



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO

June 9, 2016, Leg Update and Credo, Part 8

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 9, 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 MS. MELLO: And science on the current time frame  
2 that you include computer science in this -- for secondary courses  
3 as part of that process. We've talked a fair amount about House  
4 Bill 1222, the Online and Blended Learning Bill, because you all  
5 supported that as a Board. There is work to be done by the  
6 department and the Board in partnership with -- and the -- the law  
7 says, it's the Board and the Department, the administering BOCES  
8 which is currently the mountain BOCES and then some nonprofit  
9 entities.

10 To prepare a statewide plan for integrating  
11 supportive an online blended learning into the educational  
12 programs currently being provided by districts. And I should have  
13 said this sooner, but I'm -- I'm working up this implementation  
14 document that I know you all have as part of your process. This  
15 is -- this is something that was around long before I came on  
16 board with you all. And I have to tell you, I think it's a quite  
17 effective tool for really taking the bills that passed and  
18 breaking it down into who has to do, what, when. So that's what  
19 my -- my focus right now is kind of who -- significant pieces of  
20 work for the department, for your staff and for you all. And in  
21 that context, I highlight the -- the statewide plan up for the  
22 online and blended learning.

23 I'll highlight House Bill 1234, which requires  
24 the Department to investigate and review options on state  
25 assessments in English, Math, Science and Social Studies, and to



1 include options that would allow districts to select and  
2 administer their own. It is -- it is pretty clear and the intent  
3 of the legislation and that is to be -- be a contract. And I know  
4 the staff is working now to, you know, gonna get the RFP in  
5 process and all that. That is a \$40,000 contract that some --  
6 somebody will win to do that analysis in that work. That report  
7 is due to the joint education committees in December.

8                   That bill also requires the department to apply  
9 to be part of the Innovative Assessment and Accountability  
10 Demonstration Grant Program under ESSA. I'm not the -- the  
11 expert, my understanding is you all have been having those  
12 conversations anyway, but -- but do know that there is actually a  
13 statutory requirement out there now to -- to -- to apply to do  
14 that. How -- please.

15                   MS. SCHROEDER: I thought -- I thought it was a  
16 choice that we will have.

17                   MS. MELLO: Correct. House Bill 1289, is the one  
18 million dollar grant program I mentioned briefly before, it's  
19 around incentives to complete career development. That really  
20 doesn't go into full effect until the 17-18 budget year. So  
21 you'll see in your implementation document that staff is working  
22 on some -- kind of data collection and -- and those types of  
23 issues around it. But the actual grant program doesn't go into  
24 effect until the following year.

25



1                   The School Finance Act, I mean obviously, always  
2 one of the department's core functions is of course to be the  
3 distributor of school finance dollars of the state that will  
4 continue. As you all know, this year, the -- the school finance  
5 bill had some chart language related to charter schools amended  
6 onto it that had been moving forward as a separate bill. It got  
7 put into the School Finance Act. I thought it might -- you might  
8 be interested in some of the specifics of that. A couple of the  
9 components of -- that are worth highlighting.

10                   One, if -- if -- if the charter school is an  
11 institute charter school within a school district -- so it's  
12 located in a school district and that school district said, "Yes,  
13 we're gonna have an institute charter school in our school  
14 district." They don't get to -- the district basically doesn't  
15 get to come back and change their mind ten years later and say,  
16 "Now, we want to be in charge of that." So it essentially says  
17 that, it's just to charter schools or continue to remain  
18 accountable to CSI. It also -- there's been so much conversation  
19 and I find it endlessly confusing, honestly about automatic  
20 waivers for charter schools. There are certain things that can be  
21 automatically waived. This legislation clarifies that one of  
22 things that cannot be automatically waived, is the requirement for  
23 minimum number of teacher-pupil contact hours. So if a charter  
24 school would like to waive that or get some flexibility, they have



1 to come to you as a Board and you have to have that conversation.  
2 It's not something that's gonna just happen.

3 Charter school networks will now be audited as a  
4 single legal entity. So if it's a -- a network of four or five  
5 schools, they don't do audit separately on each school. School  
6 districts have to provide itemized accounting of central  
7 administrative costs, if they are asked by charter schools within  
8 their district. So right now under the law, districts are allowed  
9 to retain a portion of the charter school for -- for revenue, for  
10 what they call Central Administrative Costs. And this is just  
11 saying, you have to tell us what those are. You don't get to just  
12 say, we're, you know, we're holding \$10 back or whatever it is,  
13 you have to justify that. And then finally, districts have to  
14 notify charter schools of available vacant or underused buildings  
15 within the district. So those are some of the -- the charter  
16 school provisions that got amended onto 1422 that did pass. So  
17 those are all now law.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: You said available?

19 MS. MELLO: Uh-huh. It does say available.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Say that in whole phrase.

21 MS. MELLO: Districts must notify them of  
22 available vacant or an underused buildings, is how the -- the  
23 legislation raise.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: So that doesn't necessarily allow  
25 for a district to be planning. So if it has extra space but in



1 the next three to five years there is a huge development that's  
2 going to be selling 200 homes. Do you know what I mean? It -- it  
3 sounds like it curtails some of the planning that districts do  
4 tend to do sometimes.

5 MS. MELLO: I think Madam Vice-Chair, I -- the  
6 stature requirements only to notify the charter schools of that.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh okay. Okay.

8 MS. MELLO: So it doesn't, I think, by definition  
9 say that a charter school could then go into that space, when I  
10 think presumably the regular process kicks in there where they  
11 have a conversation about that. But --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

13 MS. MELLO: They have to at least say to charter  
14 schools, "Here are the buildings we have that are vacant or  
15 underused."

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Fair enough.

17 MS. MELLO: The final bill I thought I would  
18 highlight again quickly is House Bill 1429, which is the one bill  
19 that -- that added point 5 of an FTE to the department and  
20 \$44,000. This has to do with AECs, Alternative Education  
21 Campuses. It basically updates the criteria to designate a school  
22 as an AEC. Under -- before the bill passed, you had to up 95  
23 percent of students in these high risk categories, that threshold  
24 has now been lowered to 90 percent. It also gives the department  
25 a very kind of specific mandate to work on an ongoing basis with



1 AECs around issues of developing effective methods for measuring  
2 their progress in -- in the accountability system. So that is  
3 what I want to highlight. I'm happy to answer any questions.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions? Further questions  
5 for Ms. Mello? Seeing none, thank you very much Ms. Mello, we  
6 appreciate it. Oh, you do. Yes, Ms. Goff?

7 MS. GOFF: Two parts to it. First one, is thank  
8 you. I want to thank Jennifer for her presence and guidance and  
9 late nights and all the typical qualifications serving in that.  
10 And -- and the -- in line with the charter waiver conversation,  
11 just putting up seed of thought for us with our -- whether it's  
12 part of our priority package or -- or not. But to continue  
13 talking about the definition of innovation, how that -- how, if  
14 we're going to or not pursue anything around the -- the innovation  
15 act. Just a thought, what our role is, what kind of recourse  
16 there is for the Board beyond the very ceiling level, all that we  
17 have, just a thought. So --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further comments and I agree  
19 that we probably need to continue to take a look at that  
20 particular area and waivers and see where we are.

21 MS. GOFF: Innovation status too.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Innovation status, that  
23 sort of thing. Further questions? Yes.

24 MS. GOFF: In conjunction with that, could you  
25 take up that proposed bill that we did not follow through on? To



1 use that as a starting point for the wording and see if that -- so  
2 that sometime over the next two or three months, the Board can  
3 talk about that if in fact we want to support something like that,  
4 please.

5 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chairman and Vice-Chairman --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

7 MS. MELLO: -- I'd be happy to do that to send  
8 that to you all.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Yes, Dr.  
10 Scheffel.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I continue to get questions  
12 regarding the data privacy bill as to whether or not it covers  
13 algorithms. Can you speak to that or could Marcia I just -- I  
14 just need a clear statement. Does that bill address that or not?  
15 I don't have clarity.

16 MS. MELLO: Board Member Scheffel, given that  
17 what you're seeking is absolute clarity. I don't think I'm the  
18 right person to answer that question. So I don't know, I can't  
19 see behind me.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Marcia, you have an opinion on  
21 that? Excellent.

22 MS. BOHANNON: Good morning. Afternoon. To the  
23 question about algorithms, the -- the bill is very clear that any  
24 data that a vendor collects or has in its possession, has to be  
25 managed in a certain way. It has to be protected, it has to be





1 destroyed at the certain times. Algorithm and -- the word  
2 algorithm is just another way to say, they've calculated data,  
3 they've or they could have derived it or somehow come up with  
4 another data set. So the answer would be yes, it's covered in the  
5 bill because the bill talks about data that vendors have. So if  
6 they -- whether they've just collected it or whether they've  
7 calculated it, however they come up with that data, it's covered.  
8 I mean the -- the bill's very clear about that. It just doesn't  
9 use the word algorithm.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how would we know if, I mean,  
11 in other words? Is there some way to know if that's the case? I  
12 mean, is there some review that one could do or I -- I don't know  
13 how you do ensure that that's the case, I guess. It's just the  
14 derivative of the data, right?

15 MS. BOHANNON: Well I think, it will be like any  
16 law. Yeah, I mean, you'd have to take a look at what the vendor  
17 has. You know, what -- what data they're storing, what, you know,  
18 what they're doing with it? You'd have to go into actually what  
19 they're doing. But I mean, you could -- you could audit them, I  
20 suppose. I think -- I think the challenge here is that at some  
21 point, you've got to trust that they're -- they're signing the  
22 contractor agreeing to the requirements. And all of these types  
23 of situations are covered within that. So I would suggest that  
24 maybe the only thing we could do in addition to reminding them of  
25 their obligations under the law would be to point that out to



1 them. That all the data is considered, you know, no matter how  
2 they come up with it.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so would districts be  
5 responsible than to audit the practices of the vendors to ensure  
6 that they were complying including the algorithm piece?

7 MS. BOHANNON: Audit is a very large topic in the  
8 bill and review. Yeah. I mean, it's -- it's -- it's in there.  
9 There's -- we're still going through the process of really  
10 analyzing exactly what requirements are for each of the districts  
11 and for CDE and for vendors. So audit, that's -- it's a big part  
12 of it. So we're still working on that, so we can give you a  
13 little bit more information on that. I think we're planning to  
14 come back in the August Board meeting and give you more details on  
15 the actual implementation plan so we can add that to it.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Great. Thank you.

17 MS. MELLO: I did want to add that there are very  
18 specific provisions in the bill around what happens if there is a  
19 data privacy violation, right? So if a vendor or a researcher  
20 does not comply and there is evidence of that. And I understand  
21 that's different than what Dr. Scheffel is saying and that you  
22 know, how do we know they're complying is -- is one set of  
23 questions. If we know that they're not, if we know that there has  
24 been a problem, there are very specific provisions within the bill



1 around, termination of contract, public hearing around that. So  
2 the -- so the bill is quite specific on that point.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further questions of Ms.  
4 Mello? Any, none? Thank you very much. Okay. Let's see, we'll  
5 wait and see Dr. Flores returns here in just a minute. Otherwise  
6 we'll prepare for item -- item 11, which is the CREDO research  
7 proposals. So if we want to -- staff wants to set up for that.  
8 Let's see, who is -- oh Marcia. Don't try and escape. All right.  
9 Good.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Yes. Why don't we  
11 -- if you don't mind, well give it just a second here.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's time to end the meeting  
13 because my notebook has -- it's broken.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Are you out of?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's done. It's done. All  
16 it can do for this meeting.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Well, we're almost  
18 there.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores, all right. We'll  
20 start with the motion if we could -- Dr. Schroeder?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the CREDO  
22 research proposal.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So second to that motion? Ms.  
24 Goff? Ms. Goff's seconds. It has been moved and seconded that  
25 the research proposal be improved. So Commissioner, would you



1 care to start with -- with Ms. Bohannon or how do you want to go  
2 in this?

3 MS. ANTHES: I think Ms. Bohannon, just has a  
4 few over-arching comments just to set the context. And then we  
5 can turn it over to Maggie Raymond.

6 MS. BOHANNON: Hello again, everybody. As you  
7 probably remember some time ago, the Board decided that any  
8 research request and proposal, needed to come to the State Board  
9 for approval. So here we are.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One of many -- many problems  
11 with data privacy.

12 MS. BOHANNON: It's all out there, right?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Turn it off. Gees,  
14 apologies.

15 MS. BOHANNON: Yeah. Technology is at its best.  
16 I do apologize.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there an excuse for this  
18 Marcia?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: My phone rings in church  
20 occasionally. I wouldn't worry too much about it. Okay. All  
21 right. Go on Marcia, please. Go ahead.

22 MS. BOHANNON: We'll keep going. And also the  
23 data privacy law that we were just talking about has a clause in  
24 there that talks about the need to build a process for any  
25 research that's going to be requested or whatever. So we have to



1 have an internal research vetting process. So we're currently  
2 working on that and we had one before but we're -- we're working  
3 on finalizing that and making sure it's -- it's aligned with the  
4 bill and that you guys are good with it. So we'll bring that one  
5 back to you later. We're probably at the August Board meeting.

6                   So we're not gonna spend time today talking about  
7 the process. What we're gonna spend time today on is giving Dr.  
8 Raymond an opportunity to explain the research that she's been  
9 conducting at the Center for -- I got to make sure I get it right,  
10 Center for Research on Educational Outcomes, that's CREDO at  
11 Stanford University. And she's the -- the executive director  
12 there. So she is the best person to be able to describe what the  
13 value is to Colorado and the methodology, how they protect the  
14 data and that sort of thing. So I'm going to turn it over to her  
15 and let her explain that and answer any questions that you guys  
16 might have. So Dr. Raymond.

17                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Raymond.

18                   MS. RAYMOND: Good afternoon, and thank you very  
19 much for the opportunity to speak with you today. I have not had  
20 a chance to introduce myself to you before now. And so I'd like  
21 to start by just telling you a little bit about CREDO, the work  
22 that we do at Stanford and the kind of partnership that I have in  
23 mind with Colorado.

24                   We are not your typical academic research group.  
25 We've made a deliberate decision not to pursue tenure track



1 positions. And the reason for that is because it takes too long  
2 to get the answer out. We are incredibly focused on and  
3 exclusively focused on delivering evidence about policy decisions  
4 and program performance to departments of education, boards of  
5 education and state legislatures around the country. We have for  
6 the last 20 years, developed a research style that says there's  
7 urgency in giving feedback to policymakers. And there's nobody  
8 else in the country that believes that that's a full time job but  
9 we do.

10                   And so we have built a -- a practice over many  
11 years. And for the last eight years, Colorado has been one of our  
12 valued partners. We focus on issues of school choice, school  
13 performance and accountability. Those were the three areas that  
14 we work on and as far as Colorado is concerned, we think that  
15 Colorado is an essential part of all three of those stories. You  
16 have an incredible track record of policy making in the area of  
17 school choice and charter schools. And since we began working  
18 with you, we have been privileged to be able to provide you  
19 detailed information about how your policies impact students  
20 across the state. That's both at the aggregate compared to what  
21 students would normally have experienced in traditional public  
22 schools and at the breakout level of student groups that we care  
23 about students like Latinos and Blacks, and students with special  
24 education needs.



1                   We have a particular methodology that makes it  
2 important for us to partner with state departments of education  
3 because our counterfactual requires that we compare student level  
4 performance with students in traditional public schools. And so  
5 the opportunity to go around and collect data from individual  
6 charter schools in individual districts, puts us in a position of  
7 spending all of our time asking for permission as opposed to  
8 spending all of our time getting evidence about how your decisions  
9 have worked out.

10                   The project that we have come to you about today  
11 is a analysis of how charter management organizations are working.  
12 I know that you have interest in charter management organizations.  
13 You've been a leader in supporting the development of charter  
14 networks. And we would like to include Colorado and focus our  
15 next study to include you because we think there's an important  
16 story to tell. I know that there's concern about allowing any  
17 researchers to use data from Colorado and I'd like to address your  
18 concerns directly.

19                   We have data partnership agreements with 28  
20 states. We've been collecting data since 2004. We have the  
21 highest set of security standards of any academic research group  
22 in the country. We consider ourselves best of breed and intend to  
23 stay there. We have a security procedure that is equivalent to  
24 that, that in -- that is practiced by NASA, by the National  
25 Security Administration, by the Centers for Disease Control. We



1 intend to maintain every single level of rigor because as much as  
2 privacy is important to you, it's career critical for us. If  
3 there's ever a problem with any of our agreements they all go down  
4 and no one will ever -- ever again give us a data agreement.

5                   So this is a career ending moment for us. And so  
6 our incentives are completely aligned. I like my work, I'd like  
7 to continue my work. And everybody who works with me believes the  
8 same thing. Our priority is protecting and securing the data that  
9 we are allowed and privileged to have with our state partners. I  
10 think there is a balance that we can strike about providing you  
11 important feedback, that's what we do. That's part of our  
12 partnership. We knock ourselves out every day to give you the  
13 most accurate information about the policies and the programs that  
14 you enact and we hope that in turn with that we earn your trust  
15 and earn the opportunity to provide you important information for  
16 shaping your future decisions. So with that I'm going to end my  
17 comments and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

18                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions from members of the  
19 Board? Yes, Ms. Rankin.

20                   MS. RANKIN: Is this a project that you're doing  
21 now coming to Colorado? Is it part of a project that you started  
22 in 2013 or is this a new project?

23                   MS. RAYMOND: This is a new project. Each  
24 project that we do requires that we go and ask for permission





1 again. And the permission only extends to this project and ends  
2 at the conclusion of this project.

3 MS. RANKIN: And how long will that project last?

4 MS. RAYMOND: Well it was supposed to last nine  
5 months but it's taken us eight months to get to the starting line.  
6 So I really can't answer that precisely --

7 MS. RANKIN: About a month.

8 MS. RAYMOND: No. Oh please don't say that. I  
9 think we'll be done by the end of the calendar year. And what we  
10 ask of our state partners is a permission to hold the data set  
11 intact for another 12 months after we release a study. In case we  
12 get questions or challenges to our results, then we have the  
13 opportunity to go back and check and validate.

14 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

15 MS. RAYMOND: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

17 MS. FLORES: So again tell us the question.

18 Would you repeat the question that you want to ask in this  
19 research.

20 MS. RAYMOND: Certainly. So the question that  
21 we're asking is are students who are enrolled in schools that are  
22 part of Charter Management Organizations, CMOs, getting a better  
23 education because of affiliation with CMOs than they would  
24 normally get if they attended a regular charter school. A mom and  
25 pop or an independent charter school or if they would have



1 attended their traditional public schools. And so this is a three  
2 part analysis that allows us to bring to you performance  
3 information about your policies. Is that clear?

4 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Two questions, one,  
7 talk to us a little bit about that -- the data that you'll be  
8 using. And then secondly, are you subject to some kind of peer  
9 review given -- given that you are not part of the 10 year track  
10 where folks get together and review, what sort of you -- review  
11 process does your research --

12 MS. RAYMOND: Yes, thank you.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- encounter?

14 MS. RAYMOND: So the first question is what is  
15 the data that we're asking for? We -- we ask for one piece of  
16 personally identified information that is actually de-identified.  
17 We ask for student demographic information, program participation  
18 and free lunch and special ed and English language learner  
19 programs. We ask for information about performance on Colorado  
20 accountability tests and we ask for an student level identifier  
21 which we ask the department to scramble before they give it to us.  
22 We were actually the creators of the scrambled ID back in 2005  
23 when we realized that this was a way that we could adapt increase  
24 the level of security and privacy of the records that we were  
25 obtaining.



1                   We -- we at our place blend in information from  
2 the common core of data. This is a publicly available data set  
3 through the U.S. Department that explains school level aggregate  
4 profiles about the percentage of minority students, the percentage  
5 of special ed students and so on. So we append publicly available  
6 information to each student's record to reflect the condition of  
7 the school in which they attend each year. And that's the dataset  
8 that we hold and we use a particular methodology called a virtual  
9 twin, in which we identify kids who look exactly like each charter  
10 school students who go to traditional public schools that those  
11 specific students would have otherwise attended had they not gone  
12 to their charter school. So we then have a twin program and we do  
13 our study based on that.

14                   You asked me about peer review. We actually have  
15 four levels of peer review. One, our work is entirely self  
16 funded. The university does not contribute to our operating  
17 budget. So the first level of peer review is can we get any of  
18 our projects funded by -- by people? The second level of peer  
19 review is that we ask our colleagues in school reform fields if  
20 they will under contract review our work before we release it.  
21 Three, each of our data agreements requires that we provide our  
22 reports in advance of release to our state partners so that they  
23 can review it and some of them are pretty tough. And finally, we  
24 have the review of all of the entire world of academics after we  
25 review -- after we release a -- a report and we -- that's why we



1 want to hold the data set for 12 months so that we can answer  
2 those -- those requests. We actually think that our -- our peer  
3 review process is tougher than finding a journal who loves you and  
4 constantly submitting your journal articles to them.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Marcia.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

7 MS. FLORES: So are you saying that the common  
8 core tests that are given that the state the U.S. Department of  
9 Education gives you the data?

10 MS. RAYMOND: No ma'am, not at all. I don't even  
11 believe they collect it. No, that's -- that's the information  
12 that we're asking the state of Colorado to provide us. What we  
13 get from the state department of education is a school descriptor  
14 file. Remember that if we're using test data, we're only  
15 collecting data on students who are tested. So we don't get K  
16 through two and we don't get several grades in high school. What  
17 we're getting from the U.S. Department is a profile of all of the  
18 students in the school, at the school level completely aggregated  
19 up, no performance data. So the school record from the U.S.  
20 Department is here's the school, what percentage of the students  
21 in the school are minority group, how many have English language  
22 challenges, how many are reported as having special ed. These are  
23 data that you have reported to the U.S. Department and they just  
24 create an aggregate data set across the country that we use.



1 MS. FLORES: But you are using the common core as  
2 a -- a measure that is a --

3 MS. RAYMOND: Our outcome -- our outcome variable  
4 is how much academic progress does a student achieve in a year.  
5 How much progress do they make in our treatment condition which in  
6 this case is enrolling to CMOs versus other conditions, charter  
7 schools or traditional public schools.

8 MS. FLORES: And you're giving all this credit to  
9 a test that is on the line as far as credibility. I mean,  
10 couldn't you use another measure other than Common Core test, the  
11 PARCC test.

12 MS. RAYMOND: So for all of its flaws it has the  
13 advantage of being a universal test that all students in the state  
14 take. And it has the -- the opportunity, the -- the advantage  
15 that it is a consistent or reliable measure over time. That's not  
16 to say it's perfect, but it has those advantages. And since we're  
17 doing a twin study, remember every single time we have a -- in  
18 this case a charter school student and their control twin, they  
19 both have the same disadvantage with your instrument. So while it  
20 might not be perfect, it might not be perfect but it's the same  
21 condition for both of them.

22 MS. FLORES: I wait around for another test.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Hi.

25 MS. RAYMOND: Hi.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you're saying you've been a  
2 valued partner since for eight years right. So does this like re-  
3 create the extension of the partnership or how does that work. I  
4 mean how did the partnership get established eight years ago. It  
5 got through IR -- IRB and then now it's gone through you and me --  
6 tell me what we're doing since the eight year of partnership?

7 MS. RAYMOND: Well please don't take this wrong,  
8 but every single time we would approach the department there's  
9 been a new process.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

11 MS. RAYMOND: And so -- and -- and for good  
12 reason the -- the process has become more structured and  
13 standardized and rigorous over time. What I can say is that we  
14 only ask for the opportunity to work with you when there is a  
15 project that we think could provide you valuable information. And  
16 we've had a number of projects over the years that we thought  
17 would be valuable to -- to partner with you on.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so when -- when I look at the  
19 exec -- the report that you're attached in our board docs does  
20 that summarize the things that have been published since 2008? Or  
21 --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: To be honest I don't remember.

23 MS. RAYMOND: No ma'am, it does not.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I can do that for you though if  
25 you would like.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just wondering what came out  
2 of the partnership that's been ongoing for eight years.

3 MS. RAYMOND: Sure.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Maybe you could just speak to it.

5 MS. RAYMOND: Sure. So we have focused our work  
6 with Colorado and exclusively on charter school matters so far.  
7 We are looking at -- we have looked at what happens when charter  
8 schools open up and grow for the first five years. Can we find --  
9 can we find in -- early indicators of school quality early in the  
10 life cycle of a school and how much does that predict future  
11 performance. The second one was a CMO study that we did in 2012,  
12 I believe. We were lucky to include you in our last national  
13 study of charter school performance. We're -- Colorado did pretty  
14 well and we included the city of Denver in an urban charter school  
15 analysis that was released in 2015.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you. And then can you  
17 speak to the data elements that you'd be requesting. I did see  
18 kind of a list but I don't think it was comprehensive.

19 MS. RAYMOND: Sure.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: The data elements.

21 MS. RAYMOND: Sure. So we are looking for gender  
22 grade whether there were in the particular school year they're  
23 repeating that grade. Thank you very much. Their eligibility for  
24 free and reduced price lunch, their English language learners  
25 status, whether they are in need of special education services,



1 whether they are -- did I say gender? I can't remember. Did I  
2 say gender, okay sorry. Their race ethnicity, their performance  
3 on the state accountability tests and I think I've done it all.  
4 Haven't I? I think so. Oh and -- and the school that they attend  
5 in that particular year, the school.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

7 MS. RAYMOND: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

9 MS. RANKIN: I just have a quick question. When  
10 we talk about the virtual twin, how do you control for the fact  
11 that the parents choose the school as opposed to public?

12 MS. RAYMOND: I don't know that we have enough  
13 time on the docket today to go into that in depths. But -- so I  
14 have a couple of points about this. We use the starting score of  
15 a student, their baseline school performance and as we know  
16 achievement includes a lot of different things which is why we  
17 don't use achievement as our outcome variable, right? We use  
18 academic progress. And you know that as being a leader in growth  
19 modeling. So -- but that academic achievement score includes not  
20 only their past academic and down experience but also a lot about  
21 their family endowments. So when we match students, we match them  
22 on their starting score and so there is a degree of composite  
23 there about what the family thinks about education in the value  
24 that they've given schools in the past. Does that make sense?

25 MS. RANKIN: It does. Thank you.





1 MS. RAYMOND: Thank you. I have lots more to say  
2 about that if you'd like to ask me again.

3 MS. RANKIN: If we have a couple of days we can  
4 sit down and chat.

5 MS. RAYMOND: Next time. Questions?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have a question.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, yes. I'm sorry. Dr.  
8 Scheffel.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had one more question. I  
10 was looking at the conclusion for this report if you could tie it  
11 back to the methodology, I don't know if it's possible. I mean,  
12 we may not have time. But it just talks about scenarios and I  
13 don't know if that's part of the match twin approach but it says  
14 the purpose of the scenarios is not to advocate for a particular  
15 approach rather make obvious the fact that the impact on quality  
16 that accompanies closure, I think of a charter is more dramatic  
17 and enduring than efforts to improve the current stock of schools.  
18 A glimpse of what the future holds provided by these scenarios  
19 should quicken the resolve to use closure policies where charter  
20 schools are clearly under performing and so forth. Could you link  
21 that conclusion back to your methodology with the match twins?

22 MS. RAYMOND: Sure. So there's actually no  
23 connection at all between these simulations and the results of the  
24 study. This is the 2013 National charter school study. And what  
25 we learned in the 2013 study that we had not yet known was that



1 the charter sector as a sector gets better not because schools get  
2 better, but because policy actors get better about the decisions  
3 that they make. So what we were saying was there's a long left  
4 tail of performance of low performing charter schools across the  
5 country.

6 And if there were better policy decisions about  
7 how to treat under performing charter schools, you would move the  
8 whole distribution up to the right. And so these scenarios give  
9 you five different hypothetical ways of moving on low performing  
10 charter schools. Scenario A, B, C, D and E, and so it has nothing  
11 to do with the school performance -- the methodology itself, It  
12 just says if you removed schools using this criterion this is how  
13 much the -- the distribution would shift. If you got more  
14 stringent this is what the distribution would shift like and so  
15 that's what this is. Am I being clear?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes, thank you.

17 MS. FLORES: Are scenarios like case studies?

18 MS. RAYMOND: No, they're not. They're just  
19 completely hypothetical. We just said we -- we can see the  
20 distribution of school performance across our national study. If  
21 we said let's use a decision that anybody who is worse than some  
22 absolute level of achievement this is one of the scenarios. If  
23 you were -- if you were worse than 80 percent of the schools. If  
24 we just said you're in the bottom 20 percent and we're going to  
25 close you of your charter school, what would the impact on the



---

1 aggregate performance of all the rest of the schools be? How  
2 would you move the distribution? And then let's look at another  
3 scenario. Maybe the other one was you have to be worse than the  
4 local option by a certain amount of --

5 (Meeting adjourned)



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