



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
September 9, 2015, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on September 9, 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: Let's come back to order.
2 I apologize for our late start to the -- from the
3 representatives from the Sheridan School District. Let's
4 see, allotted time is 30 minutes. It's now 11:00, so Mr.
5 Clough, please proceed.

6 MR. CLOUGH: Good morning. I'm Michael
7 Clough. I'm the superintendent of the Sheridan School
8 District and I feel like this chair ought to have my name
9 on it.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

11 MR. CLOUGH: But I do appreciate your time.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll rent it to you.

13 MR. CLOUGH: Okay. I'd like to introduce at
14 the table with me today is Jackie Webbs, the deputy
15 superintendent at Sheridan, and Susan Switzer is our data
16 and assessment manager for the district. And again,
17 we're very happy to be here and talk a little bit about
18 the thing we love, and that is the Sheridan School
19 District.

20 (Overlapping)

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry.

22 MR. CLOUGH: So the next slide, please,
23 Jackie.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let me just interrupt, so
25 we get -- I apologize for one minute. Let's see, I just



1 need to read the formals. The State Board of Education
2 will conduct a public hearing pursuant to 1 CCR 301-1
3 Rule 6.00, Sheridan School District appeal, their 2014
4 district accreditation rating with priority improvement
5 and -- and then I think the balance of it is you have 30
6 minutes to make your presentation. I apologize.

7 (Indiscernible)

8 MR. CLOUGH: Thank you, sir. A little bit
9 about Sheridan, and if I am repeating myself, since we
10 were here a couple of months ago for a different
11 situation, I do apologize, but I do want you to know
12 about our district and especially the new member of the
13 board.

14 Sheridan is the smallest district in the
15 metro area. It's two and a half miles by two and a half
16 miles. It has very unique set of circumstances. It's 85
17 percent minority; 38 of our students are English-language
18 learners. We're at 95.5 percent of our children receive
19 a free or reduced-price lunch and breakfast. And one of
20 the most alarming statistics of our community has been
21 with the housing crisis as being a first-ring suburban.
22 What has happened, we have seen our homeless rates go to
23 one in four, which is very, very alarming for us as the
24 rent prices have gone through the roof. We've seen
25 doubling and tripling up. That has been one of the



1 factors that has really affected us.

2 I've been the superintendent there since
3 2008. I was hired -- I was hired from the Department of
4 Education, if you can believe it. Working on
5 accreditation was our role as regional managers. Both
6 Mrs. Webb and I were regional managers for the Department
7 of Education and had the joy of working some of you while
8 you were here. So it's always -- always good to come
9 back.

10 But we're here today to talk about our
11 accreditation rating and -- and I think it goes without
12 saying why it is so important to us. It is a reflection
13 of our school district. It is a reflection of our
14 community. And I think one of the things that bringing
15 back from the last appeal that we talked about, one of
16 the Board Members said that it -- it should recognize the
17 good works of the district. And that's what we're
18 looking at. And we do believe there has been some good
19 work. There has been some great progress.

20 I want to make some special thank yous. I
21 don't know if she's in the room, but Cindy Ward has been
22 our performance manager. We were trying to figure today
23 -- and I think it's about four and a half years that
24 she's been with us, coming out one, sometimes twice a
25 month, and she has been absolutely a dream to work with.



1 And some of that success of the district, we do put at
2 the hands of -- of the Department who has really been a
3 partner with us on this -- on this journey. We have had
4 some grant dollars, some things that we can talk about,
5 but I -- I really do want to say that I appreciate Cindy
6 Ward for -- for her -- for her help.

7 I would also like to mention Dr. Flores had
8 a chance to be with us at our opening. And she got to
9 see our new, which we are so very, very proud of. And we
10 would love to again send the invitation for you to come
11 out and see Fort Logan Northgate. It was done with best
12 dollars and community dollars. It -- it's absolutely --
13 and I think Dr. Flores would agree -- it's a showplace.

14 MS. FLORES: It is.

15 MR. CLOUGH: And we're so proud of it and it
16 just looks better now. So we are -- are very proud and
17 we were very happy to have you at our opening.

18 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

19 MR. CLOUGH: So but what we're here for is
20 to talk about our accreditation rating for the district.
21 And we're going to present a lot of noise. And I think
22 CDE's going to present a lot of noise. But I wanted -- I
23 want to narrow it down to just one thing. It really
24 comes -- and I think Alisa will agree, Ms. Pearson will
25 agree -- that it comes down to did our ACE show



1 improvement or not.

2 So everything else is kind of making our
3 point in justifying. And in the word of -- of the CDE
4 paper, inconclusive. And in our words, we think it's
5 fairly conclusive that we did indeed make progress. And
6 that's what we want to talk about.

7 The rest of it is just supporting that
8 position, but as we narrow it down, that is absolutely
9 what it comes down to. We were here before. I don't
10 think we have to tell you and it's probably been on our
11 minds. It's been a little bit on your mind at the last
12 appeal and what has risen out of that last appeal, but we
13 do understand that in the last appeal -- appeal, there
14 was no precedence set. But we believe there has been
15 precedence set over and over again for the removal of the
16 AC in the district frameworks. So I think that is a
17 given and I think the Department would agree. We also
18 note that there is a precedent that has been set that
19 we'll talk later that we think is that is something that
20 should be considered in -- as part of our appeal.

21 Additionally, CDE has allowed at least one
22 metro district to create their own AC framework, and we
23 can talk about that just a little bit later.

24 But in moving, we want to now move from the
25 -- looking at the AC, but we want to look at the



1 district, because that I think is -- it's really -- we
2 want to be clear on some of the progress that that
3 district has made. When we look, this chart and the
4 chart that you have in front of you, demonstrates it. In
5 2008, I -- I -- I want to be careful, because I certainly
6 don't want to step on any toes, but in my estimation the
7 district was quite a mess. In fact, as a regional
8 manager, I had access to the data. And I remember
9 handing it to one of my colleagues from the -- from the
10 data team and said, you know, I've just accepted the
11 position as the superintendent in Sheridan and I want you
12 to look at the data.

13 And he kind of jerked it out of my hands and
14 said it -- it can't be right. That is not possible. I
15 don't believe that it's possible to have gross scores in
16 the medians in the teens for a district. But it indeed
17 was. We -- we had our work really cut out for us.

18 So as you look at this chart, Sheridan
19 Elementary, it starts as a turnaround. Very graciously,
20 I know I've told you this before, but very graciously,
21 the Department listed the schools that fell in the bottom
22 five percent for the first round of turnaround grants
23 given.

24 And Fort Logan Elementary was one of those
25 schools that was selected. When we looked at the data,



1 the first framework for Fort Logan Northgate, which is
2 now Sheridan Elementary, had a set of 25.8. You get 25
3 points just for opening the door. And so we were -- with
4 our community, we have always felt it's very important to
5 be honest, that where we started with Sheridan Elementary
6 was a 25.8. It wasn't in the bottom five percent of all
7 schools. It was in the bottom .5 of schools.

8 And we are so happy that on our last
9 performance framework, Sheridan Elementary missed being a
10 performance school, which is the highest rating that a
11 school can get, by .8. Sheridan Middle was better, had a
12 little bit better performance, but they were priority
13 improvement. And they now are a performance school. So
14 I thought it might be interesting to take a look at the
15 schools and see where they fit. So I pulled it -- it's
16 pretty impossible to -- to pull both the free and reduced
17 data and the English-language learners, so I just looked
18 at the free and reduced data, for Sheridan Middle School
19 and for Sheridan Elementary, and when I picked the 20
20 schools that fell within the band of the free and reduced
21 of -- of free and reduced price lunches for those
22 schools, Sheridan Middle School has the highest school
23 performance framework and Sheridan Elementary has the
24 fourth highest of all those schools. So they have done
25 very well and we have made really nice progress.



1 Are we there? No. We will never say that
2 we are there. We are striving. But I have a saying that
3 I use with the staff, and that is we have to move through
4 the growth. You have to begin to grow before you're
5 going to see the achievement result. So when we talk
6 about the achievement results and the data from these
7 schools, we have shown unbelievable growth and we're
8 going to show you some of that. Now, keep in mind, in
9 2010 our SOAR Academy, AEC, Alternative Education Campus,
10 it was not a school. SOAR Academy became a school in
11 2012. And it has an improvement rating now. And that's
12 what we're -- we're here to talk about.

13 But first, I want to stay with the district
14 data a little bit. And we maintain -- I -- I would like
15 to also really comment many of my leaders from the
16 district are with me today. And I think it is we're
17 saying that Sheridan's plan for their English-language
18 learners was requested as an exemplar by the Department
19 of Education and so was our community engagement plan.
20 So you can look at our schools as we look collectively
21 across the weed.

22 We look at Sheridan High School, for
23 instance, we saw amazing growth with our English-language
24 learners. In fact, one of the things you don't see
25 sitting behind me are any principals, because today we



1 have a national level trainer, Jennifer Ellison-Finney,
2 from California, who is working with our leaders and with
3 our teachers on English-language learners. It has been -
4 - it has been absolutely our mission. Many, many of our
5 students are English-language learners and they're doing
6 very well. But they are in working today. And in fact,
7 for 30, Jennifer will be working with our community to
8 begin to engage our parents in ways that they can help
9 their children speak in an academic register. And we're
10 working very strong -- very, very hard on that
11 vocabulary. It's a combination of academic language
12 development and English language development. And Dr.
13 Flores, you got hear us talk about it and some of our
14 results at our opening.

15 So in looking at this chart, you can see
16 that the median growth percentile in the district was 48
17 in 2014 and 53 in 2015. The adequate growth percentile
18 was 40. So what that adequate growth percentile -- and
19 Jackie, if I get this wrong, correct me, please -- but
20 what that means is in a three-year span, it would take a
21 median growth of 40 to be on a trajectory for the kids to
22 be on target. So we did -- this is one of the measures
23 that we believe we do show some progress. And it is a
24 measure -- the measure of our English-language learners
25 that we are very, very proud of. Yes?



1 MS. WEBB: One thing that I would like to
2 add to this is why is data so important?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please identify yourself
4 (indiscernible).

5 MS. WEBB: Oh, I apologize. My name is
6 Jackie Webb. I'm the deputy superintendent of Sheridan
7 School District. Why is this data so important? Why did
8 we choose to pull this? Well, Mr. Clough mentioned that
9 the piece that comes next, we -- we've been very
10 successful in the growth portion. We've been very
11 successful in moving on a lot of the data points, but not
12 in achievement. Achievement, as defined by Proficient
13 Advanced on the state test, and in achievement as
14 identified by the ACT.

15 What we've noted is that coming from a
16 district that is predominantly -- has a population of
17 students in poverty and of second-language learners that
18 language is absolute key for the achievement to move
19 forward. You have to have the academic vocabulary to be
20 able to understand fully what you're reading and then
21 also to be able to show what you're writing. And that's
22 why this data point is so important to us and this is why
23 we're putting so much effort and resource into this
24 portion to support the language needs of all of our
25 students in Sheridan.



1 MR. CLOUGH: Thank you, Jackie. So moving
2 on, our -- our post-secondary and workforce readiness,
3 looking at our -- our categories, the graduation rate in
4 -- and that is if we exclude the AEC data. Again, that
5 is a -- there has been a precedent set. There is rules
6 in place to allow the exclusion of AEC data. Our
7 graduation rate in 2013 was 68.7 and in 2014 the
8 graduation rate is 93.4. So in looking that as a
9 significant improvement and when we look at the
10 graduation rates across the state, I think that is
11 something that speaks very well of -- of the Sheridan
12 School District.

13 We're also very proud of the drop-out rate,
14 again excluding the AEC. It has gone -- it has gone from
15 .9 to .6. So a very, very low drop-out rate and some of
16 the lowest drop-out rates in the county. Now, one of the
17 things again we talked about with the achievement,
18 definitely in looking at our ACT score, excluding the
19 AEC, it did drop from a 15.9 to a 15.5.

20 So this moves us to -- up here, there's a
21 lot of words, but it comes down to I've highlighted in
22 green what we're talking about -- has demonstrated
23 improved performance over time. And that is what we're
24 looking at. Again, we would -- we would propose the
25 inconclusive statement to the conclusive. And that is



1 why we're here in front of the -- of the Board today.

2 So this is a billboard. I don't know if you
3 spend much time around Federal and Hamden, but this a
4 billboard. And this is our opportunity to talk about
5 SOAR Academy that I'm very, very proud of. So I learned
6 a lot about alternative education. I was the
7 superintendent in Wylie prior to coming to Sheridan and I
8 was the superintendent in Stratton, where populations are
9 much more homogenous and much more willing to join the
10 status quo, where an entire community centers around a
11 school. So we knew in Sheridan and -- and in the area
12 around Sheridan we had an unbelievable need for
13 alternative education.

14 What I learned about alternative education
15 that I didn't know is that many alternative centers
16 around us have entrance requirements and very strict
17 entrance requirements. And one of those is a functional
18 reading level. And it makes it difficult for students to
19 get in there. So it was -- it was hard. Many of the
20 students that came to us as we started SOAR Academy came
21 with very, very low skills and very -- and many high-risk
22 factors, not one or two, but five, six, or seven high-
23 risk factors.

24 We had minimal entrance requirements because
25 we wanted to really certain that we didn't close the door



1 on the last-chance opportunity for these students. And
2 this is what the rule is all about. This is what the
3 rule I just posted up there is about, is we should not
4 disincentive -- disincentivize school districts to offer
5 alternative education to students. And I believe in
6 Sheridan, that that meant that we should not lock out
7 students. We accepted students that could not read. We
8 accept -- accepted students that had been in detention
9 centers. We had -- we accepted students who had current
10 court cases pending against them.

11 So this billboard, I want to -- I want to
12 relay a story that was really meaningful and it just
13 happened, but I love the billboard. And it's up on
14 Federal and Hamden. And initially it started with four
15 students in the picture. One student was so absolutely
16 excited about being a part of it. We figured when you
17 sign up to be a Sheridan student, you check the box that
18 it's okay to use your picture, but we thought maybe going
19 up on a billboard on Federal might be a little bit of
20 overkill, maybe we better ask them. And of course
21 they're graduates of the program. And so asked the --
22 the student if it would be okay. And he said, of course,
23 I think that's great.

24 Really interesting, one of these young men
25 said, "This is great," and the other one said, "Oh, I



1 don't know whether I want my face up there." But when we
2 sent this to the billboard company, it really ended up on
3 the floor, because there wasn't room for all four
4 children on the billboard. That's all that would've been
5 there. And he came down and we didn't call him back, and
6 I wish I would've, but I didn't think it was that big of
7 a deal. And he came down with his camera, because he
8 wanted to take a picture of the billboard and he wanted
9 to take a picture of his picture.

10 And he said he was so disappointed and he
11 said, "Because I came from a neighboring district and one
12 of the teachers told me there I'd never amount to
13 anything and you won't graduate, you're going to end up
14 on the streets." And he said, "I wanted to show him I
15 did. I ended up on the street." So it's almost worth it
16 to me to go redo the billboard to get this kid up on the
17 streets. But it is -- it is a -- a school. We learned a
18 lot about over the time and the SOAR Academy. And again,
19 I want to give some kudos to the Department of Education.
20 Judith Martinez has absolutely been very, very valuable,
21 and Cory Cantee (ph) in coming out and helping us shape
22 this. And I believe that's part of the reason that SOAR
23 Academy has made the improvement that it has made.

24 So again, I think we agree, I think the
25 Department will agree, that if the AEC data is excluded,



1 that we've been -- would have an improvement rating in
2 lieu of a priority improvement rating. And what happens
3 is -- I know I'm singing to the choir here a little bit,
4 but in those frameworks, if you're not allowed to take
5 your AEC out, then those all roll up into the regular
6 district performance framework and then it is held to a
7 different standard, because the alternative, if you'll
8 look at the -- at the minimums to score the points,
9 because it's basically a scorecard, you get points for
10 you, you get points kind of for you, and then points
11 against you that total up. And that's still the system
12 that we're using. But I think we do agree on the fact
13 that if the data is removed, that we would then be a --
14 not a priority, but an improvement district.

15 So as we look at the AEC framework, looking
16 across the academic achievement and the academic growth,
17 one of the things that -- that made some complications
18 was that the park data is not available for us, but those
19 are typically some of the measures that we can use. So
20 there is an expectation in the AEC framework that you can
21 go back and you can substitute local data for the
22 measures that are usually provided by the State.

23 In addition, you could also use the State
24 measures if they were available and then layer your data
25 on top. But again, when you look at those frameworks,



1 the expectations for the alternative education community
2 is -- is considerably different than what's expected on a
3 regular district performance framework. So then 20
4 percent comes from student engagement, we'll show some of
5 that data, and 30 percent comes from workforce post-
6 secondary and workforce readiness.

7 So now we'll present some of the data that
8 we have presented to the Department. And we do have a
9 disagreement with the Department on the AEC framework.
10 It is a bit confusing. I think I started with the word
11 horrible. And I think we settled on the word shaky.
12 Because when you look at an achievement measure, it
13 probably should be a straight achievement measure. But
14 in the AEC framework, the achievement measure is really
15 as much about growth as it is about achievement.

16 So there is one of the places that we do
17 differ on -- on how that was calculated. But again, we
18 maintain as a district that it's not so much about the
19 calculation, but it is about the fact that did we improve
20 from 2013 and '14 to '14 and '15? It's that simple. So
21 this is the data that we presented to the Department and
22 this our local data -- data looking at achievement. And
23 in 2013 and '14, 76.7 percent of our kids fell into the
24 category of making achievement. And in 2014 and '15,
25 85.7 percent of our students fell into that measure.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Which measure? Remind me?

2 MR. CLOUGH: It is the achievement measure
3 on --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: On?

5 MR. CLOUGH: -- the local data for AEC.

6 MS. MAZANEC: (Indiscernible).

7 MR. CLOUGH: Reading and writing.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I'm trying to figure
9 out what the assessment is that you're using.

10 MR. CLOUGH: The use of I-Ready, I-Ready
11 Growth, and also those students that made a year's
12 progress -- a year's progress in terms of classes is the
13 other measure that we put in -- we put in here. This is
14 a little bit --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a -- is there a
16 dispute? Help me, I read this a while ago, but is there
17 a dispute in terms of the number of students that are
18 enrolled versus the number of students that are included
19 in the measure to get to the 85 percent? There is -- is
20 that something that's an issue?

21 (Overlapping)

22 MR. CLOUGH: Yes. Yes, and we do want to --
23 we want to discuss that, but yes, that is one of the --
24 one of the disputes.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you.



1 MR. CLOUGH: And another dispute that made
2 it very difficult is ed performance is no longer -- or as
3 I understand, it is not a CDLA-approved assessment. So
4 we as a district made the decision to move to I-Ready,
5 which is an approved. So it's very challenging, very
6 challenging, to move the data from ed performance to I-
7 Ready. But what we do believe about I-Ready is that it
8 is considerably more challenging to score well on I-Ready
9 than it is on ed performance, given the results we've
10 seen in the -- in -- in the Sheridan community. So
11 again, in math, 76.5 to 85.7. So Chairman, you're
12 exactly right. There's a dispute about the number and
13 there is a dispute about the metric.

14 The next is 2015 academic growth. So again,
15 I want to reiterate, because of the AEC framework that --
16 that we believe is not -- not real clear the growth
17 measure will appear both places. Okay, again, I repeat
18 that: The growth measure will appear both places. So in
19 2013 and '14, we were at 71.5 in reading, and 2014 and
20 2015, it was 75 percent.

21 And of course you can see the map in growth,
22 60 to 86. So student engagement, this is -- this is
23 really interesting, because again it's a scorecard and
24 what it settled on between the district and the
25 Department was it's yes or a no, and we line up all the



1 indicators. You have to have more yeses than nos in
2 order for us to go to the consent agenda with it. Or you
3 have to -- if you have more nos than yeses, then you will
4 need to go before the Board for a formal hearing. So
5 again, this is a really interesting one, because this
6 almost feels like we get two nos against us on our
7 scorecard, but this is really the same measure counted
8 twice. The kids that aren't coming and the kids that are
9 truant, there's -- there's -- the -- the students that
10 are truant at a 28.3 rate, those students are really
11 counting against us on the attendance rate.

12 Again, it is -- it is very much a challenge
13 in any alternative education campus for it -- for the
14 attendance. But we do agree that our truancy rate
15 increased, which is not a good thing, and our attendance
16 rate decreased. So those would definitely be on our
17 scorecard. We do agree with the Department that those
18 have decreased and that's something that we're really
19 working on.

20 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

22 MS. FLORES: Why -- why do you think you
23 have an increase in truancy? Why do you think you had an
24 increase in truancy?

25 MR. CLOUGH: We believe that we had an



1 increase in truancy because we raised the bar and raised
2 the expectations, and students started to back off. What
3 -- what we discovered early on, and it was with the
4 Department's help, is that we were very long on the
5 rescue end of students that had so little. Leaving, we
6 had students -- one was living in Union Station, sleeping
7 on park benches. These students have some significant
8 challenges. And as we move to more of an academic focus,
9 they returned by not coming. We had to work very, very
10 hard to get the students back engaged. They -- they --
11 they rebelled against higher expectations. In fact, we
12 have continued to raise those expectations and we started
13 the year with 43 students this year.

14 So in looking at that, the -- looking at
15 students, they're starting to come in droves again,
16 because once those boundaries are established, they -- at
17 the end of the day, people do want the boundaries.

18 MS. FLORES: So Superintendent Clough, would
19 you say that you have a large number of students who are
20 homeless? You stated that one in four --

21 MR. CLOUGH: One in four in the district.
22 And I -- I -- I apologize, we haven't broken it out by
23 SOAR, but I know that our homeless rates are considerably
24 higher in SOAR than in the rest of the district.

25 MS. FLORES: Okay, that's 25 percent.



1 MR. CLOUGH: That's one in four across the
2 district.

3 MS. FLORES: Right.

4 MR. CLOUGH: It started with our
5 kindergarten students.

6 MS. FLORES: That's very large.

7 MR. CLOUGH: Are where we found the first --
8 and where we found the first high for some recent jump in
9 the number. But SOAR Academy, definitely many, many
10 homeless students.

11 MS. FLORES: And this is an area where
12 people have lost their homes.

13 MR. CLOUGH: Absolutely, absolutely. And it
14 is an area where other people that have lost their homes
15 are no longer able to afford a home are now able to pay
16 the rent in the community. So it just started a snowball
17 effect.

18 A 1,300 square feet house in Sheridan --
19 many of you probably been to Sheridan -- it was right by
20 the school, so we happened to notice, it's renting for
21 \$2,200, \$1,100 a side. So you're getting -- you're
22 getting 600 square feet for \$1,100. And that's -- that's
23 out of our family's range.

24 MS. FLORES: Right.

25 MR. CLOUGH: It -- it -- it is. So it is



1 really presented a -- a challenge. And I think it first
2 presented a challenge here for us. And one of the things
3 we're going to show -- I want to move really --

4 MS. FLORES: Well, I -- excuse me, I don't
5 want to take you from your presentation, but I just
6 wanted to ask about that, because you had mentioned it
7 earlier and I wanted you to reiterate that, because I
8 think that would bring a considerable amount of -- of
9 pressure and drama to -- to kids coming to school.

10 MR. CLOUGH: It -- it --

11 MS. FLORES: If they don't have a home.

12 MR. CLOUGH: It absolutely does. It
13 absolutely does add toxic stress of that particular
14 situation is really tough, is really tough.

15 MS. FLORES: Excuse me.

16 MR. CLOUGH: That's okay. I want to move
17 ahead that the CDE calculations, and where were the
18 benchmarks established? We established the same
19 benchmarks for '13/'14 that we did for '14 and '15. So
20 those measures are compared. And again, we want to
21 reiterate, we did not have access to the park data. And
22 there was precedent set where there is data used, local
23 data, around parent satisfaction, student satisfaction,
24 drop-out recovery, drop-out recovery growth, all sorts of
25 different measures that go into other district, another



1 district's AEC framework. So there has been some --
2 definitely some liberty taken.

3 I just wanted to show one of the CD
4 questions was perhaps we just moved the kids from
5 Sheridan High School into Sheridan's alternative program.
6 But you can see from the count that 51.4 of our students
7 come from other districts. And most of those kids were
8 denied admission because of their risk indicators. And
9 many, many of those risk indicators were around them not
10 being able to read at a -- at a sixth grade level.

11 So again, and I do want to get to the
12 Chairman's question, we -- in looking at this, why did
13 only 25 percent of the students test in both windows? So
14 we -- we did some research: 87 percent of these students
15 had multiple risk factors; 63 percent of these students
16 were seniors. I would like to mention that we had 100
17 participation at the park, and this is where a lot of the
18 emphasis of the assessment went.

19 Also, Dr. Scheffel, I'm sure you're familiar
20 with I-Ready, but it is also fairly juvenile with the use
21 of avatars. And I will tell you that our older kids and
22 our alternative ed students pushed back hard on us about
23 that particular measure.

24 Student mobility: In the time from 43 kids
25 that started this year, 187 kids were in and out of the -



1 - of the system last year. So unbelievable mobility.
2 The -- the homeless rate causes just students to come in
3 and out of systems at a very, very high number. And we
4 did indeed see that. So very few of our kids absolutely
5 just opted out, but some of the students saw what was
6 going on and what was abuzz in the state and they also
7 did indeed opt out also.

8 So I -- I apologize for rolling pretty
9 quickly here, but according to our indicators, we believe
10 that five of the eight indicators demonstrate
11 improvement, which we believe means that there should be
12 careful consideration given to moving the -- from
13 priority improvement to improved.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much.
15 We'll now proceed to the Department's presentation.
16 We'll start with Dr. Asp. If you would introduce your
17 staff as appropriate.

18 MR. ASP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just before
19 we begin, this -- this appeal process is unique to
20 Colorado. I want to remind the Board of that, that we
21 have this incorporated into our accountability system
22 that allows districts who believe that the rating they
23 received under our frameworks is not a accurate
24 description of their performance have the opportunity to
25 bring additional data. And that's what Sherry's (ph)



1 done here.

2 The other piece I'd emphasize before we
3 begin is that as a department, we don't see this as an
4 adversarial process. Sheridan came forth in -- in good
5 faith to present the data that they think is appropriate.
6 Our job as a department is to take a look at the rules
7 and regulations around this process and to evaluate that
8 data in a uniform and fair way as compared to other
9 districts across the state.

10 No matter what the outcome of this, hearing
11 will be -- will continue. We -- we applaud the efforts
12 of Sheridan to improve student achievement in their
13 district. We'll continue to work with them and support
14 them in the ways that they've already described. So with
15 that, I'll turn it over to Alisa Pearson, who's our
16 interim associate commissioner, who will do our
17 presentation. Thank you.

18 MS. PEARSON: Thanks. Mr. Chair, Members of
19 the Board, again, I'm Alisa Pearson. I lead the
20 accountability and data analysis team here. Thank you
21 for your time today. We know that this is a difficult
22 decision that you have to make. It's not a
23 straightforward easy situation that we're in. We really
24 your time and consideration on it. We want --

25 MR. CLOUGH: Excuse me. Could we get a copy



1 of the presentation?

2 MS. PEARSON: Oh, sure. (Indiscernible).

3 MR. CLOUGH: Please? So we have -- I got
4 one of these.

5 MS. PEARSON: Okay, thanks. So we want to
6 share some additional data and context to help you
7 understand how another side of the data and the
8 perspective from where we're coming from. As Dr. Asp
9 said, we're really looking at uniform and fair and
10 consistent decision making for the state, and share why,
11 because of that, we don't support the appeal today.

12 We know Sheridan has an extremely student
13 population. They are doing hard, hard work every day,
14 day in and day out with kids that really need lots of
15 attention -- of attention. And they really are starting
16 to see some improvements. But the data that was
17 submitted is just not sufficient to warrant a higher
18 rating of priority improvement yet. And so we'll explain
19 why we came to that conclusion after working with the
20 district and looking through the data.

21 So first we want to just give you a little
22 overview, kind of give you some background and a
23 timeline, why we're having this appeal hearing today, abt
24 about your role, and then we'll get into the context of
25 data and those pieces for there, and with some policy



1 implications and our recommendation.

2 So State Board, the -- the Commissioner is
3 the one in state law that is responsible for accrediting
4 school districts. With that, there this check and
5 balance that after it goes through the process of request
6 for reconsideration of the Department that districts that
7 are priority improvement or turnaround can appeal their
8 ratings to the State Board of Education. It kind of
9 gives that double check. And that's why you are hearing
10 the appeal today. We had already gone through a request
11 for reconsideration with the district previously to this.

12 There's no specific criteria in State Board
13 and rule around the hearing decision for you all to make.
14 It just is reiterates thinking about the criteria for
15 accountability in the state. I'll just - thank you. No,
16 I got it. Here we go. Thank you. I see a slot. That's
17 my (indiscernible). And I'm sorry, you all. So let me
18 to go the timeline for you and talk about how we got
19 where we are.

20 So last August of 2014, we - we issued
21 preliminary district frameworks, preliminary
22 accreditation ratings. Then come October timeframe is
23 when a request reconsiders are due. That's an
24 opportunity that's unique to Colorado, where districts
25 and schools can submit additional information if the



1 performance that we capture with the state data isn't
2 sufficient to really understand performance in the school
3 or district. And so we had 19 appeals, or 19 requests,
4 last year from districts. We had probably about 50 -- or
5 actually about 80 schools that came through. Of the 19
6 districts, we approved 16 of those, but of which was
7 shared in a not-request process. We looked through the
8 criteria, that we'll talk about some more today. And
9 unfortunately the data that was submitted then didn't
10 meet the criteria either and we weren't able to appeal --
11 or approve that.

12 So in November, the Commissioner accredited
13 the district with a priority improvement rating. After
14 that, the district submitted an appeal to you all. When
15 the Department shared our request reconsidered decision
16 with the district, we said can it lay out the criteria
17 that we need to see for the '14/'15 school year, because
18 we know the district's very close. We know they're
19 making progress, but we weren't seeing with alternative
20 education campus, SOAR Academy at that point in time. So
21 we laid out the criteria and offered to meet with the
22 district. Let's -- let's think about what data we need
23 to see so that we can come together and agree upon it,
24 support it.

25 Then in April, the district submitted its



1 position statement for that appeal hearing. And with
2 that position statement, it was clear that the district
3 wanted to submit the '14/'15 student performance data to
4 you all, which is fine. We were just concerned at that
5 point of time that we didn't have the complete picture of
6 performance. We didn't have attendance data or truancy
7 data, which we know are important and leading indicators
8 for schools. And we didn't have the ACT data. Without -
9 - with the new transition to the new assessments, we knew
10 we weren't going to have park data at that time either.
11 But that was okay. We knew we'd look at local data
12 instead, and that was part of the consideration in
13 November.

14 So when we received the district's position
15 statement in April, saw that we wanted some additional
16 information, we waited. We decided to postpone
17 altogether until September so that we could look at it,
18 the complete picture of performance.

19 At the same time in May, what happened was
20 that HB 1523 was passed that the accountability holds in
21 place. So our plans, when we were going to go through
22 this, through the request to reconsider this process this
23 fall, that kind of went out the window, since there's an
24 accountability hold. So that's why we said we'll work
25 with you all on the data through the appeal process and



1 if we can come to support it, we would recommend putting
2 it on consent agenda and recommend approval. But
3 unfortunately, when we saw the data, it just didn't meet
4 those considerations.

5 So that's kind of overview of timeline while
6 we got here. It's a little complicated. Apologize for
7 that. Sorry, this is where I skip to this is your role.
8 So again, you all have the responsibility in the case of
9 the -- of when a district wants to appeal their
10 accreditation decision, it comes to you. And then what
11 we ask you to do, or what the system asks for you to do,
12 is to look at an educational accountability under holding
13 schools and districts to the same set of indicators on
14 related statewide measures, supported by consistent
15 objective measures and then also to have a system that is
16 perceived as fair, balanced, cumulative, credible, and
17 useful. So as you make your decision today, those would
18 be some criteria you might want to keep in mind.

19 So just to reiterate Sheridan's position
20 statement, you all did a great job clearly of explaining
21 it already. But there is three main points that we read
22 in your position. First about the schools and the school
23 ratings within the district; the second one looking at
24 the district performance as a whole, especially in terms
25 of English-language proficiency growth; and the third



1 one, which is the one that's really at the crux of it,
2 because it's what we've been discussing with the district
3 on consideration is looking at the performance of the
4 alternative education campus and what comes out to.

5 So let me just back up and give you a little
6 background on the State Board rule, because it's a little
7 bit complicated, even if you've been a Board Member and
8 through this. I know it's a complicated rule.

9 Senate Bill 13-217 created a requirement for
10 CDE to figure out a way to consider the performance of
11 alternative education campuses in districts -- in
12 district performance ratings. We have a system in the
13 state where we give district performance ratings that
14 look at the performance of all students in the district.
15 And then we have -- for schools, we have the traditional
16 school performance framework -- framework -- framework
17 reports that we put out. And then for about 80 schools
18 in the state that qualify as alternative education
19 campuses, they have a different framework. We know those
20 schools, they qualify that way by having 95 percent of
21 their students meeting a high-risk definition. It's
22 different than at-risk. It's not free-and-reduced lunch,
23 but it's a high risk, but with real intense needs of
24 students. So we have about 80 schools in the state that
25 you all approve that have a different framework. We'll



1 go into some detail, like I shared and talked about on
2 what that framework looks like.

3 But there was kind of a -- a conflict there,
4 tension there, in our system that we have this allowance
5 at school level to look at school -- their school
6 performance differently. But it wasn't acknowledged at
7 the district level. So Board rule was developed with a
8 lot of stakeholder input and went through the very public
9 boardmaking process that came up with this criteria.

10 First part is if the district shows -- earns
11 a higher rating if you remove the AEC students, those
12 alternative education campuses, from the calculation,
13 that's the first part, just like Jackie said. We --
14 there's no discrepancy there. We all ran the data. We
15 all agree Sheridan would get a higher rating with that.

16 But then the second part is looking at the
17 performance of that alternative education campus, because
18 we still -- care tremendously about all the students and
19 outcomes for all students. So while we have a different
20 performance framework for AEC students, we still want to
21 have some consideration at a district level of how
22 students are -- are doing in those AECs. So the balance
23 to just removing students was to look at how the
24 alternative education campuses are doing on their own.
25 And so the rule says if they're earning an AEC



1 performance framework of performance, which is the
2 highest level you can get, they're fine. You can go
3 ahead and give them the higher rating. If they're at the
4 AEC improvement rating, which is where SOAR was this
5 year, then they needed to be showing improvements, that
6 they need to show that that school is getting better on
7 the AEC performance indicators. And that's where we have
8 a different interpretation.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, I'm sorry, Ms.
11 Mazanec.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Can you explain -- can you
13 explain the difference between the assessment -- the
14 assessment for AECs versus non-AECs? How -- how are they
15 judge differently?

16 MS. PEARSON: Sure. Do you mind a little
17 bit for the presentation? Is that okay?

18 MS. MAZANEC: Not at all.

19 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Okay. I promise you,
20 I'll get to that.

21 MS. MAZANEC: We'll get there.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, we'll get there. So
23 this is just background so you understand what the Board
24 rule is. In 2014, we approved five districts using this
25 rule. Those districts all had -- their AECs were



1 performing at the AEC performance level.

2 So now we just want to give you a little bit
3 more context around the results and data shared, just you
4 can have a little bit more background information. So
5 this slide shows 2014 and it's trying to illustrate how
6 the districts in the school ratings come together. So
7 the district in 2014 earned a priority improvement
8 rating. They were at 48.8 percentage of points. They
9 cut scores at 52, so they had a little bit to go, but
10 they're pretty close to that cut score as a district as a
11 whole. And again, that looks at all students within that
12 district.

13 The schools, like Sheridan talked about, the
14 schools have made a lot of improvement over time.
15 Sheridan Elementary was at -- earned an improvement
16 rating, as did the high school. Sheridan Middle School
17 was at the performance level. And SOAR Academy was at
18 the AEC improvement level. So on that AEC framework,
19 they earned improvement.

20 If you looked at the school on the
21 traditional framework, it would've been at the turnaround
22 level. It's the reason why we have an AEC framework, so
23 we can understand how schools are doing with their
24 students that are serving that population, but just to
25 know that that's the context. So when you roll up and



1 you look at all students together on the district
2 standards, which align with the traditional school
3 standards, that's how you have a district rating at
4 priority improvement when it looks like all schools are
5 yellow or green. I just wanted to give you all that
6 context.

7 MS. FLORES: So it's a metric that use to
8 show this, just a metric, even though it shows that
9 there's been improvement? You use another metric that
10 shows that it doesn't, that it doesn't fall within --

11 MS. PEARSON: Are you asking --

12 MS. FLORES: I'm just asking the understand.

13 MS. PEARSON: Understand the AEC rating
14 itself --

15 MS. FLORES: Yes.

16 MS. PEARSON: -- or the district rating?

17 MS. FLORES: Yes.

18 MS. PEARSON: The AEC rating? Okay. I'll
19 get into that in just a little bit --

20 MS. FLORES: Oh, perfect.

21 MS. PEARSON: -- about how it's formed. And
22 then if it's not clear, please let me know.

23 MS. FLORES: Okay.

24 MS. PEARSON: Okay, so this is, as we talked
25 about, if you remove the AEC students from the district



1 score, they cross that line and end up with an
2 improvement rating. We all agree about that, but just to
3 make sure you guys are clear, that is based on not
4 looking at the performance of the AEC at all.

5 And then we just wanted to give you a little
6 more context around the population in the district: 24
7 percent of the district's high school students are
8 enrolled in SOAR Academy. I know often we think about
9 AECs, about those alternative campuses as this little
10 teeny, small school off there, off in the side, but we've
11 got 24 percent of the students in high school and
12 Sheridan in that school. And that's why we as a
13 department felt like it's really important to make sure
14 we look at the performance of that school very carefully,
15 since so many of the high school students are enrolled
16 there.

17 MS. FLORES: Excuse me, Alisa?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah?

19 MS. FLORES: Is this unique in this
20 district? That you have that high of a percentage?

21 MS. PEARSON: That high percent? We looked
22 at some other districts. There's a few Colorado School
23 for the Deaf and Blind (indiscernible) all kids are,
24 because they have a single school and it's just an AEC
25 campus. But in terms of other districts in the state,



1 Englewood is the only district that was a little bit
2 higher. They were at 27 percent of their high schoolers
3 that were enrolled in their alternative education campus.
4 Englewood has about 80 percent of their students in their
5 alternative education campus that are coming from out of
6 district. So only 20 percent of those students in
7 Englewood are from the Englewood boundary.

8 MS. FLORES: Whereas here it's like 49
9 percent?

10 MS. PEARSON: That's what -- the district
11 presented that today. We haven't looked at that data, so
12 I'm not sure.

13 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Thank you.

14 MS. PEARSON: I can't comment on that. So
15 then just to give a little bit more background on the
16 district's performance as a whole, as an entire district,
17 we wanted to look at that, since the district brought it
18 up. And we looked at the measures that were consistent
19 from 2014 to 2015, what data we have consistently.

20 As the district talked about, we've seen
21 some growth -- growth in English-language proficiency.
22 Sheridan has put in a lot of work in terms of teaching
23 teachers and systems in terms of English language
24 acquisition, and so they're -- they're seeing some of
25 that in the data. If you look by elementary and middle



1 and high school level, which is how we look for -- at --
2 at the performance frameworks, we see improvements at the
3 elementary and high school and some decline at the middle
4 school level. But we definitely saw growth from '14 to
5 '15 at the district level.

6 When we look at graduation dropout and ACT
7 scores for post-secondary and workforce readiness
8 indicators, we see improvement -- or declines in two out
9 of three of the measures. The graduation rate increased,
10 the four-year rate, from 40 percent to 60 percent.
11 Again, that's just looking at the four-year rate. And
12 dropout rate showed an increase in more dropouts, which
13 is a decline in performance. And the ACT scores the
14 district talked about also declined.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: ACT (indiscernible).

16 MS. PEARSON: Yes, all of this data has the
17 ACT included. This is district as a whole.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

19 MS. PEARSON: Sure. So let's get in a
20 little more about the AEC rating. So we talked about the
21 rule and how that worked. What we really, as you saw,
22 are sharing from us, it's that understanding or that
23 conclusion around is the AEC improving over time or not?
24 And that's where we're just seeing the data a little bit
25 differently.



1 So I'm going to talk about the AEC
2 performance framework, that alternative education campus
3 framework, a little bit. There are four indicators in
4 that, just like the regular frameworks, but they're
5 weighed a little differently. And one of the indicators
6 is different entirely. It's student engagement. We
7 don't look at student engagement on the traditional
8 framework, but we know that that is such a challenge and
9 such, it's kind of at the core of what AECs are trying to
10 do, is getting kids re-engaged and back in school that
11 student engagement was added as an indicator for
12 alternative education campuses. So you can see how the
13 points are split up on the frameworks that way.

14 Another thing that's unique about the
15 alternative education campuses is that optional measures
16 may be submitted. Through our request-to-request
17 process, we'll look at local data for schools and
18 districts, but that's only through this additional
19 process. For alternative education campuses, they can
20 build in the data that they submit to CDE for their
21 accountability with data that they have locally that's
22 more in tune with what this school is focused on and what
23 its mission is. Additionally, most alternative education
24 campuses generally serve 11th and 12th graders. And up
25 until last year, we weren't doing any state testing with



1 11th and 12th graders. So there was about this much TCAP
2 (ph) data that we had for them. So we knew we just were
3 not getting a full picture for this school, so that's
4 another reason why the local measures were built in.

5 CDE has a guidance document. I think it's
6 at the end of the -- one -- the appendices that you had
7 in our big ole position statement, but tells districts
8 how the guidance for using local measures and the
9 criteria they need to meet.

10 MS. FLORES: Alisa, we're looking --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

12 MS. FLORES: We're looking at some
13 information here in a document from the American
14 Educational Research Association. And it shows that --
15 that AEC document is kind of extremely, extremely
16 sensitive. So that would tell you that in a like this,
17 it would just put it over the top, that that measure.
18 And why use that measure? Why are we using that measure
19 when we know that there has been improvement to begin
20 with?

21 MS. PEARSON: Dr. Flores, would you mind
22 explaining which measure you're talking about?

23 MS. FLORES: We're talking about the AEC
24 measure that you use. It's the -- the name of the title
25 is the Metric Matters -- the Sensitivity of Conclusion



1 About Growth in Student Achievement to Choice of Metric.
2 So according to this study, that measure is very
3 sensitive. So it -- it could go, you know, all over the
4 place. So I'm just saying why put all, you know, your --
5 when it is so sensitive.

6 MS. PEARSON: I think I would need to -- I'm
7 sorry, I would have to look at that paper to understand
8 fully what you're referring to.

9 MS. FLORES: Well, but the metric --

10 MS. PEARSON: I'd be happy to do that. But
11 the AEC framework is made up of a number of different
12 metrics.

13 MS. FLORES: Sure.

14 MS. PEARSON: And they are, you know, to try
15 and balance --

16 MS. FLORES: Right.

17 MS. PEARSON: -- as we get all those
18 different pieces of understanding of performance.

19 MS. FLORES: But if -- if -- if one way,
20 when you're looking at data, it shows that they have made
21 improvement and we know all these other factors where
22 there is so much homelessness and other issues that would
23 make it difficult for students to be there, and then to
24 have -- to use a metric like this to show that, you know,
25 according to the rule, it -- it just doesn't measure up,



1 because it's -- it just doesn't, because of, you know,
2 one or two percentage points that would be -- I don't
3 know, sometimes --

4 MS. PEARSON: Well, let -- if you don't
5 mind, let me go through and explain our concerns with the
6 data and where we've come to the conclusion we've had
7 today, but those are all reasons where you should -- that
8 you all have to consider for making your decision today.

9 MS. FLORES: Right.

10 MS. PEARSON: So this is just to explain our
11 recommendation. Okay? Oh, thank you. Okay, so the last
12 thing about the AEC framework is that that expectations
13 were set by (indiscernible) the AEC community. So we
14 looked at attendance rates compared to all other AECs.
15 So that's where those expectations come from -- same with
16 TCAP data. So when those expectations are set, because
17 you understand population in the AEC, those are all lower
18 expectations than what we have on the traditional
19 frameworks. It kind of explains why there's a turnaround
20 rating on the traditional frameworks on the other.

21 Okay, so -- so we want to talk about the
22 performance of SOAR specifically. On the state measures
23 that we have consistent between '14 and '15, we saw
24 declines in four out of five measures on the local data
25 that the district submitted and shared. We have concerns



1 about being able to make an interpretation around that
2 data. So let me go quickly, because I know we're running
3 out of time, so I can help you all understand why we had
4 those concerns and why we were inconclusive about that
5 information.

6 So on the student engagement measures, the
7 truancy rate, and the attendance rate, as the district
8 talked, the truancy rate increased. Mean more students
9 had unexpected absences. The attendance rate decreased
10 with fewer students attending classes. So those two
11 measures of student engagement both showed decreases.

12 In terms of post-secondary workforce
13 readiness, there was improvement in the completer rate.
14 We saw a change from 27.3 percent in the 2013 six-year
15 completer rate. We used the best of to give the benefit
16 of the doubt, to a 44.7 percent completer rate in 2014.
17 Completer rate's like grad rate, but includes the GED
18 completers in it.

19 In terms of dropout rate, we saw a large
20 increase in dropouts from 2013 to 2014. And that's a
21 decline in performance. We also saw the mean ACT score
22 drop. We used a two-year rating, because end size wasn't
23 met for the first year. Usually we average data together
24 over multiple years. Anyway.

25 And then in terms of the optional measures



1 the district submitted, you all already are getting into
2 some of those issues that we had with it, as you heard
3 from the district. We have some concerns about the
4 representative of the data, the comparable of the
5 results, and the performance expectations the district
6 used. So let me just talk through that a little bit.

7 So in terms of representativeness of the
8 data, there was 1,100 students enrolled in SOAR Academy
9 as of October 1 last year in 2014. The students in green
10 up there were not tested in the fall. So almost half of
11 the students that were enrolled weren't tested in -- in
12 the fall semester. Of the ones that were tested in the
13 fall, just the yellow, the 25 percent were tested in the
14 spring. So we are trying to make a determination around
15 the performance improvement in this school based on only
16 a quarter of students. And that really gives us some
17 pause to say does this really represent what's going on
18 in this school?

19 And the district also let us know that some
20 of the reason -- reason why the students weren't tested
21 in the fall were attendance issues enabled by the
22 telecommuting option via online courses. So students are
23 getting a different mode of instruction in kind of a
24 different kind of learning situation. And we don't have
25 data on them. It -- it further questions why -- do we



1 have enough information? Do we have a representative
2 sample of students to really be able to make this
3 conclusion that there's improvement there?

4 And also as you all noted, there was a -- we
5 had some challenges with that comparability of measures.
6 So the district for wonderful instructional reasons
7 switched from Scantron assessment in the '13/'14 school
8 year to the I-Ready assessment in the '14 -- '13/'14
9 school year -- '12/'13 -- I'm getting confused. Past two
10 school years (indiscernible) assessment. So we were --
11 it was a struggle. We were trying to figure out how we
12 could look at these two assessments and show
13 comparability.

14 The district submitted data to us on the
15 GLE. It's the green level equivalent, so about the green
16 level of students that took both the Scantron assessment
17 in the spring of 2014 and then enrolled again in the fall
18 of 2014 and took the I-Ready assessment. And you can see
19 from that chart, students that took it in the spring and
20 in the fall, they went from a 6.3 grade level equivalent,
21 about a little over sixth grade in spring of 2014, to a
22 4.7 in the fall. So we know that since students will
23 some -- have some summer learning loss and drop, but
24 that's probably more of an indication of differences in
25 that assessment expectations. And it shows that the new



1 assessment has higher expectations. It just makes it a
2 little bit challenging to compare those results to each
3 other.

4 And then our final concern has to do with
5 how the performance expectations were set. So we talked
6 about it a little bit earlier about the -- about the
7 guidance around submitting local measures. What CDE has
8 in our guidance for achievement is that either students
9 are meeting grade-level expectations or they're
10 increasing one grade level. The data that the district
11 submitted showed students meeting sixth grade math
12 expectations, that was the expectation that they set, or
13 eighth grade for reading, which is not grade level when
14 you've got a high school score. So we have concerns
15 about that. They submitted in 2015 to align with the
16 data they submitted in 2014 -- same guidance was out
17 there, the same rules were there. We had shared out
18 concerns about those expectations being well and not in
19 alignment with CDE's guidance. And so that falls with a
20 growth expectations too.

21 So to conclude, let me just talk a little
22 bit about policy implications for this decision, we --
23 you know, the way -- way we kind of walked through on
24 what some of the implications could be for how you make
25 your decision today. The first one is this isn't an



1 anomaly due to a really unique timeline in that we were
2 looking at more recent performance data to make a prior
3 accreditation rating decision. So the 2014 rating that
4 we're talking about today of priority improvement was
5 based on 2013/'14 student performance data.

6 Then the district submitted 2014/'15 data,
7 which is passed that rating to be considered in an old
8 rating. We're doing that. It makes sense to do one,
9 because the district had submitted an appeal last fall to
10 talk about it. And two, because we have the
11 accountability hole this year and we're not giving any
12 rating. If we were doing ratings this year and we have a
13 2015 rating, that's how we would consider it. Because
14 we're in this odd situation, it just -- it made sense to
15 do it this way. But we just want to make note that this
16 is a probably, hopefully a one-time thing. In the future
17 all ratings would be based on the performance of those
18 years and we won't have future data going into a prior
19 rating. So we just wanted to point that out.

20 And then another thing for you all to
21 consider is that a quarter of the district's high school
22 students are enrolled in the -- in SOAR Academy. So to
23 think about how much an AEC and the performance of that
24 AEC should be weighted in a district rating, it's a hard
25 situation. We struggled with that. It was hard when we



1 were working through that rule process, but I just think
2 you, as you make that decision, it's something to
3 consider for you how much weight should be given to the
4 alternative education campus performance, especially when
5 you've got a quarter of the students enrolled from high
6 school there.

7 So finally, we would just -- oh, thanks.
8 I'm not doing good at clicking at the same time, am I?
9 Finally, I want to talk a little bit about CDE's
10 recommendation, just a summary of where we see things and
11 why we can't -- why the data did not support for us a --
12 the ability for us to come and recommend approval to you
13 all today. It's what we were working for, it's what
14 we've been working for with the district since last fall,
15 but unfortunately the data and our interpretation and
16 what we saw in it, we couldn't come forward in order to
17 hold up a fair and uniform and consistent state
18 accountability system.

19 So as we talked about, Sheridan School
20 District as a whole, the district improved on three out
21 of six measures, but declined on three out of six
22 measures. In terms of SOAR Academy specifically, there
23 was one of the state measures were improved, completor
24 rate. But there was declines in the other four measures.
25 And then in our interpretation in our review of the data,



1 the four -- the four local measures that were presented,
2 we found this to be inconclusive. We didn't see enough
3 of the students represented in the data and we had
4 concerns about the cut scores used. And we just had
5 concerns about the data enough that we didn't feel like
6 we could say that this shows an improvement.

7 So based on all that, based on the
8 agreements and conversation we had with the district
9 around the conditions that would be needed in order for
10 us to recommend a higher rating, where we'd see a major
11 of the indicators on the performance framework showing
12 improvements, we can't support the -- the recommendation
13 for higher rating today.

14 We know the district is doing good work. We
15 believe that they will continue to work hard and look at
16 the AEC and what's going on in that school. I know they
17 have leadership challenges that they're filling and
18 addressing and we know that they'll get there. We just,
19 at this point in time, don't think that the data warrants
20 a higher rate of improvement for the district. So thank
21 you for your time. If you have questions, I'm happy to
22 answer any of those.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Pearson.
24 Any questions or comments from the Board at this time?
25 Yes, Dr. Scheffel?



1 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah, I really appreciate both
2 presentations. You know, the public really benefits from
3 having, good, clear, strong data so that they can look at
4 whether or not they want to send their kids to that
5 school. As you pointed out you have a lot of students
6 who are coming into your district from other districts.
7 For some reason, they want to be there.

8 Obviously the State is trying to stand for
9 critical system so the public has the data. I appreciate
10 both perspectives. I'm not sure if I understand the
11 answer to these few questions (indiscernible).

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

13 MS. SHEFFEL: One of the problems is non-
14 comparable data. Sheridan is -- is using certain metrics
15 that allow them to say on page whatever of the PowerPoint
16 evidence of improvement in reading achievement, reading
17 growth, math achievement, math growth, growth graduation
18 rate, but not engagement, as in truancy and attendance,
19 right? The State would say they're using different
20 metrics to say, no, actually, it's only three out of six,
21 three out of six. And are those -- so -- so to me,
22 that's one issue, non-comparable data, because you went
23 to -- I can't remember the name of --

24 MS. FLORES: I-Risk.

25 (Overlapping)



1 MS. SHEFFEL: Which is more rigorous
2 (indiscernible).

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, it is.

4 MS. SHEFFEL: So that's one issue. And
5 there's a second issue. If SOAR is completely taken out,
6 then would the State say that -- that Sheridan would
7 qualify for an increased rating? And I think you would
8 say yes.

9 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

10 MS. SHEFFEL: Okay, so it has to do whether
11 or not SOAR is included. And it strikes that there's
12 precedent for not including anything. So, you know, I --
13 I -- to me, those are the two issues we have to think
14 about. Is SOAR included or isn't it? Is there precedent
15 for that? And then given their lack of comparability in
16 the -- in the types of measures you're using to assess
17 achievement and growth, which assessments -- I -- I mean,
18 does it make sense if we look at the big picture of why
19 we're doing this? So the public has good information
20 about whether or not their kids can benefit from
21 (indiscernible) district. So to me, that helps me think
22 through do we support this appeal or not?

23 MS. FLORES: And -- and the other thing is -
24 - and Mr. Clough stated that most of these other
25 districts do not want to take those 41 percent of



1 students that they're taking, which they take, you know,
2 regardless of -- of their circumstances. And sometimes
3 they are dire. So that would lead me to believe that,
4 you know, Sheridan's a saint for doing it. That would be
5 a very positive thing, where kids would ordinarily not
6 even graduate from high school. They're taking people
7 that are down and out and really working with them.

8 So -- and I agree with also with Pam and
9 what she -- you know, her line of agreement. And also,
10 with that research on that instrument, that is very
11 sensitive. You know, if a standard deviation, it -- it
12 doesn't matter if you're -- you know, if it measures
13 this. If you have a standard deviation on an instrument
14 that's either, you know, too high, too low, it's -- it's
15 not going to show you. It's not going -- it'd be
16 meaningless, almost.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm kind of trying to
19 reflect on the whole purpose of the accountability law.
20 And what I'm seeing -- and this is -- it's very similar
21 with 191. The intent with both 191 and -- sorry, the
22 numbers -- the Educator Effectiveness Law --

23 MS. MAZANEC: I understand.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and the Accountability
25 Law is to provide extra support where we identify



1 concerns for kids and -- and teachers. And yet the
2 perception out there, by Sheridan, is that it's a
3 punishment, that by being identified as a district that
4 warrants extra support from the Department, extra grants,
5 et cetera, because of the neediness of the kids, that we
6 should ignore that and give them a higher standards in
7 order to sort of make it look better. And so I worry
8 about the glass half full-glass half empty perception
9 that out there -- that is out there. The intent of the
10 legislature, I don't think, is being perceived in the
11 same way by the school district. The school districts
12 see it as we're somehow trying to punish them.

13 MS. FLORES: But --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: That -- that worries me a
15 little bit. And so that's why I wish you hadn't come
16 forward. I wish you would wait till, like all the other
17 districts, to wait and see, number one, what happens for
18 next year, number two, the recommendations from the
19 accountability -- those reams.

20 (Overlapping)

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Work group of suggestions
22 where they've been looking at your district, those kinds
23 of things. But you end up losing if we now say, okay, we
24 recognize you're doing good work, go forward, even though
25 you've got an alternative campus that is more than an



1 alternative campus. It's a part of your high school,
2 roughly. And I'm just worried about that. Could you
3 comment, Mr. Clough?

4 MS. FLORES: May I --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, let -- let Dr. --

6 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let Dr. Clough respond and
8 then you'll be next.

9 MS. FLORES: Okay.

10 MR. CLOUGH: Dr. Schroeder, I have great
11 respect for you, but I -- I -- I have to disagree a
12 little bit.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

14 MR. CLOUGH: It -- is it a mark. And -- and
15 it is -- it is a mark on your district that is not
16 perceived as anything very positive. It is -- and -- and
17 -- and I'm -- I'm really trying to reflect on what you
18 said, because there is some merit to that, because I
19 would really encourage the Board to dig in and really
20 understand, because what this appeal process has done,
21 there are some things in there that are going to leave
22 you shaking your head, I guarantee you. In the entire
23 process of accreditation of schools, both moving schools
24 up and moving schools down, that is going to be very
25 alarming to you when you start to look.



1 And I would really encourage you to take a
2 look. But, yeah, I think it is a glass half empty versus
3 a glass full, because there are opportunities that come
4 around grants. But there's also, on this end, it feels
5 like a recognition of not valuing the work that's been
6 done and how far the district has come. You know, it --
7 it's -- it's such a delicate balance to be a
8 superintendent of a district like Sheridan. I love that
9 community. I -- I never saw myself working in an
10 underresourced community. I -- I -- I just didn't. And
11 we have made such unbelievable progress, it's -- it's
12 really unbelievable. And regardless of way the vote
13 goes, we will continue to do what we're doing. I wish I
14 could take the Board back to the vote where we decided to
15 make SOAR a school and where we decided to open it up and
16 really not have qualifiers to get in. You think about
17 the students that we took in, it's alarming. They had an
18 average reading score of 4.7. I -- these are -- you
19 know, Dr. Flores, I appreciate that these are -- these
20 are students that have had some challenges and they have
21 been locked out of the education system for quite some
22 time. And we knew as a district, given the fact of how
23 far we had to go, we knew doing that was an absolute
24 risk.

25 So I asked the Board several times, do we



1 follow the dream or do we follow the data? Because if we
2 follow the dream, the data's going to kill us. And, you
3 know, we now have an ability to move forward. One of the
4 things about the accreditation system, and it -- it was
5 talked all around it, but there's a different
6 accreditation system and metric for the schools than
7 there is for districts.

8 Ask yourself, how could all your schools be
9 improvement and performance?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

11 MR. CLOUGH: And your district to be a
12 priority improvement? So you know what? If we don't win
13 this appeal, I will think long and hard about what you
14 said and I will do everything in my power to get the
15 glass half full. But nobody likes a mark on your
16 community. I don't think it's a fair representation of
17 the Sheridan community and I don't think it's a fair
18 representation of our community schools. I hope Cindy
19 Ward is here. I would -- I would hope and -- and we --
20 we asked her to speak, but I -- I think it was probably
21 inappropriate, since she's a CD employee. So Elliott
22 said she would be willing to answer some questions.

23 But I would love the Board to get her
24 perspective on somebody whose eyes are on our district
25 once or twice a month.



1 (Overlapping)

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Indiscernible) decision's
3 been made, Mr. Clough.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So now can I continue
5 (indiscernible)?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, you can continue. You
7 have the floor.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I think we should delve
9 deeply into his, but to -- to some extent, to go to Dr.
10 Scheffel's point, what are we telling the community? If
11 we've got an ACT score of 15, I mean, this -- this also
12 brings up this dilemma between growth and student
13 achievement. And I'm guessing that where we have the
14 discrepancy is that we've sometimes put more weight on
15 student achievement in one measure than in another. So
16 growth, while it's critical, at some point we've got to
17 get --

18 (Overlapping)

19 MS. SCHROEDER: -- to the achievement level
20 that our kids need to get to. And that therein I --
21 disagree with me if you wish, but therein, I think, lies
22 some of the problems that we're having in -- in looking
23 at this.

24 MR. CLOUGH: Chairman Durham, may I address?

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.



1 MR. CLOUGH: I -- I -- I agree and it is --
2 it is the rub between how much growth and how much
3 achievement, because if there isn't a balance, you're
4 right. I -- I would also put forward when you look at a
5 metric and it shakes out schools of high underresourced
6 students and a high number of English-language learners,
7 when all those students shake out, if you buy into this
8 system hook, line, and sinker, you have to buy into the
9 fact that almost all our schools that have a high number
10 of English-language learners and a high number of
11 underresourced kids around free-and-reduced lunches must
12 not be very good places to go to school and all of those
13 that don't have those particular risk factors are pretty
14 great place to go to school.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

16 MR. CLOUGH: Because the factor that shakes
17 out more than anything is poverty. So in looking at
18 that, the other thing I would say is, yeah, you know, we
19 put it forward and so did so did the Department about the
20 measure of ACT, but when it came to the point totals that
21 we put up there, we already took our ding on ACT.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

23 MR. CLOUGH: That was just a support. I
24 mean, even giving the ACT information, we still receive
25 that number. That was just supporting. So you take --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I -- I get the part
2 with the metric. I mean, that is problematic --

3 MS. FLORES: May I --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- any time we try to put
5 numbers to their serious question, which is are our kids
6 learning and are they learning enough?

7 MR. CLOUGH: Right.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: And this is just a
9 substitute, a surrogate, a proxy for that. So I -- I
10 totally understand how many -- you can -- you can make it
11 go each way.

12 MR. CLOUGH: Absolutely.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: But I just worry about where
14 -- when we're going to get to where we need to go,
15 because we're also going to talk about graduation
16 expectations. And I don't know how Sheridan has a -- a
17 Colorado graduate -- I mean, how we're going to figure
18 out ways to ensure that those kids get to move beyond
19 that if they haven't -- if they're not able to go far
20 enough.

21 So I -- I want to say that I respect all the
22 work that you're doing. It -- you -- we're not there yet
23 and I don't want to punish you if you feel punished.
24 That's really not the intent. The intent actually is to
25 provide more and more support where you want it.



1 MR. CLOUGH: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores and then --

3 MS. FLORES: I -- I --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- Dr. Scheffel.

5 MS. FLORES: I am so glad you came before
6 us. I really am, because it shows the flaws. It shows
7 flaws that I think with this accountability system that
8 really does punish our districts who have a large number
9 of minority, poor, ESL, and probably also special
10 education. And it -- it -- it just isn't fair when we
11 know that the State is not providing the resources and
12 I'm sorry, but I really do think that when a district
13 gets a higher rating, they do get more. The teachers get
14 paid much more, according to Senate Bill 191. So to say
15 that there isn't gain, there is gain. There's a lot more
16 to gain when a district is rated higher than when it's
17 rated lower.

18 Two, I -- they've made these great gains.
19 In one district, you -- they have their own scaling and
20 such, am I correct, about Denver, that they have a
21 different system by which they rate their schools?

22 MR. ASP: Let me address that.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please, Dr. Aspect.

24 MR. ASP: Yeah, they -- they use basically
25 the State's performance framework, but they add some



1 additional measures of parent and student engagement and
2 parent satisfaction. But they use the same set of --

3 MS. FLORES: They do. And in a sense with
4 that one --

5 MR. ASP: -- performance factors.

6 MS. FLORES: -- they get higher if those
7 students that are low performing perform as does
8 Sheridan. So if Sheridan were using Denver's performance
9 measures, they would definitely be up higher --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

11 MS. FLORES: -- than Denver. Or not higher
12 than Denver, but they would be scoring higher than they
13 do.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

15 MS. SHEFFEL: Oh, I guess I would just say
16 whenever you have a system that is this -- frankly, I --
17 I feel it's confusing.

18 MS. FLORES: It is confusing.

19 (Overlapping)

20 MS. SHEFFEL: I mean, the public is trying
21 to use these data to make decisions about where their
22 children go to school. The leadership in the district is
23 trying to use these data for continuous improvement. The
24 Department is trying to create a system that can give
25 people comparable information. In this case, we have



1 just two issues to meet. We have non-comparable data
2 that the school is using versus the State. And actually,
3 the school achievement measures are more rigorous than
4 what the State is using.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Exactly.

6 MS. SHEFFEL: Which disadvantages their
7 kids.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

9 MS. SHEFFEL: And secondly, there's the
10 question of the population of the SOAR students, whether
11 they are part of the overall analysis or not when there's
12 precedent that they don't need to be, given their unique
13 needs.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Needs.

15 MS. SHEFFEL: So for me, I feel that the
16 rating strikes me as -- as unfair to the district --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: That's right.

18 MS. SHEFFEL: -- when I look at those two
19 issues. At the same time, I don't see anything wrong
20 with the State saying and should say, based on our
21 comparative data analysis, in these areas, the -- the
22 data -- the district achievement went up or didn't go up,
23 or whatever, that information can always be helpful, as
24 long as there's an asterisk that says, "And here's what
25 it's based on," and the district is saying in actuality



1 in these areas, we did go up and here's what it's based
2 on, this test under these conditions. That gives good,
3 honest, fair information for both parties.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Exactly.

5 MS. SHEFFEL: But I guess I don't see that
6 the rating makes sense based on those two issues, non-
7 comparable data and also the idea that it's the SOAR
8 data. There's precedent for that not being part of the
9 overall analysis. Those would be my two thoughts.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson? Sorry. Ms.
11 Pearson, I have a question. What was the reason for
12 allowing 2014/'15 data -- '14/'15 data to come into play
13 in evaluation of 2013/'14 accountability? I -- I -- that
14 doesn't make any sense to me and I want to know why it
15 was allowed.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think, Mr. Chair,
17 it's this interesting situation we're in right now with
18 the accountability hold, where there is no -- there is no
19 rating given for 2015. So in terms of the Department,
20 when we had talked with the districts and said last fall
21 for the 2015 rating, these are the conditions we'd like
22 to see and we can help you with the request reconsider,
23 we'll consider the '14/'15 performance data and look at
24 it then, we had made that kind of agreement with the
25 districts already.



1 After that was made, the legislation changed
2 to say that there would be no ratings for 2015. So right
3 now the only way to really consider this data for the
4 district, when the district had submit an appeal to you
5 all was around the 2014 rating.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So in theory every
7 district in the state could've submitted appeal by this
8 standard, which I -- I'd have to seriously question the -
9 - the state legislatures that we weren't going to rate.
10 So I don't know why we're rating.

11 MS. FLORES: They said to use the other for
12 this.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But secondly, our own --
15 if we follow our rule, the -- the conjunction appears to
16 be used here regularly is the word "and." And the
17 district must meet all of these criteria --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- in order to entitled to
20 a higher rating.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Correct.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct, Mr. Dyl?

23 MR. DYL: That's correct.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, any other
25 questions or comments? Yes, Ms. Rankin?



1 MS. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On Page
2 4, I would like to ask Ms. Pearson the question
3 (indiscernible). Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. This is
4 Joyce Rankin. Ms. Pearson, on Page 4, you mentioned that
5 I believe it was in April you offered to meet with the
6 district. I'm wondering if you did, if they requested
7 it, and if you did have meetings with them?

8 MS. PEARSON: Yes, thank you. We've been
9 meeting. We've been talking since last fall. Well,
10 before that, but in this rating, we've been meeting since
11 last probably August, September, on the request to
12 reconsider. And then through each of those stages after
13 April, I think we talked in April. We talked a lot over
14 the summer. We met in person. So we've had a lot of
15 ongoing conversation (indiscernible).

16 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. And Mr. Clough and
17 Ms. Webb, I just appreciate all you do. I know it's
18 difficult situation. I understand it totally and -- and
19 thank you. Thank you for what you do.

20 MR. CLOUGH: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, I think at this
22 point, there seeing no other comment, we'll close the
23 hearing on this and proceed to a motion, discussion, and
24 then a vote. Do I have a motion on this? Anyone want to
25 make a motion? Yes, Dr. Schroeder?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Based on the materials
2 submitted by the district and the department, as well as
3 the presentations we heard today, I move to deny
4 Sheridan's appeal of its 2014 accreditation rating
5 Accredited with Priority Improvement and its request to
6 be Accredited with Improvement. (Indiscernible).

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You did. Is there a
8 second to that motion? Yes, Ms. Rankin seconds.
9 Discussion? Seeing none, Ms. Burdsall, would you call
10 the roll, please?

11 MS. BURDSALL: Excuse me. Dr. Flores?

12 MS. FLORES: No.

13 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

14 MS. GOFF: Aye.

15 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

16 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

17 MS. BURDSALL: Joyce Rankin?

18 MS. RANKIN: Aye.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

20 MS. SHEFFEL: No.

21 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Steve Durham?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Aye. That motion passes
25 on a vote of 5-2. Well, now and I -- first of all, let



1 me say I thought that was a very good and very helpful
2 discussion. And while we're behind schedule, I don't wan
3 to see staying on schedule be the enemy of a good
4 discussion, because it did raise issues, a lot of
5 important issues, and I will Mr. Superintendent that, you
6 know, exactly how many of society's ills you're supposed
7 to be held accountable for is a good question and
8 probably deserves significant discussion, not only in
9 this Board, but across the street in the legislature. So
10 I -- I -- I think you're making substantial progress.

11 And so we're now --

12 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- Ms. Burdsall -- yes,
14 and thank you. Ms. Burdsall, would you read us into --
15 to give us -- to start with executive session please?

16 MS. BURDSALL: An executive session has been
17 noticed for today's State Board meeting in conformance
18 with 24-6-402 (3)(a), C.R.S. to receive legal advice on
19 specific legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402 (3)(a)(II),
20 C.R.S. --

21 MS. FLORES: Yes.

22 MS. BURDSALL: -- in matters required to be
23 kept confidential by federal rules or state statute
24 pursuant to 24-6-402 (3)(a)(III), C.R.S.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a motion to --



1 for an executive session, Dr. Schroeder?

2 (Overlapping)

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, is -- is --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Can we just have two
5 minutes? Can I --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, we're going to take a
7 break once we get into executive session, yes. No.
8 Assuming we get there. And so we have a motion. Do we
9 have a second? We don't.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, well, we'll skip the
12 second.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I second.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. This motion
16 requires five votes. Is there any objection to going
17 into executive session? Hearing none, that motion
18 cleared, passed, so the public will leave when we will --
19 executive session will stand in recess for ten minutes.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

21 (Meeting adjourned)

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 5th day of February, 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