



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
November 10, 2016

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 10, 2016,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. I apologize for the  
2 few minutes late start. The State Board of Education will  
3 come to order. Ms. Cordial, will you please call the roll?

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

5 MS. FLORES: Here.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

7 MS. GOFF: Here.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec is  
9 excused?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Excused.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

12 MS. RANKIN: Here.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Excused.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Chairman Durham?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Present. A quorum is  
19 present, and we will proceed with item 3, which is the  
20 recognition of the Green Ribbon School Awards and with --  
21 Commissioner, if you would like to introduce this  
22 particular program?

23 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you. We are  
24 pleased to be honoring our 2016 Green Ribbon Schools Award  
25 winners today, and I'm gonna turn it over to Barbara



1 Hickman, Associate Commissioner, to lead us through the  
2 program and the awardees.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Hickman?

4 MS. HICKMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Anthes  
5 and Members of the Board, good morning. There's a lot of  
6 people winning awards today. So I'm going to sit here, and  
7 they are all here, and I'm gonna talk about them a little  
8 bit, and then they'll each come up and have a minute or two  
9 to talk about what their districts have done, and then  
10 we'll do the presentations. The US Department of Education  
11 Green Ribbon Schools Award honors America's public and  
12 private Pre-K to schools and school districts. Pre-K  
13 through 12, as well as institutions of higher education for  
14 their efforts towards improving student health and  
15 achievement and producing environmental impact.

16 These schools district and IHEs, that's the  
17 Institution of Higher Education, are recognized by parents,  
18 students, staff, and government at all levels as exemplary  
19 models of achievement in sustainability, health, and  
20 environmental education. Green Ribbon Schools are  
21 celebrated for their increased energy cost savings,  
22 improved health and wellness for students and staff alike,  
23 improves student performance and engagement, and enhance  
24 critical thinking skills in science, technology,  
25 engineering, and mathematics. This year, only 27



1 elementary schools across the nation were awarded. We are  
2 honored that Heritage Elementary School in Douglas County  
3 School District was selected to be among these schools.

4                   Similarly, only 15 districts across the  
5 country were selected for this award and Poudre School  
6 District was among those prestigious few. This was also  
7 the second year the US Department of Education offered a  
8 Postsecondary Sustainability Award for institutions of  
9 higher education. The Colorado Department of Education  
10 collaborated with the Colorado Department of Higher  
11 Education to put forward a nomination for this award. The  
12 University of Colorado Springs was chosen this year as only  
13 one of 11 institutions in the country to be honored.

14                   Today, we're proud to recognize the three  
15 Colorado winners that have achieved the national Green  
16 Ribbon Schools Award, and I would like to tell you about  
17 each of their individual accomplishments, and then we'll  
18 invite them to come up and speak. Poudre School District  
19 is an award-winning nationally recognized leader in energy  
20 conservation, green building, and health and wellness.  
21 Since 1994, PSD has completed 260 energy efficient  
22 projects, resulting in a utility savings of over \$2  
23 million, and a greenhouse gas emissions have been reduced  
24 by over 5,000 tons since 2005.



1                   The district has been recognized by numerous  
2 local state and national organizations, included being the  
3 first school district in Colorado to be awarded the  
4 Environmental Leadership Award, having the first LEED Gold  
5 certified school in the nation, and earning the first  
6 Energy Star Rating for a school building under the  
7 Designated to Earn designation. The district has worked to  
8 develop partnerships with local public health groups,  
9 encourage walking and biking to school, educating students  
10 and staff on wellness topics, and is recognized how  
11 District facilities influence physical and mental wellness  
12 as a whole.

13                   Nearly 30 percent of schools in Poudre  
14 School District have onsite gardens, which are used as  
15 outdoor classrooms with a growing cycle incorporated into  
16 science classes. With student achievement as PSD's first  
17 priority, environmental education and sustainability has  
18 been integrated into the classroom through collaboration  
19 with administrators, teachers, staff, and outside entities  
20 to establish learning opportunities. University of  
21 Colorado Springs provides leadership by working to  
22 institutionalize a culture of sustainability, imparting  
23 both the knowledge and practices students can carry into  
24 their lives after college.



1                   Each year, UCCS invests in more renewable  
2 energy from onsite solar voltaic and thermal systems, wind  
3 energy purchases, participation in solar gardens, and  
4 purchase of renewable energy certificates. The new  
5 students supported and funded student wellness center in  
6 addition to the recreation center is an innovative model  
7 represented by collocation integration of recreation,  
8 mental health, health, wellness promotion, and nutrition.  
9 For over seven years, students have directed a student  
10 approved and funded Green Action Fund to conduct  
11 sustainability projects on campus.

12                   UCCS features in-house food service, a  
13 campus farm, and greenhouse. UCCS prioritizes  
14 environmental education and sustainability to ensure that  
15 all graduates are prepared to contribute positively to the  
16 global environment. Comprehensive general education  
17 requirements known as the Campus Curriculum, specifically  
18 requires sustainability course and a global diversity  
19 course for all students before graduation. Courses address  
20 social equity, environmental or economic aspects of  
21 sustainability. UCCS also offers a wide variety of  
22 academic courses that require students to partner with the  
23 greater community.

24                   Heritage Elementary School in Douglas  
25 County, there have an energy team and in collaboration with



1 their operations and maintenance department, they've worked  
2 to reduce the school's impact on the environment. One  
3 example is onsite solar panels which provide about 27  
4 percent of the building's total energy. Students and  
5 teachers work diligently to implement waste diversion  
6 strategies including recycling, composting, and using food  
7 waste to feed the school's chickens, resulting in a 57  
8 percent diversion rate. Heritage's cafeteria recycling  
9 program has made tremendous strides in just two years  
10 reducing the waste sent to landfills to just a quarter of  
11 what was seen before the program.

12 All students participate in the cafeteria  
13 recycling program and see the cycle of sustainability  
14 through composting and gardening. Students learn how they  
15 can affect the environment by producing their own food.  
16 Heritage's school grounds are a hub for the community to  
17 learn about sustainability by helping with the garden, the  
18 chickens, and the composting. Through these actions,  
19 students see a broader effect of their work and learn civic  
20 applications.

21 Heritage's sustainability champions also  
22 support other schools and districts by sharing resources,  
23 examples, and mentoring with serving to build a green  
24 school community in Colorado and beyond. So now, I'd like  
25 each of our winners to say a few words, and we'll start



1 with Poudre School Districts Energy Matter, Trudy Trimbath.  
2 You can, whoever else you brought, you're welcome to bring  
3 them up and introduce them as well.

4 MS. TRIMBATH: Mr. Chair and Members of the  
5 Board, we would like to thank the Colorado Department of  
6 Education for acknowledging the accomplishments and hard  
7 work our district is doing for our students, staff, and in  
8 the area of curriculum, in all areas of sustainability. We  
9 are honored to accept this award, and we would also like to  
10 acknowledge the hard work that Anna has -- Anna Young has  
11 done for this program. If our success in this program  
12 would not have been -- we would not have been able to be  
13 successful had it not been for all of her hard work, and  
14 support, and dedication through this process.

15 MR. DONOVAN: Hello. My name is Nate  
16 Donovan, and I serve on the Board of Education for the  
17 Poudre School District, and I'd like to thank Chair, and  
18 Members of the Board, and as a former staff member,  
19 especially to the staff that worked so hard in that  
20 beautiful process of rule-making. Perhaps -- perhaps, we  
21 can pass a policy and put our school district to have a  
22 chicken in every classroom. Would that be good? Just a  
23 little anecdote to let you know how far the Poudre School  
24 District has come. My two sons attended Harris Bilingual  
25 Immersion School in -- in the Poudre School District. In





1 about 2000, they were the first school in the nation to  
2 score a perfect 100 on the Energy Star Audit.

3                   At that time, we had recently built the  
4 Newport College High School and in about 1996, and that  
5 school scored a 50, even though it was a new building. So  
6 we've gone from there to building Putte Ridge High School,  
7 which I think is LEED -- LEED Gold certified. I don't  
8 think it's platinum. But -- so we look forward to  
9 continuing this process and appreciate your support in this  
10 award. Since we just had an election, this maybe the  
11 closest race in the state, Poudre School District voters  
12 passed a mill levy override comfortably. The bond is now  
13 leading. Out of 110,000 votes cast, it's now leading by  
14 106 votes with about 2,000 left to count. So hopefully,  
15 we'll be able to build some more LEED-certified buildings  
16 and continue the curriculum. So, we thank you very much,  
17 and enjoy the rest of your agenda. I'm sure it will be  
18 fascinating.

19                   MS. HICKMAN: Thank you to the Poudre School  
20 District. Next up, University of Colorado Springs.  
21 Sustainability Director, Linda Kogan, and I don't know if  
22 you brought other people, but same offer to you. If you  
23 have, they're welcome to come up, and you can introduce  
24 them.



1 MS. KOGAN: Yes, good morning. I'm Linda  
2 Kogan. Good morning, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board,  
3 and also, this is Kimberly Reeves, who's also from our  
4 university. On behalf of University of Colorado Springs,  
5 I'd like to thank the Colorado Department of Education, and  
6 the Colorado Department of Higher Education, and the US  
7 Department of Education for this award. I also like to  
8 thank Anna for all of the work that she did in terms of  
9 supporting us. All of you have heard now, I read the  
10 description of programs and strategies that made us  
11 eligible for this award, including energy and cost saving  
12 measures, the integration of health and wellness in a  
13 meaningful way, and a solid STEM program that provides a  
14 pipeline for math, science, and engineering students.

15 So I've been asked to share a few current  
16 highlights that we are doing at the university, and so I'm  
17 going to pick the ones that I like the best that I think  
18 are the most fun. We're continuing right now to develop  
19 the sustainability demonstration house that will be a  
20 resource for both our campus and the community. We have a  
21 goal of net zero and grid independent to showcase what we  
22 can do with the 3,000 square foot home that was built in  
23 2000, that's on the campus. There are 10 student-employees  
24 in the office, and more than 50 volunteers that are  
25 involved in experiential projects or events with us.



1                   We hope these students will go on to do  
2 great things, like show and tell. I'm wearing a necklace  
3 today made by one of our students, who is an alumni now,  
4 who has a company called TechWear. He worked in our  
5 office, and his company up-cycles circuit boards into ties  
6 and jewelry. This is an innovative entrepreneurial  
7 approach to creating value out of materials that would have  
8 gone to a landfill. We are working with our community to  
9 increase sustainability and green practices on a regional  
10 level. We participated in a several years long process  
11 with our community to develop a regional sustainability  
12 plan completed in 2012.

13                   We recently published the first Pikes Peak  
14 Regional Sustainability Report to celebrate the success  
15 within our community. While there is much yet to do, both  
16 within the university and the region, we are committed to  
17 being significantly involved. That's the report. It's the  
18 first one that's ever been done for Colorado Springs. One  
19 more show and tell that I wanted to share, Anna had brought  
20 this up to me. This is an initiative that students did on  
21 the campus. They voted to ban disposable plastic water  
22 bottles on the campus, and in order to support that, we  
23 provide water bottles. The Green Action Fund does to all  
24 first year students and put in hydration stations.



1                   So we've decreased our plastic use and the  
2 cost of buying disposable water bottles. The last thing I  
3 think is the most important to share today is, especially  
4 given the events of the last few days, is our commitment to  
5 teaching sustainability to all students before they  
6 graduate. All students who started after September 2014  
7 will have at least one course that focuses on  
8 sustainability as part of our New Campus Curriculum.  
9 Solutions for human sustainability and addressing climate  
10 change cannot and will not come from just the environmental  
11 department. We will need everyone to be aware, inspired,  
12 and contributing in a positive way. We need our  
13 sociologists, our artists, our engineers, and business  
14 majors, our communications graduates, and our information  
15 technology students to contribute to innovative and  
16 feasible solutions. Everyone. It's our hope that UCCS  
17 will continue to provide valuable, informed, and active  
18 global citizens. Thank you.

19                   MS. HICKMAN: Heritage Elementary School's  
20 Assistant Principal, Jean Wallack.

21                   MS. WALLACK: Good morning. Mr. Chairman,  
22 Members of the Board, it is with great pleasure that I am  
23 here today on behalf of Heritage Elementary School in  
24 Douglas County. Our students are passionate about being  
25 good stewards of our environment. This year, we are



1 continuing our energy push, as our sixth grade leadership  
2 students have done some research on LED lighting and have  
3 applied for a grant within our school district to replace  
4 our existing lighting tubes in our building with all LED  
5 tubes. They found through their research that LED tubes  
6 would save our school a significant amount of energy on our  
7 monthly electrical bill. This year, all of our students  
8 continue to recycle, not only paper and plastic in their  
9 classrooms but food in our lunch room. That is used to  
10 feed our 13 chickens we have on our school grounds.

11                   This food waste is also used to create  
12 compost for our school garden. Not only do our students  
13 plant every spring in our school garden, but this past  
14 fall, they harvested the garden, and then planned a school  
15 wide farmer's market, where they sold the wonderful produce  
16 that we had grown. The funds that they gained will be used  
17 to plant our garden in the spring. Our schools healthy  
18 living team continues to encourage healthy habits each  
19 morning on our school announcements, regarding exercise and  
20 making good food choices. Together, our Heritage  
21 Elementary School community is proud to be a conscientious  
22 green school. By continuing to recycle, we use compost and  
23 conserve energy. This important sustainable learning  
24 aligns with our goal that each of our students understand



1 the meaning behind being good stewards of our environment.

2 Thank you.

3 MS. HICKMAN: So as our award winners move  
4 up to the front, please do join me in another round of  
5 applause to congratulate the Green Ribbon School Award  
6 winners of Colorado 2016.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. On behalf of  
8 the Board, we would like to extend our thanks for your  
9 commitment to conservation. Good news is you all get a  
10 certificate. The better news is you get a gift certificate  
11 for a \$1,000 from Busch Systems. I will start with the  
12 pictures first with Poudre, and then we'll do UCCS, and  
13 then Douglas County, last. Dr. Schroeder could not be with  
14 us this morning, so Commissioner Anthes will handle that.

15 MS. HICKMAN: You did a nice background for  
16 this photo, so follow --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

18 MS. HICKMAN: -- follow Ms. Anthes.

19 (Inaudible).

20 MS. WALLACK: Okay. Okay.

21 (Overlapping)

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you. Thank  
23 you very much. And we'll now move on to our briefing item  
24 4 on the Every Student Succeeds Act. Commissioner, if you  
25 would like to introduce this as well. Thank you.



1 MS. ANTHES: Sure. Thank you Mr. Chair. We  
2 do have a number of staff helping to present today because  
3 there are a lot of different areas that need in-depth  
4 content. So I think we have name tags for them. Is that  
5 true? We -- we -- we'll try to get name tags.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll get by.  
7 (Inaudible).

8 MS. ANTHES: Okay. But I will turn it over  
9 to Pat Chapman who you know very well, Executive Director  
10 of Federal Programs and then each one of the staff members  
11 will introduce themselves as they speak.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. Mr. Chapman.

13 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Commissioner Anthes  
14 and Chairman Durham. So first as a follow up to yesterday,  
15 I just want to thank you -- thank the Board again for the  
16 additional time to pull together, the ESSA State Plan.

17 MS. ANTHES: Pat, can you speak up a little  
18 bit? Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That moves, so you should  
20 pull right up.

21 MR. CHAPMAN: There we go. There was a  
22 great sigh of relief over at the building over on Broadway  
23 to the extent that I think the external walls of the 11th  
24 floor expanded. So we -- we very much appreciate the extra  
25 time. I also apologize for the length of the presentation



1 today and all the materials you received. There was a -- a  
2 lot of information that we really tried to condense down.  
3 So we will have a number of people presenting today. We  
4 really couldn't cut it down anymore without really  
5 sacrificing the intent of the presentation. So bear with  
6 us, we'll move through it as quickly as we can.

7                   The goals for today are to give you  
8 additional information about the work of the ESSA Standard  
9 Spoke Committee and additional information about the work  
10 of the ESSA Title Programs and Assurances Committee. Our  
11 purpose is to gather any feedback, any concerns,  
12 recommendations, any direction that you might want to  
13 provide to us when we go back to those folks so that we  
14 make sure that we cover the areas that you're interested in  
15 when we come back as the Title Program Spoke Committee in  
16 January. And then as you know the -- the Standards Spoke  
17 Committee we gonna -- it's a little bit different timeline  
18 for that committee. So let's go ahead and introduce the  
19 staff.

20                   MS. ANTHONY: Hi, I'm Tanni Anthony with the  
21 Exceptional Student Services Unit.

22                   MS. COLSMAN: Good morning, Melissa Colzman,  
23 Teaching and Learning.

24                   MS. BACH: I'm Lulu Bach from the Office of  
25 Cultural Linguistic Diverse Education.





1 MR. CHAPMAN: And so they're here today to  
2 represent the Standards Spoke Committee and present that  
3 work. And so with no further ado let me turn it over to  
4 Melissa.

5 MS. COLSMAN: All right. Thank you, Pat.  
6 Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board. I want  
7 to express the appreciation for the involvement of the  
8 Spoke Committee who has contributed to the section of the  
9 State Plan that you have before you today. Also would like  
10 to acknowledge the contributions of Karol Gates who's not  
11 in with us today, Rebecca Ottenbright, who is in the  
12 audience, as well as Morgan Cox from the Office of  
13 Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education. I'm not  
14 sure if there are any Spoke Committee members in the  
15 audience today? But they are aware of this and many of  
16 them listened online to the Hub Committee on Monday and are  
17 aware of today's presentation as well.

18 Speaking of the Hub Committee -- I'm sorry  
19 the Spoke Committee, first I would like to start off with  
20 just some information about the Spoke Committee, how the  
21 work was accomplished. We'll talk about that ESSA  
22 requirements and decision points. We'll share with you  
23 some of the key conversations that the committee had and  
24 then we will walk through the section of the State Plan.  
25 So the composition of the Spoke Committee, there's a 70-



1 member committee. You'll see that the two largest  
2 categories represented on the committee were educators and  
3 school district administrators with 31 percent and 30  
4 percent representation respectively. You'll see also that  
5 CDE has a large portion of the committee membership in the  
6 role of staffing the committee in providing the resources  
7 necessary for the committee to do its work.

8           You see that we had involvement from  
9 institutions of higher education, school administrators,  
10 community organizations, early childhood, education  
11 advocacy, parents, professional educator organizations and  
12 a couple of retired educators as well. All who applied to  
13 the committee were accepted. The way that the Spoke  
14 Committee accomplished its work was beginning in August  
15 when the Spoke Committee recruitment process began. We had  
16 an informational web -- webinar to ensure that all the  
17 members would have an understanding of what the purpose of  
18 this Spoke Committee was and was not.

19           We began with a process where we presented  
20 the committee with essentially an empty draft outline which  
21 was showing the three sections that are part of the  
22 standards portion of the ESSA State Plan, to ask them what  
23 they think ought to be included in that particular section.  
24 From that empty draft outline, we created an outline for  
25 the committee tubers -- to react to, to ensure that we had



1 the input of the committee correct in what the outline of  
2 the section should look like.

3                   From there, we drafted the language for each  
4 of the three sections of this portion of the State Plan,  
5 provided that back to the Committee for their revisions.  
6 From there, we incorporated all of the suggestions from the  
7 committee and have the D-plan section that you have before  
8 you today. What you'll see in the draft section from these  
9 standards portion, is that there is a comment section which  
10 essentially is showing you what the requirements of each  
11 portion of that section are. We're gonna spend some time  
12 going over what those requirements are in just a few  
13 minutes. But I just wanted to orient you to -- to that  
14 section.

15                   So we'll move on to the ESSA requirements  
16 and decision points for the standards in relation to ESSA.  
17 Unlike other -- other sections of the ESSA State Plan,  
18 there are no decision points for standards. Instead,  
19 states must provide assurance or evidence regarding  
20 standards in three areas; Challenging academic standards,  
21 Alternate Achievement Standards, and English Language  
22 Proficiency Standards.

23                   Colorado currently meets all Department of  
24 Ed requirements related to standards, and that includes  
25 everything in -- within ESSA. And because the way our



1 state statutes are written, Colorado will continue to meet  
2 ESSA requirements, even as we go through a standard  
3 revision process. There are a number of restrictions  
4 placed on what the US Department of Education can require  
5 of states related to standards. First of all, states  
6 cannot be required to submit our actual standards for the -  
7 - to the Secretary of Education for review. Secondly, the  
8 secretary does not have any authority to mandate, direct,  
9 control, coerce or exercise any direction or supervision  
10 over any of the states challenging academic standards that  
11 are adopted or implemented by the -- by states. So  
12 essentially this is a -- a very local control portion of  
13 ESSA. By way of context setting and some background --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: May I interrupt --

15 MS. COLSMAN: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- for a second, Ms.  
17 Colzman. In terms of providing assurance, does that have  
18 to be any more complicated than a statement from the  
19 Commissioner that we meet the standards or do you fill this  
20 with all kinds of things which might be more binding and  
21 necessary as some of these requirements become minimized as  
22 time passes?

23 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chairman, that's a very  
24 good question. In terms of providing assurance there are  
25 some specific portions of ESSA for standards; Alternate



1 Achievement Standards and English Language Proficiency  
2 Standards. So there are somewhat like four requirements  
3 for challenging academic standards where we have to explain  
4 how we meet that particular requirement the same with the  
5 other two sets of standards that we have. Regarding the  
6 putting things in our plan that might bind us in the  
7 future, that was a discussion of the committee. We believe  
8 that we have simply described what our state law requires  
9 and how that meets federal law and how we have implemented  
10 our state law to -- as an assurance that we are meeting  
11 federal requirements.

12 MR. CHAPMAN: If I may, the -- for the  
13 waiver, the ESSA flexibility waiver, we simply attached a  
14 record of the State Board's minutes reflecting the adoption  
15 of the state's standards.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

17 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you. So related to some  
18 of the key conversations, and in fact, that was one of the  
19 conversations that the committee was, how much should be  
20 put into this section? One of the other conversations that  
21 we needed to have was making sure that there was an  
22 understanding of the respective roles of federal  
23 government, state government, and local school district  
24 policy in relation to standards. Being able to distinguish  
25 what's required by the Federal Government versus State and



1 Local was -- was something that -- kind of at times would  
2 trip up some conversations. And so I want to make you  
3 aware that that was something that was important to  
4 distinguish because there can be some confusion about what  
5 is required by each level of the system.

6                   Because ESSA puts tight parameters around  
7 the federal government in Colorado, the primary authority  
8 for standards rests with -- at the state level with the  
9 State Board of Education, and at the local level where  
10 districts are required to adopt standards that meet or  
11 exceed state standards and districts may choose to adopt  
12 standards. The bottom line is we already meet all of the  
13 requirements of the federal government. I'm showing you a  
14 slide that we shared yesterday. Again, not necessarily for  
15 the purpose of the Board, but for the purpose of some  
16 members of the audience who may not have been part of the  
17 conversation. Just to reiterate what is required by the  
18 state and what is the state has -- jurisdiction over versus  
19 the local districts and in Colorado, standards rest at the  
20 state level, but local curriculum and instruction is at the  
21 local level.

22                   Just also by way of some context setting not  
23 necessarily for the Board, but for some of our listening  
24 audience, the thousands that are listening online right  
25 now, standards are not new to Colorado. Standards were



1 initiated back in 1993, and in 2008 when Colorado's  
2 Achievement Plan for Kids was passed. It initiated an  
3 overhaul of Colorado's Academic Standards and all in 10  
4 different content areas. And Colorado Law CAP4K, requires  
5 standards in the areas that are listed and there are some  
6 specific requirements which are within CAP4K as we talk  
7 about those, they meet federal requirements. So for  
8 instance the content areas that Colorado has exceed what  
9 the federal government requires. The requirement that  
10 Colorado's standards be comparable in scope, relevance, and  
11 rigor to the highest national, international standards  
12 meets a portion of ESSA for challenging standards and or  
13 alignment with post-secondary education and career in tech  
14 education is also a requirement by the Feds and we meet  
15 that through Colorado Law.

16                   So now we're just going to quickly take you  
17 through kind of the three portions of ESSA requirements  
18 related to standards, and we will explain what you will  
19 find in the draft section. So there are four basic  
20 requirements related to Academic Standards in ESSA. The  
21 first is ESSA requires that we provide an assurance that  
22 we've adopted Challenging Standards. We have done so in  
23 2009 and 2010. They are challenging because they're  
24 comparable in scope, relevance, and rigor to the highest  
25 national, international standards. ESSA requires that



1 standards apply to all public schools. Our state law  
2 requires that all districts, all local education agencies  
3 adopt standards that meet or exceed the state standards.  
4 ESSA requires that standards include at a minimum Math,  
5 Reading or Language Arts and Science.

6 CAP4K requires that we have standards in  
7 those areas plus the four arts areas, and also financial  
8 literacy, physical education, and computer science as of  
9 July 2018. And finally, ESSA requires that standards are  
10 aligned with credit bearing coursework and state career and  
11 technical education standards. Those are also met with our  
12 state law which requires that the Colorado Academic  
13 Standards align with postsecondary and workforce readiness  
14 descriptions, and lead to postsecondary workforce  
15 readiness. So you will find the section that provides the  
16 assurance around our academic standards in pages one  
17 through 12 of the draft plan. ESSA also has requirements  
18 related to Alternate Achievement Standards and Alternate  
19 Achievement Standards apply to students with significant  
20 cognitive disabilities and Dr. Tanni Anthony is going to be  
21 describing what the ESSA requirements are and how we are  
22 currently meeting those.

23 MS. ANTHONY: Thank you. Good morning. The  
24 Alternate Achievement Standards are standards that have  
25 been modified for 1 percent of the school population. They





1 are reserved for children who have the most significant  
2 cognitive disabilities, and there are five requirements  
3 that I'll review. The first is that they -- the Alternate  
4 Achievement Standards are aligned with the state academic  
5 standards. This has happened. The extended evidence  
6 outcomes is the name that we give our Colorado Alternate  
7 Achievement Standards and they were developed concurrently  
8 with the Colorado Academic Standards.

9           The second requirement is they promote  
10 access to the general education curriculum at the enrolled  
11 grade level and they do that. They reflect professional  
12 judgment as to the highest possible standard achievable by  
13 students with the most significant cognitive disabilities  
14 and they do that. When we put these together, we gather  
15 people who had content expertise both in special education  
16 as well as the general content area and people worked very  
17 hard to maintain the highest level of rigor. And I will  
18 say, this has been an exciting contribution to Colorado  
19 because what we see is that we've actually moved children  
20 who before had curricula that were basically focused on  
21 life skills to that of academics. So our children are  
22 learning to read and write, participate in the general Ed  
23 curriculum.

24           They need to be designated in the  
25 individualized education program for each student as the



1 academic achievement standards that will be used for the  
2 student. This has happened. We have an approved  
3 eligibility process that IEP teams use to determine whether  
4 or not the children will use the Alternate Achievement  
5 Standards as their standards for instruction. They are  
6 aligned to ensure that a student who meets the Alternate  
7 Achievement -- Achievement Standards is on track to pursue  
8 post secondary education and employment, and they do this.  
9 And from a state requirement our Colorado Exceptional  
10 Children's Education Act corresponds to our federal  
11 guidance.

12 MS. COLSMAN: So the third area of ESSA  
13 requirements related to standards relates to English  
14 Language Proficiency Standards and Lulu Bach will be  
15 explaining how Colorado's English Language Proficiency  
16 Standards meet these federal requirements.

17 MS. BACH: Good morning. There are three  
18 major requirements that ESSA requires of our English  
19 language proficiency standards. One being that they are  
20 derived from the four recognized domains of speaking,  
21 listening, reading, and writing. And so the CAP4K requires  
22 and Colorado was also a member of the WIDA consortium back  
23 in 2009. So with the support of WIDA and CAP4K, we've  
24 incorporated these four recognized domains. The second  
25 requirement is addressing the different proficiency levels



1 for the English learners. Language develops across  
2 different levels of language proficiency in the Colorado  
3 English Language Proficiency Standards, framework  
4 distinguishes these levels defined in detailed criteria one  
5 through six.

6 One being entering language, two emerging,  
7 three developing, four expanding, five bridging language,  
8 and then including all of them six reaching, reaching  
9 proficiency. The last requirement of ESSA requirement is  
10 aligning -- aligning our proficiency standards of the  
11 state, challenging academic standards and not only do we  
12 meet that criteria but the Colorado English Language  
13 Proficiency Standards provides English learners with social  
14 and instructional language necessary to perform in school  
15 as well as access till the grade level content.

16 MS. COLSMAN: So as you can see, the three  
17 areas within the ESSA state plan related to standards,  
18 Colorado currently meets all of those requirements and  
19 again, because our state laws meet and exceed federal laws,  
20 even with changes to -- to any of our areas of standards,  
21 we will continue to meet ESSA requirements. So our next  
22 steps --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 2: Oops. I'm sorry.

24 MS. COLSMAN: Oops. You already did it.

25 Okay. Beat me to it. The Standards Spoke Committee will



1 make any needed revisions to this section of the plan based  
2 on your feedback, as well as public feedback, we've already  
3 presented to the Hub Committee on Monday and received their  
4 endorsement for our section of the plan, and we are pleased  
5 to answer any questions or respond to any comments that you  
6 have.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does anybody have any  
8 questions? Dr. Scheffel.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for the report. So it  
10 kind -- this kind of goes back to our discussion yesterday  
11 by examining underlying assumptions and documents that  
12 inform the process of adopting the 85 percent of our  
13 Colorado standards as common core in the first place in  
14 2009. Has this -- has this committee looked at any of  
15 those seminal documents that informed the development of  
16 the first iteration of those standards? In 2009, Achieve  
17 had a big part in that, there's a number of reviews on  
18 their influence in terms of the content and the assumptions  
19 that sit underneath the way they inform the process. Has  
20 this committee kind of gone back to basics and thought  
21 about some of that?

22 MS. COLSMAN: So Dr. Scheffel that's a very  
23 good question. Throughout this process, we've tried to  
24 distinguish between our state standards revision process  
25 which is governed by CAP4K in which will -- is just going



1 to be beginning. And what is required by the ESSA, and we  
2 have distinguished those as two separate processes and have  
3 determined that the -- that type of conversation is the  
4 best in the discussion that will be a state driven standard  
5 revision process.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, so what is this charge  
7 then of this Standard Spoke Committee then?

8 MS. COLSMAN: The charge of the Standard  
9 Spoke Committee was to assist in the development of these  
10 standards section of the ESSA state plan, which was to  
11 provide the assurance to the federal government that we  
12 meet their requirements in relation to academic standards,  
13 Alternate Achievement Standards in English language  
14 proficiency standards.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it's -- it's actually --  
16 it's just saying that what we have right now meets those  
17 three thresholds?

18 MS. COLSMAN: That's correct.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so what -- what -- how  
20 would we know though if we adjust or change, or go a -- a  
21 different direction that we would still meet those three  
22 thresholds of acceptability?

23 MS. COLSMAN: That's a- that's a great  
24 question. Our -- our thesis throughout the section of this  
25 plan is that because our state law requires the same or



1 greater levels of rigor and requirements in relation to  
2 these three sets, as long as we continue to meet state law,  
3 then we will continue to meet federal law.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, all right. And so when  
5 we look at the minutes for this meeting is -- it sounds  
6 like it's somewhat formulaic because we already meet that  
7 and I mean is that -- it sounds like a short portion of the  
8 ESSA state plan and just saying, state law says this,  
9 federal requirements are these, we already meet them, done  
10 deal. Or are there more deep discussions going on? I  
11 guess I haven't reviewed all the minutes.

12 MS. COLSMAN: So all of the- all of the  
13 meeting minutes are posted on the standards section of the  
14 website. They're available for your review. Because of  
15 the -- the way that ESSA was written around standards, it's  
16 and -- and likely because of some of the concern of -- of  
17 federal overreach into state concerns especially in  
18 relation to standards. There was quite a bit of  
19 restrictions placed on the role of the U.S. Department of  
20 Education in relation to this. So I think just  
21 necessarily, the development of this portion of the plan  
22 was intended to just put the owners of standards back on to  
23 states. So we didn't see that there was as much necessary  
24 in terms of developing for -- to meet those requirements  
25 since we already do.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So does this committee come  
2 up with recommendations then or is it more they review the  
3 situation, they look at federal requirements state law,  
4 that our standards meet the three thresholds of  
5 acceptability. It's all good.

6 MS. COLSMAN: So yeah. So the committee --  
7 if the committee had a concern that we weren't meeting what  
8 the federal requirements were, there would be an  
9 opportunity to make recommendations but because we already  
10 meet that minimum threshold, there really are no -- no  
11 necessary recommendations and there weren't any. When  
12 there were some recommendations, the conversation was that  
13 -- about changing any of our standards. That is a state  
14 process and we tried to keep those two processes separate.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So does this committee meet  
16 anymore? Is it's charge fulfilled?

17 MS. COLSMAN: The committee's charge will be  
18 fulfilled once we have an approved state plan by the state  
19 board. So right now, the committee as it has it's first  
20 draft ready, will be reconvened as any suggestions and  
21 answer questions come forward.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you. I  
23 appreciate it.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions?

25 Ms. Colman, continue please.



1 MS. COLSMAN: Well actually I get to hand it  
2 to Mr. Chapman.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. If there are no other  
4 questions then we can move on to the next section of the  
5 ESSA work. Thank you very much you guys. The other people  
6 -- okay, so I think we have everybody here? If we -- we  
7 just take a second to introduce ourselves.

8 MS. YOUNG: Sure. My name is Anna Young.  
9 I'm the Grants Specialist in the Office of Competitive  
10 Grants and Awards and that's in the Federal Programs Unit  
11 at CDE.

12 MS. COX: Good morning. I'm Morgan Cox. I  
13 am in the unit of Federal Programs Administration in the  
14 Office of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education.

15 MS. RUTHVEN: Good morning all. My name is  
16 Misti Ruthven. Executive Director of Innovation and  
17 Pathways.

18 MS. SIMONS: Good morning. My name is  
19 Jennifer Simons. I'm with the Office of ESEA Programs in  
20 Federal -- in Federal Programs.

21 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. So just to provide  
22 a little bit of context if you guys remember early on in  
23 that ESSA process when we presented an overview of what  
24 ESSA does. We mentioned that it does two things; first,  
25 it establishes broad policy requirements for states and





1 local school districts that we need to meet in the areas of  
2 standards that we just talked about as aligned assessments,  
3 school accountability, school improvement, and school  
4 effectiveness. So these are the things that we have to do.  
5 With that we have to put into place and in receipt of these  
6 dollars. The other thing it's -- it does is it creates  
7 title programs and provides fundings to state -- funding to  
8 state and local school districts to implement the  
9 requirements, raise student achievement, and close  
10 achievement gaps.

11 So these are the grant programs that are  
12 created under the ESSA and that's largely what we'll be  
13 talking about today. How we go about administering those  
14 grant programs as a state, and together with local school  
15 districts BOCES and schools. So in the ESSA State Plan  
16 Development will -- this is who we'll -- we will be talking  
17 about the title Program and Assurances Committee for that  
18 committee in Colorado. We've largely utilized the  
19 Committee of Practitioners, the ESEA Committee of  
20 Practitioners that's created in the ESEA statute, ESSA  
21 statute. There are 25 members, they represent private  
22 schools, school board members, superintendents, advocacy  
23 groups, charter schools. There is pretty broad  
24 representation.



1                   It's 25 people so far as spoke committee  
2 we've met four times, we'll be meeting again next week with  
3 and a lot of information in front of them and we will  
4 continue to do that until that ESSA state plan development  
5 process is complete. If you do want more additional --  
6 want additional information about the committee, it's work,  
7 it's agendas, it's meeting minutes, that's the link where  
8 you can find that information. So as I mentioned, the  
9 charge of the Spoke Committee is largely to look at how we  
10 administer the programs that includes information like  
11 grant applications, requests for proposals. We have to  
12 discuss the monitoring of implementation of local plans and  
13 program reviews.

14                   There are a lot of fiscal issues that we are  
15 -- we'll be dealing with as well as reporting issues,  
16 program evaluation and -- and -- and the support and  
17 technical assistance that we provide to BOCES and school  
18 districts in administering these programs. So a lot of it  
19 as the administrative process tied to grants -- to -- tied  
20 to grants. There are two overarching questions that have  
21 been proposed by the U.S. Department of Education to which  
22 we'll need to respond as part of our ESSA state plan. And  
23 so a lot of what we're talking about today is sort of we  
24 have to submit a state plan to the U.S. Department of  
25 Education for them to approve in order for them to release



1 funds to us. A lot of what we're talking about today is  
2 the -- how we make funds available and get them out the  
3 door to school districts and BOCES so the application  
4 process that they have to be a part of in order to access  
5 funds.

6                   The two larger overarching questions that we  
7 need to answer as -- as a Spoke Committee in putting  
8 together our state plan or how we use funds at the state  
9 level and support use of funds at the local level to ensure  
10 that all children have a significant opportunity to meet  
11 challenging state academic standards and career and  
12 technical standards and attain at a minimum, a regular high  
13 school diploma. So how will we use the funds? And then  
14 also, how to describe our system of grants performance  
15 management for implementation of state and local Plans  
16 regarding supporting all students with an emphasis on a lot  
17 of particular student groups, homeless students, migrant  
18 students, economically disadvantaged, English learners and  
19 -- and so forth.

20                   And in describing our system of performance  
21 management, we have to talk about how we go about making  
22 the funds available, how we review and approve local plans,  
23 how we collect and use data, how we monitor the  
24 implementation of the local plans, how we leverage the  
25 funds toward in a -- in a manner that results in continuous



1 improvement and the technical assistance that we provide to  
2 BOCES school districts and schools. As we go through these  
3 slides, we'll be talking about three types of grants. We  
4 get -- we received three types of grants from the U.S.  
5 Department of Education, three -- three types are built  
6 into ESSA. There are the Competitive Grants, those that we  
7 put out an RFP and school districts or BOCES submit an -- a  
8 -- a proposal.

9                   There is a State Administered Grant in  
10 Colorado that's for Migrant Education Program. So that's a  
11 Grant where we actually have to meet the needs of the  
12 intended beneficiaries at the state level as opposed to  
13 flowing funds to the local level. We've come up with a  
14 process for doing that and then we'll be talking about the  
15 Formula Grants and that's the bulk of the money that --  
16 that we receive under ESSA that passes through to school  
17 districts. That's the Title I, Title II, Title III, Title  
18 IV, that we administer as part of the consolidated  
19 application. All of the grants re -- regardless of whether  
20 they are competitive, or state administered, or formula  
21 grants have some fundamental components.

22                   There is an allocation and there is a  
23 budget, there is assurances that -- that the school  
24 districts need to agree to. Those are the conditions of  
25 receipt of the fundings. So if they want to accept the



1 funds, here are the -- the strings attached. There's a  
2 process of stakeholder consultation and the needs  
3 assessment. The needs assessment is the basis for the  
4 majority of these grants, local needs assessments that  
5 drive the use of the funds, and then there is a plan that  
6 must be developed and approved. A lot of the plans have  
7 specific program requirements that and include strategies  
8 and timelines and then there's a monitoring component and  
9 reporting component that we've talked about with you in the  
10 past especially the reporting requirements. There is a lot  
11 of data that needs to be submitted to state. We in turn  
12 need to submit to the U.S. Department of Education.

13 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Of course.

15 MS. FLORES: I know that that's very  
16 difficult to do to really you know, keep up with migrant  
17 kids -- kids -- kids that are homeless and such. And I  
18 know that there was a dinosaur program, you know when I  
19 worked with Ohio that had -- that brought together teachers  
20 from the public schools and as well as the Department of  
21 Health to get nurses and social workers and such. Are we -  
22 - I know you -- you went through it kind of quickly but I  
23 want to ask, are you s -- are there still programs that  
24 work with the homeless, with -- and we have. I -- I was  
25 just surprised to -- to get see that figure of how large of



1 a homeless and migrant kids that we have that are always  
2 you know, going all over our estate. So is there a  
3 concerted effort to work with other departments? I know  
4 money is not -- money is tight to really go let's say to  
5 the camps to wherever these children may be. To, you know,  
6 provide tutoring, to provide health care, to provide, you  
7 know, all of those needs that these --

8 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah a -- and that's a good  
9 question. Thank you very much. We will be talking a  
10 little bit more about the migrant program and the -- and  
11 the homeless program and -- and we can certainly address  
12 that as part of that section that supports that -- that  
13 these funds allow us to put into place at the local level.

14 MS. FLORES: So -- so it's not really the  
15 state? Is the state kind of working together with  
16 districts? In other words, I'm not talking about --

17 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes, I think --

18 MS. FLORES: -- central districts but  
19 districts where, you know, that a lot of homeless kids are  
20 just thinking about the corridor here with the -- you know,  
21 the --

22 MR. CHAPMAN: I think there's cross agency  
23 work and there is collaborative work between the State  
24 Department of Education and local education agencies to



1 first identify students so that we can provide those  
2 services to them.

3 MS. FLORES: But the department is -- the  
4 departments are working together to benefit these kids.

5 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes, indeed . And -- and  
6 Misti will cover homeless. Do you wanna do that now or --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin had a question,  
8 as well.

9 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay.

10 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Chapman, on the three types  
11 of grants, the competitive state administrative and formula  
12 grants, I'm assuming those are all directly federal grants.  
13 Can you attach a price -- a combined price to those  
14 ballpark figure for one year?

15 MR. CHAPMAN: It varies by grant type. We  
16 will be covering the fiscal part of this pretty extensively  
17 as at the latter part of this presentation.

18 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. CHAPMAN: But in general, it's around  
20 \$220 million that we receive under ESSA. The bulk of that  
21 funding is formula funding, a smaller portion is  
22 competitive funding.

23 MS. RAKEN: Thank you.

24 MR. CHAPMAN: And so in -- one of the things  
25 that I think generated a lot of a fair amount of



1 excitement, I wouldn't say a lot, a fair amount of  
2 excitement in the field where the newly allowable or what's  
3 perceived as newly allowable activities under ESSA. It's  
4 not necessarily so that these things were not allowable  
5 under No Child Left Behind but they weren't necessarily  
6 explicitly stated or featured as part of the statutory  
7 language.

8           Among those are career and tech education,  
9 so when we're talking about these themes, these are things  
10 that you can use funds for at the state or the local level.  
11 Now there's a real emphasis on career and tech ed, early  
12 learning, healthy students and well-rounded education,  
13 supports for teachers and supports for students and so one  
14 of our jobs in administering these grants is to build those  
15 themes into the materials that we use to make these funds  
16 available and work with school districts and BOCES to help  
17 them understand how they can use their funds that they  
18 receive in support of these areas.

19           And then finally before we get into the  
20 different types of grants starting with a competitive, I  
21 just want to spend just a minute talking about sort of our  
22 theory of action or how we go about our philosophy of  
23 grants management, the driving effort is to minimize the  
24 administrative burden tied to these funds and maximize the  
25 impact on behalf of students, parents and, you know,





1 taxpayers. We really do try to be efficient and frugal  
2 stewards of the funds, we take that role seriously. This  
3 is a lot of money that we're talking about and it's  
4 taxpayers money. So we do not want to waste that money in  
5 any way.

6                               What we're trying to do is help ourselves  
7 first to be informed consumers of the grant so that we  
8 understand the requirements but also can take advantage of  
9 the opportunities and the flexibility afforded in the  
10 statute and in the regulations to be a monitor of the  
11 proposed rules so that we push back as appropriate. But we  
12 feel that if local school districts and BOCES and schools  
13 go about that needs assessment process together with their  
14 stakeholders, we just want to add to that the value that we  
15 can add is helping them understand exactly how you can use  
16 the funds, how you can coordinate these funds across  
17 programs in support of improved student services. We do  
18 want to understand the legal requirements and make sure  
19 that they are met and we do want to work towards equitable  
20 opportunities for all students and there's a real role that  
21 these funds can play in helping that happen. So when we  
22 walked through --

23                               CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Flores.

24                               MR. CHAPMAN: Okay.



1 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry to have stopped you  
2 at this --

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay.

4 MS. FLORES: -- this point, but we do know  
5 that recently, there were some school districts who were  
6 able to garner money from their own constituents and such.  
7 So we know that some districts have monies and we know that  
8 some districts like really, you know, you know, they try  
9 and they try. Jefferson tries and tries and, you know,  
10 they don't get the monies. So and I know that too, we know  
11 that some districts have the capability, in other words the  
12 people power and the resources to write these grants. Are  
13 we making very, very sure that these monies are getting to  
14 districts that really need it? Where there are a number of  
15 kids and I'm talking about some rural kids, you know, as  
16 well, do they get the monies? Are you making really sure?

17 MR. CHAPMAN: And I think we will talk a  
18 little bit about that. In general, this is a pretty small,  
19 a relatively small amount of money when you think about all  
20 the money that's there in support of education. So there  
21 are various estimates but it's about 8 percent of the  
22 funding that schools and districts have to provide services  
23 to students. But we also know that in some cases, there's  
24 greater discretion in how these funds are spent and so it's



1 not that these are not dollars that are budgeted before  
2 they're even received --

3 MS. FLORES: Right, but --

4 MR. CHAPMAN: -- and so we recognize that  
5 there's an important role that they can play in improving  
6 the quality of services for schools.

7 MS. FLORES: So I guess what I'm getting at,  
8 is there may be a district who doesn't write the best, you  
9 know, grant? And by that writing but the need is really  
10 great. So and I've been in grant writing, I mean, grant  
11 reading groups where they think "Oh no, this is so much  
12 better written this is so much --" but yet the need is here  
13 in a badly written, you know, grant.

14 MR. CHAPMAN: And that tees up this next  
15 section really nicely cause that's exactly what we're gonna  
16 be talking about as part of the competitive --

17 MS. FLORES: Thank you. But I just wanted  
18 to --

19 MR. CHAPMAN: No, I understand.

20 MS. FLORES: That's an -- that's an  
21 important issue to me.

22 MR. CHAPMAN: -- and that's a real issue.  
23 So let me turn it over to Anna who's gonna walk us through  
24 a little bit of that. The competitive grant process.



1 MS. YOUNG: Thank you. So like Mr. Chapman  
2 said, there are several types of grants that CDE  
3 administers and I'll just spend several minutes talking  
4 about the competitive side of this funding opportunities.  
5 So we wanted to share with you both our application and  
6 review process because they are different from our formula  
7 fund process. So first of all, for the application  
8 process, the office of competitive grants and awards and  
9 program managers for these grants meet to develop the  
10 rules, funding eligibility, application requirements,  
11 scoring rubric and timelines for these competitive funding  
12 opportunities.

13 Then once the application is approved, CDE  
14 releases the applications and the scoop so they go out to  
15 everyone who has subscribed to this scoop and the program  
16 also posts the grant applications on their website and  
17 since the application is out to their networks of  
18 constituents as well. Our role in our office, working with  
19 the program managers, is to provide technical assistance to  
20 potential applicants and that includes hosting a grant  
21 specific webinars as well as posting any frequently asked  
22 questions in the form of Q&As, so everyone knows the most  
23 information that will be helpful to them for those award  
24 programs. And then we also answer questions and we provide



1 technical assistance that way very directly and one on one  
2 with potential applicants for those grant applications.

3           Then our review process is the next step in  
4 awarding competitive grants. So the competitive grants and  
5 awards office as well as the grant program managers and the  
6 grants fiscal office at CDE review the applications for  
7 eligibility and making sure that the application includes  
8 all the required elements. So things like complete  
9 signature pages and electronic budget submissions along  
10 with their application. And then the applications are sent  
11 to peer reviewers and I do want to stress that our  
12 competitive grant review process really relies on those  
13 peer reviewers who have service subject matter experts and  
14 the grants that they are reading and reviewing from the  
15 applicants.

16           So the peer review is individually read,  
17 review, and score the applications for quality in adherence  
18 to the scoring rubrics that we create with the grant  
19 program managers and then the reviewers come together after  
20 they've individually scored to work in an in person team  
21 review day and reconcile the scoring that they've come up  
22 with to make finding recommendations to the CDE program  
23 managers. And finally at that point, CDE reviews the peer  
24 scoring and the feedback and grants fiscal reviews, the  
25 budgets for the applications. Then we finalize the



1 feedback and send the grant award notifications. And at  
2 that point, if there are any required changes that the  
3 applicants need to make, they'll send them back to CDE.  
4 Otherwise, they are funded and we provide full feedback on  
5 all of the grant applications that we get from that peer  
6 review process.

7 MS. FLORES: May I ask?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: You know, I guess getting to  
10 the bottom line of what I'm getting at here is, why just  
11 not give that money instead of the grants and such and, you  
12 know, expending all this energy. Giving the monies to  
13 those districts that are at the bottom, you know, 5 percent  
14 that really need -- that really need the help. And we know  
15 that budgets, I mean, I know some of my colleagues may not  
16 agree but money sometimes makes a big difference. And here  
17 we have, you know, lots of us -- lots of you people, I  
18 don't cost any money, but lots of people that cost a lot of  
19 money, cost a lot of energy.

20 And why not expend those energies in other  
21 ways and just get the monies to the people that really need  
22 it. You know, and when you say "Oh well, we'll see that  
23 they have every part is in their for the competitive bids."  
24 I know what that looks like and I've been at the federal  
25 level and at the state level, you know, reading those



1 grants and seeing that they have this and they must have  
2 this. And all I'm asking is, is it possible to give it to  
3 the people that need it, that really need it who may not  
4 have the resources to, you know, write these grants?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Chapman, this is  
6 federal money. So is it federally permissible to  
7 accomplish what Dr. Flores suggests?

8 MR. CHAPMAN: We do try to reduce the  
9 administrative burden. These -- the ones -- the grants  
10 that we're talking about right now and I think the next  
11 slide kind of gets at it, are intended to be competitive or  
12 awarded competitively. So we put out on our --

13 MS. FLORES: When I hear competitive, I  
14 hear, you know, it may not go to the people who really need  
15 it.

16 MR. CHAPMAN: I think the idea is to create  
17 an equitable opportunity for all school districts to access  
18 the funds when there are competitive -- when it's a  
19 competitive process and a lot of the award is based on  
20 need. So that's part of the competitive process where they  
21 describe their need and what they intend to do with the  
22 funds and that's sort of the need of the competitive grant  
23 process.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And Mr. Chapman, these are  
25 Title One Funds so are they, as a general rule directed to



1 -- I mean by requirements, are they directed to  
2 disadvantaged students, correct?

3 MR. CHAPMAN: In the case of these two  
4 competitive grants that we're talking about today, they are  
5 not Title One Funds. There -- it's the Title Four, 21st  
6 Century Learning Center -- Community Learning Center Grant  
7 and the Homeless Grant. Those two grants are awarded  
8 competitively.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chapman, I think we  
10 -- let me just make sure this is right. The federal  
11 government requires us to distribute this competitively.  
12 So we don't have the choice to --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Can I just look  
14 at that?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have the  
16 choice to just distribute. This is a requirement.

17 MS. FLORES: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Dr. Scheffel.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So on slide 29, I think we're  
21 a little beyond that. But it just lists the three types of  
22 grants under Title, which are competitive, state  
23 administered and formula. We're on the competitive  
24 portion.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: Correct.





1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And when we look at this lump  
2 sum, although it's not really allocated that way, what  
3 percent is in each of these categories roughly? It's a  
4 pretty small percent under competitive, right?

5 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah and I would have to do  
6 the math.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Most of the funds are Formula  
8 Funds?

9 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. Yes.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: As in 80 percent, 90 percent  
11 --

12 MR. CHAPMAN: The vast -- the bulk of the  
13 funds are awarded on a formula basis. So the funds are set  
14 aside for school districts based on that formula and then  
15 they submit an application and we release the funds. There  
16 are a couple of grant types that are grants that are --  
17 that must be awarded on a competitive basis. So we develop  
18 an RFP, we send that RFP out to all those eligible  
19 applicants and they submit a proposal and then we go  
20 through a review process and make the awards. And I'd say  
21 it's probably around less than -- certainly less than 20  
22 percent of the funds are awarded on a competitive basis.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So let's say it's 80:20 or  
24 something.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. Probably even more like  
2 90:10.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's not my sense, so of  
4 that 10 or 15 percent that's competitive, two of the grants  
5 inside of that are required to be awarded competitively?  
6 Or is that the whole 15 or 10 percent?

7 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. And there are actually  
8 other competitive grants that we are talking about as part  
9 of the School Improvement Spoke and those are the School  
10 Improvement Funds and so we're not talking about them today  
11 because that's part of the work of the School Improvement  
12 Spoke. So the two competitive grants that we're talking  
13 about today are 21st Century and McKinney-Vento Homeless.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. And so what are state  
15 administered grants then on page -- slide 29?

16 MR. CHAPMAN: That's the -- that's one grant  
17 ant that's the Migrant Education Program and that's what  
18 we'll be talking about next.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Got it. Okay. And then one  
20 more question. What's new in this? So is this really  
21 looking at what we've done all along, we know we're in  
22 federal compliance or we would be in big trouble.

23 MR. CHAPMAN: I think that what's new and --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Inaudible) these funds for  
25 decades. Is there anything new here?



1 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah and that's a very, very  
2 good -- thank you for raising that. So we have, as Dr.  
3 Scheffel mentioned, this is a process that we've been  
4 implementing for years because we've been administering  
5 grants for years. So I think that part of what's new is  
6 that, this is a day to day reality for a lot of school  
7 districts and BOCES where they have to apply for these  
8 funds and meet the reporting requirements and receive  
9 monitoring and so forth. We would just want to make sure  
10 that we are administering these programs in a way that  
11 meets the needs of the students enrolled in both, whether  
12 you're a BOCES or whether you are an online school, whether  
13 you're a charter school, whether you're a small district or  
14 large district. We're trying to create an administrative  
15 process that both minimizes the burden on districts and  
16 maximizes the impact of the funds once they're received.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: So do you have any feedback  
18 loop going then we've gotten feedback from the public, the  
19 districts, the schools saying, these are the 10 things that  
20 make Title Funds really hard to use.

21 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And then so that's the  
22 work of our Spoke Title Program Spoke Committee. So we  
23 have representatives from charter schools, we have  
24 representatives from private schools, and we have  
25 representatives from small school districts and large



1 school districts. So we're trying to get with them to  
2 identify areas that have been problematic for them in the  
3 past and address those in setting up administrative  
4 protocols that are supportive of students and the districts  
5 that serve them.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So but it looks like, is the  
7 last meeting November 17th? I mean, is there a slide that  
8 shows we're doing all these work, we've got all these  
9 money, all these schedules and all these schools to get  
10 this money? Here's the five or 10 things that could be  
11 better and here's what we going to fix it and we're getting  
12 great input. It's gonna -- I mean it looks like the  
13 meetings are almost over and I'm just looking for --  
14 where's the feed back loop?

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And so that -- so what  
16 we're asking of you today is to provide any sort of  
17 direction, any sort of raise, any sort of concerns that you  
18 have about this process so that we can take it back to our  
19 Spoke Committee. One of that, we have met four times.  
20 We've got one more meeting scheduled. I think we're gonna  
21 have to add a meeting or two in order to get to the point  
22 where we can post a draft and come back to you with the  
23 recommendations of our Spoke Committee. But a lot of what  
24 we're doing is we're developing the app -- a consolidated  
25 application and our monitoring protocols and going back and



1 forth in an iterative process with our Spoke Committee to  
2 make sure that we're getting it right.

3                   A lot of the people who are on our Spoke  
4 Committee have been on our committee practitioners for  
5 years, so they're fairly familiar with the process. I do  
6 think that what's new is that we're really having maybe a  
7 deeper and more open dialogue with the consumers of these  
8 protocols so that we really are being intentional in trying  
9 to make sure that it works for particularly like a Board of  
10 Cooperative Educational Services. In the case of a BOCES,  
11 they're applying on behalf of, you know, sometimes 20 or 25  
12 school districts and that's a very -- can be a very  
13 burdensome process for them. So we're trying to identify  
14 ways that we can simplify the process.

15                   MS. SCHEFFEL: So are you saying that we  
16 would see the feedback loop later? I mean in other words  
17 something I hear all the time and you hear it too,  
18 regulatory burden, so much paperwork, so much time. I mean  
19 is there some place now or in the future where -- somewhere  
20 it would say, regulatory burden, paper chase, whatever?

21                   MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And so when we --

22                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Are you cutting that back or  
23 maybe you can't cut it back?

24                   MR. CHAPMAN: When we come back to you and  
25 we may be that we want to come back to you one more time



1 before we come back to you for the final visit, is we hope  
2 to bring to you prototypes of the application materials and  
3 identify areas where we've made some modifications to  
4 address some of the concerns of our constituents or  
5 consumers of these grants.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could I ask one more  
7 question?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Where do the themes come from  
10 on Slide 13? I am just trying to figure out where is the  
11 room, for input into this process. Do these words lift off  
12 of the guidance documents?

13 MR. CHAPMAN: In the allowable users, so in  
14 -- in the law, there is a section that -- that sort of lays  
15 out the purpose of a -- a grant and there's always a  
16 section that talks about the allowable uses of funds, how  
17 the funds can be used at the state level and the local  
18 level. These are the career in Tech Ed under No Child Left  
19 Behind, there is very little, if any, mention of career in  
20 Tech ED. And so those are themes that are pulled out when  
21 looking at the allowable uses of funds that weren't present  
22 to the extent that they are under ESSA.

23 MS. RANKIN: One final question. What's the  
24 end of this? What is going to come to us at the end of



1 this classes? Something about five or six meetings? A lot  
2 of detail.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Prototypes of our materials  
4 that we'll be using as part of the administrative process.  
5 Example, application so a lot of the funds, I think 80  
6 percent of the funds or so, flowed as part of on a formula  
7 basis as part of our consolidated application. So what we  
8 would want to bring back to you are the components of our  
9 Grants Performance Management System. So applications for  
10 funding the assurances that are part of this process, the  
11 fiscal controls, amount projected, amounts of allocations  
12 to school districts. The monitoring tools that we need to  
13 use to monitor implementation of local plan. So it's the  
14 sort of those grant administration components that we would  
15 want to bring to you to determine that you're comfortable  
16 with what we're doing in the system that we've created to  
17 manage these grants.

18 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Go and  
20 proceed, Mr. Chapman. Excuse me.

21 MS. YOUNG: All right. Thank you. We do  
22 have several guiding principles that guide our work with  
23 the competitive grant management process and that allows us  
24 to administer these and strive to create an equitable  
25 indefensible process, for administering these grants. So



1 we do that through general and targeted technical  
2 assistance and peer review. A couple of examples of that  
3 technical assistance like I said Grant specific webinars  
4 that we provide to walk applicants through the actual  
5 components of the application, so everyone is getting the  
6 same amount of information and no knows exactly how to  
7 apply for those.

8                   Generally speaking, we also provide full-day  
9 regional Grant Writing Trainings. We've been doing that  
10 throughout the state for about two years now, going into  
11 various regions of the state to talk through our  
12 competitive process and get potential applicants to raise  
13 their awareness about not only the competitive funding  
14 opportunities that we have but how to actually go about  
15 applying for them. Then going along with that, helping  
16 them to leverage resources and funding to create maximum  
17 impact for the field and positive student outcomes  
18 regardless of where you are in the state.

19                   As far as the actual grant program  
20 implementation, like Mr. Chapman said, we are striving to  
21 create efficiency in our grant management and maximize  
22 those funds as well as minimizing administrative burden,  
23 while also adhering to any federal than also state  
24 compliance as well. And part doing that implementation and  
25 providing evaluation to make sure that those grant funds





1 are really providing quality programs that ultimately  
2 result in student success. So I wanted to end this  
3 presentation on competitive grant funding. And just to  
4 share a landscape of statewide funding for competitive  
5 funding opportunities. We wanted to share with you average  
6 success rates for grantees who are actually going after  
7 these grants and applying for these funds. And our numbers  
8 show that you can be pretty successful if you're actually  
9 going after these funding opportunities and making sure  
10 that you're, you know, maximizing your funding for your  
11 students.

12 We also pulled out rural grantees and they  
13 actually have fared better than our general applicants or  
14 applicants across the state. And then grantees with 100  
15 percent success rate that means that for every grant that a  
16 district or BOCES applied for they received. So again,  
17 that's a pretty significant number there that more often  
18 than not they are actually receiving funding if they do  
19 apply for these competitive funds. And the average number  
20 of applications per grant is 12.

21 So what that shows us that even though a lot  
22 of eligible schools and districts can apply for these  
23 grants that's on a large number, so it doesn't seem too  
24 competitive. We are seeing trends where that is actually  
25 going up that they are more and more competitive. But on



1 average, we are able to fund a lot of the applicants that  
2 come through our office for federal funding. And then  
3 finally, the median, a word amount is 125,000. So that's  
4 not an insignificant amount of money especially for small  
5 and rural districts who can really leverage those funds to  
6 supplement their services for students in addition to their  
7 formula funding.

8                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Now, yes, Ms.  
9 Goff.

10                   MS. GOFF: Thank you. Thank you, Anna. I  
11 am -- just wondered I'm looking to see if it's here and I'm  
12 not seeing it but the actual number of rural districts in  
13 even a ballpark figure, or an average would do on a  
14 universal competitive type of grant. What would be a  
15 number of our hundred and how many -- over a hundred rural  
16 districts in our state considered smaller. How many of  
17 them applied? Because to see the percentage of a success  
18 rate is not -- it's insignificant here.

19                   But it doesn't represent the number of  
20 districts that actually go ahead apply our successful --  
21 and as well as most of these percentages, there's not a  
22 definite number. And I think Colorado, we often have to  
23 think -- we have to think in terms of how many rural and  
24 small districts in the state are aware of and have access  
25 to help about doing this process. Ask for it. Literally.



1 And so if there's any way to talk about that I'd like to  
2 know sometime. Some number that gives us an average basis  
3 to think about this and --

4 MS. YOUNG: If I may I can actually answer  
5 that. So generally speaking, it's about a quarter of our  
6 total applicant pool for each grant. I would say sometimes  
7 up to 50 percent. It does depend on the grant application  
8 and that's generally speaking not just with the federal  
9 funding opportunities. But now I'm also speaking about  
10 state funding opportunities as well.

11 MS. GOFF: So if we just -- let's -- I'll be  
12 happy to narrow it down. Let's just say we were talking  
13 about the Migrant Ed the Homeless, and I know this is part  
14 of another piece of legislation funding but the McKinney-  
15 Vento. So if migrated, let's use that one because it is  
16 specifically illustrated in our talk later today. How many  
17 of our -- well, we'd have to know what the basic percentage  
18 of districts who are impacted most heavily by the migrant  
19 education situation and of that percentage, how many of  
20 them actually take the initiative and pursue a grant that  
21 is applicable to -- that they might have access to. That's  
22 -- that's basically want to know, how much awareness is  
23 there? How much initiative is being taken on behalf of  
24 districts to get involved in these competitive programs?



1 MR. CHAPMAN: And we do. Next on the list  
2 are two of them. So it might be a good opportunity for  
3 Misti to address that with relative to these two  
4 competitive programs.

5 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Thanks.

6 MS. RUTHVEN: Thank you, Mr. Chapman. So  
7 moving forward just a few examples of federally-funded  
8 competitive grants. I'll also be happy to clarify some of  
9 the questions that you've had regarding McKinney-Vento and  
10 Homeless Education throughout. If we don't cover that, I  
11 know we have some limited time today. We'll be happy to  
12 respond to your questions in writing and follow up. So the  
13 first grant that we're discussing today is 21st Century  
14 Learning Community and I think it's important to know that  
15 the purpose of this grant is to increase student  
16 achievement and close the achievement gap for some of our  
17 most vulnerable populations across the States.

18 Specifically, schools and centers are  
19 located in high poverty areas and have a lower performance  
20 of their students. This last year, there were 22,000  
21 students across our state served by 60 locations within the  
22 21st Century Learning grant. So it's interesting to know  
23 that these programs provide academic enrichment  
24 opportunities during non-school hours for children



1 including tutoring, academic enrichment for reading,  
2 writing, and math.

3                   So specifically ensuring that students that  
4 receive these supports have had significant increases in  
5 their academic outcomes such as 76 percent had better  
6 academic performance, 74 percent had improved participation  
7 in class and 68 percent improved completing their homework.  
8 And so this is also sent out to the -- this is a survey of  
9 teachers that sent out specifically about the impact that  
10 the 21st Century program has had. I'm happy to answer any  
11 more specific questions you might have about 21st Century.  
12 This is a five-year grant and we've seen great successes in  
13 those outcomes as much as mentioned.

14                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Questions -- yes, Dr.  
15 Scheffel.

16                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you connect the 21st  
17 Century piece with the Workforce Readiness piece? Do they  
18 connect? I mean, you know, you look at this talk about the  
19 four Cs of 21st Century Learning and then you see the  
20 Workforce Readiness piece and the language that defines  
21 that. And then you look at the classes kids are taking now  
22 in some schools about 21st Century and they're fairly good  
23 picture of what is that? I mean I've read the standards  
24 but I mean what is this actually doing and how does it  
25 relate to post Workforce Readiness?



1 MS. RUTHVEN: Mr. Chair. So Dr. Scheffel if  
2 I may just clarify your question briefly.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: What goes on in a 21st  
4 Century Community Learning Center and is it the standards  
5 that they're coming up with programs that link to the  
6 standards? And how does that relate to post Workforce  
7 Readiness which I think they're quite linked.

8 MS. RUTHVEN: So I also think that the 21st  
9 Century Community Learning Center as the feds are applying  
10 it and that's a great point of clarification is a bit  
11 different, but also duplicative of some of the ways that we  
12 use 21st Century skills. And so these centers are specific  
13 to After Hours Enrichment. So this does span elementary,  
14 middle as well as high school to really provide those in-  
15 depth tutoring services. So those tutors are often times  
16 teachers and they are offering standards-based support.  
17 Again, we can give you more information.

18 MS. RANKIN: Why would they call it 21st  
19 Century Community Learning centers? Why wouldn't they call  
20 it After School Tutoring? I mean, does it linked to these  
21 goals or themes of Career and Technical Education really  
22 learning healthy students well-rounded education? Is that  
23 why it's different because it's more than just you can come  
24 here and get tutoring for math and reading.

25 MS. RUTHVEN: Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Ruthven.

2 MS. RUTHVEN: So Dr. Scheffel, if I may, I'd  
3 love to follow up more specifically and provide an outline  
4 for you that links the standards between the efforts of the  
5 21st Century Learning --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I mean, in general,  
7 somebody gets these funds they're writing a plan, it aligns  
8 with these themes but I'm trying to connect them to the  
9 standards somehow, Workforce Readiness and 21st Century  
10 skills because they all relate. And there's federal  
11 version, state version --

12 MS. RUTHVEN: Right. So absolutely, this is  
13 in the context of the federal language and the Competitive  
14 Grant program that's basically for after-school learning  
15 supports that you're talking about. We're happy to provide  
16 you more in-depth information about how those services  
17 connect.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: That would be great and does  
19 it relate to these themes or am I off on that? I  
20 referenced the themes on slide 29 I guess, Healthy Students  
21 Well-rounded Education --

22 MS. RUTHVEN: So some of those yes I would  
23 say not all programs are inclusive of all of us.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: But they could submit a grant  
25 with those themes.



1 MS. RUTHVEN: Correct.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Are they supposed to be  
3 guided by those themes?

4 MS. RUTHVEN: Not necessarily and they're  
5 not limited to those pieces. They're really specific to  
6 reading math and writing.

7 MR. CHAPMAN: But after-school program could  
8 have a focus on Workforce Readiness or career in Tech Ed as  
9 opposed to the academic learning supports that might be  
10 provided.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Or (inaudible) which would be  
12 the arts. I think the only way to get the details to  
13 really look at your RFPs, right? And how you are actually  
14 wording this.

15 MS. RUTHVEN: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So these centers are not  
17 specific necessarily sole purpose locations but are perhaps  
18 a classroom used after-school. And the funding is largely  
19 for staffing or occasionally for technology provision or  
20 some combination of both?

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Boys and girls, perhaps?

22 MS. RUTHVEN: And both of them are --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they're not all in  
24 schools, then?





1 MS. RANKIN: Correct. Yes, primarily in  
2 schools have their other non-profits and services and both  
3 of your assumptions are correct, Mr. Chair, and that  
4 staffing these dollars go for staffing but also other  
5 services of course students as well as technology.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Okay. Please  
7 proceed.

8 MS. RUTHVEN: Thank you. So the next topic  
9 that we'd like to highlight is McKinney-Vento Homeless  
10 Education. And I know there's been several questions come  
11 up today regarding this. Today, we're talking about the  
12 competitive grants process piece of this. However, know  
13 that there is also a formula side of this. So  
14 approximately \$30 a student for homeless children across  
15 the state which we have about 25,000. It's kind of tacked  
16 on to the per people revenue. So one of the things that  
17 are important to know is that we've had significant  
18 increases in the number of homeless students across our  
19 state.

20 We've also become much better at  
21 identification of homeless students across our state within  
22 the past 10 years. So we've seen a threefold increase and  
23 the number right now for the most recent year we have data  
24 is the 14-15 school year which is right around 25,000  
25 students. So this includes students within the K-12 system



1 and those that are homeless without their parents or with  
2 their parents. Specifically, dollars and resources for the  
3 approximately \$30 per student goes to support a district  
4 liaison in every district across our state to help with  
5 identification and also helps homeless students navigate  
6 education and connect with community services as well as  
7 you had mentioned, Dr. Flores.

8                   So within the Homeless Education Competitive  
9 grant process, we do see great need across our state and we  
10 do not have enough resources that are certainly coming in  
11 the average grant is about \$32,000 which does not -- which  
12 supplements somewhat the efforts at the local level. So we  
13 also have seen that the districts are partnering with their  
14 communities and are collaborating. There's actually a  
15 state-wide effort called the Federal Regional Council on  
16 Homelessness and we do have a statewide coordinator of  
17 Homeless Education for McKinney Vento is the federal name  
18 of that that supports those community efforts as well.

19                   MS. FLORES: Who is that person?

20                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

21                   MS. FLORES: Is that person here with the  
22 CDE houses here?

23                   MS. RUTHVEN: Mr. Chair?

24                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. RUTHVEN: Thank you. Thank you for  
2 great question, Dr. Flores. So yes. That statewide  
3 coordinator of Homeless Education is located at the  
4 Colorado Department of Education at CDE and they also must  
5 collaborate with some of the other departments and agencies  
6 across our state as well to support homeless youth.

7 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

8 MS. RUTHVEN: So just in conclusion, one of  
9 the questions that Mr. Chapman had asked us put together,  
10 were some of the questions that we're hearing from  
11 stakeholders on these two competitive grants across the  
12 state. So I won't read these to you. These are certainly  
13 self-explanatory in many ways but also happy to add other  
14 pertinent information if helpful.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. Thank you very  
16 much. So the next type of grant that we're going to talk  
17 about are -- are state administered grants. In this case,  
18 it's the Migrant Education Program which has Title I Part  
19 C. The purpose of the Migrant Education Program is to  
20 support high quality, and comprehensive educational  
21 programs for migratory children and to ensure that  
22 migratory children who move among the states or among --  
23 move among school districts are not penalized in any manner  
24 and that there is to promote continuity of their education.  
25 Colorado receives under -- just under seven million dollars



1 a year for this program. And it's a little bit unique in  
2 that we receive the grant award and then we create the  
3 design together with our stakeholders; the design of the  
4 program.

5                   In Colorado, we are utilizing a regional  
6 approach where there are five migrant education regions.  
7 The regions are established based on where the majority of  
8 the migrant students reside, based on the agriculture  
9 that's in that area. And so we work with the BOCES and  
10 school districts to identify lead fiscal agents. And then  
11 they receive the grant award, and they're in charge of  
12 ensuring that the students -- the migrant students within  
13 their region, and who are enrolled in the school districts  
14 in their region receive the services that's done through  
15 migrant advocates. There's also an effort to identify  
16 students so that we can get them services. But it's --  
17 it's different in that, we don't -- there's no formula that  
18 we flow the funds, and there's no competitive process where  
19 school districts in BOCES are competing for these funds.

20                   The regions are established by the state  
21 together with the local education agencies and then those -  
22 - each of the regions develops a plan together with the  
23 BOCES in the area and the school districts in the area.  
24 They submit that plan to us and then -- and then we approve  
25 their plan. So it's a little bit different than the



1 formula programs. And the -- it's the basis of it as a  
2 comprehensive needs assessment where are the students and  
3 then establishing a service delivery -- delivery plan as  
4 part of that planning process, allocating the funds and  
5 providing the supports to the migrant students in the  
6 region. And it can be academic services and it could be  
7 non-academic services. So that's the migrant education  
8 program. It's the one program that we have at the state  
9 level through the ESSA that is administered by the state.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

11 MS. CHAPMAN: I'm sorry.

12 MS. RANKIN: Can you define migratory?

13 MR. CHAPMAN: It's -- and I'm not compelled  
14 to define it as well as our migrant education director  
15 who's not in attendance. This is one of the ones that the  
16 work plan was to have him be part of this panel presiding,  
17 but we are really trying to minimize the number of folks.  
18 But it's a student who has -- who based on work needs,  
19 employment needs, moves from one place to another. So one  
20 school district to another, one state to another. And so  
21 whose education is disrupted by that move.

22 MS. RANKIN: So it's the student that's the  
23 worker?

24 MR. CHAPMAN: It's the -- no. Like it's the  
25 parent -- it's part of the student as a part of a migrant



1 family and the family needs to move from location to  
2 location for employment.

3 MS. RANKIN: For any kind of employment?

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Agricultural employment.

5 MS. FLORES: Specifically?

6 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And does it go beyond  
7 to agriculture?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fisheries.

9 MR. CHAPMAN: And food services.

10 MS. HICKMAN: It's the -- about the intent.  
11 And so sometimes families can be eligible if their intent  
12 was to find work in the agriculture business, and they did  
13 not -- and they end up working in another role that may not  
14 be agriculture. That family could still be eligible as a  
15 migrant family.

16 MS. RANKIN: But initially it's for --

17 MS. HICKMAN: It's about the intent. How  
18 they're --

19 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

20 MS. HICKMAN: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

22 MS. FLORES: But I remember, I mean years  
23 ago, and I think I asked this in the Hub committee that it  
24 was for food, agriculture, fisheries, and I think railroads



1 used to be part of that as well. Because they were  
2 involved in the --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

4 MS. GOFF: Out of courtesy. Are you all --  
5 will it come up here in a minute or I don't think I see it  
6 coming. But if there has been -- does the Department of  
7 Justice and any encounters or conversations with or  
8 guidance from the Department of Justice, does that interact  
9 at all with what we can do, as this is a state grant, as  
10 are still some possible interactions among districts? As  
11 you know, we've had a couple of districts over the years --

12 MR. CHAPMAN: It's a -- yeah.

13 MS. GOFF: -- that have been involved in the  
14 Department of Justice, it does this impact. Is it a  
15 general impact across other types of grants including the  
16 migrant grant? But is there any incentive or disincentive  
17 or consequence that any districts have to pay and even  
18 enacted and enforced, that word, by us as this migrant  
19 program is played out, because if we have grants that have  
20 already been awarded and or, you know, does it matter when  
21 a decision or an imposed action on the part from the  
22 Department of Justice on the district? Does that impact  
23 their ability to collect grants to apply to -- does it have  
24 anything to do with the criteria for that?



1 MR. CHAPMAN: It may have an impact on their  
2 ability, how they are able to use the funds. So the  
3 migrant program isn't Every Student Succeeds Act, it's a  
4 federal grant. It's administered by the state, and so like  
5 Title I, it flows through. It's a federal grant that flows  
6 through and it's administered at the local level. So if a  
7 school district, the intents of these funds is to sort of  
8 operationalize civil rights within the context of  
9 education. So if a school or a district has received, for  
10 example, on a visit from the Office of Civil Rights or the  
11 Department of Justice, and has a plan that they must  
12 implement as a result of that visit, that limits the  
13 ability to use these federal funds in support of certain  
14 activities. If does that kind of get at what you're saying  
15 --

16 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

17 MR. CHAPMAN: -- so there is an intersection  
18 between these programs, these funds and how they may be  
19 used based on the district status with the OCR or the  
20 Department of Justice.

21 MS. FLORES: Would the Migrant Education  
22 Grant Program be the only one that some of those  
23 considerations are --

24 MR. CHAPMAN: No. Title III in particular  
25 and Title I. It could be any of the federal education





1 programs and it might -- the impact may differ from program  
2 to program. It depends on what the school district is  
3 required to do as a result of that OCR visit.

4 MS. FLORES: Okay, thank you.

5 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. So now -- so we've  
6 gone through the competitive grants a couple of them, and  
7 the Migrant Program which is state administer grant. Now,  
8 we're going to talk about the Formula Title programs and if  
9 you want to --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: -- and we're going to go  
12 through the formula programs relatively quickly so that we  
13 do have some time to cover a lot of the fiscal issues. How  
14 the funds are allocated and some of the -- a couple of the  
15 decision points. And so Dr. Scheffel's point, and I  
16 certainly understand it does -- it may seem a little vague.  
17 What are the decision points here? There are a couple of  
18 concrete decision points we have, but a lot of it is in how  
19 we -- the application materials that we put together for  
20 the school districts to respond to. And so we definitely  
21 will bring those back to you as a board. And so to begin,  
22 Jennifer Simons is gonna walk us through Title I part A.

23 MS. SIMONS: So Title I part A is the  
24 largest formula program that is administered through our  
25 office. It is one of those pass-through grants that the



1 CDE receives some of the administration funds but also a  
2 large part of it goes to our allies through a formula. And  
3 the purpose of Title I Part A is to provide all children  
4 significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and  
5 high quality education, and to close achievement gaps. So  
6 essentially, when LEA do receive these funds, they have the  
7 discretion to choose a poverty measure that is used to  
8 determine how rank order will be applied. They have to  
9 follow certain parameters honoring order of how schools are  
10 served with these funds. But once they choose that measure  
11 and once they have complied with those parameters of rank  
12 order, they do have an amount of discretion in how those  
13 funds are distributed to schools.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So if I might -- you know,  
15 Ms. Simons. So a district gets funds and then they can  
16 elect from this menu of distribution methods. How are the  
17 districts -- how are the funds initially allocated to  
18 districts? Is it on a single major? And do we choose that  
19 measure or is that measure dictated to us?

20 MR. CHAPMAN: And I'll take -- and so that's  
21 the extensive part of what David Schneiderman, our grants  
22 fiscal management director will be covering. So there's  
23 are a number of fiscal slides and so she's going to be  
24 talking about district to school. David will talk about  
25 state to district.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

2 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

4 MS. SIMONS: Thank you for that  
5 clarification. Once they have made those decisions about  
6 how the funds will be distributed to the schools, the  
7 schools can make a decision in consultation with their  
8 district whether or not they run a school wide or a  
9 targeted assistance program with these funds. And the  
10 differences between the targeted assistance and school wide  
11 programs in a Title I program, essentially, a school-wide  
12 program has the goal of upgrading the entire educational  
13 program within the school, whereas a targeted assistance  
14 program is addressing the instructional needs of students  
15 identified for services and again this is where LEA do have  
16 some discretion in how they identify students for services.  
17 So while those poverty measures are used to identify the  
18 schools to receive the funds based on concentration of  
19 poverty, a students receiving services particularly in a  
20 targeted assistance program are receiving services based on  
21 academic need. And how that's identified is up to the  
22 discretion of the district and the school.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You tell me about how  
24 many, on a percentage basis, which of these two methods is  
25 most --



1 MS. SIMONS: Most common?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- popular?

3 MS. SIMONS: We do have far more school wide  
4 programs than we do targeted assistance, but we do still  
5 have some targeted assistance programs in the state.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

7 MS. SIMONS: Schools running targeted  
8 assistance programs do submit data to CDE on the  
9 performance of those students. School-wide programs do  
10 not. School-wide programs also have a lot more flexibility  
11 in how they use those funds. So it may not be just for  
12 direct academic supports, it may be for social-emotional  
13 needs within the school. They have to conduct a  
14 comprehensive needs assessment each year to determine what  
15 needs need to be addressed with the funds in the school.  
16 And in both programs, there is a requirement that parents  
17 and teachers are involved in the planning of the use of the  
18 funds. Specifically for these programs, LEA has to have a  
19 plan on file with CDE. And this slide here gives you an  
20 overview of what that plan must address.

21 We do collect that plan through the  
22 consolidated application and that is something that our  
23 spoke committee on an ongoing basis provides input on how  
24 we collect that plan, what it looks like, what questions  
25 that we ask on both for the development of our state plan



1 for ESSA, but also on an ongoing basis outside of that  
2 process. There is a number of parent information that has  
3 to go out when an LEA in a school accepts these funds. One  
4 of them is -- it's called the parents right to know. So  
5 each year, the school has to notify the parents in the  
6 school that they have the right and the ability to request  
7 information on the qualifications of their child's teacher.  
8 They also have to notify the parent about their child's  
9 academic performance and they also have to notify them if  
10 under ESSA, this is a little bit of a change from 'No Child  
11 Left Behind'. So 'No Child Left Behind' they have to --  
12 had to notify parents if their child was taught for more  
13 than four weeks by a teacher who was not highly qualified.

14                   That changes to notifying parents if their  
15 child's teacher, after four weeks in the classroom, does  
16 not meet state licensure requirements. They also now have  
17 to notify parents of the policy regarding student  
18 participation in state-wide assessments and post  
19 information on each assessment that is administered, and  
20 they have to inform parents of English learners of the  
21 reason their child was identified as an English learner and  
22 the services for which they're are available. So  
23 Supplemental Educational Services, also known as SES, does  
24 change a little bit. So the required reservation for LEAs  
25 is eliminated, so there's no forced reservation of funds



1 for Supplemental Educational Services but states may  
2 reserve up to the 3 percent for that direct services set  
3 aside and one of the allowable activities within that set  
4 aside is similar to the SES activities under 'No Child Left  
5 Behind'.

6                                   And so that's another decision point for our  
7 spoke committee, so we do welcome any input you have for  
8 what to take back to them on that. And also LEAs also have  
9 the flexibility to take other district level set asides  
10 that are optional with their Title I funds to provide  
11 similar services. But they wouldn't be bound by all of the  
12 rules and regulations that surrounded SES under 'No Child  
13 Left Behind'. Title I Part D is the funding source within  
14 Title I that is, to address the educational services for  
15 children and youth in state and local institutions for  
16 neglected and delinquent children. So our LEAs that have  
17 those facilities within their district boundaries, receive  
18 these funds and work together with those facilities to  
19 provide services to those students in those facilities.  
20 Title II -- yes, Dr. Scheffel?

21                                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Dr. Scheffel?

22                                   MS. SCHEFFEL: What did you just say you  
23 look forward to our input on? What was it?

24                                   MS. SIMONS: So the -- the three percent set  
25 aside on -- on, whether or not, that -- that's state level



1 set aside, and I believe the school Improvements Spoke  
2 Committee is also going to be talking about that because --

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: What was the decision point  
4 less more allocated differently?

5 MS. SIMONS: -- or whether or not to take it  
6 -- whether or not to take it and then award it out  
7 competitively.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Three percent set aside for  
9 CDE School?

10 MS. SIMONS: For Direct Student Services.  
11 It's set aside for Direct Student Services.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So the decision point is?

13 MS. SIMONS: Whether or not to take it. It  
14 is optional.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, and we'll be covering  
16 that a little bit more on the fiscal part. But it's --  
17 it's whether or not to reserve three percent of our Title I  
18 award to make available. I mean, these would be  
19 competitive grants for Direct Student Services. It's a  
20 finite pie. So if we take that three percent and reserve  
21 it for the Direct Student Services grants, that means that  
22 school districts will receive a little less under regular  
23 Title I funding. And so there are some pros and cons --  
24 pros and cons tied to each decision, and we'll talk a  
25 little bit more on that.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And does CDE keep a portion  
2 of three percent?

3 MR. CHAPMAN: We would only get some of this  
4 is. So we'd be reserving around 4.5 million. And CDE  
5 would be able to retain one percent of that 4.5 million, so  
6 around \$45,000 to administer the Direct Student Services  
7 Fund.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, thank you.

9 MS. SIMONS: Thank you for that question.  
10 Let's get back to it. So Title II Part A also continues in  
11 Every Student Succeeds Act. And the purpose of this grant  
12 is to ultimately improve student achievement, but to do  
13 that through improving, not only the quality but the  
14 quantity of our effective teachers and principals in our  
15 schools, and to provide low income and minority students  
16 greater access to effective teachers and school leaders.  
17 So this slide gives you a little bit of a side-by-side and  
18 what's changed and what remains. The same in Title II, the  
19 amount of funds that the state can set aside to provide  
20 state level support to, toward the purpose of Title II part  
21 A, changes a little bit.

22 The administrative funds are the same, but  
23 what changes is under NCLB. There was a small percentage  
24 that went towards higher education partnerships that was  
25 awarded out competitively through our Department of Higher





1 Education. That is no longer in place under the Every  
2 Student Succeeds Act. So there is an opportunity for the  
3 CDE to perhaps provide more state level supports in  
4 recruiting, retaining, and developing teachers and school  
5 leaders. The allowable uses under Title II, part A, have  
6 not changed drastically. So you see on the left side there  
7 -- there, essentially four main buckets of how these funds  
8 have been used under the allowable activities. That's  
9 professional development, recruitment of teachers,  
10 retention activities, and class size reduction. But  
11 essentially, anything that was supplemental and research-  
12 based and in service of the purpose of Title II Part A, has  
13 always been allowable under those funds.

14                   So LEAs had significant flexibility in how  
15 they use those funds. And -- and that continues under the  
16 Every Student Succeeds Act, but what's added, so Mr.  
17 Chapman had mentioned earlier, some things that may have  
18 been allowable before but now are explicitly named in the  
19 law. And so on the right-hand side, there you see some  
20 things that are now explicitly named under Title II Part A  
21 that LEAs can do. So one of those is training on trauma  
22 and mental health for educators, training on school safety  
23 issues, identification of gifted students, training on the  
24 prevention of child sexual abuse, and upgrading  
25 instructional library programs, are all now explicitly



1 named as allowable activities under Title II. For  
2 accountability under this program, under NCLB, if a  
3 district fell below a certain threshold of highly qualified  
4 teachers, there were sanctions on the funds, and that they  
5 had to come to an agreement with CDE on how they used  
6 those. That changes under the Every Student Succeeds Act.  
7 And now, what it reads is that, if there are any gaps in  
8 the equitable access to effective teachers, that the LEAs  
9 must first use Title II funds to address those gaps. Okay.  
10 I'm going to turn it over to Morgan Cox now to talk about  
11 Title III.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Cox?

13 MS. COX: Good morning. Just to preface,  
14 there are many, many provisions related to English learners  
15 throughout the entire Every Student Succeeds Act. What I'm  
16 going to present to you today is just specific related to  
17 the Title III statute per piece of the Every Student  
18 Succeeds Act. Basically the -- the spirit of the law has  
19 remained the same. It is established to assist schools and  
20 districts to develop, implement, and modify evidence-based  
21 programs for English learners. That evidence-based did  
22 change from research based under the No Child Left Behind  
23 Act. It provides resources to schools and districts to  
24 develop teachers and administrators, and providing training



1 for those instructional and non-instructional staff working  
2 with English learners in schools and districts.

3                   It also provides resources to schools and  
4 districts to -- for them to provide resources and programs  
5 for parents and community and families of English learners.  
6 I've included here the definition of English learner, which  
7 has also changed minimally. They -- the naming convention  
8 of English learner was limited English proficient or LEP  
9 under the No Child Left Behind Act, and they did change  
10 that to English learner. It defines that the -- the  
11 statute defines this student as, "an individual who among  
12 other things, has difficulties in speaking, reading,  
13 writing or understanding in English language that may be  
14 sufficient to deny him or the him or her, the ability to  
15 meet challenging state academic standards." So this  
16 definition is key, as there is one major decision point,  
17 that we will be seeking your input and from stakeholders  
18 around some of the proposed regulations that limited our  
19 current state's process. There are -- oops

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

21                   MS. COX: Yeah. There are few required  
22 activities under the Act for LEAs. They do -- they must  
23 provide effective programs for students of that are -- that  
24 are identified as English learners, to increase their  
25 English language proficiency, and -- and ultimately attain



1 English proficiency, as well as meet challenging academic  
2 standards. They must provide professional development to  
3 educators and non-instructional staff such as community  
4 liaisons, and working with English learners, and they must  
5 include parent and family community engagement activities  
6 related to improving outcomes for English learners and  
7 engaging families of English learners.

8           The one major decision point that we are  
9 seeking input from, from the State Board as well as  
10 stakeholders across the state, is around the requirement in  
11 the statute that says that, "States must establish and  
12 implement with meaningful consultation, standardized,  
13 state-wide EL entrance and exit procedures." Our current  
14 process, our current State guidance meets this statutory  
15 requirement. However, on May 31st, the US Department of  
16 Education released proposed regulations. And where, one  
17 area where they chose to regulate was this -- this -- this  
18 requirement. And what they clarified on and what they  
19 regulated on was that, these criteria must be standardized  
20 and applied state-wide. There would not be this local  
21 option of including local data, it had to be standardized  
22 and applied across the entire State, and that they must  
23 include objective valid and reliable criteria, including  
24 the score on the State's English Language Proficiency



1 Assessment, which is our access for ELLs. What they did  
2 clarify is that states -- I'm sorry. Yeah? Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, just go on.

4 MS. COX: -- that States could not use  
5 content assessments or criteria from content assessments  
6 and utilizing or making a decision on a student's  
7 eligibility to leave the program or to exit a program and  
8 that -- what they also clarified in is that, if you are a  
9 Title I school and you are not receiving a Title 3 grant,  
10 that this criteria would apply and this reg -- this  
11 regulation would apply to both subgroups of students.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So can you just remind me the  
14 State's annual English Language Proficiency Assessment, the  
15 name of that test and the publisher?

16 MS. COX: Yes, ma'am. It's Access for ELLs,  
17 and it's published by the WIDA Consortium, The World Class  
18 Instructional Design and Assessment.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: All these categories of NEP,  
20 LEP and FEP. FEP, being the most, that's the proficiency,  
21 right? Fully English Proficient.

22 MS. COX: Yes.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Are those buckets determined  
24 by performance on that WIDA assessment?



1 MS. COX: Yes. Those are reporting  
2 categories through state law, there's at Bill 109. And so  
3 because our -- the -- the categories could change during  
4 standard setting of assessments, they keep them broad  
5 enough that we can keep some consistency in the state.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: But when we, when students  
7 are in those buckets or identified by those labels, is it  
8 based on WIDA test score or other information as well?

9 MS. COX: Yes, ma'am, it's based on the  
10 access for ELL score.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. FLORES: And what -- excuse me.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores?

14 MS. FLORES: And what about the human here?  
15 What about the human here, which is better than any of  
16 those tests? Especially if that ear is attached to a human  
17 being who is very qualified as far as language or is it --

18 MS. COX: Our state's current guidance  
19 requires, we -- our guidance says, u -- utilizing the  
20 access for ELL's assessment of five overall and five in  
21 literacy on that assessment, and then using a body of  
22 evidence to include one -- one piece of evidence that shows  
23 that the student is at grade level standard in reading, and  
24 one piece of evidence that shows that the student is at  
25 grade level in writing.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: What is the motivator for  
3 reaching FEP for a student, for a teacher, for a district  
4 for? Because if more money attached to not being fully  
5 English proficient. Am I right about that, when you look  
6 at the -- how do we motivate? What is the motivation for  
7 getting out of that bucket into Fully English Proficiency?

8 MS. COX: So students move into what's  
9 called the monitor phase of two years and our state ELPA  
10 program actually does fund those -- those students, if  
11 they're in that -- if they're still within their five year  
12 limit of being funded. They do fund Monitor one and two  
13 students, as well as Title III does include the Monitor one  
14 and two students and the allocation.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is there a motivator for  
16 getting into Fully English Proficient? I mean, how does  
17 the -- I mean, it seems like the money falls off once they  
18 reach that, right?

19 MS. COX: The -- the -- the -- the two  
20 grants, ELPA and Title III, both included allocations for  
21 students in that Monitor phase. Once they're exited from a  
22 program, they -- they would not receive any funding. And  
23 so then they move into, you know, there, there is no -- I -  
24 - I'm not sure what the -- what the motivation is from a  
25 district. But districts do, from accountability point,



1 they have to include those students, and they account that  
2 disaggregated subgroup for up to a certain amount of years,  
3 and then they get credit from moving them out. So the  
4 accountability under Title III then has now moved into  
5 Title I, has a indicator of attaining English proficiency,  
6 so that is included, it will be included in the  
7 accountability plan under ESSA.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: You said that for moving them  
9 out, what does that mean in other words?

10 MS. COX: They -- there's a target and the  
11 indicators under the Every Student Succeeds Act that, that  
12 States must measure how many students are attaining English  
13 proficient -- proficiency and that's related to our growth  
14 trajectory. So they get cred -- they meet that expectation  
15 by -- by -- by becoming English proficient.

16 ME. CHAPMAN: So you get credit for moving  
17 students from NEP to LEP, LEP to FEP and then exiting  
18 programs from the accountability standpoint. I'm thinking  
19 that maybe there isn't a real monetary motivator or  
20 monetary service.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So that is a demotivator or  
22 not really? Because their budget, they get less money once  
23 they have more students moving into FEP; am I right?

24 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. Certainly, school  
25 districts don't express that, and -- and working with them





1 and consulting with them about how -- how this will look  
2 that there is a disincentive to move students.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean, I know people have  
4 altruistic motives for being in education in the first  
5 place. But I'm just saying, from a monetary perspective,  
6 would the -- would people feel like they're losing budget?  
7 Some might. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Chapman, this maybe,  
9 it is a good point to -- to interrupt. We're about out of  
10 the allocated time and by my estimation, we got quite a few  
11 pages left here. Maybe I could ask a -- a -- a few  
12 questions, and because I think obviously we may need to  
13 come back to this. But if -- if you're taking the plan as  
14 a whole that we're required to submit, would you estimate -  
15 - do you care to estimate the number of pages including  
16 attachments and appendices, that how long a submission or  
17 how big a submissions this will be?

18 MR. CHAPMAN: With the -- the waiver, and  
19 there's -- there are a lot of similarities to the proposed  
20 template for the ESSA state plan to that of the waiver. We  
21 had about 400 pages including attachments. I think it was  
22 about 250 of narrative -- 250 pages of narrative and about  
23 another 150 pages of the attachments. I think in the case  
24 of this ESSA state plan, that we could exceed that. Maybe  
25 not so much in narrative. I think the narrative would be



1 comparable, but I think, I'm estimating with regard to  
2 attachments that we're probably looking at around 300 pages  
3 of attachments. So I think around 500 pages or so.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it's around 500 pages?  
5 And you've talked about certain decision points for the --  
6 for the Board. How do you -- how do you conclude that  
7 something is a decision point versus something that is not,  
8 how do you conclude that?

9 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And I think that --  
10 that -- that's in this case, and especially with the Title  
11 programs, that's a real issue. I think that because we  
12 have been administering these kinds of grants for lots of  
13 years, the -- some of that decision points maybe aren't so  
14 much decision points. But how can we improve the process  
15 so that this process is more in line with how schools and  
16 districts operate and so that we can, like I said, maximize  
17 the impact of a dollars and reduce dollars spent on  
18 administration? So it's -- some of the questions might be,  
19 is this process working for both (inaudible)? Is this  
20 process working for small districts that receive very  
21 little? Yes, I say money.

22 Is it working for large districts that  
23 receive a lot of -- a lot of funding? Are they -- are the  
24 dollars really being used in a manner that directly  
25 benefits students? So -- so it's I think, are the



1 materials that we have in place in support of this process  
2 the -- the right materials. There are some specific  
3 decision points with regard like -- with regard to the  
4 standardize criteria for entrance and exit of English  
5 Language Development programs. Whether we -- we reserve  
6 the three percent for Direct Student Services Grant. So  
7 there are some concrete decision points and then there are  
8 some that are a little bit more ambiguous.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Commissioner, did you have  
10 a comment?

11 MS. ANTHES: No, I was just kind of add to  
12 that last piece, which is there, I mean, any time there was  
13 a new piece in the ESSA, that either required us to look  
14 at, or a new piece of flexibility that requires us to make  
15 a change in how we're administering something, we would  
16 consider those decisions points. So example for  
17 accountability saying, you can add a new -- you can add a  
18 new variable to your accountability system. So do we want  
19 to add that? And so what would it be? You know, that's an  
20 example of a more concrete one.

21 MR. CHAPMAN: And then, there's that new --  
22 a new formula title program, Title IV Part A, which we're  
23 just getting to. That's -- that will be added to the mix  
24 as part of the, the programs that we administer how best to  
25 do that.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I mean, in theory if you  
2 listen to the hype about ESSA theoretically, there are  
3 fewer things required. How are those -- how are those  
4 delineated and do we -- are we voluntarily including  
5 anything that is not required?

6                   MR. CHAPMAN: No. I would hope not, I --  
7 that we would -- that would be one of our goals is to not  
8 include anything that's not required and to keep it just  
9 rest -- restrict it to those things that we're required to  
10 do. So you know, I mean, with regard to reductions. So  
11 when we're looking at assessments, the assessment  
12 requirements are there -- is there an opportunity to reduce  
13 our assessments. But really, I think that to a certain  
14 extent given that it reverts discretion or control slightly  
15 back towards states, that doesn't necessarily reduce our  
16 burden, that in some cases kind of adds to the burden  
17 because we need to make a decision as a state.

18                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

19                  MS. SCHEFFEL: You know, we're thinking how  
20 can we look at this state plan so that it makes a  
21 difference for Colorado. That's why we're doing it, right?  
22 So when we look at the goals of ESSA in the theme words is  
23 this a leverage point? Let's only - let's make the RFP  
24 targeted toward career and tech -- technical education  
25 support for teachers and students and let's not include



1 healthy students and well-rounded education which strike me  
2 as very ambiguous categories. But maybe that's not a  
3 leverage point. I mean, how can we think about targeting  
4 these funds, so they could actually address issues in  
5 Colorado that we care about because it's just more and more  
6 and more in this statute. Is -- is, you know, sometimes  
7 subtraction is better than addition --

8 MR. CHAPMAN: So is the --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- We have discretion to  
10 subtract, so let's pin point these areas.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: As a theme, so with regard to  
12 supporting students, the reason that sort of a new theme  
13 and -- and hasn't necessarily been present is that we do  
14 have the option of reserving some of our Title I funds to  
15 make grants available that where there is a direct  
16 connection to good things for students, whether it's  
17 concurrent enrollment or AP -- AP exam fees, those kinds of  
18 things. And so there- - there hasn't necessarily been that  
19 kind of grant in -- in ESEA in the past where there are --  
20 those direct connections that you can apply for a grant to  
21 -- to do some specific things for some specific.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Good and finish Dr.  
23 Scheffel, and then --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just wanna follow up but  
25 that's a small portion of the money. I'm just thinking



1 broadly speaking is a 500 page document with multiple  
2 attachments. Is there a way to tilt the writing of the  
3 plan, so that it more -- in a more targeted way addresses  
4 things that we care about that we haven't been able to  
5 touch?

6 MR. CHAPMAN: And I think --

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so I'm just saying when I  
8 look at those themes, some of them strike me as very  
9 ambiguous. Others if they're defined properly, might make  
10 a difference. This is a lot of money, \$150 million; am I  
11 right?

12 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, for Title I.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: For Title I.

14 MR. CHAPMAN: And so with the themes I think  
15 that what we're trying to do is enable those who are  
16 applying for the funds to understand that those are  
17 allowable uses of the funds. So if they did want to  
18 implement a strategy and support of a well -- more well-  
19 rounded education or healthy students or supports for --  
20 supports for students or career tech ed that they would be  
21 -- that they would be allowed to do so, that those are  
22 eligible activities for them to use their funds if their  
23 local needs assessment suggests that it's a good idea that  
24 they do that.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, they're allowed by the  
2 feds but I mean, I'm just looking at our decision making in  
3 this case.

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Can we -- can we narrow the  
5 focus?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: We wanna narrow it's just to  
7 say yes, these are allowable but as a state we've  
8 identified these priorities, let's ask that -- that schools  
9 really target their RFP and the way RFP is written.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: And I think that is --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't know but I'm just --  
12 there might be a way to ensure the money makes them better  
13 difference?

14 MR. CHAPMAN: -- and that's sort of the  
15 sweet spot that I think we're trying to find as is being  
16 prescriptive and -- and -- and applying some rigor to the  
17 release of funds so that we -- to help ensure that the  
18 funds actually make a difference for students but at the  
19 same time recognizing local control in that decision --  
20 decision making process. So it's more prescriptive on --  
21 on the one hand but also acknowledging local control on the  
22 other.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

24 MS. FLORES: Well, in adding to that  
25 targeted, you know, area I think that we kind of know that



1 we have this gap that's growing. I mean, Colorado used to  
2 be at a point at one time when that gap was hardly  
3 noticeable but yet here we have this gap that's growing and  
4 growing. And this money should be and we should say it  
5 loud and clear that that money is for those kids that are  
6 not doing well and -- and to close that gap and we should  
7 do everything possible. I mean, if we're talking -- this  
8 is equity money. This is equity money to get those kids  
9 who are poor, who are minority, who are second language  
10 learners to get them to be at the level where everybody  
11 else is, to -- to equalize it. And so this is equity money  
12 for equalization. And I think that, you know, we're going  
13 into all of this if we did those things that would close  
14 that gap, smaller classes for those kids, getting  
15 counselors, getting people that are social workers for --  
16 for those kids. I mean, we know what it takes and what to  
17 do for those kids. We're not talking about any of those  
18 things. And I think that we need to talk about those  
19 strategies and make districts aware of the strategies that  
20 will close that gap. And I think that's what the \$150 --  
21 150 -- \$150 million are for and I think that the state  
22 needs to do everything possible if those \$150 million are  
23 not enough to further work. I know we have a legislator  
24 here and I hope he's hearing that we -- that we need to --





1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Welcome representative  
2 Rankin.

3 MS. FLORES: -- and I know he's here.

4 MR. CHAPMAN: And I think that's exactly the  
5 approach that we're trying to take is to identify those  
6 best practices, identify those ways that you can use these  
7 funds together or -- or in isolation of one another in  
8 support of good things for students and to help school  
9 districts those who are making decisions about how to spend  
10 their money, and the vast majority of the funds do flow  
11 through to the school districts to help them make the best  
12 possible decision. So if they're spending those funds on  
13 the right, you know, for the right thing at the right time  
14 for the right purpose.

15 MS. FLORES: And I think this document, 100  
16 pages should be towards those strategies that are going to,  
17 you know, get that gap, close that gap and we're not --  
18 we're not closing it. And when we say money doesn't make a  
19 -- a difference, we know money does make a difference. We  
20 wanna spend that money wisely and target it towards those  
21 individuals that will get them up and I hope that we do  
22 that.

23 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

24 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: I do, too.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think Mr. Chapman, I  
2 think we are gonna have to wrap this up and it's  
3 unfortunate we'll have to figure out how to catch up on the  
4 balance but I do agree with Dr. Flores in -- in this that,  
5 you know, what are we held accountable for? As a practical  
6 matter, we're held accountable for educational outcomes and  
7 specifically we're held accountable for math, science, and  
8 English or language proficiency, that's specifically what I  
9 think we're held accountable for. Therefore, I think  
10 that's what the districts are held accountable for -- for  
11 the use of these funds. So having things in here like make  
12 students feel better somehow about themselves; a, it's  
13 hard to measure and b, it's an easy -- it's an easy out for  
14 not doing hard work, for not producing outcomes. And I  
15 think we ought to bleed all of that stuff out of these  
16 applications, it may be permitted by federal law but it's  
17 something we don't have to consider. And there's a  
18 difference between permitted and required. And I think we  
19 ought to wanna go through every one of these and- and, you  
20 know, it may be a permitted use but the one thing we  
21 mentioned in our -- in our submission and the only we -- we  
22 encourage the districts to do is to pound away the  
23 educational outcome.

24                   I mean, that's -- we're just not doing our  
25 job and we're failing our kids if we're worried about the



1 peripherals. And every time- - every time we deal with  
2 healthy this and healthy that, that's all nice and it would  
3 be great if we had all the money in the world, we don't.  
4 So I think when we get to the decision points, let's make  
5 sure we bled out as much of this what I consider to be  
6 superfluous kinds of commentary and words and goals, and  
7 let's focus on what we are being held accountable for and  
8 let's try and hold those who receive these funds  
9 accountable for the same things. I think we need to head  
10 in that direction. So not everyone's gonna be happy about  
11 what's ex -- about what's excluded but unless there's a  
12 different point of view on the Board I think we'd like to  
13 see that, I'd certainly like to see that focus. And I  
14 think that's needs to be the objective. Ms. Goff?

15 MS. GOFF: Well, you're gonna -- you're  
16 gonna hear a different point of view that at least does not  
17 -- what's different about my point of view is that the way  
18 you just expressed this is highly, highly irritating. To  
19 cause -- to -- to turn something about kids help and that  
20 doesn't mean just the physical and the obvious factors of  
21 that. I don't know how we can deal with a certain group of  
22 kids who are in -- living life in some extremely  
23 challenging circumstances to begin with including the  
24 physical. You cannot -- you cannot expect academic  
25 achievement to just overnight appear and make a big mark on



1 them and your are -- your are meaning us, the gap that we  
2 experience with student outcomes, which I'm assuming today,  
3 Mr. Chair, you're referring to the academic outcomes of  
4 scores and the -- and just the basic academic achievement.

5 I don't know how we're gonna talk to a  
6 community if we try to submit a plan that says, you know,  
7 we consider bleeding out things like some mental health ass  
8 -- assistance for these kids. Who are among many of the  
9 sectors of that population impacted heavily by certain  
10 trauma that is occurring in their lives and as a result of  
11 our decision making points here. I'm -- I'm distressed  
12 that this Board would be sending a message that we consider  
13 things superfluous and it's necessary to bleed them out.  
14 I'm -- I'm trusting and I do believe that the constituency  
15 out there does not see it as that superfluous to be  
16 concerned about the opportunity for local districts and for  
17 us as a state to apply for money that is available. And  
18 that we don't appear to be trusting them enough to figure  
19 out how is that going to be working best in their  
20 communities.

21 And I'm not talking any particular in the  
22 economic level here, I think that applies across the Board.  
23 There are certain needs that districts would like to  
24 pursue. I understand and accept because I do believe it's  
25 important that the majority of this Title I and -- and the



1 ESSA application applies to kids in need. And so what does  
2 it take to put -- what we need all the way around, a little  
3 bit bigger picture here, to satisfy some of the needs they  
4 have that will lead them to do better at school? I'm just  
5 one of those people that believes that your -- your  
6 environment, your -- your health habits, the attitude about  
7 health, and maintaining a healthy lifestyle is something  
8 that pervades families for the most part. Not enough of  
9 our kids have that -- that advantage of having a family who  
10 is completely aware and given access to information. I'm -  
11 - I'm quite disturbed by the way that was just phrased and  
12 I -- I would not be too proud of my state or my -- my  
13 message as a state board member if words like -- if the  
14 attitude is to bleed out and -- and term superfluous. So  
15 I'm not ready to end this conversation now.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, I'm not either  
17 because since the institution of No Child Left Behind,  
18 we've had almost zero progress academically and -- and  
19 we've made almost zero progress in closing achievement  
20 gaps. And I think it's in large measure because we  
21 envision schools as being all things to all people and  
22 providing all services. If there are mental health needs,  
23 they should be provided by the Department of Health and  
24 those should be funded separately from educational efforts.  
25 Our job is to provide quality education. Our job is -- it



1 should be the job of those agencies charged with -- with  
2 health concerns to provide for, develop those standards,  
3 and deliver those funds. What we have done is we have made  
4 the educational effort very diffuse and we have diverted  
5 resources from outcomes, from educational outcomes to  
6 outcomes that should be funded and identified for what they  
7 are which is programs that belong elsewhere.

8           And we can continue down the path we've been  
9 on for the last 15 years, where we don't improve outcomes  
10 and where we don't narrow the achievement gaps or we could  
11 think about trying something different. And I for one I'm  
12 willing to admit that, not to admit but simply to state  
13 that the federal programs have by enlarge failed, they've  
14 failed. You look at their objectives, there is no result.  
15 Are we gonna just say, well, let's just go right ahead and  
16 let's keep doing it. No reason to change anything. So  
17 yes, I'm more than happy to have this debate. And -- and I  
18 -- as far as I'm concerned, we need to focus on educational  
19 outcomes. And I have to agree with Dr. Flores that, you  
20 know, reducing class sizes for at risk kids is something  
21 that actually can produce a very positive result but if we  
22 wanna divert resources to feel good things, we can do that,  
23 too.

24           MS. GOFF: I don't think we're having a  
25 debate. I certainly don't see it that way. I just see it



1 as something that has got to be considered from the -- the  
2 viewpoints within which we all deal. One of them is the  
3 state viewpoint and we're- - we're actually a little subset  
4 of that whole thing ourselves. There is a local viewpoint.  
5 There is a school viewpoint. And frankly, these days  
6 there's a home viewpoint and a lot of children do not have  
7 the advantage of the majority those viewpoints in their  
8 access to find out what -- what would work, what would be  
9 better. I don't wanna get into the weeds on that point.  
10 I'm just -- I'm just concerned that if we approach this as,  
11 and I do actually, I probably agree with more with what you  
12 said than you wanna think right now.

13 Yes, we do need to do something about  
14 achievement. We've got to move things along faster. We've  
15 been aware that this has been -- we've been stagnant, it's  
16 doesn't feel good for the last seven, eight years, it's  
17 really become obvious. So what is it about? We have -- we  
18 believe we have good teaching going on. We believe we have  
19 strong school communities. We believe we have access to  
20 great resources. We believe we are moving ahead with our -  
21 - our professional development endeavors but that -- that  
22 works better. I'll just put it this way. All of that  
23 becomes more effective and works better if you've got some  
24 basic human conditions being addressed, it just seems to go



1 together better. I do think that as far as this grant and  
2 this part of the ESSA application process and so on.

3                   If the money is there, I -- I totally  
4 encourage us to take part in it. Well, I don't want to see  
5 something happening out here that we're considering just  
6 withdrawing from every opportunity, that'll not be good.  
7 But on the other hand, I -- I was just having a hard time.  
8 My brain doesn't work that way. I don't see how they don't  
9 all interconnect. What we have to do is find better ways  
10 to spend the money, and be a little bit smarter about our  
11 integration of those -- those funds. That's what I think  
12 our challenge is. It's spent better, spent smart.

13                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We need to conclude, so  
14 Ms. Rankin has had not an opportunity to speak on the  
15 subject, we'll let her close, and we'll come back to this  
16 at a future date. Ms. Rankin.

17                   MS. RANKIN: Mr. Chapman, thank you. Thank  
18 you for this report. Thank you for what you do. Thank you  
19 for ESSA committee, and condensing this 500 pages to 100  
20 pages. I'd like to just go back, and touch again on what  
21 Chairman Durham said about defining our responsibility, and  
22 our accountability to this process, and when we keep that  
23 in mind, we -- we meet to come up from some of the depth of  
24 these reports to really look at it, and see, you know, what  
25 -- where are these decision making points for us, and how





1 do we go about doing that in -- in the right way? I also  
2 would like the next time we have a meeting, if there's  
3 anything that is overly discussed at some of these  
4 junctures of these reports by the stakeholders, if you  
5 would bring that up sometimes we get the -- the summary but  
6 then there's one issue, or something that, and I -- I know  
7 what these issues are because these are the same  
8 stakeholders that call us, or e-mail us, and tell us what's  
9 on their mind. So maybe just an overview, I -- I don't  
10 mean every comment there is but one, or two, or whatever  
11 that strikes you as a real concern of the stakeholders  
12 that, you know, we may have to address it at a future date.  
13 But -- but those are my kind of main points of -- of what  
14 happened today, and again thank you for that report.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, and we'll -- we'll  
16 do that.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chapman, we  
18 appreciate it, and we'll get together, and talk about how  
19 to conclude with the parts we didn't get to. We'll now  
20 proceed to item 5.01, update on the Governor's budget  
21 proposal. Ms. Emm are you -- you responsible for this?  
22 Not for the Governor's budget but --

23 MS. EMM: Oh my! Thank you. Jeff Lanford,  
24 Leanne Emm presenting, and Jeff Lanford is also here. He's  
25 our CFO, and he can fill in any gaps that I might have. So



1 briefly I'm going to focus on the school finance portion of  
2 the Governor's budget request. As you all know it's one of  
3 the largest line items in the state's budget, and so where  
4 we are at is that the request estimates that the Total  
5 Program for -- for school districts would increase by  
6 approximately \$218 million, and the Total Program is  
7 generated through the School Finance Act. School Finance  
8 Act basically attempts to equalize funding due to  
9 demographics of districts, and various things that  
10 districts experience with their populations. So with that,  
11 it would increase funding for Total Program by \$218  
12 million, of which \$170 million of that would be funded  
13 through the local share which would be property, taxes, and  
14 specific ownership taxes, and then a \$48 million increase  
15 to the state share.

16 Inflation is based at 2.7 percent, and this  
17 is based on the office of state planning, and budgetings,  
18 economic forecast. That 2.7 percent is applied to base  
19 funding per pupil, and then factors are applied to that  
20 base funding. Growth in students is about 8,100, students  
21 about 0.94 percent a little less than one percent. At risk  
22 students would -- are estimated to grow by about 2,900  
23 students about a little less than one percent. And I want  
24 to compare this to if we were to fully fund growth, and  
25 inflation for students, it would cost approximately \$263



1 million. But since we -- since the state is saying we  
2 cannot afford that full amount of funding of the \$263  
3 million, then what they -- what this request also proposes  
4 is to increase the negative factor by about \$45 million  
5 also. So that -- that's kind of the balancing act there,  
6 that if we were to fully fund growth, and inflation, \$263  
7 million. But the state is saying, "We can't afford that so  
8 we're going to increase the negative factor by -- to about  
9 876 million."

10                   That will take a statutory change, because  
11 right now statute does say that the negative factor will  
12 not increase from the year before. So that will take a --  
13 a statutory change. The per pupil state-wide average, per  
14 pupil funding under this scenario would increase by about  
15 2.5 percent, or about \$182 per student, and you have on  
16 your board documents a spreadsheet that illustrates the  
17 district-by-district comparison on this, and the -- the  
18 orange columns on your document would illustrate what --  
19 what has been appropriated for this year, and then the blue  
20 columns illustrate what the projection is under the  
21 Governor's proposal, and then finally there's estimated  
22 changes in the white columns.

23                   So every district except for a few would see  
24 a change in their per pupil funding under this proposal  
25 which would increase their funding. There are a few



1 districts that decline. However, it -- they are not very  
2 many, and those are pretty much usually due to the increase  
3 in the negative factor when they have large per pupil  
4 funding amounts, and we could -- if you have questions on  
5 that I'm -- I'm happy to look at that. I know our time is  
6 short so with that I would ask if you have any questions  
7 around Total Program Funding under the Governor's proposal.  
8 And keep in mind this is all going to change by -- by the  
9 time May comes around, this will change.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Will be unrecognizable.  
11 Yes, any questions from members of the board on -- on Total  
12 Program Funding? Can I say none? Do you have a -- we had  
13 I think two, or three items we requested.

14 MS. EMM: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Legal fees, and I'm trying  
16 to remember the others but could you update us on what the  
17 Governor recommended any of those, and where we stand?

18 MS. EMM: Yes. All of the requests that you  
19 all had seen were also included, so that did include staff  
20 support for the concurrent enrollment program, so that is  
21 included. There is also --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There was one FTE?

23 MS. EMM: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.



1 MS. EMM: And actually it's a 0.9. They  
2 took it to a 0.9.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect.

4 MS. EMM: So I -- I don't know where we --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Will find someone.

6 MS. EMM: You know.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

8 MS. EMM: And then also for the -- the to  
9 revise the state standards. That was approximately  
10 \$340,000 that was submitted, and then the increased legal  
11 costs, and also the school, and the deaf, and the blind --  
12 for the school of the deaf, and the blind they had  
13 requested an increase to cover salary increases there.  
14 Those were all included, and then we also had the  
15 categorical program requests, that is a typical request.  
16 We have to per amendment 23 those programs increased by  
17 inflation. So that was submitted. Also --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: When you say submitted,  
19 submitted by the Governor to the legislature or --

20 MS. EMM: Yes, and we actually do that  
21 submission for that proposed increase, and then the  
22 Governor's office did. Also --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That they agreed.

24 MS. EMM: Yeah -- yeah, they agreed with it.  
25 One other thing that the -- that the Governor's office had



1 put into the department's request was an expansion of the  
2 school health professional grant by \$9.7 million. This is  
3 due to increases in the marijuana -- Marijuana Tax Cash  
4 Fund, and the Governor's office -- we did not ask for this  
5 request but the Governor's office did put this into the  
6 department's proposal, and this is an expansion of the  
7 grant which would potentially put 150 additional school  
8 health professional -- health professionals into secondary  
9 schools. It's an expansion of an existing program.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, and do you have  
11 enough top with the permissible uses of that 9.7 million,  
12 or could it be used to buy down the negative factor for  
13 example?

14 MS. EMM: If the -- if the legislators  
15 wanted to use that Marijuana Cash Fund in order to buy down  
16 the negative factor, there might be some strings from a  
17 constitutional standpoint that -- the -- if the uses are  
18 specific --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: To the use for capital  
20 construction.

21 MS. EMM: The capital construction right now  
22 \$40 million is moved from the marijuana funds over into the  
23 best program, and that's in the Constitution that the first  
24 \$40 million of excise tax.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: They could move 49 if they  
2 want?

3 MS. EMM: I would have to check on the  
4 allowable uses (inaudible). I have somebody from the joint  
5 budget.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm just -- I'm just  
7 making I'm using this opportunity to make suggestions to  
8 the budget committee.

9 Yes. Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: So with this -- so with this  
12 9.7 million be used for nurses? Counselors?

13 MS. EMM: They could be, now this is one of  
14 those competitive grant programs. Schools would have to  
15 submit -- submit applications in order to receive a cut of  
16 that 9.7, and Misti Ruthven is here, and she has much more  
17 information about the specifics of the program.

18 MS. FLORES: But if we have 100 -- 179  
19 districts, and I don't know 150 professionals -- health  
20 professionals, I mean --

21 MS. EMM: They would -- would potentially go  
22 into secondary schools.

23 MS. FLORES: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's 150 more than we  
25 would have.



1 MS. FLORES: That's right. I like that.  
2 But I -- I like it where it is. Steve I -- I -- I -- I  
3 like it in the health because I mean if we take away  
4 Obamacare, we're going to need that in the schools.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, probably not right  
6 away anyway. Nothing removes that fast at the federal  
7 level. Okay. Any other questions for Ms. Emm on budget  
8 submission? All right thank you very much. Oh, I'm sorry.

9 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Emm, can you update us on  
10 Scirocco, and the situation there please?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. I'm sorry, I  
12 forgot.

13 MS. EMM: Yes. Thank you. So the South  
14 route county has received a payment from Peabody Mine at  
15 about \$1.8 million. The Treasurer is distributing those  
16 dollars to the taxing entities within the county, and we  
17 had an update from the school district that the checks will  
18 be ready at the county to pick up on the 10th today. So  
19 those -- and that's typical tax distribution day. And so  
20 South route will be receiving a portion of that at which  
21 time they'll be sending us back \$564,000 of that loan that  
22 they had received back in July, and August. So \$564,000 is  
23 representative of the '15-'16 taxes that were not paid back  
24 in April of this year. So that will be coming back to us.  
25 Thank you.





1 MS. FLORES: So we're not getting the  
2 million dollars back?

3 MS. EMM: The -- thank you. Dr. Flores, the  
4 school district had received a million dollars from us of  
5 which \$564,000 was for taxes that were not paid, and '15-  
6 '16 --

7 MS. FLORES: Oh, I see.

8 MS. EMM: -- and the remainder was basically  
9 in advance to the school district making the assumption  
10 that it may be difficult for them to get '16-'17 taxes  
11 also. However, Peabody is reorganizing, and attempting to  
12 restructure so that they are an ongoing, so that we won't  
13 have this problem again this next year but we'll have to  
14 wait, and see what happens with our tax collections in  
15 spring of '17.

16 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you very  
18 much.

19 MS. EMM: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further discussion?  
21 Anything else to come before the Board? Yes, Dr. Flores?

22 MS. FLORES: I'd like to ask that we be  
23 given at least 15 minutes to walk -- just to walk. I think  
24 we sit here all day long, and -- and -- and everything is



1 important that's presented. So just a human plea request  
2 to get up, and maybe walk around the block.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Do you want it as a  
4 group, or individually?

5 MS. FLORES: They could do something else  
6 but I'd like 15 minutes to walk. (Inaudible).

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That's -- that's --  
8 just I'm working on that right away. So all right no other  
9 business has come before the Board, and we'll -- we'll --  
10 we'll try, and do that. I think it we do need take a few  
11 more breaks than we have. We'll stand adjourned until 9:00  
12 a.m., Wednesday December 14th, 2016. Thank you.

13 (Meeting adjourned)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

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

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

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

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25