



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 11, 2015, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 11, 2015,
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: And so we will now proceed
2 to Item 1601, Notice of Rulemaking for the Administration
3 of the Exceptional Children's Education Act.

4 MS. BURDSALL: I'm ready.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the Notice
7 of Rulemaking Hearing to Amend the Rules for the
8 Administration of the Exceptional Children's Educational
9 Act.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that
11 motion?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved and
14 seconded that --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- that we approve the
17 Notice of Rulemaking. Dr. Asp do you wish to provide any
18 comment and or --

19 MR. ASP: Just to remind you that --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- commentary?

21 MR. ASP: -- this is for a Notice of
22 Rulemaking. Before we actually get into that process,
23 itself, I have Assistant Commissioner Randy Boyer here to
24 discuss this.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Boyer.



1 MR. BOYER: Chairman Durham, the State Board
2 Member is Dr. Asp. I'm Randy Boyer, Assistant
3 Commissioner for the Exceptional Student Services Unit
4 and State Director of Special Education. To my left is
5 Judy Stirman, Director of Facility Schools. We -- we are
6 here today to ask the State Board to Approve the Notice
7 of Rulemaking to Amend the Rules for the Administration
8 of the Exceptional Children's Educational Act.

9 An approval of the Notice of Rulemaking will
10 set the timeline for a hearing in the January State Board
11 meeting and a requested vote to approve the Rule changes
12 by the Board in February. We cannot request a hearing in
13 December due to the required number of days to post the
14 Notice. The Office of Legislative Legal Services
15 informed the Department that the current rules for the
16 administration of the Exceptional Children's Educational
17 Act do not align to statutory language regarding
18 applicable revenues for approved facility schools.
19 Current rules define applicable revenues as the state
20 average per pupil revenue.

21 Previous amendments to the Public School
22 Finance Act altered the formula for applicable rules for
23 approved facility schools to 173 percent of the state
24 average per pupil revenue. Current practices for -- for
25 applicable rules for approved facility schools in the



1 state share allocations are being based on the 173
2 percent of the state average PPR. We ask the Board to
3 approve our Notice of Rulemaking to correctly align
4 Sections 9.01(1)(a) through 9.03(2)(a)(b) of the Rules
5 for the Administration of the Exceptional Children's
6 Educational Act to the Colorado Revised Statutes Section
7 22-54-129(2)(c)(II). Mr. Chair, we would answer any
8 questions at this time.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: That was fascinating.

11 MR. BOYER: Thanks.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Essentially what you're
13 saying is that we've been doing it the right way, but in
14 the Rules it hasn't been stated properly?

15 MR. BOYER: Yes --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Is that right?

17 MR. BOYER: -- Ma'am. That is correct.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this is just a
23 housekeeping issue, basically.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kind of --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It is the result of some
2 changes in definitional or terms from the General
3 Assembly.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It does stem from
5 structural (ph) language that came from the General
6 Assembly.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions? The
8 motion -- if there is no -- no further discussion, the
9 motion before the Committee is the Approval of Notice of
10 Rulemaking. Is there objection to the adoption of that
11 motion? Seeing none, that motion is adopted unanimously.
12 Thank you very much.

13 MR. BOYER: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We will now proceed to
15 16.02 Recommendation for School Turnaround Leaders
16 Development Program.

17 MS. PEARSON: Good afternoon. Thanks. So
18 we've got two goals for our presentation today. Myself,
19 Alyssa Pearson, Interim Associate Commissioner for
20 Accountability for Department (ph) (Indiscernible), and
21 (Indiscernible), Executive Director of School District
22 Performance.

23 I'm here to talk to you about two things.
24 First, last month when we did the Notice of Rulemaking
25 for the Turnaround Leaders Rule, you all had some



1 questions about that program the (ph) students (ph). So
2 we wanted to come and address those and kind of give you
3 some context for the supports -- the school districts and
4 leaders supports that we offered at CDE (ph).

5 Second, we have some work to do today. You
6 all, by statute are asked or required to approve
7 providers to this program. So we've got two new
8 providers that have been through the recommendation
9 process -- through the grant process that are coming to
10 you today for formal approval.

11 MR. SHERMAN: Good afternoon.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Identify yourself, please.

13 MR. SHERMAN: Again, I'm Peter Sherman. I'm
14 the Executive Director here at CDE for School and
15 District Performance, for that unit.

16 With close to 80,000 students in Colorado
17 attending districts and schools that are not meeting the
18 state academic expectations, it's imperative that we
19 provide leadership and support to those schools. This
20 slide is an overview of some of the supports that exist
21 in our division at the district level, at the school
22 level, and at the individual leader level.

23 Today we are focusing on one state-
24 legislated program HB14-124 of the State Turnaround
25 Leaders Development Program. This program establishes



1 two grants. One grant is to identify providers of high-
2 quality turnaround leadership development. Some of these
3 providers will require funding to develop their programs
4 and some will not require funding. And the second grant
5 is to identify participating participants serving
6 priority improvement or turnaround schools and to support
7 their choice of turnaround leadership training.

8 Per the state program, CDE's role is to
9 recommend providers for your approval and participants
10 and to manage the grant program, and your role as a state
11 Board is to approve providers and participants.

12 This slide describes the timeline of the
13 program and when certain decision points occur. Last
14 winter this Board approved funding for five provider
15 organizations as well as for 87 participants from eight
16 different districts. Today we're recommending as Ms.
17 Pearson said, two additional programs for your approval,
18 and I'll describe these programs in more detail in a few
19 minutes.

20 This grant program is impacting about 26,000
21 Colorado students that are being served by leaders that
22 are trained in these identified provider programs. And
23 46 schools and eight urban, suburban, and rural districts
24 are benefiting from the training. Per statute and rule,
25 the following criteria were used to identify provider



1 organizations: Providers experience in developing
2 successful and effective leadership in low-performing
3 schools and districts; the leadership qualities that the
4 provider's expected to develop. These are tied to our
5 Colorado Principal Quality Standards; the provider's
6 capacity to implement the program that they propose; and
7 the availability of providers to be able to serve
8 throughout the state.

9 Providers are selected to ensure that we
10 have programs to serve leaders in rural, mountain,
11 suburban, and metro areas, also to be able serve teacher
12 leaders, aspiring leaders, principals, district
13 supervisors, and support staff, as well as to
14 serve -- specifically to serve underperforming students
15 such as English language learners, special education
16 students, or students that are living in poverty,

17 These providers deliver training in
18 multiple -- via multiple methods: through on-site
19 courses and coaching; through clinical experiences and
20 residencies; through regional and centralized gatherings;
21 and through individualized experiences and networking.

22 This is the third round of provider RFPs
23 that we've gone through. In total, 24 providers have
24 applied and eight have been approved or recommended for
25 approval.



1 The next three slides describe the programs
2 that are offered by the five approved providers from last
3 year. Your handouts also include our report from the
4 first year of this program, and within that report are
5 more detailed descriptions of these providers beyond
6 what's on these slides.

7 So currently the identified providers
8 include these providers, and I can speak more in detail
9 about any of these if you'd like: The University of
10 Denver; the University of Virginia; Catapult School
11 Leadership; the Relay Graduate School of Education and
12 their Principal Program; and Generation Schools Network.

13 MS. FLORES: I'd like you to speak on three.
14 May I?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, (Indiscernible).

16 MS. FLORES: And, especially, Relay, because
17 I received a -- the community received information of
18 research that had been done. It was published in a
19 neighborhood newspaper, and there were lots of questions
20 that just -- and then I talked to people who called me,
21 people who emailed me --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

23 MS. FLORES: -- who had a lot of concerns,
24 especially about Relay, because it's a very short
25 program. And, you know, my -- my big concern is that



1 you're putting these -- these people who are going to be
2 trained in schools where they are turnaround, and usually
3 those schools have kids that are the most vulnerable
4 kids. And we should have the best and more experienced
5 people in those schools as opposed to somebody who goes
6 for six weeks and gets training and then gets placed in
7 these schools. It just doesn't seem fair for these kids
8 who really need to have -- and the teachers really need
9 to have great guidance into how to turn these schools
10 around. And it doesn't seem to me that a six-weeks'
11 program is going to do it for -- for teachers or for the
12 kids in those schools.

13 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. Relay is -- their title
14 is the Relay Graduate School of Education. They
15 originated in the east coast, and they have been
16 providing services here in Colorado for the last, I
17 think, year-and-a-half, and their intention is to
18 continue to do that. The program that we identified last
19 year that your -- that you all approved is what they call
20 the National Principal, I think, Academy Fellowship, --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

22 MR. SHERMAN: -- if I'm getting that right.
23 It's -- it's a training program for both aspiring and for
24 existing principals. So these are folks that are working
25 in schools currently that are licensed and that are



1 experienced leaders.

2 MS. FLORES: But not all of them are. Not
3 all of them are licensed, and that's my concern. In
4 placing such individuals in these schools where they
5 really need seasoned people who understand curricula and
6 who understand how to deal with teachers.

7 For instance, I think that one of the big
8 problems that I've -- I've heard from teachers and from
9 seasoned teachers about what happens to new teachers is
10 that they get in trouble for -- well, it may be that
11 they're Teach for America people that only have a few
12 weeks of training, themselves, but then they don't have
13 really an idea of what school is about. They get in
14 trouble because of -- of what I would call little rules
15 that then escalate into bigger rules because the
16 administrator doesn't know how to deal with the training
17 that should go on after, you know, that infraction or so.

18 MR. SHERMAN: Again, I think what Relay
19 offers -- I mean, one of the reasons that they were
20 identified and approved for this program is because
21 they -- they provide very practical and very tactical
22 training for school leaders. Their training is -- the
23 training that they offer -- it's -- there's a two-week
24 intensive session during the summer, and then there are
25 four what they call intersessions, which are weekend



1 courses, throughout the school year, --

2 MS. FLORES: My point.

3 MR. SHERMAN: -- and Relay provides ongoing
4 training throughout the year for those folks. These are
5 not necessarily inexperienced leaders that are attending
6 Relay. Relay serves folks from a variety of different
7 schools, whether they be charter schools or district
8 schools.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Asp.

10 MS. FLORES: I keep seeing them --

11 MR. ASP: I just had a comment -- a
12 clarification for you, Mr. Sherman. My understanding is
13 districts choose which of these programs they want to be
14 involved in, and they decide who goes to the training.
15 That's not something that CDE decides? Am I correct on
16 that?

17 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

18 MR. ASP: Okay. So whether or not they're
19 experienced --

20 MS. FLORES: Right, but -- but --

21 MR. ASP: -- or inexperienced --

22 MS. FLORES: -- we approve -- we approve
23 these programs that are six weeks -- six-week programs or
24 six-weekend programs, and I think we -- we need to be
25 more --



1 MS. PEARSON: We're not giving them license
2 (Indiscernible).

3 MS. FLORES: We just need -- we need not
4 approve six-week programs is, I guess, my -- my point.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson, do you have a
6 comment?

7 MS. PEARSON: Sure. I was just going to
8 clarify. This isn't like a Teach for America program
9 where people are getting placed into a job --

10 MS. FLORES: I know.

11 MS. PEARSON: -- with that. So it's -- it's
12 giving them extra support in professional development
13 that's a little more job-embedded, but it's not giving
14 them the licensure and saying they're certified to be a
15 principal of a Turnaround School.

16 MS. FLORES: But they --

17 MS. PEARSON: It's just on top of it.

18 MS. FLORES: -- they're still placed in
19 those schools -- just as Teach for America. People
20 are -- do not have -- they're not certified but yet their
21 placed.

22 MR. SHERMAN: If -- if I could clarify this
23 grant -- this grant program and the process that we go
24 through, we have two different RFPs or two are (ph)
25 different applications. One, as I said earlier, is for



1 provider organizations, which is what we are here for
2 today and which we went -- came to you twice last year to
3 approve five different organizations that provide the
4 training. And then what would happen next, potentially
5 next week, is that we'll release an application out to
6 all of the eligible districts out there that have schools
7 that are in priority improvement or turnaround, and as
8 Dr. Asp said, those districts, then, can select from
9 those providers that we've approved and can apply for
10 certain training for any number of leaders in their
11 district. But that's entirely their choice. That's
12 not --

13 MS. FLORES: Well --

14 MR. SHERMAN: -- something that's our
15 choice.

16 MS. FLORES: We're -- we're approving
17 programs. We should -- we should be -- the state Board
18 should be approving people -- people who have shown a
19 track record that they can turn schools around. And
20 programs are not people, again. I think we should
21 understand that, and -- and certainly I'm -- I'm -- the
22 reason I'm concerned is because it's my community, and
23 that's where this happens. And so my community is -- or
24 communities in my area are not being served.

25 This is where we have a lot of children that



1 are -- are not proficient. They are in -- in limbo
2 sometimes, and especially when the chaos of the -- the
3 changes. We have these -- these people who come in for
4 15 hundred dollars a day and to train -- who actually
5 don't have experience in what goes on in schools. And
6 I -- I'm sorry, but we can't do this to children. We
7 just can't. It's -- it's -- it's immoral, really. This
8 is -- I'm sorry.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well maybe are you asking how
11 are these entities recommended? So you must use some
12 kind of vetting process, such that they end up on a list
13 that you're recommended to us. That's your question,
14 Val, which is --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right. Are
16 they --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- how do they end up here?
18 Can you -- do you look at the type of consultants that
19 would be hired by these entities to do the coaching --

20 MS. FLORES: And they go around the
21 country --

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- and the type of
23 experiences that they have. I mean, I think that's kind
24 of what you're asking.

25 MS. FLORES: That's -- that's right.



1 Because I don't think they have the experience to be in
2 turnaround schools -- schools that are in
3 trouble -- schools that are not performing -- schools
4 where you need really seasoned, experienced people, and
5 we should be identifying those people at the state to
6 provide districts with that. We shouldn't be providing
7 programs for them. We should be providing people for
8 them.

9 MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

11 MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely. The -- the whole
12 reason that this program -- grant program exists is
13 because we have 190 schools across the state that are in
14 priority improvement -- are in turnaround. We have a lot
15 of schools with students that are not being served in the
16 way that they need. And so the -- the purpose of this
17 grant program is to really raise the bar and to be able
18 to have more leaders out there that are qualified to be
19 able to serve in the schools and the particular
20 challenges that those turnaround environments entail.

21 We do go through, Dr. Scheffel to your
22 question, we do go through our competitive grants process
23 as do -- as are many other grants in the department, as
24 you know. And this -- the -- the providers that have
25 gone through here are vetted by teams of folks that read



1 the applications that are submitted. There's a -- a
2 scoring rubric that's -- that, of course, we -- we abide
3 by, and only the providers that are -- earn enough points
4 in that process are recommended for funding. So Relay
5 certainly had gone -- went through that process last
6 year, and as you'll see there, --

7 MS. FLORES: And --

8 MR. SHERMAN: -- one of the
9 additional -- one of the additional --

10 MS. FLORES: And Peter, --

11 MR. SHERMAN: -- recommendations.

12 MS. FLORES: -- how many administrators do
13 we have that really have been through -- come through as
14 principals and have been trained and as superintendents
15 and such. How many of those people do these people
16 employ? What would be a typical --

17 MR. SHERMAN: I would --

18 MS. FLORES: -- employee?

19 MR. SHERMAN: -- yeah, I would have to get
20 back to you about the number of folks that are employed
21 at Relay. Certainly, hear your -- your feedback, and I
22 would be happy to share more details about that.

23 MS. FLORES: Well we -- from, you know, the
24 word out there in my district is that they're not
25 experienced. They have not had the -- the -- they're not



1 certified principals. They're not certified
2 superintendents. They have not -- they've been around in
3 other districts, but their one-day, one-thousand-dollar-,
4 15-hundred-dollar-a-day people that go about and show
5 them how to be --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The superintendent?
7 Are you talking about the --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

9 MS. FLORES: I'm talking about the people
10 that these people hire to go into turnaround schools.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh.

12 MS. FLORES: They are not seasoned,
13 experienced individuals, and, you know, I mean, we
14 just -- we read proposals -- we haven't even read the
15 proposals. I mean, you should be able to give us a
16 person or others (ph) --

17 MR. SHERMAN: I -- I -- I can answer --

18 MS. FLORES: (Indiscernible) are they
19 principals, --

20 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

21 MS. FLORES: -- are they --

22 MR. SHERMAN: Sure, happy to answer that. I
23 mean, I think if you look at all of the providers that
24 we've approved and those that apply, they have a -- they
25 have a wide array of different qualifications and



1 experiences. Part of the application process is that we
2 ask for resumes and qualifications from the people that
3 would be running those programs and implementing and
4 providing the training. I know for -- for example, with
5 the Relay program, there's a gentleman named Paul
6 Bambrick-Santoyo who was a school leader and then became
7 a supervisor of a number of schools -- of a network of
8 schools who's written a number of books, --

9 MS. FLORES: Well, see -- number of --

10 MR. SHERMAN: -- and he --

11 MS. FLORES: -- books, a number of schools.

12 That's not one single school that they're going to
13 turnaround, and that's my concern.

14 MR. SHERMAN: He does have experience
15 turning around schools. We'd be happy to -- I'd be happy
16 to share more information with you in the future, and
17 we -- happy to gather more details (Indiscernible).

18 MS. FLORES: I'd like to read the RFP, --

19 MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely. Happy to provide
20 that (Indiscernible).

21 MS. FLORES: -- on Relay and those other
22 three.

23 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So if I understand it,
25 the --



1 MS. FLORES: And I don't think we should be
2 deciding (Indiscernible).

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- the issue is not with
4 the people receiving the instruction who are already
5 district employees, it involved already employed by the
6 schools that are in turnaround status, but that the
7 consultants that -- that are made available through a
8 particular provider may or may not have met an
9 appropriate set of criteria, and your job is to -- is to
10 review the criteria of the -- to review the resumes of
11 the employees of these providers and ensure that
12 these -- these resumes -- or that these people then have
13 qualifications necessary to actually be successful in
14 assisting a turnaround. And so I think the -- part of
15 the question is a -- one of practical experience, if I
16 understand Dr. Flores' comments --

17 MS. FLORES: That's correct.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- one of practical
19 experience of being involved in turnaround and a more,
20 shall we say, academic approach to turnaround, and I
21 think what you should be encouraged to do is -- is make
22 sure that, in addition to academic qualifications, that
23 there is practical experience on the part of the --

24 MS. FLORES: And years (ph).-

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- individual's setting



1 and perhaps experience that fits the location to which
2 they are being sent, in terms of disadvantaged students
3 and that sort of thing. And so I think --

4 MS. FLORES: They are.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- I think you need to
6 monitor that and be able to assure us that you're
7 monitoring that in an appropriate fashion, and that you
8 believe that the contractors are measuring up and, in
9 fact, meeting the provisions of the RFP.

10 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you -- happy to do that,
11 and we can provide you more information. And part of
12 our -- part of our management job in this grant program
13 is to assess each of the organizations each year and the
14 work that they do if leaders.

15 MS. FLORES: And do we have to approve
16 this -- this time, before reading those RFPs?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What's -- what's are
18 timeline on this, for you to be able to have these grants
19 ready to go? Are you --

20 MR. SHERMAN: We are asking for your
21 approval today, because we are queued-up to send out the
22 participant RFP out to about 53 different districts,
23 which we would like to do next week, and part of that is
24 that they need to know which providers are identified
25 such that there can be funding for those.



1 MS. FLORES: And, you know, that this Board
2 did not hear the -- before. Maybe the past Board did
3 hear testimony on these programs, but I don't think this
4 year we've heard anything on this.

5 MR. SHERMAN: We --

6 MS. FLORES: From January to now, I have not
7 heard anything about this.

8 MR. SHERMAN: -- we did. I thought -- I
9 don't know the exact date, but the -- the first
10 round -- the providers were approved -- I believe it was
11 in January or February of 2015. I -- I can find out the
12 exact date, but I'm --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they -- they were
14 approved at an earlier Board meeting, and then -- yes,
15 Dr. Schroeder?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So what's a consequence of
17 putting this off a month?

18 MR. SHERMAN: If these -- if these
19 additional recommended providers are not approved today,
20 we will not include them in the participant RFP that goes
21 out.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that -- I think -- I
23 think I see two things -- three, sorry?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Three?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Three. One is provider



1 grants, one is participants, one is \$100,000 for
2 the -- for the Department.

3 MR. SHERMAN: These are funding lines, yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are funding
5 lines, and that's what you want us to vote on.

6 MR. SHERMAN: No, you -- the vote
7 today -- we're just asking for you to approve
8 two -- two --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two additional --

10 MR. SHERMAN: -- provider programs that we
11 will speak to -- that -- which we haven't gotten to yet.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: When we --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- when we talk about
15 those two new programs.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, so sorry.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then we'll proceed
18 after you've had a chance to talk about the two programs.

19 MR. SHERMAN: Sure. I'm going to skip ahead
20 to -- whoops, I skipped too far ahead. There we go.

21 So the -- these are highlights of the two
22 providers that are recommended for your approval today.
23 As you recall, again, that you had -- that your -- your
24 role is to provide the providers for this program. So
25 one of which is the Relay Graduate School of Education.



1 They became an approved provider last year for their
2 principal training program, for which they did not
3 request any funding. Relay applied again for funds this
4 year to build on their expanding training program for
5 principal supervisors. So those folks in districts that
6 directly supervise and manage principals.

7 This program will support principal
8 managers to learn and receive about ongoing, targeted
9 feedback on their own work, because they supervise
10 principals throughout the year. Participants in that
11 Relay program would attend the two-week intensive
12 training in the summer plus ongoing support and seminars
13 throughout the year, to include in-person and virtual
14 coaching.

15 The other organization is -- is a
16 partnership between an organization called Promethean and
17 the University of Florida, and they're requesting funding
18 to develop and adapt their turnaround leadership training
19 to meet the unique needs of Colorado -- leaders with an
20 emphasis on rural districts. Promethean's program will
21 serve teacher leaders, principals, and district support
22 staff. This one-year program will train instructional
23 leaders and teachers to develop instructional leadership
24 teams, focus on providing actionable feedback and data to
25 teachers. Structured leadership development activities



1 include coaching, and mentoring would also be provided.

2 MS. PEARSON: So if I can just clarify
3 process for you all a little bit. Providers apply to CDE
4 through an RFP process that is vetted through the CDE
5 competitive -- like a competitive grant process,
6 according to the criteria laid out in law (ph), which
7 includes the provider's experience in developing
8 successful, effective leadership in low-performing
9 schools and districts, who they need to show that they
10 have proven record of being able to do that; that their
11 leadership qualities that the providers are expected to
12 develop are aligned with Colorado Principal Quality
13 Standards, so we're sending one message about what we're
14 looking for -- for leaders in the state; and the
15 provider's capacity to implement their program and they
16 (Indiscernible) throughout the state.

17 So through that RFP process, those two
18 providers have been identified. The RFP process and all
19 the reviewers on that recommended those two for approval
20 and so then it's coming to you all to say, here's
21 the -- we've gone through the process, we've recommended
22 it, and would like your vote of support.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Would it be typical that part
25 of the funds would be used to help these entities develop



1 their programs? I mean, it seems to me that -- is that
2 normal use -- wouldn't it be a better use of funds if we
3 would go find folks that are already up and running and
4 they are --

5 MS. FLORES: (Indiscernible) kind of
6 experience --

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- have -- align (ph) to what
8 we need as opposed to hang (ph) to align.

9 MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Dr. Scheffel, just to
10 repeat what was on this slide. So, again, there are two
11 sides -- the big picture there are two sides to this
12 grant. One -- one grant goes to providers, the other
13 goes to participants.

14 On the provider side, which is what mostly
15 we're talking about today, our goal is to identify
16 providers that we believe meet all the criteria for this
17 grant program. Some of those providers come to us with
18 an application requesting funds to say, hey we are here,
19 we think with some development funds we can be here, and
20 that's the intent of the statute and how this grant
21 program was established.

22 Some providers come to us and say, we don't
23 need funds. We're already there. We already deliver
24 these programs. So, of the five programs that we
25 approved last year, Relay and the University of Virginia



1 were two that did not request any funding, because those
2 were -- those were training programs that they already
3 offered.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So are we helping these other
5 entities come up to speed because we want more
6 competition, or do we have the discretion to say we're
7 only going to fund entities that are already up to speed?
8 I mean, I'm just trying to --

9 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I haven't read -- read the
11 statute recently to look at the intention there.

12 MR. SHERMAN: The intention is to develop
13 more providers within the state of Colorado. I believe
14 that this is a capacity-building grant program.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: But they're not in Colorado.
16 One is with Florida, right?

17 MS. FLORES: Right.

18 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct, and -- and I
19 think that we've had applicants -- we've had a variety of
20 applicants, some from within the state and some from
21 without.

22 MS. FLORES: And you said that -- that the
23 Florida people were going to come in and work with rural
24 districts. So what experience does Florida have with
25 rural districts in -- here in Colorado?



1 MR. SHERMAN: So the Promethean
2 program -- there intent is, if they're approved, is to
3 hire local people -- Coloradans to work with Colorado
4 districts, but what Promethean and that University of
5 Florida program are doing is developing that program and,
6 again, adapting it to the Colorado context.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: So last year only 12 percent
8 of the funds went to providers -- 82 percent to
9 participants this year. With the proposal that we're
10 putting forth, it's only nine percent of funds for
11 provider for development programs.

12 MS. FLORES: And then if we look at the page
13 where the districts who are helping, these are districts
14 that really need help. They don't need people
15 experimenting on -- on programs. They really do need
16 principals -- they need superintendents to come in and
17 turn these schools around and help them turn these
18 schools around.

19 MR. SHERMAN: These --

20 MS. FLORES: Aurora --

21 MR. SHERMAN: -- this is the best (ph) of
22 the eight districts --

23 MS. FLORES: -- Denver public schools --

24 MR. SHERMAN: -- that were approved for
25 funding last year.



1 MS. FLORES: -- Pueblo -- those are all
2 districts that are underperforming.

3 MS. RANKIN: (Indiscernible)

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, I'm sorry.

5 MS. RANKIN: Joyce.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

7 MS. RANKIN: Four of these schools are in
8 my district. I visited one, spoke to the superintendent,
9 toured the school, talked to all the teachers. Another
10 one I have spoken to the superintendent within the last
11 three weeks, and I have -- what I've heard is -- I get
12 all the help I need from CDE, I'm terrified of going
13 through five years and not being able to turn this school
14 around, and, if there's any other suggestions you can
15 give me. And -- but they seem to be very challenged but
16 working hard, and the programs that they have been
17 awarded the grants seem to be at least, from their
18 feeling, very, very helpful. So I -- I applaud you for
19 this, until I hear otherwise. And I -- I -- if it's
20 doing this for 50 percent of the schools in my district
21 that are turnaround, I mean, more power to you. I -- I
22 just do appreciate it.

23 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we ready for a
25 motion?



1 MS. GOFF: Jane.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

3 MS. GOFF: Thanks. I'm trying. A question
4 related, I think, to that. Of the turnaround -- the
5 network that you've spoken to us before, which I'm -- I
6 am hoping I'm remembering right, is this set of schools
7 and others who are interested in communicating with,
8 interacting with sharing types of things.

9 Is the network that we have
10 established -- signed on with, or are they following one
11 of the programs that's offered by some of these
12 providers, one or more or a combination of program
13 components or (Indiscernible)?

14 MR. SHERMAN: Principals -- so of the 87
15 individuals that are participating in this grant program,
16 some of them are within our turnaround network. We're
17 working with 22 schools right now. I don't know if all
18 of them, but I would say most of them are engaged in
19 one -- in -- in one or another of these programs.
20 So -- so we are -- I appreciate your asking that
21 question, because per that first slide, we are seeing
22 these different supports at the district, school, and
23 individual level as being cohesive and being -- working
24 together.

25 MS. GOFF: So members -- what



1 proportion -- I'm not sure that even matters -- but
2 members of the 22-school network are -- are -- would you
3 say that those are predominately CDE-led and engine
4 powered, or is -- is the -- is the thrust (ph), I'm sorry
5 about the puns, is the force behind it directly a result
6 of involvement with one of these providers?

7 MR. SHERMAN: We're -- we are work -- we
8 are -- I would say that we are -- designing our network
9 supports. And the performance management that we're
10 doing very much in alignment with these organizations.
11 We have, I believe, 16 or 17 of those network principals
12 are engaged in Relay, and one or two are engaged in DU
13 right now. And, again, we're -- or I believe that those
14 programs are very well aligned with the work that we're
15 doing.

16 MS. GOFF: And the -- and the principals
17 would agree?

18 MR. SHERMAN: I -- I think so, and I think
19 to --

20 MS. GOFF: They're in align with -- with the
21 strong (ph) point (ph) stuff (ph)?

22 MR. SHERMAN: I think to Dr. Rankin's
23 comment -- I mean, -- some -- a lot of our principals in
24 our -- in our network that -- with whom we're working
25 directly are -- are working very hard and they're quite



1 challenged, but we know that they need to be because of
2 the challenges that they're facing in their schools. So
3 we're trying to be as supportive as possible and ensure
4 that they're working to improve the -- the -- the
5 learning of their students as -- as acutely as possible.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree.

7 MS. GOFF: (Indiscernible) My -- one of my
8 districts did tricks (ph) (Indiscernible), too. It's
9 been -- it's been interesting to watch, and really, I'd
10 like to see what their reaction to this -- to the
11 interaction with -- it's been --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

13 MS. GOFF: Yeah -- yeah. I -- I don't know.
14 From what I pick up as only a semi-outsider it's that the
15 whole attitude -- the whole approach in the community is
16 a little bit more positive. And there's more -- there's
17 more of a sense of this is the direction that we've
18 needed for a while and (Indiscernible). But it's early,
19 and we'll --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's hard.

21 MS. GOFF: -- we'll do their thing.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's hard. It's hard.

23 MS. GOFF: Hard work.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

25 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question? I



1 thought -- and I have been thinking this throughout my 11
2 months here, that we were going to be coming up with a
3 program that -- and it could include retired principals,
4 retired superintendents who had had experience and who
5 would be turning -- who have the capability to turnaround
6 schools. Is this not an option anymore, or are we just
7 turning to these -- these six-week, six-weekend programs?
8 I mean, don't we have that on the table still -- that we
9 can decide on a core of administrators that we can call
10 upon to help the non-performing districts or that
11 can -- that we can say, here are these administrators
12 that -- I don't know maybe sometimes we need to take over
13 a district if they're not performing well -- to have a
14 master administrator take over a district where
15 performance is -- is -- is not available.

16 That should be an option, as opposed to
17 getting piecemeal -- these little consultants here and
18 there, which is what I see these people as being,
19 consultants. They're consultants who hire other
20 consultants, who may not be trained.

21 MR. SHERMAN: Dr. Flores,
22 the -- the -- Accountability Law that we have, and SB 09-
23 163 in Colorado, certainly speaks to some of what
24 you're -- you're referring to, and I think that probably
25 begs a different conversation. I would say that with



1 those 190 schools and many others that are -- that are at
2 the verge of -- of being priority improvement or some of
3 those that are on the downward trend, the needs out there
4 are varied.

5 And what we have learned across the
6 Department, I think, is that some schools need support
7 in -- in teacher effectiveness, some schools need support
8 in developing a school culture, some need support in how
9 do they engage with their districts, some districts need
10 support in variety of different systems. And what we are
11 trying to build and, I believe, are building here at CDE
12 is -- is a web of different kinds of supports, to be able
13 to help diagnose and assess what exactly those needs are.
14 And in the same fashion with these leadership training
15 providers, we are trying to select and work with a
16 variety of different organizations that conserve teacher
17 leaders that principals and district staff that are
18 in -- in -- in different places and that need -- that are
19 working in schools and districts that have different
20 needs.

21 So we're trying to -- we're trying to fine-
22 tune this. This is not a -- sort of a blanket that you
23 throw over a turnaround school. There are a lot of
24 nuances to the work that has to happen out there. I
25 believe that this program is helping to provide that.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions? Dr.
2 Schroeder.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I want to know if you wanted
4 a motion?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Motion would be in order.

6 MS. FLORES: Can I make a statement before?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

8 MS. FLORES: There's two million dollars
9 that were appropriated. Is it for this year or for the
10 coming two years, or three years -- that were
11 appropriated by the legislature?

12 MR. SHERMAN: My understanding is that's an
13 ongoing appropriation -- an annual appropriation.

14 MS. FLORES: So every -- every year there's
15 two million? What if we would just have maybe -- take
16 back a 15 -- a million and five hundred thousand to do
17 what I'm suggesting and to have, you know, people that
18 have been successful to do this. Or maybe even half of
19 this amount and appropriate two master administrators to
20 go in and take over a district and turn it around,
21 because you're talking about -- to me it -- it's always
22 about the whole system. It's not a piecemeal -- at least
23 the big school districts that I've looked at and small
24 school districts, it's usually -- it's usually very
25 fundamental, and it's usually leadership, and it's



1 usually leadership at the very top. And so, if you are
2 going to turnaround a system, you need a new leader in
3 there who's going to do that. And that's what my --

4 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you.

5 MS. FLORES: -- my years of experience in
6 research show.

7 MR. SHERMAN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Sherman, at the
9 present time, because of the time out on this, we -- we
10 probably don't have the authority at this time to go in
11 and replace or to actually take over a school district,
12 and that that authority will not return to this Board
13 until when?

14 MR. SHERMAN: Do you want to take it?

15 MS. PEARSON: I can take it, okay?

16 MR. SHERMAN: Sure.

17 MS. PEARSON: So at the moment, the state
18 Board actually has the authority. I don't think you ever
19 have the authority to take over a school district. You
20 have authority to direct the local school board to change
21 management of a school. It's one of the options that you
22 all have. You all -- for schools and districts that have
23 entered year five with priority improvement or
24 turnaround, you need to take action by the end of the
25 fifth year. I don't think there's anything



1 prohibiting -- Tony, you could way in here, too, if I get
2 this wrong -- but I don't there's anything that prohibits
3 you from directing a local board to take action prior to
4 the end of that time. So you would be able to do that
5 now if you thought that it -- or --

6 MR. SHERMAN: (Indiscernible) turnaround.

7 MS. PEARSON: -- or a priority improvement,
8 because you're in year five already.

9 MR. SHERMAN: I'm -- I'm sorry.

10 MS. PEARSON: Anybody's who's on just
11 turnaround and not in year five, the law also allows for
12 the state Board to take action before the end of the
13 fifth year. So it could be in year one, two, three, or
14 four.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So where are we? Which
16 year are we in?

17 MS. PEARSON: So we have schools in
18 districts that are in year five, and then we also have a
19 variety that are in four and three and two and one.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So we have some we could
21 do, and we've had some of those reports, is that correct?

22 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely, you've had one,
23 Aurora Public Schools brought forward -- a school and
24 brought forward their recommendation for their school to
25 you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The Aurora

2 (Indiscernible) --

3 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- as I recall.

6 MS. PEARSON: Exactly,

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it's my understanding
8 of this program, just to summarize, most of the money
9 goes directly to districts to purchase services from
10 these providers, and they choose the providers
11 they're -- they're selecting. So --

12 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The onus, at least, to
14 make a good decision is, in part, theirs to make a
15 decision that fits them, and our involvement with
16 providers is about a ten or ten percent of the grant
17 money --

18 MS. FLORES: I wish it would be more.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- to -- to assist the
20 providers in getting up to speed, which, and -- and, I
21 presume, you supervise those providers. So if -- if it
22 came to your attention they were not using qualified
23 people, you could intervene at -- at, essentially,
24 anytime on that?

25 MR. SHERMAN: Yes, that's correct. And we



1 do have ongoing relations with each of those providers,
2 and those that were awarded design grants last year, we
3 have regular check-ins with them to see how their
4 programs are developing, when, in fact, about two hours
5 ago, I had one of those phone calls.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right a motion
7 is in order, Dr. Schroeder?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the
9 recommendations for grant recipients and the amount of
10 the grants.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And -- and the two that
12 we're approving are Relay --

13 MR. SHERMAN: The Relay Principal Supervisor
14 Program and the Promethean Program.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, no (ph).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Promethean. Okay. All
17 right. Is there a second to that motion?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well it's been moved and
20 seconded. Questions or final comments? Seeing none. If
21 you would call the roll, please, Ms. Burdsall?

22 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: No.

24 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

25 MS. GOFF: Yes.



1 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.
2 MR. MAZANEC: Yes.
3 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.
4 MS. RANKIN: Yes.
5 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.
6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.
7 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder.
8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.
9 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham.
10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Aye. The motion's adopted
11 on a vote of six to one.
12 MS. FLORES: Six to two.
13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We will now proceed --
14 MS. FLORES: Five to two.
15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Was it five to two
16 (Indiscernible)?
17 MS. BURDSALL: (Indiscernible) yes vote
18 (ph).
19 MS. PEARSON: It was six to one.
20 MS. BURDSALL: Six to one.
21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Six to one.
22 MS. FLORES: Oh, you voted yes.
23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And you (ph) said no.
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I voted yes
25 (Indiscernible).



1 (Overlapping)

2 MS. FLORES: I voted no, and I thought you
3 voted no, too.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So I did get that
5 right. Let's -- let's try six to one. I think that's
6 correct.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. That -- that -- that is
8 accurate.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

10 (Meeting adjourned)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of January, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600