



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
May 11, 2016, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 11, 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: Come back to order, and  
2 we'll start with 11 point -- 11.01, Early Literacy Grant  
3 Recipients.

4                   MS. BURDSALL: Mr. Chair.

5                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

6                   MS. BURDSALL: I think we're just gonna drop  
7 out of order to --

8                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. We are.  
9 We will take item 14.09, which was removed from the consent  
10 agenda. I understand there are people here who could be  
11 available to answer questions, if any. I think the removal  
12 of 14.09, which is now off the consent agenda, Colorado  
13 Christian University's request for reauthorization of  
14 specific endorsement for preparation pathways was simply for  
15 procedural reasons. So yes, Dr. Schroeder.

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the  
17 Colorado Christian University's request for reauthorization  
18 of specified endorsements preparation pathways.

19                   MS. GOTH: I second it.

20                   MR. DURHAM: It's been moved and seconded.  
21 Dr. Scheffel?

22                   MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm recusing myself from this  
23 vote for obvious reasons, since I'm the Dean of Colorado  
24 Christian University for this -- with these programs. And  
25 I'd like to thank the Colorado Department of Education,



1 Department of Higher Education, Doctors O'Neill and  
2 (inaudible) for the great work that they did. And also I'd  
3 like to thank my colleagues from the CCU who partnered on  
4 this visit. And again, I recuse myself to a vote. Thank  
5 you.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Dr. Scheffel's  
7 request for recusal is granted. Is there a discussion of --  
8 was there a second to the motion, otherwise. Yes.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

10 MR. DURHAM: Is there objection to the  
11 adoption of the motion? Seeing none then, the motion's got  
12 adopted by a vote of six to zero, with one abstention.  
13 Thank you very much. And thanks to those in attendance from  
14 Colorado Christian University. We'll now go back to item  
15 11.01, and let's see. Early recommendation, Early Literacy  
16 Grant Recipients. Yes.

17 MS. DORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members  
18 of the Board. We are here today to share with you  
19 information about the Early Literacy Grant. I bring with me  
20 Dr. Rachel Anderberg, who is the manager for this particular  
21 program. In front of you, you have your Board memo. You  
22 have a short PowerPoint slide deck. We also included the  
23 list of recommendations, and we included a copy for those of  
24 you who have -- were not on the Board at the time the rules  
25 for administration of this particular grant program.



1                   So just to give you a little context through  
2 the Colorado READ Act. There are \$4 million appropriated  
3 annually for the distribution in the form of competitive  
4 grants. These particular grants are really designated to  
5 support schools in creating comprehensive literacy  
6 programming across kindergarten to third grade. And what  
7 that means is that these grants are able to put in place the  
8 structures and the systems to support instruction at all  
9 tiers, to support assessment practices, to support  
10 professional development, including consulting from an  
11 external source off of the advisory list of professional  
12 development providers, as well as an in-building coach. And  
13 so those are sort of the structures that this grant helps to  
14 support. And so Rachel's going to tell you a little bit  
15 about the highlights of our Cohort 1 grants, and then we'll  
16 go from there to tell you what the process was leading to  
17 today's recommendations for Cohort 2.

18                   MS. ANDERBERG: Thank you. Cohort 1 was  
19 initially reviewed and approved. The rewards were given in  
20 May in 2013. Cohort 1 included 30 schools representing 15  
21 Districts and approximately 7,000 students across the state  
22 of Colorado. You will see on the Board that from the  
23 baseline data we took in 2013, and across the first two  
24 years of the implementation of the Early Literacy Grant,  
25 Early Literacy Grant schools reduced their percentage of



1 students with a significant reading deficiency by nearly  
2 seven percent, which is a big difference from the state as a  
3 whole. So we're very proud of the change in those results  
4 for those schools.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Remind me. What were the  
6 statewide numbers? I -- I -- I read that report, but I  
7 didn't actually make that comparison.

8 MS. ANDERBERG: So you'll see right above the  
9 Early Literacy --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh above there --

11 MS. ANDERBERG: Grant numbers, the state --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- okay.

13 MS. ANDERBERG: -- numbers as a whole. So --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: As they dropped.

15 MS. ANDERBERG: -- we had a high -- a  
16 remedial group of -- of schools that began, so they are at a  
17 higher percentage that -- but they did reduce by one.

18 Additionally, there are several targets that the schools  
19 have to meet in order to be considered for refunding across  
20 the three years of funding. This next slide highlights how  
21 the schools did on those at the end of last school year. So  
22 29 of the 30 schools reduced their percentage of students  
23 with a significant reading deficiency by 25 percent. When  
24 we looked at matched cohorts of students, so the same  
25 students tested in the fall and then, a school had the



1 opportunity to instruct those students all year, those  
2 students were reduced by nearly 50 percent within those  
3 schools.

4                   Additionally, 12 of the 30 schools reduced  
5 their students scoring below grade level competency by 50  
6 percent. So this includes not only those students with  
7 significant reading deficiency but also students who have  
8 not quite reached grade level competency. So 12 of those  
9 schools reduced that number of students by 50 percent.  
10 Eleven of the 30 schools currently at the end of last school  
11 year had percentages of significant reading deficiency that  
12 was less than 10 percent.

13                   In order to help sustain the work that has  
14 been put in place by these schools, the decision was made to  
15 reserve \$1 million of the current year's funding for  
16 sustainability efforts for those schools. So 22 of the 30  
17 schools are participating in assist -- limited funds grant  
18 for one more year to help them put sustainability practices  
19 in place for their buildings, so that we can keep the work  
20 that they've started in place beyond grant funding.

21                   This winter, we began the work of reviewing  
22 new applications for a Cohort 2. So those applications were  
23 released in January. We provided support through webinars  
24 for writing those applications. We also encouraged those  
25 schools to select their consultant that they would be



1 working with to try and have that literacy expert help them  
2 put a plan in place for the grant process. And that review  
3 took place on April 1st. So we brought together nine teams  
4 of reviewers. Each have three reviewers in place. There was  
5 at least one literacy expert on the team helping to review  
6 these applications. And then as you will see, we received  
7 36 applications from across the state. The total combined  
8 request was \$8.7 million for year one, so we were not able  
9 to fund all applications that came in. We were able to fund  
10 the 14 top scoring applications representing 22 elementary  
11 schools across all regions of the state, and that list you  
12 have in front of you.

13 MS. DORMAN: So we would entertain any  
14 questions you would have about the grant program, or we  
15 would seek approval for the recommended list. And we would  
16 make those awards upon your approval.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions from members?  
18 Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for the presentation.  
20 Such an important issue, this Early Literacy piece. Can you  
21 speak to the -- how much money make -- that the grant  
22 schools or districts request the grant, am I right, at  
23 school level and the district level growth.

24 MS. ANDERBERG: Districts request on behalf  
25 of the schools.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: How much money they receive  
2 and then how much the State keeps back. And I've got a call  
3 from one grantee where I think they were granted 900,000 but  
4 they -- the State kept 300,000 of it. So is that necessary?  
5 What does that money do? How -- where do we arrive at that  
6 metric? How does that work?

7 MS. ANDERBERG: So that -- we -- we  
8 distribute almost the full 4 million -- all \$4 million of  
9 that. So when these grants come in, sometimes the requests  
10 are beyond what we're able to fund. And so there are  
11 sometimes slight reductions made in the request of that  
12 grant. It -- I -- I believe --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, anyway, there was some  
14 confusion. Is that --

15 MS. ANDERBERG: Yes.

16 MS. DORMAN: There is a particular grant.  
17 There -- these grants are awarded for a period of up to  
18 three years of continuation funds. So a district puts in a  
19 budget for the full three years of implementation, but we  
20 only bring to you what their year one request is. So what  
21 they were confused about is why they weren't getting full  
22 funding for all three years. Right now we're only bringing  
23 a year one recommendation to you, because they have to meet,  
24 as you see, performance targets to be able to continue year  
25 after year after year. We've been very successful in seeing





1 that schools and districts have been able to meet those  
2 continuation targets, so we don't anticipate that's an  
3 issue. But we wouldn't give them the full, one (inaudible)  
4 because we only have 4 million, and that would have only  
5 allowed us to fund probably three or four grants in the  
6 district level. This way, we can fund them more, and we can  
7 distribute it more widely across the state. But we can't  
8 hold any of these monies back. They can't be used for any  
9 other purpose. It is statutorily line item, that \$4 million,  
10 and it's all distributed to schools. There is no  
11 administrative monies associated with this grant.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it's a misunderstanding --

13 MS. DORMAN: It's a misunderstanding.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- for grant (inaudible).

15 Maybe it would help to work with you on how to (inaudible).

16 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

17 MS. ANDERBERG: And -- and I believe I know  
18 that grantee, and we've spent a long time on the phone.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay great.

20 MS. DORMAN: We can talk about it Friday.

21 DR. SCHEFFEL: And my second question is to  
22 what do you attribute the success of some of these grantees  
23 in closing achievement gaps and reducing numbers of students  
24 that are not proficient in reading? We know that the, you  
25 know, the research in Early Literacy is some of the most



1 robust in education. We kind of know how to do this in terms  
2 of early literacy, and to create the greatest outcomes for  
3 the most students. What do you attribute the success of  
4 these grantees to, and how can we spread the -- replicate  
5 these results in non-grantee schools?

6 MS. ANDERBERG: I think one of the biggest  
7 benefits of our Early Literacy Grant is that we support  
8 literacy at all tiers of instruction. So Literacy Grant --  
9 Early Literacy Grant recipients are required to implement  
10 scientifically based reading research and universal  
11 instruction, as well as your tier two and tier three  
12 intervention. And we have a list of programs that they  
13 choose from that really help them to do that. So when we're  
14 able to go into these schools and really provide first best  
15 instruction and provide them with the materials that they  
16 need, that makes a significant difference in their schools  
17 because their schools -- many of their students never fall  
18 as far behind.

19 Additionally, having the literacy experts at  
20 least on a monthly basis in buildings, supporting coaches  
21 and principals in systems and structures is probably the  
22 thing that schools tell me more than anything that they are  
23 grateful for. Just having someone help look at a system-  
24 wide level and what they'll be able to do to make those  
25 changes.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just think that there's a  
2 lot of good research here that we could use when we're  
3 trying to encourage turnaround schools, because literacy is  
4 just at the core of how to move those scores. And a lot of  
5 times in the -- in the turnaround plans or whatever, I don't  
6 see enough emphasis on that. And I think this is kind of a  
7 microcosm of what can be accomplished, because literacy is  
8 so highly correlated with success on the assessments.  
9 Thanks for the great work.

10 MR. DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So associated with that, I  
12 suppose one of the questions that we probably should be  
13 asking for those schools is how many of your students are  
14 significantly --

15 MS. DORMAN: Reading deficient.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: -- significantly reading  
17 deficient. And what have you done up till now. I mean, this  
18 is a grant of about 4 million, but there's actually 33  
19 million that's --

20 MS. DORMAN: Correct.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- identified. What have you  
22 done in the past, et cetera, because I think that's the only  
23 way -- the appropriate way to get to your concern which is  
24 maybe, there's more that's necessary. I'm a -- just a  
25 little bit confused when you said that you're holding back a



1 million for those particular -- for -- for a subset of those  
2 districts that had already received the grant. Was that  
3 intention -- I mean, was that your intent when you first  
4 granted it, or did you find that they now still needed more  
5 intervention as opposed to having the 4 million for the new  
6 -- for the newbies?

7 MS. ANDERBERG: So that was not the intention  
8 necessarily when the grants were first brought forward in  
9 2013. We just -- looking, spending time with schools and  
10 principals talking about what was going to change, I mean,  
11 it really did take a full three years to get these systems  
12 into place. And so most of our -- you know, the change and  
13 implementation research says really expect three to five  
14 years, so we felt really, I -- I -- I was very cautious to -  
15 - as to what would happen to these schools if we just  
16 completely moved off the work that we had done this year.  
17 So by providing very limited funds, no school will receive  
18 more than \$50,000 in a sustainability fund. However, they  
19 still will have that consultant checking in at least three  
20 times a year making sure they are still on track. They'll  
21 still be held to the requirements of their Early Literacy  
22 Grant, so they still can feel that pressure and -- and  
23 remember all those different structures that they put in  
24 place. So really, it was more of being able to slowly  
25 reduce the support that we're giving in schools, so that we



1 don't just completely take it away and they are not able to  
2 continue.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So explain to me with some  
4 examples of the difference in the -- per student of the 33  
5 million that go to a school and then this grant. I mean  
6 what's the -- what's the connection? Is there a connection,  
7 or are they completely -- are they completely different  
8 programs?

9 MS. ANDERBERG: Thank you for your question.  
10 So yes, they are different in some ways and no, not in  
11 others. So the per pupil intervention dollars are  
12 designated only to a subset of the student population. So  
13 they are only going to reduce risk for students who have  
14 been identified.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So they can't be used for a  
16 broad effort?

17 MS. ANDERBERG: Correct. So they could not  
18 be used for that universal or tier one instruction, meaning  
19 every kid gets good basic first instruction at whatever  
20 grade they're assigned. The READ Act per pupil intervention  
21 dollars are not presently directed for services to all  
22 children. They are only directed as intervention dollars to  
23 a subset of students who've demonstrated risk. So the  
24 system structures that the grant supports are not able to be  
25 sustained through the per pupil intervention dollars because



1 they are not allowed for indirect services to children. You  
2 can't buy professional development. You can't buy reading  
3 coaches to do and lead professional development efforts.  
4 They can only be used when it comes to materials, for  
5 intervention materials, to support the kids at risk. They  
6 can't be purchasing things that aren't on, you know, sort of  
7 the advisory list, those kinds of things for other purposes.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: So what -- what does that  
9 look like in a classroom?

10 MS. DORMAN: What does it look like? It  
11 looks different. And -- and thank you for asking, because  
12 we have just created the list of school districts from all  
13 over the state that we're about to investigate and have a  
14 more in-depth conversation about what it looks like, because  
15 we don't actually know what it looks like at the level  
16 you're asking. We get reported to us the way schools spend  
17 these dollars in aggregate, sort of categorical descriptors.  
18 They spend it on intervention, but we don't really know what  
19 that intervention looks like. We know they're buying  
20 tutoring services, but we don't know what that looks like.  
21 They might have summer school, but we haven't seen the  
22 structures of summer school and know what that looks like in  
23 any formalized, planned way.

24 So we're beginning to meet that criteria,  
25 which is part of the implementation of the READ Act, but it



1 hasn't been done to this point. So the grant gives us a  
2 great lens, as -- as was mentioned, into what structures  
3 could look like that would get this kind of outcome and  
4 impact. And I would just reiterate that I would attribute  
5 the success of these grantees to the fact that every  
6 decision they're making about instruction and strategies  
7 related to instruction are guided by research or evidence-  
8 based decisions according to what we know about the best  
9 practices in reading.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So the 33 million may not --

11 MS. ANDERBERG: And the 33 million --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: We don't know.

13 MS. ANDERBERG: We don't know.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Although there have been  
15 improvements in the districts --

16 MS. ANDERBERG: Correct.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that don't have the  
18 grants. So we know some good things are happening for kids.

19 MS. ANDERBERG: Correct. We know more --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: But we believe -- we believe  
21 some good things are happening for kids.

22 MS. DORMAN: And we know more specifically  
23 what those good things are, right? We know what those things  
24 are and what -- what changes are being made through the lens  
25 of the grant. So we're using that to help sort of frame the



1 dialogue, if you will, for what could happen. And just to --  
2 to be honest to -- to also bring together other programming  
3 dollars that -- that schools and districts receive around  
4 literacy, which could come from other federal program  
5 sources like Title. And -- and to help them think about how  
6 the system structures could be created that would replicate  
7 the grants.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Ms. Mazanec,  
9 did you have a question?

10 MS. MAZANEC: Just along those lines --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry.

12 MS. MAZANEC: -- I was wondering exactly what  
13 -- what they're doing with these dollars that you know, to  
14 Dr. Scheffel's point, it's early literacy, but you're  
15 talking up just the intervention for children who have been  
16 found to have a significant reading deficiency.

17 MS. ANDERBERG: You meant per pupil dollars  
18 versus the grant dollars.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

20 MS. ANDERBERG: Yes.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

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

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have one more comment.  
24 So it'd be great if we could look at the funds that have  
25 been spent on turnaround schools, because these are schools





1 where literacy is such a high correlator with how they might  
2 be able to move the data and get out of that bucket. And it  
3 would be interesting to know how those funds have been spent  
4 at CDE to support the districts in terms of literacy  
5 instruction. So I'd love to talk with the commissioner and  
6 Chair about that and see if we can get some visibility on  
7 the funds that have been spent over time and to what extent  
8 literacy has been a focus. It's a huge leverage point.

9           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So I think -- I think -- we  
10 need a motion to approve this, but I think I'll ask it be  
11 put back on the agenda. We'll approve it today. But I --  
12 I have a list of questions I'd like answered at the next  
13 opportunity. One is Ms. Dorman, this deals with significant  
14 rating deficiencies, which I -- I don't -- personally, I  
15 don't believe that's the appropriate measure. We should be  
16 reading at grade level. And that was the purpose of the  
17 READ Act. So I'd like to see things majored in reading at  
18 grade level as opposed to significant reading deficiencies,  
19 because I -- I don't -- I think that's -- that's an  
20 inappropriate measure based on the intended stated purpose  
21 of the READ Act.

22           Secondly, what districts appear to be making  
23 good improvements based on not only the grants, but -- but  
24 other criteria, and what services do we seem to provide  
25 those districts that -- that are making that progress?



1                   Finally, a summary of -- of DPS's progress.  
2 I understand that I might have this wrong, but only three  
3 percent of their kids -- maybe it's 31 percent. I might have  
4 written it down wrong -- are proficient under the provisions  
5 of the PARC exam. Under and per exam, I'd like to have some  
6 explanation of either of those numbers.

7                   And finally, how districts, to the extent we  
8 can, are spending the -- the READ Act money and whether we  
9 have any suggestions of how that can be improved. We'll add  
10 those because I happen to agree with -- with Dr. Scheffel  
11 that this, all of the things we could do to make a  
12 difference, it's probably, at least on my list, number one.  
13 And so any effort we can put into making sure we're pushing  
14 and getting the best out of every dollar is important. So  
15 we'll ask if we can't put this on the agenda for kind of  
16 answering those questions and others. Is there a motion?

17                   MS. SCHROEDER: Sure. I move to approve the  
18 recommended list of Early Literacy Grant reports.

19                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that  
20 motion?

21                   MS. SCHEFFEL: I second it.

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Okay. Dr. Scheffel.

23                   MS. SCHROEDER: I did visit an -- an  
24 elementary school last week as part of the program that I  
25 attended and was amazed in the kindergarten how many of



1 those kids were reading in kindergarten. So it's not all --  
2 I mean, it's not all --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's a good thing.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

5 MS. DORMAN: It smells like success.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: They were knocking it out of  
7 the park.

8 MS. FLORES: And -- and do we -- do we know  
9 how many teachers really get trained in reading? Do -- is  
10 it required in this state to --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

12 MS. FLORES: -- to be trained in reading?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Literacy is a huge part of  
14 the program.

15 MS. ANDERBERG': By (inaudible) rules will be  
16 putting a higher emphasis on the training and preparation of  
17 teachers around literacy. Those words will be adopted and  
18 they have a -- a much greater emphasis and focus on  
19 literacy.

20 MS. FLORES: (Inaudible) too, right? I  
21 wonder how much of an effort. I mean, it is hard.  
22 Kindergarten and first grade are really hard because of the  
23 reading. And I just wonder how much of an effort principals  
24 make to really get teachers in those classrooms, in those  
25 kindergarten and first and second classrooms, of teachers



1 who really know how to teach reading. I mean, they should  
2 know at third and second grade.

3 I was really surprised at a dinner party the  
4 other night, when a seasoned teacher who had worked with the  
5 Department of Defense in schools abroad, said that she had  
6 been teaching in elementary school for like five years, and  
7 all of a sudden -- she was teaching, I think fifth or sixth  
8 grade -- she had to teach first grade, and she said, "What  
9 am I gonna do in first grade? What -- what could I do? I  
10 didn't know how to teach reading." I mean, so I thought  
11 well, how could somebody place a person who cannot teach  
12 reading in this very important grade level? And she knew  
13 it, and she said, "Well, I made all the effort during the  
14 summer, you know, to get ready to -- to teach reading."

15 But I think, you know, that's kind of common  
16 knowledge, but I'm wondering if principals, you know, kind  
17 of do that, or when we place Teach for America people who  
18 don't know how to teach reading in those very important  
19 grade levels and we get the results that we do. And they're  
20 so important.

21 MS. ANDERBERG: Thank you.

22 MS. DORMAN: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thanks. So we -- yes, Ms.  
24 Goff?



1 MS. GOFF: Real quickly. Our ELL kids, are  
2 they part of this, the groups that are involved in this?  
3 Does it overlap? Is the -- does the program ask to address  
4 how -- how this program would overlap with any current ELL  
5 programs that they might be involved in or a part of? I  
6 would -- I think the answer is obvious. But I'm just --  
7 I'm curious about whether it's money or whether it's other  
8 grant money or whether it's other distribution rates. I --  
9 native or heritage language incidences as well, I just  
10 wondered how much -- how much of the -- if there even is an  
11 estimate of the overall population of kids affected by the  
12 grant money in the program. If that's -- it's just teaching  
13 reading period, right? And then the question is how does  
14 that overlap with their own -- with their -- with their  
15 native language studies as well?

16 MS. ANDERBERG: I -- I -- we can give you  
17 anecdotally what we have seen in best practice among the  
18 schools in the grant. And so all children are supported  
19 through the grant, and there are different programming  
20 requirements that are related to this support for students,  
21 minorities, and in particular, English learners. And we  
22 could share with you examples where those grant program  
23 monies have been very nicely integrated with other funding  
24 and support for those students. But the grant itself  
25 specifically doesn't have some stipulation or requirement



1 because again, it would depend on the population of students  
2 represented in the grants that you just awarded. So we have  
3 made conscious efforts to bring professional learning to  
4 those grantees in relationship to language, literacy and  
5 linguistics --

6 Okay.

7 MS. ANDERBERG: -- as part of our work.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Let's -- let's move  
9 on for candor. We're running late.

10 MS. DORMAN: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. And there's motion and  
12 second. Is there objection to the adoption of motion?  
13 Hearing none, that motion is declared adopted by a vote of  
14 seven to zero. Thank you very much.

15 MS. DORMAN: You're very welcome.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We're going to  
17 -- somebody want to read the script for executive session?

18 MS. BURDSALL: Mr. Chair, before we go into  
19 executive session, (inaudible)?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Jane, you wanted  
21 that off the agenda?

22 MS. BURDSALL: I think it was Joyce.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, was it Joyce? I'm  
24 sorry.



1 MS. RANKIN: Yeah, I'm in a later one, 11.08.  
2 I just have a -- I just have a couple of questions about  
3 11.02 on the second handout that we had the high cost  
4 reimbursement for '14-'15 expenditures for Special Ed. I  
5 noticed Boulder County School District has 120 students, and  
6 the highest any other district has is 16. What -- what's  
7 the explanation for that?

8 MS. DORMAN: Thank you very much. That's a  
9 very good question, and I have my director of fiscal and  
10 budget and grants, Barb Goldsby. And she has very intimate  
11 knowledge about how that is -- that process for determining  
12 those, so I'm going to let her answer those -- that  
13 question.

14 MS. GOLDSBY: Thank you Mr. Chair, Members of  
15 the Board. Every district has the opportunity to submit  
16 applications for their high-cost students if they meet a  
17 certain threshold. Districts choose whether or not to  
18 submit applications. Many districts will submit  
19 applications that meet the minimum threshold. For in-  
20 district where you saw Boulder had 120 applications, they  
21 applied for probably all of their students who met that  
22 \$25,000 threshold, which means that the students cost more  
23 than 25,000. Other districts either didn't have as many  
24 students that met that threshold, or they only submitted



1 applications for those that were higher, much higher than  
2 the threshold.

3                   When you look at Boulder you take that 120  
4 students or applications, and you divide that by the  
5 4,000,282. It comes to about \$35,000 per student. When you  
6 look at another AU, let's for example take San Pedro BOCES.  
7 They only submitted one application, and that particular  
8 student was 26,000. So it looks then at the fiscal impact  
9 on the district. It's an -- it's an option for districts to  
10 submit any number of applications that at least meet the  
11 threshold.

12                   MS. RANKIN: So it is the reimbursement, is  
13 that the one that the grant pays for? Is that the amount  
14 there?

15                   MS. GOLDSBY: The reimbursement amount by AU.  
16 Yes, that is correct.

17                   MS. RANKIN: So that means those ones with  
18 just the line, including Boulder with 120, didn't get any at  
19 all. Is that correct?

20                   MS. GOLDSBY: Correct. That is correct. It  
21 goes by fiscal impact on the district.

22                   MS. RANKIN: I see. Okay. So what you did  
23 at the bottom, you added up all the ones that you were able  
24 to give and that -- that was the 2 million mark. But if you





1 could have granted everyone that applied what they wanted,  
2 it would've been \$14,700,000?

3 MS. GOLDSBY: Yes, that is correct.

4 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. I just wanted to  
5 make that clear.

6 MS. GOLDSBY: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Ms. Rankin, would  
8 you like to move to the approval --

9 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- for 11.02?

11 MS. RANKIN: 11.02 is approved.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. There's a  
13 motion and a second. Or is there a second with Dr.  
14 Schroeder? Is there objection to the approval of 11.02 and  
15 approval of -- of the (inaudible). Yeah, the 11.02 for the  
16 students in high-cost programs? Seeing no objection, that  
17 motion is approved by a vote of seven to nothing.

18 MS. DORMAN: Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, now, Ms. Burdsall,  
20 can we go into executive session, please?

21 MS. BURDSALL: Yes. An executive session has  
22 been noticed for today's State Board meeting in conformance  
23 with 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific  
24 legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) CRS in  
25 matters required to be kept confidential by Federal Law,



1 rules, or State statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III)  
2 CRS.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. So we  
4 end in an executive session.

5 MS. BURDSALL: We need a motion.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, yes. I'm sorry. Was  
7 there a motion to go into executive session?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: So moved.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second? It is  
10 moved. Is there an objection to that motion? It requires  
11 five votes. Seeing -- seeing no objection, we are now in  
12 executive session. Thank you. We'll take a five-minute  
13 recess before we start. We'll come back -- we'll try and  
14 come back at 1:00 before the presentation of awards. We'll  
15 be as close to that as we can. Okay.

16 (Meeting adjourned)

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 October, 2018.

/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