



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 12, 2014, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 12, 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)
Debora Scheffel (R)
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come
2 back to order. Colorado Board of Education will now
3 conduct a public rulemaking hearing for the rules of
4 administration of the Adult Education and Literacy Grant
5 Program. That was literacy and grant program --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Literacy.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- the State Board
8 approved the notice of rulemaking at its September 10th,
9 2014 Board meeting. A hearing to promulgate these rules
10 was made known through publication of a public notice on
11 September 25th, 2014 through the Colorado register and by
12 the State Board notice on November 5th of 2014. State
13 Board is authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant to
14 Article 9, Section 1 of the Colorado Constitution and
15 Sections 22-2-106-1A and C of the Colorado revised
16 statutes as well as House Bill 14.085.

17 Mr. Commissioner.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. As you
19 stated, this is an accordance with House Bill 14.1085.
20 I'll turn it over to Rebecca Holmes and Margaret
21 Kirkpatrick who have been here before for the emergency
22 rules when we talked about this and now for the permit
23 rules --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair. Good
25 morning, Mr. Chair. Good morning, Members of the Board.



1 So we are here today with the first of many rulemaking
2 hearings in front of you at this -- this meeting. These
3 are the permanent rules for the administration of the
4 Adult Education and Literacy Grant program. As you know
5 from when we discussed the emergency rules for this
6 program, the program was created in the 2014 legislative
7 session by the Adult Education and Literacy Act. The
8 purpose of this grant program as outlined in that Act is
9 to offer a path for low achieving Colorado adults to
10 attain basic skills, enter skills training and ultimately
11 lead toward postsecondary education and career and job
12 employment.

13 This program is the first ongoing set of
14 State dollars for adult education in Colorado and the
15 grant has been administered so far by our office of Adult
16 Education and Family Literacy which is led by Margaret
17 Kirkpatrick. I know we have at least one member of the
18 public here today to comment on the rules, but we'll start
19 with an overview from Margaret.

20 MS. KIRKPATRICK: Thank you very much.
21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Board.

22 The Adult Education and Literacy Grant Fund
23 funds local workforce development partnerships and these
24 partnerships will be composed of local adult education
25 programs, workforce skill providers and workforce programs



1 so that we can take those low-achieving adults all the way
2 from basic skills training through skills training and
3 into employment. These partnerships must be built upon
4 existing services allowing for the provision of additional
5 resources and collaboration and bridging opportunities for
6 local collaboratives to serve those most in need Colorado
7 adults, age 17 and above, to help them gain skills and
8 move into employment and economic self-sufficiency, a
9 benefit both to the individual and to the Colorado
10 economy.

11 The funds will be distributed to the
12 workforce development partnerships through the adult
13 education agencies thus insuring that lower skilled adult
14 learners are in fact included in the benefits of these
15 programs. The statute requires collaboration at the State
16 level and this collaboration has begun with the
17 departments; Department of Labor, Department of Human
18 Services and higher ed. These collaborations will
19 increase communication between all the partners and serve
20 to identify the unmet State needs and to identify areas
21 where adult education services should be provided.

22 During the September Board meeting, you
23 approved the emergency rules in order to allow the request
24 for proposal process to go forward so that these local
25 partnerships will be ready to -- to start serving students



1 the very first part of 2015. The permanent rules have
2 been posted since September and two comments were
3 received, both from Julie Pelegrin who is the director of
4 legal services for alleged counsel and the bill writer.
5 These comments were that the rules didn't explicitly
6 include explanation of the criteria for determining the
7 duration of the grant and that the rules did not address
8 the process for annually reviewing a multi-year grant and
9 clarifying under what circumstances a grant would not be -
10 - the grant would not be continued if the recipient was
11 not making appropriate progress.

12 Each of these comments has been addressed
13 and the revision which has been submitted to you for
14 approval. Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, if I might
16 just for the record. Julie Pelegrin's comments were
17 addressed to the emergency rules so staff took this
18 opportunity to incorporate those into the permanent rules,
19 but she does not normally comment on rules until they've
20 been promulgated by this Board so just for the purposes of
21 this record, I didn't want it to be -- be implied that she
22 was commenting on our permanent rules.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. At this point,
24 then, is -- we've got a couple people signed up to speak.
25 C. Robert, please if you would step to the mic, state your



1 name, the organization you represent, limit your comments
2 to three minutes and we'll give you a notice over here
3 when your time is up.

4 MS. ROBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair and
5 members of the Board. My name is Char Robert and I'm here
6 as coordinator of the Skills to Compete Coalition. It is
7 the Coalition which advocated for and is pleased to see
8 this new grant program implemented. Skills to Compete is
9 a multi-sector advocacy coalition working to help people
10 obtain the skills in education that are required for
11 today's and tomorrows' jobs. We have a particular
12 emphasis on in-demand middle skills training for jobs that
13 require some post-secondary training, but not necessarily
14 a four-year degree. Our members of the coalition come
15 from employment-based non-profits, people working higher
16 ed, adult literacy program, workforce programs, vocational
17 rehabilitation businesses, research and advocacy
18 organizations.

19 In previous years, the coalition has worked
20 on legislation to integrate adult education with skills
21 training. We advocated for the creation of the skills for
22 (indiscernible) report which counts education credentials
23 granted versus job openings and we advocate for the
24 development of career pathways.

25 In 2014, we identified the adult education



1 and literacy as the biggest need. Over nine percent of
2 Coloradoans lack a high school degree or credential. Many
3 have literacy and numeracy skills too low to take
4 advantage of skills training program. At the beginning of
5 this year, Colorado is the only state which put no state
6 money into adult education and literacy.

7 I vote for the Colorado (indiscernible)
8 policy as the manager of the family economic security
9 program. CCLP provides research, education and advocacy
10 on behalf of low-income Coloradoans. Of Coloradoans who
11 are 25 and older who lack a high school diploma or
12 credential, 25.5 percent live below the federal poverty
13 level. This is cut in half to 13.3 percent when one
14 graduates from high school. If just some college or an
15 associate's degree, the poverty level drops to 8.8 percent
16 and with a B.A. it drops further to 4.5 percent. So as an
17 organization who works to help people find a path out of
18 poverty, CCLP recognizes that few things are more
19 important than completing a high school credential and
20 acquiring the skills that are in demand. The program
21 these rules describe support the workforce partnerships
22 that can help this happen for students. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

24 Frank Waterous.

25 MR. WATEROUS: Am I being picked up? I'm



1 not sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of the Board and
2 Mr. Commissioner. My name is Frank Waterous. I'm a
3 senior policy analyst, thank you, with the Bell Policy
4 Center here in Denver. The Bell many of you may know is a
5 non-profit, non-partisan research and policy organization
6 founded on progressive values and dedicated to expanding
7 opportunity for all Coloradoans. I want to thank you for
8 the opportunity to be here today and also for the
9 opportunity, too, to have been able to almost completely
10 defrost from my trudge across the Sherman Street barrens
11 here to be with you today to strongly support this
12 program, the Adult Education Literacy program and to urge
13 you to adopt the rules that are before you today for its
14 administration. The Bell Policy Center also I should say
15 is a proud member of the skills to compete coalition for
16 which Char Roberts just addressed you in support of these
17 -- of these rules as well.

18 We think this is an important program for
19 two reasons and that is that it addresses two key
20 education and workforce issues that Colorado faces right
21 now. First off, more than 430,000 Colorado adult working
22 age adults lack a high school diploma or -- or its
23 equivalent and many of those lack the basic skills needed
24 to function effectively in the workforce. More
25 importantly and central to your mission here, the skills



1 that individuals would -- would acquire through this
2 program will also help them in their educational
3 obtainment become more effective in their ability to be
4 partners in their children's education. We know the
5 importance of the connection between adult educational
6 attainment and children's academic success so this program
7 will have the secondary benefit of being able to help more
8 parents across the state acquire the skills to be
9 effective partners in their -- in their children's
10 success.

11 The second issue that this program
12 addresses is the skills gap in middle skills jobs that
13 Char mentioned. Middle skills jobs, again, are those that
14 are -- that require some level of post-secondary
15 education, but less than a four-year degree. There are
16 many jobs available. A significant gap in this state from
17 employers and businesses across the state who desperately
18 wish to have people who are trained for those middle
19 skills jobs, but we have a gap in the people that are able
20 to fill those jobs for them.

21 And as a result, this program will also
22 actually help us to start closing that gap, but
23 particularly through the partnerships that Director
24 Kirkpatrick mentioned between the adult education
25 providers across the state, postsecondary providers and



1 workforce development providers to ensure that -- that
2 adults continue to advance from skills acquisition in the
3 adult education sphere into post-secondary training and
4 credential attainment and eventually into employment as
5 well.

6 So again, for all those reasons, we
7 strongly support this program. We urge you to adopt the
8 rules and we thank you for the time.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

10 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. I don't have
12 anyone else signed up to testify. Would anyone care to
13 testify specifically on this rule? Okay.

14 MS. NEAL: On this rule.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Please, step to
16 the microphone. State our name, your organization if you
17 represent one and limit yourself to three minutes, please.

18 MR. WALKER: Good morning, Board, and
19 congratulation to Vice Chair Neal and Chair Lundeen. We
20 welcome you to the House and Dr. Goff, congratulations.

21 MS. NEAL: You just got promoted.

22 MR. WALKER: And Dr. Flores, welcome. Look
23 forward to it.

24 I'm George Walker. I had no idea that when
25 you get your molars pulled it affects your speech too much



1 so I'm not going to talk very long.

2 I can't think of anything that would affect
3 this bill and this issue more than the immigration issue.
4 It's part and parcel of it. And you have before you an
5 October 17 letter from President Obama that really is to
6 you through me. In August, I addressed you about the S.S.
7 Saint Louis, 1939, as a man of Jewish and Cherokee
8 ancestry and talked a little bit about immigration and
9 these young people from Central America who will be --
10 some of them will be part of our schools. There's no
11 board -- this is an elected Board -- in this state that
12 the immigration issue affects more. I think the President
13 may agree with me, he hasn't said that, and I'll be
14 sending some more things. Hopefully his office will call
15 in today. I hope someone can get this issue on the
16 agenda. I'm not an expert nor am I Hispanic. There are
17 people in this room and on our Board who are Hispanic
18 Latinos who are experts. And I'd like to quote from the
19 President's letter to me really for you.

20 The letter says that the President intends
21 to fix our broken immigration system once and for all.
22 And this letter was written before the election and it was
23 given to your Board on October 29th before the election
24 and I think we all know how the immigration issue may be
25 the first major decision that our President says he will



1 make before January. Hopefully the President and the
2 Congress can get together on this issue, but he says that
3 he may go it alone by executive order. He needs to hear
4 from this elected Board as to how it affects our students,
5 our children, in all areas and certainly I think it's
6 appropriate to include this and I support the issue that
7 you hear in this bill. And immigration, adult literacy,
8 income level, that's all part of the immigration issue.
9 And I come to you and release the letter to you out of
10 respect.

11 Sometimes I get the feeling that I think
12 this Board is more important than it thinks it is and you
13 all respect yourselves, but sometimes I think I respect
14 you more than you do. There's nothing wrong with saying
15 I'm an important powerful person and this Board is more
16 important and powerful than many people recognize. I've
17 attended the meetings for -- for many years. You're
18 important. People listen, and I think you need to flex
19 your muscles more. Thank you for listening --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Walker, I'm going to
21 flex my muscle, grab the gavel and say your time is up.

22 MR. WALKER: Thank you, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much,
24 sir.

25 MS. NEAL: Thank you --



1 MR. WALKER: And good luck in the house.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

3 MR. WALKER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Are there questions,
5 comments of staff or I guess I should ask is there anyone
6 else in the public that cares to testify on this measure?
7 No. So for the questions of staff, I've got -- okay. Dr.
8 Scheffel, we'll go here, we'll go left and we'll go right.

9 MS. SHEFFEL: So thank you for the
10 presentation. I just have a couple questions about the
11 rules. Are the vendors or the local education providers
12 for-profit and not-for-profit? It's sort of confusing
13 'cause it says non-profit agency organization and then the
14 next page says business or business association. So as
15 far as who can deliver these services, is it both?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is unchanged
19 since the emergency rules (indiscernible)

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. The adult
22 education programs are non-profit, but they can be in a
23 collaboration with an employer as part of the skills
24 training or the job placement, but if it is an institution
25 of skills training as a technical college, those are



1 private public non-profit entities.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we have discretion
3 on that? Would we want to allow profit-based or not? I
4 mean, I know that some change in the emergency rules, but
5 they were emergency rules --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's actually
9 defined in the statute that non-profit education providers
10 are not allowed to be funded.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Good. That's -
12 - I mean, that's what I wanted to know. All right. And
13 then why a three-year period? Is that by statute?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

15 Thank you for that question. It -- the
16 statute says multi-year and three year was chosen because
17 these are new programs that are being put together and in
18 order to give the partner -- and working with low level
19 adults -- low-skilled adults. In order to give the -- the
20 adults time to go through the full steps of basic skills
21 instruction and then skills training and into employment,
22 it was felt that three years was really necessary to give
23 a full time of opportunity and then evaluation so that
24 outcomes could be judged.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. And so I



1 see the part was added to .04 on the evaluation piece.
2 And so is the evaluation year by year and what are the
3 benchmarks? I guess I -- it just says very generically
4 toward achieving the goals of the Adult Education and
5 Literacy Act, but (indiscernible) specifics in there where
6 we're looking for achievement gains? I mean the goals
7 could be (indiscernible) somewhat expansive and then in
8 other parts they're more specific so could the language be
9 more specific here to say we're looking for achievement
10 gains in literacy?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

12 The -- the rules -- we're looking at such a
13 variety of potential partnerships and the skills training
14 that would be developed and actually the focus group of --
15 the target group that they would be approaching so that
16 rural areas might have an entirely different group of --
17 of students that they would be serving with different
18 needs than say an urban area. So the rules try to be
19 generic enough to allow the partnerships to identify their
20 own specific outcome goals and then part of the reading of
21 the RF piece, the request for proposals and the judgment
22 would be on how much of -- how clearly they could
23 articulate their anticipated gains and then over the --
24 and each year looking at how they had achieved those
25 gains. It really was -- because in some cases perhaps



1 literacy wouldn't be the primary goal, but perhaps
2 numeracy would be or the skills training would be. So we
3 didn't want the rules to limit the partnerships from
4 looking at a full -- a full addressing of the local needs.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I understand. I would
6 feel a little more comfortable with a little tighter
7 language in here, but I don't know what others think.
8 Just because a lot of times these grants get released,
9 people take the money and then when you really look at the
10 impact it can be pretty diluted just because the language
11 is pretty generic, but I would welcome other people's
12 thoughts on that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So does anyone --
14 because that was a question I --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- was going to ask as
17 well so I would -- does anyone want to engage in that at
18 this point?

19 Pam, you said you had a comment. Go ahead.

20 MS. MANAZEC: Kind of along the same lines.
21 I was wondering do -- do I understand that a lot of these
22 programs actually tailor themselves to fit the needs of
23 the community and that's partially why you want it to be a
24 little loose, but how much are these grants? Do they vary
25 based on request?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is a total
2 amount of about 820 to \$850,000.00 available. And then we
3 anticipate that each grant will be from 80 to 100 to
4 \$120,000.00 for the entire partnership. They do have to
5 build upon existing services so this -- this is not to
6 fund all of the services that would be offered by the
7 partnership to lead people to employment, but it would be
8 for those -- the building on and pulling of the
9 partnership together. We anticipate the RFP -- did say
10 that we anticipate six to eight applicants to be
11 successfully funded.

12 MS. MANAZEC: And how do you gage success?
13 I mean you said some of these people actually require
14 literacy and numeric -- how --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Numeracy.

16 MS. MANAZEC: Numeracy. Thank you.
17 Numeracy. Others need job skills, but how do you gage
18 success? Is there -- is there some -- is that
19 individualized per -- per program that gets funded or do
20 they -- do they take a GED-type test in -- in literacy and
21 numeracy?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23 Each of the programs does have to -- and
24 there are a (indiscernible) tell us what standardized test
25 they will -- they will use in order to judge the interim



1 success measures and the interim success measures would be
2 the -- I mean -- I'm sorry -- the education growth while
3 they're in the adult basic -- basic education part and any
4 skills certificates or other indications of skills
5 attainment, but the overall final goal that we are looking
6 for for the individual student is employment. So there
7 are interim skills training objectives that we ask the
8 programs to identify and that we will use as judgments,
9 but we are really looking to take the -- the student all
10 the way to employment, and that may take more than one
11 year which is why we -- we need interim goals to -- to
12 make sure that the students are moving forward and that
13 the programs are truly working on a continuing basis with
14 the students.

15 MS. MANAZEC: (indiscernible) okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll just add the
17 adult workforce centers do have a host of traditionally
18 used statewide and nationally recognized assessments that
19 wouldn't be as -- as familiar to this group because
20 they're not K-12, they're really intentionally geared at
21 measuring the academic progress and the skills progress of
22 adult learners.

23 MS. MANAZEC: Okay. Just one more.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. Go ahead.

25 MS. MANAZEC: How often is the periodic



1 meeting of representatives? It just says periodic, so.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 The advisory committee has met twice and we
4 are anticipating at least quarterly and as -- as topics
5 that -- that need to be discussed come up, it could be
6 more often than quarterly, but we have right now a
7 tentative quarterly schedule.

8 MS. MANAZEC: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Do you want to
10 talk to this measures questions? Go ahead.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it seems to me that
12 the ultimate goal here is to help those who are unemployed
13 or underemployed achieve a higher level of employment and
14 standard of living and so I don't understand why there's
15 not a measure in there that is provided by the Department
16 of Labor of ongoing employment. Just to get a job is one
17 thing, but to be fully employed for five years for me
18 would be a much better measure of whether this has been a
19 successful effort. And so I would love to see some sort
20 of a more long-term measure. It wouldn't be our -- I
21 guess that's what I'm saying. It would be something that
22 I don't think would be very difficult to get out of the
23 records from the -- from the Department of Employment to
24 determine that, yes, we have fully employed, and maybe
25 some general measure goes to the -- I mean I think that



1 would be the overall measure that we're seeking.

2 Particularly I guess that the legislature
3 will be funding and refunding and refunding this, and at
4 some point, I would think they'd want to know whether this
5 is raising the bar as well as the kind of data that we
6 have received from these organizations that tell us the
7 shifts. And hopefully we would see more people with
8 college degrees, et cetera, et cetera, but nevertheless,
9 given the way the changes in skills that we're seeing
10 today, the constant changes, I would anticipate something
11 like this would need to be continued, just in a very
12 different way. Maybe we're not doing the reading and
13 writing so much, but certainly the skills development. So
14 this -- for this to be a really strong program, we need to
15 have some strong results.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17 We certainly can write in as part of a
18 reporting measures longer term follow up after -- after a
19 successful student has entered employment. And we do have
20 in the RFP the need for self-sustaining economic measures
21 and we did --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's that -- what's
23 that mean, please.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It -- it -- it's the
25 Department of Labor's definition of full employment



1 meaning that a family could be independent and self-
2 sustaining on that income.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But -- but thank you
5 for that comment and I -- we will make that part of our
6 reporting.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And to -- to this issue
8 of measures and renewal, 2.04 and 2.05, this comes back to
9 the Board every year for re -- essentially reauthorization
10 of the funding, the grants that are being awarded,
11 correct?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, yes. The
13 grant approval would come to you the same way grant
14 approval (indiscernible)

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And -- and so the
16 measures piece, the report that you'll bring to the Board,
17 is still under development and some of these comments I
18 think are helpful in guiding (indiscernible) measures
19 piece looks like. Okay. Good. So that (indiscernible)
20 that other questions. Angelika, go ahead.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So I just had one more
22 question which is that -- forgive me for my lack of
23 familiarity with these programs, but are they free to
24 students and does this reduce their cost? What is the --
25 what is the change for an at-risk adult who would like to



1 participate in this?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 They are either free or they are offered
4 assistance so that they are enabled to attend, but -- but
5 the -- a -- any kind of -- of fee or any kind of monetary
6 situation would not preclude any student from attending.

7 And it's my understanding from having
8 reviewed some of the RFPs that some of the funds from this
9 grant would be used to pay for the skills training to
10 enable those students to get from a community college, for
11 example, to enable them to go through the whole process.
12 So it's not only paying for the fees, but also making sure
13 that the curriculum is fit for them and that they are
14 focused towards specific skill training that would lead
15 them to employment, but there is -- there should be no
16 monetary barrier for a student to be able to take
17 advantage of these programs.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: And then do we also measure
19 the retention rate of these folks whether they stick to it
20 or don't stick to it? Is that part of the measures?

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23 Yes, that -- that will be one of the
24 reports that we will be looking at, and it is what we will
25 request them -- any of the programs who receive funding to



1 -- to make sure that they keep records and that that's
2 part of the report they make back to us.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions?

5 Okay. I've got a question in a different
6 area. 5.01.3, education -- excuse me, I've got a frog
7 today -- the education progress made by participating
8 students as measured by standardized tests and training
9 completion, I infer from that some personally identifiable
10 information. So I would request that we add, you know,
11 5.01.5, something that says data -- or with regard to this
12 data piece, shall be compliant with the highest standard
13 of personal student data privacy in force in Colorado
14 public education. So I think we just want to live to
15 whatever the standard becomes in Colorado public education
16 with regard to student data privacy in all of our projects
17 and we just will start with this one right here.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Say that again.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'll -- I'll send a note
21 over. So I've got it written here on my screen, I'll send
22 you my language over.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, run it by
24 (indiscernible) what -- see if I can understand it.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Shall be complaint with



1 the highest standard of personal student data privacy in
2 force in Colorado public education. So you can massage
3 that to make it specific to the --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So FERPA doesn't apply
5 to adults.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: FERPA doesn't apply,
7 but (indiscernible) not the -- it's not the ceiling --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and we can work --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You've got FERPA
11 (indiscernible) privacy things. I'm just saying this
12 Board is concerned about student data privacy, and these
13 are students, and so let's just speak to that, that issue,
14 and let's move to the highest level. That's what I'm
15 trying to do.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. As long as it
17 doesn't mean that we don't collect the data that we want
18 to.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All data can be
20 protected whether it's a adult student --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, right.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and educator or
23 (indiscernible)

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) data



1 (indiscernible) but we can address (indiscernible)

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Okay. All right.
3 So other questions, comments, thoughts? Is the Board
4 prepared to take action?

5 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, I move to approve the
6 rules for the administration of the Adult Education and
7 Literacy Grant Program.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's a proper motion.
9 There's a second over here, Dr. Scheffel. Is there any
10 objection?

11 With -- as amended -- I guess let's be
12 clear -- move to approve the rules for the administration
13 of the Adult Education and Literacy Grant Program as
14 amended.

15 MS. NEAL: With your -- that's your
16 amendment that you added?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Do we need that?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, with the privacy
19 deal (indiscernible)

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And long term.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) taken
22 care of it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's not in there.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Push it back 30 days and



1 vote on it next?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Vote on it so that you
3 have the language --

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. Let's get
5 the language clear that way there's not confusion or
6 concern later. So -- so the motion has a second, but
7 fails for whatever reason. What's my language here?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

9 MS. NEAL: (indiscernible) Chair didn't
10 (indiscernible)

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And why did I --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) rules
13 as presented to you and it would be a unanimous vote
14 because -- because the Board has suggested changes be
15 made, I would suggest the Board have an opportunity to
16 view those changes before (indiscernible)

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So we're all good in
18 that and I sense that the Board's there, but to follow the
19 rules properly, what do we need to do to back out of this?
20 Do we need to rescind the second and the motion or does it
21 matter or --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) I can
23 call the roll and it won't be a unanimous vote I would
24 imagine.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So as long as



1 we're technically able to back away on this minutia, we're
2 -- we're backing away here with. Thank you. Motion fails
3 for whatever reason, the motion fails. We'll pick this up
4 --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Motion fails for lack
6 of unanimity.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The motion fails due to
8 lack of unanimity which is required at this point. Thank
9 you very much.

10 Next item on the agenda is public comment.
11 Members of the public will have an opportunity to address
12 the State Board. Our tradition is three minutes. Please
13 state your name and organization if you represent it. If
14 you don't represent an organization, let us know where
15 you're from. Limit your comments to three minutes. And
16 I'll get my little timer out. It makes a chime and Ms.
17 Markel will waive a visual reminder as well.

18 Also we have I think in this section of our
19 -- our meeting a request for an extended time from a
20 superintendent and we are going to in fact allow that. I
21 understand it is the authority of the chair to do so and
22 so I will give an extra two minutes in that particular
23 instance. The superintendent from Montrose will have five
24 minutes.

25 So in order, Stewart Toland, Montrose



1 School District.

2 Now, to be clear, I'm only giving Mark the
3 extra time.

4 MR. TOLAND: Oh, well, sound fair to me.
5 Good morning and thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm
6 Stewart Toland. I'm a school board member from Montrose
7 County School District. We recently submitted a request
8 for waiver from PARCC and CMAS testing which I presume
9 that you have all received a copy of. We received a
10 response -- I think it was on Monday -- from Commissioner
11 Hammond and it was a pretty emphatic no which didn't come
12 as a huge surprise to us, but people who know me will tell
13 you that I don't take no real easy and that's why I drove
14 five hours one way so I can speak to you for three
15 minutes. I do want to verbalize the concerns that we
16 have.

17 Before I get to those specific concerns, I
18 just want to give you a real brief overview of our school
19 district. Montrose is located about 50 miles south of
20 Grand Junction on the western slope. We have
21 approximately 6,000 students in our district. We have a
22 very large population of free and reduced lunch students
23 as well as English language learners. We're one of the
24 lowest on a per pupil basis. We're one of the lowest
25 funded districts in the state. We recently tried to get a



1 (indiscernible) override pass in our district. Our
2 community very resoundingly told us no, make due with the
3 resources that you have.

4 In spite of those challenges, we feel that
5 we have recently begun to make some meaningful progress in
6 terms of student achievement and student growth. And we
7 see the -- the PARCC and CMAS testing as being a real
8 momentum killer for us, but aside from the fact that we
9 see it as a momentum killer, we have some concerns about
10 legal issues surrounding the CMAS and PARCC testing.
11 We're pretty well aware of what the requirements are under
12 federal law and state law. We understand your position
13 and we understand the ramifications of not moving forward
14 with the testing, but we're concerned that even if we do
15 move forward with the testing, there's a very good chance
16 that we're going to be in violation of both federal and
17 state law and specifically the clauses in federal law.
18 And these aren't suggestions or anything like that, these
19 are actually as much a part of the law as the requirement
20 to test.

21 Federal law requires that these assessments
22 be valid and accessible for use by the widest possible
23 range of students. Requires that they be used for
24 purposes for which they are reliable. Requires that they
25 produce individual student interpretive, descriptive and



1 diagnostic reports that allow parents, teachers and
2 principals to understand and address the specific academic
3 needs of their students. And finally -- and this is
4 federal law, requires that they objectively measure
5 academic achievement, knowledge and skills.

6 And although I included it in our --
7 although we included it in our resolution, I just want to
8 cite the Colorado law that's relevant here which requires
9 that the assessments administered pursuant to the law be
10 designed to generate results in a form that will enable
11 students, parents or legal guardians, teachers, schools
12 and school districts to use the results as diagnostic
13 tools to assist in preparing strategies for student
14 academic achievement -- improvement -- excuse me -- in
15 specific areas.

16 Now, there are a couple primary reasons
17 that we're concerned that those sections of the law will
18 be violated. One of 'em just simply has to do with the
19 timeliness of the result. The best information that we're
20 able to get from CDE today is that testing for this year
21 will not give us results until possibly sometime late next
22 year. I've even heard possibly end of the following year.
23 So timeliness is one major issue. I don't know too many
24 educators that tell me that data is eight months old is
25 going to be useful as a diagnostic tool for improving



1 instruction.

2 A second concern, and maybe even larger
3 concern that we have is the technology requirements for
4 this testing. Because of the financial challenges that we
5 face in our district, we're not in the twenty-first
6 century yet when it comes to technology. And so it's
7 unclear to us whether we're going to be testing our
8 students for their competency in these academic areas or
9 whether we're going to be testing 'em for their computer
10 skills.

11 Those are serious concerns that we have
12 about the legal issues of proceeding with the testing, and
13 I thank you for your time.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

15 Mark Mikhail. And Mark, we're going to
16 give you five minutes.

17 MR. MIKHAIL: Sorry, Stew. Didn't mean for
18 them to give me the extra time, but I appreciate it.

19 We appreciate the opportunity to speak. We
20 respect the work you're doing and we know you have a
21 difficult challenge in front of you.

22 As Stew explained, Montrose is a very
23 unique community. We're the third largest district west
24 of Denver, but we're still rural. My name is Mark
25 Mikhail. I've been a superintendent, principal and



1 teacher in rural Colorado for over 25 years.

2 We have -- we're on that list that you
3 showed earlier. We turned our district around. We've
4 turned schools around and we're proud of the work that
5 we're doing. We still have a long way to go and we face
6 significant challenges. We chose not to read our
7 resolution to you. We hope that you read it in depth and
8 come to understanding that you have questions that you
9 contact us.

10 I'm going to focus on three areas for the
11 next few minutes. One is our concern that CDE lacks the
12 capacity to manage this testing platform and system. It
13 is simply not ready. Number two is that the current
14 Colorado testing system is not an example of best
15 practice. In fact, we fear it is an example of bad or
16 even worse practice. And third, a call for leadership and
17 cooperation amongst Colorado stakeholders and approval of
18 our waiver.

19 Number one, to address CDE's lack of
20 capacity, it's not for lack of want or effort. They work
21 very hard, but they're underfunded and they're not ready
22 for this. And I have a detailed example of the challenges
23 we faced and the hurdles that they have yet to overcome
24 that I would like to share with the Board and leave with
25 you and I'd appreciate it if you'd read it. It's



1 significant. They simply are not ready. They lack the
2 staff and haven't been given the time and the resources to
3 properly plan, train, test or prepare the test that almost
4 a million children will take this year.

5 We have a document of our concerns; they're
6 very specific. We spent the last two days in our district
7 taking our entire technology department, which by the way
8 for 6,100 students, it is two people, working to get them
9 to make CMAS work. It is a failure in our district not
10 for lack of trying. We have done everything that CDE
11 asked us to do. We were prepped on the front end and the
12 back end and still Pearson claims they don't know what's
13 wrong. CDE struggles. They actually uploaded a fifth
14 grade test for our seniors to take yesterday, and I have
15 proof of that, yet they blame us for doing that.

16 Is the answer that 300 high schools call
17 Pearson and work out their problems? I hope that's not
18 the answer. I don't know if CDE is aware of these issues,
19 but they exist. We have other districts calling us; they
20 have no one else to call.

21 Number two, the testing system as it is
22 envisioned is flawed. Research is very important in
23 education. I have my PhD in research and education. We
24 have 17 years of increased focus on testing, increased
25 standards and the results are flat, and that is a fact.



1 We very much believe in accountability. As
2 a principal and superintendent, I've worked in schools and
3 districts where we've used student data to take high
4 poverty schools and break the mold and do what others are
5 trying to do. We've achieved accreditation with
6 distinction -- not in our current district, but we have
7 taken our district. We are no longer on a plan of
8 improvement. There are people that know what they're
9 doin' out there.

10 Research and common sense is clear.
11 Students should only be tested in a similar manner to how
12 they are taught. The average student in our school
13 district does not use a computer for learning in any
14 meaningful way, yet we're going to test them using
15 computers. When we were comparing Aspen and Boulder to
16 Montrose, I was okay with that until I realized that those
17 kids learn on computers every day and we don't. And I
18 fear that the results that you will see from many
19 districts around the state will be vastly skewed because
20 of that. And I believe that's a civil rights issue.
21 We've been threatened with civil rights action if we
22 refuse to test our students. I would turn that around and
23 look at the civil rights accountability of not allowing
24 our students to show what they know in impoverished areas.
25 We have schools with 90 percent free and reduced in



1 Montrose School District. We have entire departments and
2 schools and districts that are now focused on dealing with
3 PARCC and CMAS instead of doing the work that we've done
4 in the past to improve our school district.

5 In addition, we know that there are other
6 tests coming such as the READ Act which requires an hour
7 and a half on average to -- for an individual teacher to
8 do with each individual student. That's seven or eight
9 days at the beginning of the year that that teacher will
10 not be with their kindergarten students and I don't know
11 how we're going to solve that problem. I guess we'll hire
12 subs and put subs in place and have teachers test and subs
13 teach. We are greatly concerned by that.

14 Finally, I'd like to issue a call for
15 leadership and reduction in the politics that are facing
16 Colorado today. I've been around for a long time; 20
17 years an administrator in Colorado, and the politization
18 of our schools right now makes a lot of us very, very
19 nervous. I won't go into detail about that, except to
20 note that over 300 people showed up in Grand Junction for
21 the assessment task force. A task force with only three
22 public educators and 13 other members who represent
23 charter schools and are paid by outside interests who are
24 attempting to influence Colorado school.

25 I'll wrap up. I realize the State School



1 Board and CDE did not pass these laws, but you can provide
2 leadership. You can be an advocate for our students. You
3 can pass our waiver. We ask that you take on the role of
4 chief advocate for our students and we respect that you
5 provide us with the waiver that we're being asked for
6 today. Thank you very much.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You know, I will stay in
10 order and reserve comments for the -- the Board Member
11 report section of our meeting today, but I personally have
12 comments with regard to what we've heard here today.

13 Dr. George Walker. And George, I will -- I
14 will say you weren't highly germane in the last
15 presentation. Is this the same presentation?

16 MR. WALKER: Out of respect for
17 (indiscernible) I'm not going to speak (indiscernible)

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, we hope your mouth
19 --

20 MS. NEAL: He got it in.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- mouth is -- is
22 feeling better soon.

23 Did anyone else care to speak in the public
24 comment section?

25 MS. FLORES: I would.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

2 MS. FLORES: I didn't plan to speak today,
3 but I think I should. In my campaign these past months,
4 I've learned that in Denver Public Schools, which is what
5 I'm going to speak about, there are many teachers that are
6 concerned that children do not have keyboarding skills and
7 this is in the lower grades, middle grades, upper grades.
8 And they do not have the materials, they do not have text
9 books. And they have not been trained on the -- on which
10 -- on the testing that will take place. And I think
11 that's -- that's very sad.

12 I attended a meeting on Monday of the
13 Denver Public Schools. It was a working meeting and I was
14 -- I was really -- went home very dismayed. In finding
15 out that they have a five-year plan to get this in place,
16 but it's going to take five years. So that's teacher
17 training, they do not have any books, seriously, that are
18 common core and they don't feel that the teachers are
19 ready to provide a curricula and that that's going to be
20 something that they will be working in the next five
21 years. I'm not really -- came here to criticize Denver
22 Public Schools, but just to give you a picture of what I -
23 - I've learned, you know, through all this and this is not
24 just teachers, but administrators and parents that are
25 very concerned about what substance you will know or you



1 will get from the results of this test. And that is all.

2 I just wanted you to be aware of this. So I know --

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible) for the
4 record, state -- state your name into the record.

5 MS. FLORES: My name is Dr. Val Flores.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent. Thank you
7 very much.

8 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other participants
10 in the public comment session?

11 Very well.

12 MS. NEAL: Can we take a brief break?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We can take a brief
14 break.

15 MS. NEAL: Two minutes?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Two -- an honest two-
17 minute break.

18 MS. NEAL: We never do that, but yes.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Two minutes.

20 MS. NEAL: 'Cause I wanted to get a chance
21 to pick on Mark before he left.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Sounds good.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go pick on him.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll take a two-minute
25 break. Thanks.



1 State Board will come back to order.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Order, order in the
3 court.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Colorado State Board of
5 Education will now conduct a public rulemaking hearing for
6 the rules of the administration of the turnaround school
7 leaders development program. State Board approved the
8 notice of rulemaking at its September 10th, 2014 Board
9 meeting. The hearing to promulgate these rules was made
10 known through the publication of a public notice on
11 September 25th, 2014 through the Colorado register and by
12 State Board notice on November 5th of 2014.

13 The State Board is authorized to promulgate
14 these rules pursuant to Article 9, Section 1, Colorado
15 Constitution and Sections 22-2-106-1(a) and (c) and 22-2-
16 107-1(c) of the Colorado revised statutes as well as
17 senate bill or S.B. 14-124.

18 Mr. Commissioner.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman, you
20 couldn't have said that any better if I tried.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Because it's in this --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I will turn it over
23 to Keith Owen and Peter Sherman who will go through this
24 with us. We've already talked about this before, but this
25 is the actual rulemakings.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good morning. We're
4 here to talk about the rules for the administration of the
5 school turnaround leader's development program, do a quick
6 overview and then Mr. Sherman will talk about some
7 feedback that we received specific to these rules and how
8 we've incorporated that feedback into the rules that are
9 in front of you today.

10 So this program was -- legislation was
11 passed last year to create a leadership development grant.
12 The grant for providers of turnaround leadership training
13 is one that we're going to be identifying who the
14 providers are, they can receive a one-time grant to
15 develop the capacity to provide programs in the state.
16 And then the second part is that there's a grant for
17 applicants to enroll in the 10 programs that are
18 identified as being successful. The applicants can be
19 districts, charter schools, charter management
20 organizations, charter school institute. So again, this
21 was passed last -- last spring. Signed into law June 9th,
22 2014.

23 We introduced emergency rules to State
24 Board on September 11th, 2014. The only written feedback
25 on the rules was from the Office of Legal Services, Julie



1 Pelegrin. Peter is going to walk you through what those
2 changes were -- the changes that were suggested and how we
3 incorporated those. Today is permanent rules that we're
4 bringing to you.

5 We also worked with public impact to
6 synthesize and summarize national research and practice
7 around turnaround leadership. This work resulted in
8 identification of core components of turnaround leadership
9 programs. Peter held stake -- stakeholder events to share
10 the possible components of an RFP and drafted and
11 finalized an RFP for providers and we're ready to send
12 that out hopefully this week.

13 So Mr. Sherman, would you like to talk a
14 little bit about some of the feedback, some of the reach
15 out and where we're at right now?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Welcome back, Mr.
17 Sherman. Do you have an oversized chart for us today?

18 MR. SHERMAN: I do not --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You do not.

20 MR. SHERMAN: That'll be at the next
21 presentation --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

23 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chair, good afternoon,
24 everyone, or I guess it's still the morning.

25 The -- as Dr. Owen was saying there are two



1 different sides to this grant program. One is for
2 providers, one is for participants. The only feedback
3 that we received was from Julie Pelegrin and the Office of
4 Legal Services. There was some question on the provider
5 grant. It's a one-time grant and so providers or
6 organizations can apply for design grant funds for one
7 time and that could be to create or to develop an existing
8 program to have funds to do that. We also want to be able
9 to identify providers that may not necessarily need the
10 funding so providers that are already have -- have
11 turnaround leadership development programs that are in
12 existence, but just want to be considered an identified
13 program that then it would allow them to be eligible for
14 the participant grant which will come a little bit later
15 in this year.

16 So Julie's questions were just around some
17 of the wording in the emergency rules to clarify that
18 distinction that one could apply that the RFP could be
19 applicable for someone applying for funds or just to be
20 identified. And so we changed a couple of things in the
21 rules that I think you -- that draft changes and the final
22 -- it was really just a phrasing to -- to clarify that
23 point.

24 I held some events as Dr. Owen said. We --
25 what we contracted with public impact which is a nonprofit



1 research organization out of North Carolina just to do
2 some synthesis around the turnaround leadership programs
3 nationally and we received a nice report from them which
4 has been on our -- our website for quite some time.

5 I held two different stakeholder events
6 back in August to share some of those findings and gather
7 feedback. We invited probably 20 to 30 individuals and
8 organizations. There were seven different organizations
9 represented at those couple of hours when we met. Shared
10 some of those components with folks and they offered some
11 very good questions and some good critical questions about
12 it which has helped to shape the RFP that as Dr. Owen said
13 we've prepared and was ready to be sent out.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chair, with
15 that we're happy to take any questions or I'm not sure if
16 anyone signed up for comment on this.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. I guess that's
18 correct. Let me stay in order here. We've got a sign-up
19 sheet that is empty. Is anyone here that would like to
20 speak with regard to the turnaround leaders development
21 program?

22 Okay. Seeing no one, then, I would open it
23 up to questions. Go ahead, Dr. Schroeder.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm kind of tryin' to
25 understand the -- how this is actually ends up being



1 implemented. By the way, LLS, that's Legal Services, is
2 that -- 'cause I (indiscernible) are we talking about any
3 kind of a certification for individuals who participate in
4 this? Is this a special program that you're certified and
5 then you basically jump from district to district once
6 you're qualified to be a turnaround leader?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The statute does not
10 say anything about certifications so there's nothing that
11 we're obligated to do around that. I have been in contact
12 with Colleen O'Neal from our licensing department about
13 the idea of creating a certification for a turnaround
14 principals. So potentially for -- for folks that go
15 through these programs successfully that's something that
16 I think that we could create. Of course it will come in
17 front of you as well. So it's something that we've been
18 exploring, but I personally, professionally, don't want to
19 do that unless I feel like it's going to create a real
20 incentive and -- and have some added value for folks.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So I think our experience
22 has been that when have a very effective turnaround leader
23 in a school they don't stay and so I'm -- I guess having a
24 program like this allows us to continue to prepare folks
25 for that, but it worries me whether the investment that's



1 being made is really going to stay in Colorado, is going
2 to stay in schools as opposed to in administrative levels
3 where some of those direct skills won't continue. I don't
4 know how -- exactly how to address that, but I do -- I
5 think what I want you to think about when we support folks
6 to participate in that, do we -- what do we expect back
7 from them?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

9 One thing we might do and one of the things
10 we've been doing with districts that we've been working
11 with priority improvement and turnaround status is working
12 with them on the use of funds, federal funds, their
13 budgets and incentivizing opportunities to keep people
14 that have track records of success. So we've seen in some
15 of our schools some of the innovation schools that are in
16 turnaround that through that innovation process and also
17 just utilizing federal funds in a different way they've
18 created opportunities to incentivize the leadership and
19 the teaching staff at some of the harder to staff schools.

20 And so I think that process of us
21 encouraging and also maybe calling out what they're going
22 to do to incentivize insuring that staff stay on after
23 training is something that we could certainly take into
24 consideration as part of the process that we go through in
25 developing those grants when we put 'em out to the



1 districts and assurances, some understandings that we
2 would put into writing with the district. So I think it's
3 a great comment and something we certainly can consider.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then how do we --
5 how do we measure the effectiveness of this program?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

7 I'm just -- just to follow up also on your
8 question, I think smartly what was written into statute
9 was that the participant grants can fund not only existing
10 school leaders, but also teacher leaders --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Teacher leaders.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- as well as district
13 leaders that are supporting priority improvement or
14 turnaround schools. So I think the -- I think the program
15 really does look at sort of the pipeline and allows a
16 school principal to develop a team (indiscernible) benefit
17 from some of the training programs.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. I did not
19 that.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Should've said
21 that earlier.

22 So some of the evaluation, what we've --
23 some of the -- some of the pieces that we've written into
24 the grant, the statute does call out that the -- both the
25 providers and the participants are required to report



1 annually and so we needed to articulate some of the
2 variables or some of the things that we think that they
3 can report out on. As you know if -- especially if say
4 there's a teacher leader or someone who's going to become
5 a principal goes through an extensive program that may
6 take up to a year and then is placed into a school, we
7 know that a lot of the typical achievement data that we
8 have there's going to be a two or three-year lag time --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we want to look at
11 what other indicators are there. So from some of the --
12 from the providers -- and we've just simply -- some of the
13 more simple things we want -- we will ask of them are
14 number of applicants that they've had (indiscernible)
15 their program (indiscernible) the number of participants
16 that start and the demographics of those as we're -- we
17 would want to encourage a more diverse group of school
18 leaders, the numbers of schools, districts, or CMOs that
19 are served. What happens with those folks as they
20 graduate from these programs? Are they hired into
21 assistant principal or principal roles or other kinds of
22 situation? We would like to track that.

23 We would also expect that any provider has
24 a very articulated set of competencies that their program
25 is designed to target and that those are tied to our



1 principal quality standards for Colorado. So we would
2 want to see some sort of pre and post assessment against
3 those competencies so before -- before -- as part of the
4 application process for a participant and then as they're
5 graduating and hopefully as -- in the years that follow.
6 So we'd want to be able to see some of the skills and
7 competencies that we know are important in leaders. We
8 want to see those develop and change over time.
9 Potentially satisfaction results or a survey results from
10 the schools or from the communities. Certainly if grants
11 are -- if -- if funds are awarded, we would want to see
12 detailed reports -- financial reports from them as well.

13 And then I think if we are -- if -- if
14 providers or participants can track some of their data
15 over time and start to see what this impact on the student
16 achievement is that would -- we would articulate that as
17 well.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the critical
19 piece, but as you said. And then my last question is does
20 this provide for -- do these programs provide for coaching
21 of school leaders or teacher leaders?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

23 It doesn't -- the statute doesn't
24 particularly call out coaching. I think that there's
25 enough flexibility in here that -- that coaching -- that -



1 - that, again, there could be funds --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could be.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- to train folks sort
4 of either end of a principal. We -- in the RFP that we
5 have we certainly -- it emphasizes the idea of not just
6 infusing skills to a principal, but really looking at
7 helping the district figure out ways that they'll
8 systemically support that school. And I think the idea of
9 having a residency program or a real-time experience for
10 folks through these programs is critical so coaching ought
11 to be part of some of the programs that the providers have
12 -- part of their design.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.

15 MS. SHEFFEL: All right. Thank you.

16 My question is this is big picture, helping
17 us build capacity as a state, right? To help us with
18 leadership particularly in turnaround schools. How much
19 do the turnaround schools already get and then how much
20 might they get through this? Is this you intend to have
21 10 grantees or 100 or what's the money associated with it?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Mr. Chair.

23 There are roughly 170 schools throughout
24 the state that are -- have the priority improvement or
25 turnaround plan type and so that's a lot of schools. We,



1 from my office and from other offices here at CDE, we
2 support folks in different ways. We -- for example, we
3 have a turnaround network right now, but when it's serving
4 a fraction of those schools directly and those leaders
5 directly.

6 So I think it's believed that this program
7 will, first on the provider side, we hope that we'll be
8 able to identify as many providers meet a certain bar and
9 a certain qualifications for providing services. I'm
10 hoping that we would be able to -- we'll go through a
11 formal process with these RFPs, but I would love to be
12 able to have four to six to seven different providers
13 identified this year and then that would be subsequent
14 each year thereafter. And then we would hope that there's
15 no limitation in terms of how many participants can apply
16 in the RFP later this winter so that we could have any
17 number of principals go through such programs.

18 MS. SHEFFEL: Is it possible that this
19 grant would serve all 170 schools?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Without --

21 MS. SHEFFEL: And their principals?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I do believe
23 it's possible. I don't -- without doing sort of the math
24 around -- depending on the costs of each of the providers
25 and -- and the numbers of folks that -- that apply --



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Could -- could you
2 outline the buckets for each of those grant programs? The
3 dollar amount, too --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, yes --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- of course I could.
7 So -- so the legislature allocated two million dollars a
8 year for this program. It's an ongoing funding source.
9 There's \$100,000.00 which is allocated towards FTE for our
10 -- here and our staff so we have hired for -- to support
11 the program. And then there's a 1.9 million dollars that
12 goes to the grant program. The statute identifies that
13 about a third of that go toward the provider grants, so
14 about \$608,000.00 I think it is towards these providers
15 for the one-time (indiscernible) grant (indiscernible)
16 remainder could go out to participants.

17 So that's about 1.2 million dollars
18 annually which is significant --

19 MS. SHEFFEL: Substantial. Yes. So I
20 would piggyback on what Dr. Schroeder said which is
21 without imbedded professional development, you know, we
22 all know I think enough about professional development to
23 know that if it's a sit and get, you go to a meeting and
24 you hear a lot of great information, you go back to your
25 school, how to really implement it. It's pretty tough



1 without somebody going to your school with you and helping
2 think through how it really happens once you get back to
3 your school. So is that possible to make that as a
4 requirement in the RFP?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

6 Yes, it is. And I -- I'll review it
7 exactly, but it is definitely there's a component around
8 that -- around the coaching and sort of ongoing support
9 even beyond the terms of the actual program itself so into
10 the service of the -- of the leaders, so yes, it is.

11 MS. SHEFFEL: But does the Board oversee
12 the RFPs? Not really. So there's no feedback loop on
13 that. 'Cause I think this is kind of a key issue, right?
14 We have these targeted schools with targeted money where
15 they're really coming in and being somewhat surgical about
16 how to really help these schools and so I -- I'd hate to
17 see the professional development plan through these
18 providers be great information, but hard to implement.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

20 I would certainly agree with you, and I
21 think it is important and I do believe that it's something
22 that we'll look for in the process.

23 MS. SHEFFEL: Which kind of relates to how
24 somebody becomes an identified provider. So is there a
25 set of -- you have rubrics, I'm sure, to say these six



1 make it and these other ones don't because they have other
2 -- I mean, what is that based on?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair --

4 MS. SHEFFEL: I mean, broadly, it says that
5 the provider's leadership is expected to -- I don't know -
6 - list the qualities that the provider is going to develop
7 or whatever.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

9 The statute outlines a couple of -- a
10 couple of components of how we would evaluate those
11 providers, and certainly they're not sufficient and I
12 don't think they were intended to be. So the RFP, we have
13 11 different big components in terms of the program and
14 the quality of the program that with -- and we'll be
15 following our standard RFP process so there is a rubric
16 with points that will be given by the reviewers.

17 I think that some of the big pieces that
18 we, you know, that are in here, just for -- for -- for you
19 to know as sort of the clarity of the competencies on how
20 they tie into the Colorado principal quality standards.
21 We believe that that's very important. The recruitment
22 and selection is important. I think that there is a lot
23 that such programs can do on the front end in terms of
24 insuring that you have folks entering into these programs
25 with the right mindset and some of the skillset that they



1 need that we would expect that there'd be a very engaging
2 curriculum. We're not looking for a lecture delivery in
3 this sort of thing and a methodology that really engages
4 people, but that has very much (indiscernible) in school
5 and in practice components. We would expect that there'd
6 be some sort of a residency or an -- or an experience
7 component where people are getting real-time coaching as
8 you both brought up. We think that that's very important.

9 And then finally that there is that the
10 district is really engaged and that there is -- that we
11 look at the investment into leaders as having some sort of
12 a team. We know that there's too many stories of, you
13 know, of hero principals out there that can -- that can
14 move schools for short periods of time, but that's not
15 sustainable because they don't have staff and folks at the
16 district level that are really supportive.

17 MS. SHEFFEL: And part of that is that the
18 leaders become instructional leaders in their buildings.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

20 MS. SHEFFEL: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

22 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Logistics, I
23 probably will ask about more than anything. Is there a --
24 is there a look toward having homegrown -- I mean --

25 MS. NEAL: (indiscernible)



1 MS. GOFF: -- local -- is that a preference
2 so that we're not necessarily eliminating or discounting
3 an application from an out of state or another university
4 program or something like that, but just -- that's just
5 rhetorical on what -- what looks to be the best way to go
6 for our Colorado schools.

7 The other part of my thinking today is what
8 about current -- districts and/or schools that are
9 currently in the throws of turnaround or priority
10 improvement work. Just thinking around how to align this,
11 how to -- how to make it make sense. Are we possibly
12 inviting the potential of a school being interrupted, so
13 to speak, while a leader goes off for more training or new
14 recruits are being integrated into the schools work? I
15 think that would be a concern about how the timing of
16 choices and where they're placed I think might be a --
17 something to consider that people would need to know as
18 they fill out an application or they're looking to be
19 recruited, what is -- what is that possibility for their
20 life at that point?

21 And then the other -- the other part would
22 be in -- tied in with our earlier conversation, and
23 frankly, we've all been having it for a couple of years
24 now. Where does this put schools and/or districts on the
25 accountability spectrum? Does it lend thought to if we're



1 going to be flexibilizing (ph) and we're going to be doing
2 some different timelines, where do those goals that are in
3 the middle of it, of a leader being -- being trained and -
4 - and developed for that very purpose, how does that work?
5 I mean, it would be another area for our thinking around.
6 What's -- what's best flexibility where people can still
7 comply and they are still able to be accountable for the
8 right reasons?

9 So that's -- that's sort of where I'm
10 thinking, too, about if I were going to apply for this
11 possibility and potential, and frankly someday I wish I
12 could. I think that'd be a great thing to do, but how do
13 we convey that.

14 The -- the last very part of it -- thank
15 you, Mr. Chair, for letting me go on -- is -- is there a -
16 - would there be -- should there be -- could there be an
17 expectation of community involvement during this training
18 so that part of their -- part of the expectations are that
19 -- that the folks in the training, make sure they in their
20 overall plan -- improvement plan or in their ongoing work
21 there is an expectation that communications happens with
22 the community about what all this means and -- and what
23 the ultimate goal and outcome should be for that -- that
24 neighborhood for example.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.



1 Just briefly, and I think it's a good
2 question about current work clock, potential work. How
3 does that all intersect? And so one of the things that we
4 really looked at when we try to think about applying these
5 funds to current work that's happening to partnerships
6 that we have to supports being provided to schools and
7 districts in the state already.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How do we utilize best
9 practices and let schools and districts have an
10 opportunity to braid some of this work with current work?
11 And I think there's real opportunity there. So for
12 example if we're working with the district around the
13 University of Virginia in a partnership that we've
14 established with the school program specific to turnaround
15 leadership there, they might have an opportunity now to
16 expand that in their district by applying for some of
17 these funds where it was limited before. Between three
18 schools, it's a very expensive program. So they -- they
19 can see an opportunity now based on that good work and
20 their -- their ability to implement. Say we want to put
21 all of our school principals that are in challenging
22 schools through this together and have a focus as a
23 district, and I think we've already got several districts
24 lining up to do exactly that specific to that. So that's
25 just an example.



1 And I think there's other opportunities for
2 Colorado, specific programs, to be supported and developed
3 utilizing these funds that would help schools. There's
4 also an opportunity I think to look at nationally what's
5 best practice around programs that are working or in the
6 country. So I think it's a great place to be because I
7 think we're going to get both. I think we're going to get
8 both of these kind of opportunities to explore leadership
9 and see how it is applied across the state and measure
10 that success and impact in addition to the working that
11 we're currently do.

12 So we look at it as really an opportunity
13 to parallel both of the pieces. And I think it's a great
14 insight on your part and I think it's something as schools
15 and districts come to you that are reaching the end of the
16 clock that conversation about the work that they're doing,
17 the support that they've been providing and future work
18 are all great components for you to be asking about and
19 for them to be explaining to you because I think it's
20 going to help you make decisions about what type of impact
21 you want to have there locally and whether you need to
22 interfere with current work or whether you need to support
23 current to work. And I think that's great context to have
24 going into the clock conversations.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions down this way?
4 Yes, no. Okay. Are we in a position to take a motion,
5 then? Madam Vice Chair.

6 MS. NEAL: I was not paying attention.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We have -- just to be
8 clear, we've passed no public testimony and we're ready
9 for a motion.

10 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, I move to approve the
11 rules for the school turnaround leaders development
12 program.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's a proper motion.
14 Is there a second?

15 All over the places seconds. Pick
16 whichever one you'd like. Is there any objection?
17 Hearing no objection, motion carries.

18 Thank you, gentlemen.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 MS. NEAL: We've seen you so often today
23 (indiscernible) got any more?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're going to --
25 unfortunately you're going to get to see me a lot more.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, yeah. We got a lot
2 of rules today.

3 Ms. Markel, would you please announce an
4 executive session?

5 MS. MARKEL: An executive session has been
6 noticed for today's State Board meeting in conformance
7 with 24-6-402 CRS to receive legal advice on specific
8 legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III)CRS in
9 matters required by Federal Law or rules by State statutes
10 pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III)CRS.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Do we have a motion?

12 So moved would be adequate. Is there a
13 second? Any objection? None. We're in executive
14 session. Thank you very much.

15 (Meeting adjourned)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



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 5th 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