which one of these areas -- I'll  
19 do it in the positive -- do we have the most going for us  
20 now, or can we -- can they even be separated?

21 It just seems -- you know, if we want to  
22 talk about the engagement being the priority, and from  
23 that all of good things flow, that's one particular take  
24 on it. Or is there -- would we be better set as -- this  
25 cannot be answered today. Would we be better set to



1 really delve into what does risk mean, what is risk all  
2 about? So, what are we asking districts and ourselves  
3 and our staff and our education message throughout the  
4 state, what are we asking people to not so much do, but  
5 what's going to be our outline for thinking? Is there  
6 one? And if so, is there a way to pick out one of these  
7 things that would be best suited to getting -- get a  
8 real, results-driven conversation going on any of this  
9 for the public.

10 MS. HOLMES: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

12 MS. HOLMES: That is a great question. You  
13 did mention, and it's very true, that many other people  
14 at this table, and the commissioner's been involved in  
15 the GELP work, so I'll first just see if anybody else  
16 wants to take a stab at that.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're (indiscernible).

18 MS. HOLMES: It's really interesting as --  
19 I'd have to probably do a lot more reflection, but my  
20 first thought as I look at these five is that they -- you  
21 would have a different answer in different geographies.  
22 You'd have a different answer in some charters, not all  
23 charters. You'd have a different answer in some  
24 districts and small and large and rural.

25 I think we certainly have schools who feel



1       accountable for multiple outcomes. I think that's  
2       probably not true in all schools and it might not be the  
3       message we've sent. Right. And I think we certainly  
4       have schools that have -- and leaders that have done  
5       remarkable work at breaking down those sort of structural  
6       barriers to make their district largely about all  
7       decisions being driven by teaching and learning.

8                       But how do we do that and signal that that's  
9       important at a state level I think is the question. If  
10      there's a great deal of potential in any one of these, I  
11      think there's potential in all of them. But the third  
12      one, moving from centralized decisions to co-created  
13      schooling, teaching and learning and creation of  
14      institutions probably has a great deal of potential at  
15      uncracking the other four.

16                      UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well said.

17                      MS. HOLMES: Okay.

18                      MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

19                      CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, Elaine.

20                      MS. BERMAN: So, we brought this up, I know,  
21      every time that GELP is reported at a STATE board  
22      meeting. I guess my biggest concern, or whatever, is  
23      that as the state board makes decisions that we're always  
24      taking into account where we want to go, and sometimes I  
25      don't think we necessarily do that. So, I think as



1 different topics come up that relate to any of this  
2 vision -- because I think we can all embrace the decision  
3 that this vision -- I don't know about Deb. I was  
4 confused about what Deb said, but I certainly very much  
5 embrace this vision about what education should look like  
6 versus what -- versus what it looks like today.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: And that's why I would think  
8 that we should have a much deeper discussion.

9 MS. BERMAN: Oh, absolutely.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess I don't agree  
11 necessarily depending on what the words mean. I don't  
12 know what the words mean.

13 MS. BERMAN: Oh, well I do, so we can talk  
14 about it. Assuming we embrace the vision, and when we  
15 have that deeper conversation, I just think as we make  
16 decisions over the next year or two years we should  
17 always keep that in front of us and consider where we  
18 want to go and not make decisions that are going to be  
19 counter to the direction that we want to go. And if we  
20 can't agree on where we want to go, I think that's a real  
21 problem for the state board.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam?

23 MS. MAZANEC: This may not be what was  
24 intended by this vision, but -- and while I agree with  
25 Deb that we may not know exactly what we're seeing, looks



1 to me like as (indiscernible) right to where I would like  
2 to go, which is school choice. More school choice. We  
3 could get a lot more co-creating as opposed to  
4 centralized decisions, you know. We could get a lot more  
5 accountability, lot more involvement by parents we have  
6 more school choice. Let's go there.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb, quick response.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, maybe I can respond.  
9 And I totally agree if that's what the words mean. If  
10 you read the documents under -- sitting underneath this  
11 document, it would be an interesting discussion to look  
12 at the meaning of the words. And that's why I said not  
13 knowing what the words means is -- sounds like a naïve  
14 statement. Actually, the documents underneath this  
15 document would be very interesting to examine as far as  
16 how they define choice.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika, want to jump  
18 in?

19 MS. NEAL: Keep it in mind that we're  
20 running late.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, we're -- and I've  
22 got --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: And I'll -- and I'll just  
24 sort of restate, maybe, but in this description of the  
25 different attributes of today, and to the -- I would be



1 helped a lot with some stories. Yes, you are at 50,000  
2 feet, so bring down -- and hopefully that'll come up in  
3 the reading, so I'm -- I don't know that this makes a  
4 whole lot of sense to comment on this until we've done  
5 some readings and have some examples. Because some of us  
6 are a little -- at least I am way too concrete to look  
7 back at --

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Do you want a response on  
9 that, or you good with the comment? Okay, so -- and I  
10 think we are at a very high level, and I think it's very,  
11 very difficult to make a lot of sense with this, so I'm  
12 going to -- three quick points. I'm going to start  
13 within the construct that you've given us and say: Summer  
14 reading's cool. I loved summer readings. Finance would  
15 be the specific place that I want to know everything  
16 there is to know about the future -- forward thinking on  
17 finance.

18 And then let me kind of begin to walk away a  
19 little bit and challenge, and I'll start with just  
20 referring back to a story that was in last week's  
21 Washington Post. Big interesting story, "How Bill Gates  
22 Pulled off the Swift Common Core Revolution" and it kind  
23 of details how it happened, and I think it's a pretty  
24 insightful piece that explains.

25 And I think to the extent that we're casting



1 vision, that we're trying to understand what education  
2 should look like in Colorado tomorrow, five years from  
3 tomorrow and 10 years from tomorrow, the way that we go  
4 about it of engaging people, engaging the users, the  
5 parents the students on the front end into the at  
6 conversation as opposed to the way the kind of common  
7 core thing can happen, where it happened and then all of  
8 the sudden people began to understand: Well this is  
9 what's happening. And many people were very concerned  
10 about what that looks like, to the extent we could avoid  
11 that by virtue of going into -- and, you know, a black  
12 box creating an interesting construct and then releasing  
13 it, that's beneficial.

14                   And it's beneficial in a couple of ways.  
15 First of all, because of the three points that you called  
16 out to change of practice, change of policy and change of  
17 engagement. It gets the engagement on the front end.  
18 And the benefit of getting the engagement on the front  
19 end is you're going to get the wisdom of crowds. We're  
20 going to get -- its' a tougher process to manage, its' a  
21 more challenging way to go after things, but at the end  
22 of the day, the product that you come out of the black  
23 box with is a superior product, to my way of thinking.

24                   And then that leads me -- so that was kind  
25 of lecturing a little bit of how I think the process





1 should go. Um, exactly how we get at that I don't know,  
2 but I think it's important that we kind of reverse the  
3 pyramid or reverse the process from the way that it has  
4 happened on previous major policy changing pathways, I.E.  
5 common core, et cetera.

6 And then -- and then I'll come back to the  
7 three points that you raised. Kind of as an explanation:  
8 Here's what we got to do. We got to change the practice,  
9 we got to change the policy, we got to change the  
10 engagement.

11 My perspective would be I -- and you know  
12 me. I mean, we've interacted on some pretty interesting  
13 things with regard to education vision. I think we need  
14 to start one step outside that, because if, in fact, we  
15 can create a marketplace, a transformation, an  
16 opportunity for a change in the way education is  
17 delivered, then all of the sudden the engagement's  
18 inherent in what you're building, and it limits the  
19 policy response necessary, and it automatically drives  
20 the practice change necessary.

21 So that was kind of, you know, my -- a  
22 minute-and-a-half on a brainstorming session, or an  
23 engagement session, at a GELP level kind of conversation,  
24 but I would -- I would challenge us, this board, to  
25 engage as Dr. Scheffel is saying let's do. And as



1 Angelika, you've asked, let's understand truly what the  
2 words in this, as it's being distilled now coming back to  
3 this board, what do those words mean?

4 I think it's important to do that, and if we  
5 can have a method of making this process, and I realize  
6 it's cumbersome and difficult and challenging, but we  
7 make it more robust and engage people from the outside to  
8 it from the front end. That would be wonderful.

9 Can I please have a 30-second response. No,  
10 I'm just teasing you.

11 MS. HOLMES: I'm aggressively note taking.

12 COMM. HAMMOND: I was, too.

13 MS. HOLMES: I think as a closing response,  
14 I would say we've done a little bit of work so far in  
15 terms of trying to change the paradigm around having this  
16 be co-created. Shopping to every group of teachers who  
17 would have us, for example, and starting to really engage  
18 workforce knowing that -- and some powerful student  
19 groups so far, which I will certainly include in the  
20 stories, because those are, I think, some critical  
21 stories that really kept our team going.

22 But it's fair point that is a really  
23 different paradigm for how any of us in this space have  
24 worked before, and I think we all appreciate the push at  
25 -- it'll need to be a constant push to make sure that



1 that's the way we're carrying this forward.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent. So -- and I  
3 have no idea how to, you know, make an effective and  
4 useful study session that isn't 17 days long on something  
5 of this nature.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's go through the  
7 summer reading.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Let's do our  
9 summer reading and maybe we can think about really trying  
10 to engage on this in some constructive way, and I guess I  
11 would ask staff, and this is an ask, to help me as chair  
12 figure out how we could possibly create a study session  
13 that we could really elucidate and engage on these issues  
14 that you're trying to get at.

15 MS. HOLMES: Great.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough. Okay, so  
17 with that I think we may want to take a quick break  
18 before we come back to the next item.

19 MS. NEAL: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thanks for the report.  
21 Appreciate it very much.

22 MS. NEAL: Thank you, Becca.

23 (Meeting adjourned)

24

25



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 April, 2019.

/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