

**DCSD School Board Meeting
5-4-10**

Present: John Carson, Clifton Stahl, Justin Williams, and Meghann Silverthorn, Dan Gerken. Absent: Douglas Benevento

5:24 p.m.: Call to Order, Roll Call, and Pledge

- Pledge of Allegiance; Motion to accept a change to the agenda to move public comment to 7:00; Motion seconded and approved by voice vote.
- Roll Call: Carson, Stahl, Williams, Silverthorn, Gerken

5:27 Public Comment: Carson: during the public comment portion members of the public can address the board on topics related the schools...max of five minutes.

5:29 Adoption of Consent Agenda:

Seconded and approved.

Carson: we have been having a back and forth on the legal statutes for fees...are we settled on that? Herzog: Darci? Mohr: we need 30 days written notice. Herzog: that was made public months ago. Carson: we can make a public comment section in an upcoming meeting. I would like to make sure we comply with (rules). Herzog: the SAC/DAC input...I assume we may see some tonight, 7:00 seems to be the time for public comment. I would expect some...channel 4 News filmed the entire meeting last week. One gentleman asked when he could specifically address the board. Carson: we will see the proposal the first of June? Herzog: no the (May) 18th. Fante: I see this as another round; it has certainly been on the docket for 30 days before this meeting.

Carson: as an extra precaution I will make it a matter of public record that we will take public comment on the 18th of May. I am going to be clearly on record in that I support it (fees). If a majority of the board looks at the comments and (decides differently)...but in this current climate it would be hard to walk away from 2 million in fees.

5:39 p.m.: Teacher Evaluation Presentation, CITE (Continuous Improvement of Teacher Effectiveness). Presentation: Brian Ewert, Brenda Smith, Karen Brofft, Dan McMinimee, and Pat McGraw (please see power point for all of the details of this presentation. I have only taken notes on questions and answers. PowerPoint available with notes at www.deft.net or with the agenda at www.dcsdk12.org)

- **Questions:** Stahl: are the budget numbers...ratcheted up each year? Ewert: no. McGraw: right now Pay For Performance is 2% (of the total compensation budget), with this it would be up to 7%. Ewert: it is a matter of what it would take to completely redesign our compensation system. We think it can be done; AFT is poised to help along the way. Gerken: this stuff is very complicated because there is a transition period...a teacher could stay in the old system and it would be required of new teachers (?) Ewert: they may find that the new system could drive up their earnings. Gerken: I think it is important to note that I don't know anyone who is looking to decrease (teacher's) overall compensation. With public education we have been doing the same thing for many, many years. This is not some sort of Trojan Horse. Ewert: this is important, there is fear out there. Teachers think you will cut pay by 20,000 and make them earn it back. Having talked to the folks in Harrison...they think what they are changing will increase their budget by 1 mill (with 450 something teachers in their district). Multiply that by 8 for our district. Gerken: I think you will see an increased willingness from the public to pay more for

teachers. Ewert: there is a lot of work to be done before we can tie teacher pay to performance. That is why we want to make sure it is meaningful and correct.

Gerken: is there anywhere in the country where this has been done? Ewert: no.

Smith: by far we are further along than any of the other (places). Gerken: is it fair to say that if we keep pushing along we could be the first district to be successful at this? Herzog: we are technically ahead, but (other districts have more money).

Gerken: all of these other districts that are getting more money...Ewert: Gates has been very clear on where the money goes (this is in reference to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation). Gerken: can we go to some of these foundations and say we can get there first...(and earn) license fees, etc. on our plan? Ewert: the longer we wait to roll this tool into the system the longer it will take to make it to the end. It is important for the teachers to see what they will be evaluated with. It will be low stakes at first. Gerken: at what extent is our speed slowed because we don't have money? Ewert: I would say significantly, especially around assessment tools.

Gerken: how much do we not have now that we need? McMinimee: 6-8 dollars per student...\$500,000 for our district to have a system that could be used by our teachers and principals. Brofft: actually it would be a little more per kid... we also need to pay for teachers to develop the actual assessments (\$800,000). Herzog: that is very important. It takes some time to revise after field-testing in the next year. Fante: not only to the actual infrastructure, bank, teacher involvement, conservative $\frac{3}{4}$ to a million dollars. Karen can speak to what is going on at a state level right now.

Gerken: with Race to the Top (RTTT), Brenda and the board can gather with AFT...I can not understand how we can't meet with someone...Smith: there will be some dollars in the second application of RTTT. Gerken: we can show people what we can do...next year the plan is to evaluation every teacher? Ewert: yes, there will be different steps to doing that...we are looking at 25/1 or 40/1 ratio (of teachers to evaluators) next year. I don't think you will have a high degree of reliability when you are expecting principals to evaluate 40 people. We might need to look a peer review, but that would cost money. Gerken: what do you think the reaction will be from principals? McMinimee: there is a cost return, the most important thing as a principal is to have the best teacher in the classroom. If we can have a system that provides this, it is value added. In my building it was 18-20 teachers (per evaluator)...to add 4-8 more people it will increase the work but will still help them understand where they are. Williams: how much in this new field...how much of this plan falls under...what other school districts have done? Has it all been done before? Smith: the current system going out now will look very similar to what our teachers are used to. We have added a fourth column, distinguished, but it is not unfamiliar. Williams: I just wonder about, yes we are trying something new but has it been done before? McGraw: maybe different things were there, but we are trying to add some pretty advanced metrics to these...the credibility piece needs to be there because of the high stakes that will be there. Brofft: in the past it was generally satisfactory and unsatisfactory...Charlotte Danielson's work is more of a coaching model, looking at teacher performance and turning it into an evaluation system...hasn't been done. Stahl: could you elaborate...one of the things is trying to remove the subjective piece. I think that is a huge component and all of our employees would want that. All of our employees would want to feel like they have

an even hand. Brofft: inter-rater reliability is really important and one of the things we want to look at is why is a teacher marked one way at X school and then Y school. We need to know with principals how they will rate...we can hope to at least align the system. McGraw: one of the things we are trying to look at is training people...if people are going to do this we need to get the same rating (between raters). Smith: we need a check and balance system and SB 191 does some of that. McMinimee: are we that far off on the 21...it would be interesting to look at that data. Stahl: if you look back in the presentation it is incredibly difficult to evaluate, teachers or not, on those things. It is very difficult to assess these (in reference to the Secondary Indicators). Brofft: when looking at the validity, if you have students that are consistently underperforming on some (you study the validity of the indicator)...if we have some indicators that are like that (the same thing would need to happen). Stahl: have there been some kinds of components that we have talked with SACs around "this is the kind of teacher you are going to get." Brofft: we have linked to survey data from parents in the past. McGraw: Brian Hales has done some research...we are getting feedback from parents and students. There is discussion around asking students about how they learn and how they are taught, not just do they feel safe (in reference to other student surveys). Silverthorn: I wanted to follow up on that...around 360 surveys, I have done quite a few of those in my career...Hales: the 360 survey is a tool of feedback from parents and students. The surveys we currently do... this would be specifically tied to an individual teacher. They will work on a bank with their evaluator, around which ones they want feedback on. Brofft: the feedback is for the supervisor. Silverthorn: do you see that as an evaluation tool or a goal setting tool? Hales: it would be both a goal setting for the next year and an evaluation for the current year. Silverthorn: as a union do you use 360s? Smith: currently used district wide. Silverthorn: I appreciate all of this work you are doing. Carson: I have a few questions, as you know the board will be meeting about a potential tax increase...I have always felt what the public is looking for are a few things, if we could say a few things we could match it up to some grants. I think we need to say to the public three things: life-time tenure for teachers is a thing of the past, we will not be removing teachers as we have this ... With 15-20 years seniority. Raises are no longer going to be based on the number of years in the system but results in the classroom and third the top performers should be making the best teacher's salaries in the United States of America...when we get to a point we can pay that teacher \$100,000 dollars per year. Those are the things we can say to the public; we are going to get rid of tenure, pay the best...Smith: I am sure you have read the language in SB 191. Tomorrow we will come out in support of SB 191. Tenure in Colorado was removed in the 1990s, it will be based on effectiveness first, then seniority. Second question is around paying the teachers that are the most effective. A big piece is mobility between districts, they may be more effective in another district. SB 191 will do a lot of that and we are coming out tomorrow at noon in support of it. Carson: I am convinced that the AFT is serious about that. It is historic because of the other union in the United States of America. You are going to reap huge rewards because people are ready for it. Question on measuring the results...I saw something in my daughter's parent teacher conference the other day, I don't know what it is called...the teacher showed my wife and I reading progress

from quarter to quarter. Those measurements are pretty objective; it says we don't expect to see that each of your students is at a certain level but that they are... Brofft: I think you are referring to Aims web...we do not have each of our schools using that. We have found that we have kind of a cafeteria approach...the secret is to finding a way to capture all of those tools. To try to transfer that into a way to measure a year's worth of progress. That is what we are trying to accomplish. McMinimee: that is one of the things we will look at in the Halogen tool we can look at specific teachers or groups and what measures they are using to move forward. If Aims web comes out as effective in 75% of our classrooms. Gerken: what do you need from the board or superintendent to get these common assessments in place? Brofft: we need to have support that this is an expectation, we need some systemic measurements. Gerken: how far away? Brofft: a year away.... Herzog: the cost... Brofft: that is what we put up (PowerPoint). Gerken: 2-3 million for the infrastructure. Carson: in terms of the support of the board you have that, for a new system, and as for the superintendent (you have support) or we wouldn't have hired her, we will work to get the money and I think that will be eventually going to the voters. Fante: I think it is important to talk to the system as being all types of schools, charter, etc. Carson: is that what you are looking for? Well, that is a much more comprehensive question than we can answer tonight. Gerken: we would need to hear from charter schools. Do you have the money you need for 10-11? Brofft: no. We would not have money for building the assessments. Fante: correct me if I am wrong the WAN would help that? McGraw: not really.... Gerken: at our next Thursday meeting, I would hate to slow these things down...how much do you need? Brofft: 500,000. Gerken: if you had the money you could do it next year? Brofft: let's be clear we need (closer to) \$800,000...Stahl: they need 1 million. McGraw: right now we have built that into a three-year process... Carson: I think we need to find a million dollars, that may sound a little odd in this budget, but this is right now our biggest priority. We have a plan on the table and need to have some discussions over the next few weeks to find this money. Brofft: initially it was not to find that money right away. Carson: we cannot put this off...we need to look at our budget and some grant opportunities. Gerken: what can we look at in private donations? Brofft: with our demographic we would need to find someone who was interested in Douglas County. Gerken: how easy is it to demonstrate how far along we are? Hodges: I do believe the Rose Foundation would be interested. Stahl: I do suggest...Dan I do think we can think outside the box on this. We can find this. Smith: there almost needs to be a sub group to look at this. Stahl: we owe (the group) a huge amount of gratitude. We need to do our job to find the money to fund the efforts. Silverthorn: I want to thank Brenda and Courtney and the other DCF Leadership and the teachers of this district for looking outside of the box. It is incredible. Smith: Pittsburg is looking at evaluation; at this point Denver is looking at "who do we need to have in the room?" I would say in comparison we really are further along. McGraw: our deficit is in the common assessments. Fante: where they have mandated a battery of common assessments, I say battery because it feels like it is done to them...we have not been as prescribed... McGraw: we believe if we are to do this we need the buy in from the teachers. Carson: I had no idea we were this far along with this. Thank you.

7:14 p.m. Public Comment

- Deborah Scheffel: I want to thank you for the incredible work you do, I think Douglas County is the best possible district. I also want you to know I am running for a seat on the State Board of Education in district 6, which includes Douglas County. I am very much appreciative of some of the reforms you are doing as the board.
- Carson: any other public comment? No.

7:19 p.m. School Leaders for America Inc., John Evans and Mark Baisley

- Evans: we have been operating since 2002, wanted to talk a little about the program. It is not exactly a slam-dunk program to get into. I have given you a checklist...all of these things must be completed before allowed into program. Most of the candidates take two years to complete the program. A lot of times we are asked what is an alternative program. School districts may select from a pool of people, traditional and non-traditional. Need not have prior teaching experience to be a part of the program. Carson: let me ask a few questions, you mentioned this would not be a cost to the district, is this accurate? Evans: yes. Carson: we have a hiring process for the district, and you have some candidates coming through the program, how do you envision this working? In a sense to me if there is not cost to us and you are looking at individual candidates for us.... Evans: we would work with the individual candidates and the district to make sure they would be in a majority position in administration. Stahl: don't we work with this program anyway? Fante: actually the program would have to have a candidate guaranteed in a part-time administrative role. Evans: we have six candidates currently. Three candidates are currently employed as principals. Stahl: we have this listed as a board decision...what are you looking for? Evans: the proposal called for a joint working relationship. We have not had the opportunity to work with HR in Douglas County we have found that HR was not willing to open up positions to non-traditional candidates. In the past we have worked more in partnership in Aurora, etc. One of the things we would like to do in working with you would be to make it known to employees. They currently look at University of Phoenix or others that are not as high quality as our program. That is the kind of relationship we would like to see. The proposal included existing principals and to work with them on projects that encourage entrepreneurial... Carson: Aurora, Cherry Creek... Evans: we work all over Colorado. Carson: you mentioned 6 candidates... Evans: we have 6 candidates, I would like to instead of a referral-based program have a commitment by you to work with the program. I would like to see a directive to the superintendent to work with us. I would like to see HR working with us. Stahl: what is your current relationship with this system? Hodges: we post jobs... Stahl: are you closed to non-traditional candidates? Hodges: no. Stahl: that is what I am confused by.... Evans: this is a leadership issue, unless you take a position as a board to want to seek the best leadership. Most programs start it that way. When I was a member of the State Board of Education, we pioneered the alternative licensure program. Why? Because a district is spending thousands of dollars reeducating individuals. This came to us by superintendents and boards that they want major changes. Where does it start? Your commitment to becoming leaders. There is no reason Mark Baisley can't become a great leader. Stahl: that is what I don't understand. Herzog: we have hired dozens of non-

traditional candidates. What we find here, both Johns, is that when we get down to the candidate pool. We do have some people that can be directed to the program. I think that Cliff's question is...this is more of a staff decision. Evans: you ask me is it staff? Yes, but I think it is more the desire you have to make sure you see the kind of people you want. Stahl: who are your competitors? Evans: in the alternative (area)? I don't think we have a competitor. Stahl: my concern is you are asking for an endorsement for your particular program, correct? Evans: yes. Stahl: I don't want to get in the business of endorsing...my point is I don't know specific to this particular entity, I am not comfortable giving to staff an endorsement to work with "School Leaders for America." I strongly endorse the concept of non-traditional candidates.... Carson: Mark would you like to make a few comments? Baisley: I did just want to show my support for the program. It is quality stuff, and predictably about myself to you guys I support the idea of non-traditional leadership in education. Having that mix going both ways. So for a quality program...there are a lot of folks retiring from a career. I understand the challenges of endorsing this program specifically, but it is championed by someone who has been involved in education and community (in reference to Evans). Carson: you may have some comments on Cliff's questions John and then I have some comments. Evans: we felt that we could be of definite service in the area of our resources. You won't find coaches and mentors in Jones (University). You are welcome to weigh our program against any other program. The other area I don't want to overlook in the program is around making schools better entrepreneurs. I think it would be a great addition to your quality. Williams: the program sounds great, bringing outside people, I think the timing of going for the hard endorsement right now and I know very little about the subject. I would like to talk to staff, I would also like to talk to the new superintendent. I would be more comfortable waiting. Carson: what I was going to propose is to have the staff continue to work with School Leaders of American and to figure out how we could constructively work with this program and bring to the superintendent. Herzog: if you need a letter for you grant we can surely give you a letter. I have taught for this program, there have been a number of excellent candidates. Carson: is that acceptable to everyone?

7:55 p.m. Board/Superintendent Updates

- Search for a new Board member. Silverthorn: 29 candidates, we need to discuss when to do interviews. Williams: how do we decide who we will interview? Silverthorn and Stahl will go through the applicants, pare down to reasonable number, all resumes will be made available to each board member....
- Retreat scheduled for the 15th. Dinner on the 14th is not necessary. We will start at 8:00 Saturday morning. Carson: when you (Nona) talked to the Sheriff was he available? Is everyone available for dinner on Saturday? Carson: agenda? Williams: Terry Casey in the morning, David Hart, retreat may go until 12:30 or when we get kicked out at 3:00.
- Stahl: David Hart if you wouldn't mind regarding Castle Pines North. Hart: the board became aware of Castle Pines North, invited us to an orientation and asked us what our reaction to the urban renewal authority is. There will be a tremendous number of single-family homes. We have no assurance of building a school at that

site. I would remind the board that the capitol program was cut by 1/3 this year and additional the next year. In the absence of the ability of building a school we would be looking at the impact of overcrowding in surrounding schools.

- SB 191? Stahl: we are very pleased with Brenda and her group and the collaboration and work they have done down at the Capitol. Tomorrow at noon, AFT will be showing their support for the amended measure. On Thursday Dr. Herzog and myself will testify with Brenda in support of the bill. Truly making a statement that it is a value to our community and our teachers as well.
- Williams: we would love to have a member on each SAC as a Wellness Champion. We would have a parent at each school responsible for wellness.
- Choice: Carson: I don't have a date yet but I have asked two people from the Independence Institute, Pam and Benjamin DeGrow. I have asked Frank McNulty and Rick Hess to be on the task force, Doug Benevento is also very interested in this as well...someone else from the charter schools...maybe Gary Stueven as well.
- Carson: Bill (Moffitt), not to put you on the spot...Moffitt: we are rolling out a RFP (request for proposal) for a power agreement. To install solar panels on 31 of our schools. No capital costs they take advantage of rebates. They sell the power generated back to us at a reduced rate. Considering a wind generator for PHS, works in a similar fashion. Carson: all of this is structured not to cost us anything? No. Gerken: how long is the deal? Moffitt: usually 20 years. Gerken: we own it? Moffitt: no we don't there is a site lease involved. Gerken: do we have any termination rights? Yes. There is quite a bit of protection built into these. Herzog: DPS just entered into a similar agreement.
- Carson: anything else I missed before we go into Executive Session? Herzog: long-rang planning, Sky View Charter school has invited us out. Justin, I don't know if you want to mention the meeting we had (around nutrition)? Very well attended. We would like to have them every quarter, some (vendors) asked about every month.
- Silverthorn: (during budget cuts) I have heard from several very concerned parents that we may be emphasizing wellness over academic achievement. Williams: I am glad you brought that up. It is not my intention to take anything out of the classroom for this. However if we don't understand what our kids eat...if we feed them corn dogs and chips all the time it is irresponsible. Sometimes it is more expensive but many times it is not. Silverthorn: I think we need to make sure we emphasis... Williams: having them change what they buy is not going to take anything out of the classroom. Carson: my daughter is a big fan of yours.
- How did the breakfast go? We had Harvey, McNulty, etc...we brought them up to speed on our budget, Pay for Performance, I think the interesting points that came out...Littleton found they are successful if you are asking the voter to maintain the system not improve it.

8:36 p.m. Carson: do I have a motion to go into executive session? Williams: motion. Bump: you just need to state the purposes. Carson: legal issues, negotiations, personal matters, individual student matter/ student discipline. We have a motion to go in for those reasons. Approved by voice vote.

- *Notes taken by Courtney Smith, DCF Office. If you have any questions on the content of the notes, feel free to contact me at Courtney.smith@dcsdk12.org or 303-688-3381.