

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

BEFORE THE PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
PUBLIC MEETING
VOLUME TWO
June 16, 2017
9:00 a.m.

Mabry Hall, Jerry Apodaca Education Building
300 Don Gaspar
Santa Fe, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR-CRR, NM CCR #219
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

JOB NO.: 8158L (CC)

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 843-9492



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMISSIONERS:

MS. PATRICIA GIPSON, Chair
MR. GILBERT PERALTA, Vice Chair
MS. KARYL ANN ARMBRUSTER, Secretary
MR. R. CARLOS CABALLERO, Member
MR. JAMES CONYERS, Member
MR. TIM CRONE, Member
MS. DANIELLE JOHNSTON, Member
MS. MILLIE POGNA, Member
MS. TRISH RUIZ, Member
MS. CARMIE TOULOUSE, Member

STAFF:

MS. KATIE POULOS, Director, Charter School Division
MS. ICELA PELAYO, Deputy Director, Options for
Parents & Families
MR. DAVID A. STEVENS, Assistant Attorney General
Counsel to the PEC
MS. LAUREL PIERCE, CSD Staff

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 843-9492



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1	I N D E X T O P R O C E E D I N G S, Continued	
2		PAGE
3	12 Discussion and Possible Action on	183
4	Performance Framework with Public Impact	
5	14 Adjourn	416
6	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	417
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 843-9492



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I'm
2 reconvening this meeting of the Public Education
3 Commission. It is Friday, June 16th -- I don't have
4 my -- I don't have my cheat sheet.

5 It's Friday, June 16th, and it is actually
6 about 9- -- probably about 9:03. That clock is off.

7 Before we get started with the
8 presentation by Public Impact, there is two things I
9 just quickly want to go over with everyone.

10 The first is our -- our discussion at the
11 end of the day yesterday about the Community Input
12 Hearings. I think the dates are wrong that were in
13 the agenda, because the dates said the 20th and the
14 21st.

15 We were originally supposed to be in
16 Cruces on Friday, the 21st, and in Albuquerque --
17 so I just want to -- before we take roll call and
18 everything, I just want to discuss -- you know. So
19 I think we should be in Albuquerque on the 19th and
20 20th, and not the 20th and 21st.

21 So when Beverly gets back, I'll -- I'll do
22 those dates. But just so that everyone is clear
23 that it'll be the -- our meeting will be on the
24 19th, and the Community Input Hearings will be on
25 the 20th. So we have a Work Session. And then the

1 regular meeting will be in the afternoon of the
2 19th, and then the Community Input Hearings on the
3 20th. And then we're done.

4 And if folks would, sometime today, if
5 you're interested in -- we talked about the RFP
6 committee, and hoping to also be able to have that
7 meeting in Albuquerque when we're down there in
8 July. So if you just let me know if you're
9 interested in serving on that sometime today, as
10 we're breaking or whatever, that's okay.

11 All right. So now I will ask Commissioner
12 Armbruster to do a roll-call vote.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sure.
14 Commissioner Caballero?

15 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Here.

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
17 Conyers?

18 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Present.

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
20 Toulouse?

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Present.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Are you present,
23 Commissioner Peralta?

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Secretary, I
25 already answered present.

1 THE CHAIR: No. She said Commissioner
2 Peralta.

3 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: No.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: No.

5 Okay.

6 Commissioner Gipson?

7 THE CHAIR: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
9 Ruiz?

10 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Present.

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
12 Crone?

13 COMMISSIONER CRONE: Here.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
15 Johnston?

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Present.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
18 Pogna?

19 COMMISSIONER POGNA: Here.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Commissioner
21 Armbruster is here. We have ten today.

22 THE CHAIR: So today is hopefully going to
23 be a -- an interesting conversation, as we've been
24 plowing through our discussions with revamping the
25 performance framework.

1 And we welcome the folks from
2 Public Impact in aiding us in this venture that
3 we're journeying on. And I will just ask you to
4 introduce yourself for the record.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. So my name is Tim
6 Field. I'm a Senior Consultant with Public Impact.

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: My name is Lyria Bost, a
8 Senior Consultant with Public Impact.

9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm sorry.
10 Could you both introduce yourself one more time and
11 use the microphone?

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes, I'm sorry. So my
13 name is Tim Field.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: For Millie.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes. Sorry. So my name
16 is Tim Field.

17 THE CHAIR: You have to -- there's
18 probably a clip right there. You can clip it down.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: Got it. All right. How
20 do we sound? Is that better?

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: You probably
22 have to hold it a little bit.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: My name is Tim Field. I'm
24 a Senior Consultant with Public Impact.

25 MS. LYRIA BOST: I'm Lyria Bost. I'm a

1 Senior Consultant with Public Impact.

2 THE CHAIR: I'm not exactly sure the
3 format that you're going to use. Are you going to
4 start with something up here? Only because I'll
5 move if --

6 MR. TIM FIELD: I would say -- we're going
7 to have -- this first half an hour or so, looking at
8 the agenda and such, I don't think we need to
9 probably move. I think it will probably be to just
10 talk through it. You may turn around some.

11 Then some parts of the second -- after we
12 do -- there will be times -- I'll instruct you guys
13 when maybe you want to rethink.

14 Would you come to the table?

15 We're out there. It doesn't matter.

16 I think for right now, stay where you are.

17 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. You're going to
18 have to turn a bit, though.

19 THE CHAIR: Okay.

20 MR. TIM FIELD: So are we ready to get
21 started?

22 THE CHAIR: We are.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. So it's a great
24 pleasure to be here. We're exited about the day.

25 We're going to start with -- we introduced

1 ourselves. But not all of you know Public Impact,
2 so we're going to do a brief introduction of what
3 Public Impact is. And then we're actually going to
4 have some time for you all not only to introduce
5 yourselves, but actually do what I would call an
6 ice-breaker of sorts. But I think it'll be fun.

7 So Public Impact, for those who may not be
8 familiar with our organization, we are based in
9 North Carolina. We are a education policy and
10 management consulting firm. We're about 25 people.
11 Our mission is very much focused on improving
12 educational options for students, especially
13 students in underserved communities.

14 We do a wide range of work all over the
15 country. I think our four main areas are listed on
16 the screen; but I'll just talk briefly.

17 First, expanding access to great teachers
18 and leaders. Right now, I do a lot of work on
19 working with schools and districts on redesigning
20 schools to have great teachers have a bigger impact
21 in schools through teacher leadership and through,
22 also, ways of using time, technology differently.
23 Such a big focus of the work we do -- we do a lot of
24 work with low performing schools. We work with
25 districts, states, and directly with schools.

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 843-9492



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com

1 We do principal development. We help
2 schools with school improvement planning, but a lot
3 of work in turnaround. We do a lot of work in
4 charter schools. We'll talk more about that. And
5 that, obviously, is the focus of our work today.

6 We do a mixture of direct consulting. We
7 also do a lot of kind of thought [ph] leadership
8 reports and research. So we do a real mix of work.

9 Within charter schools, probably three
10 things we really focus on:

11 One is strengthening charter authorizing
12 practices, which is very much the focus of our work
13 today. Lyria leads a lot of this work. We've
14 worked with many authorizers, specifically on
15 performance frameworks and accountability systems,
16 both on thinking through the measures they're using
17 to evaluate charter schools, but, also, the
18 protocols and procedures for how those -- those
19 metrics are then used to make decisions.

20 We also do a lot of work on the policy
21 side. Our focus, really -- our belief is that
22 charter schools can -- we believe in great,
23 high-quality charter schools. So in addition to
24 authorizing, we focus on things like pipeline, how
25 can we increase the pipeline of high-quality charter

1 schools. And we'll do research and opinion papers
2 on that and try to influence the field.

3 We work with funders, funders who are
4 funding charter schools, and, again, thinking how
5 they can better influence and improve the sector.

6 I think with that, I, personally, Tim
7 Field, I've been with Public Impact about four years
8 now. Prior to Public Impact, I worked for the Kipp
9 Foundation and was a regional director for them and
10 worked in the -- kind of the southeast of the U.S.
11 in helping them grow schools and strengthen their
12 network. I worked for the Philadelphia School
13 District before that and was a charter authorizer,
14 responsible for improving charters and monitoring,
15 and also did a lot of work with leadership at
16 Philadelphia.

17 So Lyria can introduce herself.

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: So I'm Lyria. I've been
19 with Public Impact for almost seven years now.
20 The -- I lead our analytic team. And my background
21 is more in data and survey research. I've always
22 worked for research firms.

23 And especially in the past four to five
24 years, we have had a focus on working with
25 authorizers, revising, or in some cases, creating,

1 you know, new performance frameworks, and with a
2 specific focus to the academic performance
3 framework. So we have worked sort of in that
4 process.

5 That can be a very long process. So we've
6 worked with authorizers on stakeholder engagement;
7 but also just the thinking of what are the metrics,
8 what are the appropriate metrics, testing those
9 metrics.

10 We do quite a few trial-run-type
11 engagements with authorizers. And then there are a
12 number of authorizers who have -- some authorizers
13 that are a one- or a two-person shop. So there are
14 authorizers that we support in terms of ongoing
15 performance monitoring and actually helping them to
16 run their frameworks and reports each year.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: Great.

18 So with that, I'd actually -- for our
19 benefit, if you would indulge us, maybe we can just
20 go around -- we see your names on your placards.
21 But I wonder --

22 THE CHAIR: We have to remind ourselves
23 occasionally.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: If you could just go
25 around and just briefly -- your name, how long

1 you've been on the Commission. I know there's
2 probably different lengths and terms here. We'd
3 love to hear what your work is outside of the time
4 you spend together at the Commission.

5 So maybe we can start with Ms. Ruiz?

6 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Good morning. My name
7 is Trish Ruiz, and I'm from Hobbs, New Mexico. I am
8 a counselor and a test coordinator, and I just
9 joined the Commission in January.

10 COMMISSIONER CRONE: Good morning. My
11 name is Tim Crone. I am a mostly retired college
12 professor at Northern New Mexico College. I'm
13 teaching adjunct at several small colleges here in
14 Northern New Mexico.

15 MS. LYRIA BOST: What is your field?

16 COMMISSIONER CRONE: Sociology and
17 anthropology.

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: My name is
19 Danielle Johnston, and I'm a retired New Mexico
20 educator. I did my entire teaching and education
21 career in the State of New Mexico. I worked with
22 the public school districts for many years, and then
23 I did nine years in the charters. And I was
24 fortunate to be a head of school at one of the
25 charters in the initial years of the charter

1 movement here. So I've participated in it for many,
2 many years.

3 COMMISSIONER POGNA: Hi. Millie Pogna. I
4 am a volunteer in education. And I have served on
5 the State Board of Education and the Public
6 Education Commission for nearly 40 years. This is
7 going into 40 years. And that's it.

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Hi. I'm Karyl
9 Ann Armbruster. And I taught special education for
10 about 40 years -- or a million, maybe. But I only
11 started when I was six. And so, then, I have been
12 on this Commission since 2014. And -- what else do
13 I have to say? I don't know. That's good enough;
14 right?

15 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yeah, yeah. Great.

16 THE CHAIR: I'm Patty Gipson. I'm a
17 retired educator from New Jersey. I taught high
18 school history and also did a lot of contract
19 enforcement for NEA.

20 And in my spare time, when I'm not here,
21 I'm doing PEC work; so that's --

22 MR. TIM FIELD: So the accent is not fake.
23 That's real.

24 THE CHAIR: No, it's real. It's combined
25 New York and New Jersey, and a little bit of

1 New Hampshire in there.

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: All right.

3 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Good morning.
4 Gilbert Peralta, District 6. I'm from Socorro,
5 New Mexico, where I'm currently a school
6 administrator. And I am in my seventh year on the
7 Commission.

8 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I'm Carmie
9 Toulouse. My family's been in New Mexico off and on
10 for probably 250 years. They -- my dad's side were
11 the French fur trappers and traders. And I have
12 cousins all over the state, which is why I tend to
13 have to recuse myself from many votes on our
14 Commission, having connections to many of our
15 charter schools.

16 I'm the other anthropologist on the
17 Commission. That's what my degrees were in. And I
18 originally, until I adopted children as a single
19 parent, where I went to work for the State Human
20 Services Department, spent 30 years there.

21 Then I was on our -- in Albuquerque,
22 Central New Mexico Community College Board for
23 12 years, on the National Board of the Association
24 of Community College Trustees for five years, and
25 got my arm twisted to run for this a number of years

1 ago. And I've -- this is my fifth year on this
2 Commission.

3 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: I'm Jim Conyers.
4 I'm from Bloomfield, New Mexico, in the northwestern
5 part of the state. Been on -- I came on when Carmie
6 did. So what have we been -- is it four-and-a-half
7 years we've been on the Commission?

8 Previously, when my wife and I came to
9 New Mexico, we worked at the Navajo Methodist
10 Mission School in Farmington, where I taught
11 government and chemistry and was the school
12 counselor. Then I spent 30 years in the Bloomfield
13 Public Schools, where I was a counselor and
14 principal. Retired from there.

15 Went out to Dzilth-Na-O-Dith-Hle School,
16 south of Bloomfield, which is a BIE grant school,
17 which is the Navajo Nation's equivalent of a charter
18 school. And I retired from there about three years
19 ago as the Executive Director and Principal.

20 And currently, I teach as adjunct at
21 San Juan College, teaching sociology. And I also
22 served on the Bloomfield Public School Board of
23 Education for eight years.

24 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Good morning. My
25 name is Ricardo Carlos Caballero. I currently

1 represent District 1 in Albuquerque. I am new, like
2 our Commissioner Ruiz and some of the other
3 Commissioners. So it's a new experience, but not --
4 not as -- I'm not new for the game of -- of boards.

5 I served on a Education Service Center in
6 El Paso County for 17 school districts, Service
7 Center No. 19, and I served for 14 years.

8 I'm a retired educator at the
9 junior-college level and taught at the public
10 schools, and also was involved in a couple of
11 programs for at-risk students that needed to go to
12 college. So I -- I'm happy to -- to be here back
13 into education.

14 MR. TIM FIELD: Want to say anything,
15 Katie?

16 MS. POULOS: I'm Katie Poulos. I've been
17 working with the Commission now for two years and
18 three months. And prior to that, I was at the
19 Arizona State Board for Charter Schools; and prior
20 to that, taught; and prior to that, practiced law.

21 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. And I won't go to
22 the audience, but I appreciate members of the PED
23 that are here, as well, and other members of the
24 community. So we are certainly happy to have
25 others.

1 Before we get into the agenda and the meat
2 of our meeting, we are actually going to force you
3 to indulge in what I think is a very fun activity
4 that will actually give you a chance to get to know
5 each other a little better, but also get us ready
6 for a day of -- I think, of engagement.

7 And that's speed-dating. So who has ever
8 speed-dated before? You don't have to admit it; but
9 it's going to happen today.

10 What I'm actually going to do is I'm going
11 to have us count off 1-2, 1-2. So we'll start with
12 Ms. Ruiz, who will be 1.

13 2.

14 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: 1.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: Millie is a "2."

16 THE CHAIR: 1.

17 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: 2.

18 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: 1.

19 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: 2.

20 MR. TIM FIELD: We'll keep it like that,
21 where we just have the Commissioners do this.

22 So here's what's going to happen. I'm
23 going to pose a kind of a question. You're going to
24 talk in pairs. And then we'll give you about
25 two-and-a-half minutes or so for you both to share

1 your response to the question.

2 And then I'm going to have the 2s
3 leapfrog. So, for instance, we'll have Tim switch
4 places with Millie. Millie will switch places with
5 Patty, and so on. We'll kind of guide you through
6 that.

7 And we're just going to kind of -- each
8 question is eight questions. We're going to
9 leapfrog, and it should work out. I'll figure out
10 how we'll switch it up.

11 MS. LYRIA BOST: Should these guys be
12 doing that?

13 FROM THE FLOOR: Oh, right. I want to be
14 partnered with him.

15 THE CHAIR: Kevin apparently has
16 experience with speed dating he doesn't want to
17 admit.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm not going to force
19 what's happening in the audience. I'm not going to
20 exclude them, either. So it's not my way. So we're
21 going to get this started.

22 So the first question -- so we'll kind of
23 have you go ahead and turn to your partner. Karyl
24 Ann, you might want to scoot over to Patty.

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: The 1s and 2s are

1 partners in the beginning.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: So Gilbert is with
3 Carmie -- all right. All right. And we're actually
4 going to have the 1s move.

5 So our first question is, "If you could
6 spend one hour with any historically influential
7 person alive or in the past, who would it be?"

8 So take turns sharing your responses.
9 We'll give you a note to change in about two
10 minutes.

11 (Discussion held.)

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Okay. We're going to have
13 you switch now. Have the 1s -- so Trish will scoot
14 over. Danielle is going to move. Actually, Karyl
15 Ann will move. Gilbert is going to move. And, Jim,
16 I'm going to have you come around -- actually, Tim,
17 you stay put. Trish is moving. The 1s are moving.
18 And you'll need to come around, Jim. Jim and Tim
19 will be together.

20 Next question. You are given
21 \$1 million -- \$1 million -- \$1 million to donate
22 anonymously to a charity or to a stranger. Who
23 would you give it to?

24 (Discussion held.)

25 Okay. We're going to switch. Same

1 routine. Same routine. We're going to switch. So,
2 Jim, we'll have you come around and join -- not Jim.
3 I'm sorry. Gilbert. Gilbert, would you like to --
4 this is a good one for someone who had more time in
5 the day.

6 If you had more time in your day, month,
7 or year what would you spend it doing?

8 And it can't be working.

9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Or at the PEC.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: Or at the PEC.

11 (Discussion held.)

12 MR. TIM FIELD: We're going to switch
13 again. Do two more of these, and we'll call it
14 quits. Next question.

15 THE CHAIR: Do we move again?

16 MR. TIM FIELD: Move again. Karyl Ann,
17 correct. Move over. Karyl Ann, you're a
18 rule-breaker. I can tell. You changed it all up.
19 You're going the other way.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Do you want me
21 to come this way?

22 MR. TIM FIELD: I don't care.

23 All right. Question 4: If you could go
24 back in time and tell your teenage self one thing,
25 what would it be and why?

1 (Discussion held.)

2 MR. TIM FIELD: All right. We're going to
3 go to the last question, have you move one more time
4 before you find your original seats. Do your
5 leapfrog.

6 So No. 5 -- and we're going to go away
7 from the fun and ask you what inspires you to work
8 for New Mexico's public school students.

9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And "money"
10 shouldn't be the answer; because I want to announce
11 that. Because I want to announce that my --

12 THE CHAIR: We're not doing this for the
13 money.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: -- my Social
15 Security went up \$2.00 a year from my pay last year.
16 Just want to put that out there.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: So what inspires you?

18 (Discussion held.)

19 MR. TIM FIELD: We're going to have you go
20 back to your original seats. As a thank you, it's
21 not always easy to engage in these things. I hope
22 it was fun, and you learned something new about a
23 colleague.

24 So let's get back to our seats, and I'm
25 going to get us started for the day.

1 First thing I want to talk about is
2 meeting objectives. And you should have a
3 salmon-colored agenda in front of you. So this has
4 the objectives, as well as the activities for the
5 day.

6 So, actually, if you don't mind, maybe
7 we'll start on this side. Carlos, can you start us
8 by reading the first? We'll go down, Carlos, Jim,
9 Carmie, Gilbert. Read the first objective from the
10 screen.

11 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Okay. "Clarify
12 and refine overall Commission goals for revisions to
13 the performance framework and accountability model."

14 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Okay. No. 2:
15 "Understand trends in charter authorizer performance
16 frameworks and accountability systems."

17 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. 3: "Establish
18 shared views on the current strengths and gaps in
19 New Mexico's charter school performance framework
20 and accountability model."

21 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: And last one is:
22 "Establish time line of activities to revise and
23 implement the performance framework and
24 accountability model, including approach for
25 collecting internal and external input."

1 MR. TIM FIELD: So we developed these
2 objectives, both the feedback from both Katie, as
3 well as Patty, in a couple of pre-calls before the
4 meeting. So this is our intent we'd like to
5 accomplish today.

6 One question I have for you is are there
7 any additional objectives you feel like are
8 important to cover for today's session that are not
9 up there? Are there any questions about the
10 objectives?

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's a lot.

12 THE CHAIR: It is.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. So here's how
14 we're going to run the day.

15 So the first -- after -- we were going to
16 wrap this up in a second, and we'll talk about norms
17 for the day, for the session, and then we're going
18 to talk about Commission goals.

19 So one of the important pieces of pre-work
20 was the survey. And we had almost everyone complete
21 it; so I really appreciate that.

22 What we're going to talk about, kind of
23 really clarifying the goals you have as a Commission
24 for revising the framework. That'll be the first
25 hour.

1 COMMISSIONER CRONE: Tim?

2 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER CRONE: I did not complete
4 the survey. I didn't recognize your name, and I
5 didn't know --

6 MR. TIM FIELD: That's all right. We had
7 nine of ten. Tim outed himself. So we now know --
8 we now know who -- but -- so we had nine of ten,
9 though, which is great.

10 MS. LYRIA BOST: We'll expect you to
11 participate a lot today. We really want to hear
12 your voice.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: I don't know who completed
14 it. It was anonymous. That was news to me.

15 So we'll have a break. We're then going
16 to spend -- before lunch, we're going to talk about
17 trends. That'll probably be the biggest
18 presentation portion of the day, where Lyria and I
19 are going to talk about trends, and we're going to
20 apply those trends to what is currently in
21 New Mexico.

22 We'll have lunch. Lunch is coming in. It
23 will be a free working lunch. If you feel like
24 you're behind or want to talk, we can continue to
25 talk, or we can use this as just free time.

1 After lunch, we are going to really dive
2 into what our kind of perspectives -- what are our
3 options for revising the framework based on the
4 morning's conversation. We're hoping to come out
5 with concrete things you want to test out in a
6 revised framework.

7 We'll have another break. We'll spend
8 that half-hour -- we drafted a time line of
9 activities that we think could be a starting point
10 for what the Commission can be doing and what PED
11 can be doing to make the revisions and getting
12 input. We'll get feedback on that. Then we'll have
13 time for wrap-up at the end. That's the basic
14 outline of the day. We're going to try to stick to
15 that agenda.

16 One thing I want to talk about is norms
17 for the day. And I won't have you read these out,
18 out loud. But the first one, we will start and end
19 on time. We're going to end at 3:30. We're going
20 to stick as closely as we can to the agenda. But
21 we'll modify, as we feel necessary; but we are going
22 to end by 3:30.

23 We really want you to be present.

24 No. 2, 3, and 4 on that list -- I'll give
25 you a second, actually, to read. I'll pause for a

1 second. Please read the norms, if you would, to
2 yourself. And I would just make one comment; then
3 I'll invite others. If you want to suggest other
4 norms or refinements to norms, I'll invite that.

5 Part of what we're going to be doing is
6 looking at survey results. There are places where
7 there is alignment, and places where there is
8 disagreement. This will be a much more productive
9 meeting if, one, people are ready to weigh in, speak
10 their truth, why they feel like they feel about the
11 framework or about the accountability system. But
12 it's important to share that view.

13 But it's also important to have a
14 productive dialogue where there's disagreement.

15 No. 5. Assuming good intentions. One
16 thing you'll see, there's a lot of alignment in this
17 group about what the objectives are about making
18 revisions to the framework. The place where I think
19 there's work to figure things out is what does that
20 mean, or what are the refinements we need to make?

21 But a lot of alignment on objectives. I
22 think everyone has the intention of having great
23 charter schools for the state and holding schools
24 accountable. But -- so I think that really is an
25 intention all of us have.

1 The last comment -- then I'll invite it up
2 for any additional norms -- is I will use -- we will
3 use a parking lot when we have topics or important
4 issues that come up which are a little bit off the
5 immediate discussion. I will take facilitator's
6 privilege to put those aside. We will come back to
7 them at the end and address anything that was kind
8 of put aside.

9 But in order to get through the agenda, we
10 will, if necessary, try to put some things to the
11 side. We'll mark those down and come back to them.

12 Any additional norms folks want to add to
13 this or refine what's up there for the day?

14 Great. Let's get started.

15 So Lyria is going to pass out a packet
16 that has results from the survey. And as you know,
17 we asked ten members of the New Mexico Public
18 Education Commission to share their thoughts about
19 objectives for revisions to the charter school
20 performance framework and accountability model. And
21 you responded. So thank you for those who were able
22 to respond.

23 As a show of hands, who had a chance to --
24 this was sent out in advance. Who had a chance to
25 look at this in advance of the meetings, to look at

1 some of the survey results?

2 (Show of hands.)

3 So a number of us, not all of us. That's
4 fine. We're going to kind of walk through some of
5 the results.

6 It really wasn't ominous. We don't know
7 who responded. We don't have any insights --

8 THE CHAIR: We'll add ourselves throughout
9 this conversation, I'm sure.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: But the first thing -- one
11 of the first questions we asked was, "Do you think
12 that charter schools should be held to the same
13 performance standards as traditional district
14 schools?"

15 And what I -- what we noted here -- and
16 we'll be interested to hear your response, as well.
17 Even though there were nine responses, six -- even
18 though one was "no," one was "yes," our
19 interpretation of this message is there was a lot of
20 alignment here, that folks feel like charter schools
21 should be held to the same standards, plus.

22 Some of us phrased it as they should be
23 higher standards, and some phrased it as, yes, but
24 also mission-specific standards that charter schools
25 should be held accountable to.

1 But I think what was noteworthy here was
2 this notion of alignment to what all public schools
3 are required to be accountable for, plus some
4 additional things that we think that are special to
5 charters.

6 And one question I have is -- what's
7 different here is this notion of higher standards
8 versus the difference, you know, versus this plus
9 mission-specific standards. And I'm curious if
10 anyone wants to share how they -- do they feel
11 that's a real distinction? Or is that just
12 semantics?

13 THE CHAIR: I'll speak. I think it's --
14 there is a difference. I think there are -- my own
15 personal belief is they're certainly as accountable
16 as any other public school in their area. But to
17 the additional accountability that comes in, to me,
18 it is the mission-specific, which doesn't
19 necessarily create a higher accountability.

20 When I -- when I think of higher
21 accountability, I think there's, like, greater
22 rigor. There's additional accountability with the
23 mission. And they're held -- I guess it is
24 semantics to some degree -- the higher
25 accountability is, to me, if they're not fulfilling

1 their mission, but they're performing equally to the
2 schools in their area, they're failing what they're
3 supposed to be doing, so that there is a higher
4 accountability in that sense, that they have to hold
5 to that mission.

6 And they could be closed, even though
7 they're a -- on paper, a high performing school; but
8 they're not fulfilling their mission. And that's
9 what they were -- that's what we authorized them to
10 do.

11 But I don't see it as -- when I think of
12 higher accountability, I think that they have to
13 have a "B" instead of a "C," or -- so that's how I
14 viewed it.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: Other responses to that?
16 Yes, please, Carmie.

17 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: My feeling is we
18 have so many different types of charter schools that
19 it's very hard to look at a single standard. For
20 instance, you know, my heart, having spent 30 years
21 in human services programs, are with our SAM
22 schools. And to me, the fact that we have students
23 there who want to graduate, to get a diploma, those
24 standards are going to be different just in areas
25 like graduation, those things, because many of them

1 don't even get to some of those schools until
2 they've already had four years of high school.

3 I also think that we have some schools
4 that have a much larger number of English Language
5 Learners that take longer to get up to where they
6 need to be.

7 We have -- many of our schools have more
8 students with IEPs. We have some that bother me
9 because they don't seem to have any; just like they
10 don't seem to have any English Language Learners.
11 In this state, that concerns me. But in general,
12 people are gravitating with children with needs.

13 For instance, I have a grandson with an
14 IEP who absolutely needed to be in that smaller
15 school, smaller classroom, with the kind of
16 attention he gets.

17 And so I think it's very hard, when you
18 have small numbers of students, as opposed to the
19 large numbers you get in a public school, to look at
20 all these standards and do them on percentages. And
21 so I think there has to be an allowance for these --
22 these -- these schools' other things that they've
23 set out that they want to do.

24 I think it's much more important to see
25 the number of students who graduated from a SAM

1 school, you know, than it may be from a regular
2 public school, because that shows a lot more effort
3 in that SAM school to get those students to
4 graduation.

5 So that's why I looked at it as, yes, they
6 have to meet the standard; but I don't think -- to
7 be higher is not something everybody in these
8 schools can do. But they can push to meet it.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. So it sounds like
10 you're -- maybe you answered "yes" in this case, or
11 "plus" to kind of mission-specific. I will just
12 note, we'll talk more about this. Certainly, there
13 are elements of the New Mexico accountability system
14 that does try to account for differences in student
15 populations.

16 Two of the questions we also asked, which
17 we'll get to, "Is there a separate accountability
18 system or framework for SAM schools? Is that
19 something that needs to be tackled?"

20 We'll come to that.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: We've been trying
22 that for several years. And it's still being worked
23 on. So we know that.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: Other responses to this.
25 Yes/no. Yes, please.

1 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: As I think about
2 this, you know, and charter schools, I think about,
3 you know, why -- when we're authorizing, why do we
4 need this school? Or what purpose is this school
5 going to have? Because we know it takes a lot of
6 time, effort, money, everything, to get it going.

7 And so if it's just going to be another
8 school on the block, compared to the public school,
9 then maybe we don't need that.

10 So I -- I attended a conference in
11 San Diego a few years ago. And one of the
12 presenters had been a -- he had run a charter school
13 in Chicago.

14 He said, "Well, we ran it for several
15 years, and we weren't doing any better than anybody
16 else; so we just closed it," you know.

17 And I thought, well, that's -- I think
18 there's a lot of the credibility in that, you know,
19 that it needs to either have a -- as we say, a
20 different purpose or mission, or, you know,
21 excelling and doing better than those in the
22 community.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: Thank you. I'm curious.
24 For those who might have -- yes. Please go ahead.

25 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Yes. I tend to

1 view the charter schools having a higher standard.
2 And it -- to me, it goes to the heart of what's the
3 purpose of charter schools? Is it to replace public
4 schools?

5 And I realize there's a trend afoot
6 everywhere to -- to replace and privatize schools.
7 And so I see charter schools and the intent for
8 charter schools was to provide that different
9 approach, and the states provide the support so that
10 approach can flourish, or not.

11 But it will need all the support. And
12 those practices transfer to the public schools and
13 set up a system to do that.

14 So the first question in my mind of all
15 Commissioners, what is your purpose? How do you see
16 the authorizing mission by the State? Was it to --
17 and we call it "Options for Parents." But options
18 for what? The option for the purpose of dismantling
19 public schools altogether and setting up private
20 schools that are paid for by the State? Or is it
21 still public schools trying to experiment and coming
22 to a better approach?

23 I was very fortunate to be part of an
24 experiment in the sixth and seventh grade. My high
25 school was overcrowded. They had to push down

1 the -- the middle school to another school. And
2 those teachers took advantage, and they proposed a
3 totally different curriculum. What I learned in the
4 sixth and seventh was repeated in the eighth and
5 ninth, because I moved somewhere else to the high
6 school/middle school. And we all realized it was a
7 waste of the two years that we went to eighth and
8 ninth.

9 Had we continued the same rigorous
10 experiment that those teachers said, we would have
11 been different animals. So all of those cohorts
12 graduated; they all finished college. Most of them
13 are engineers.

14 And -- and so I view -- I saw that
15 experiment to be the experiment that we should be
16 having. And so I tend to be that the standards have
17 to be very, very high; otherwise, all we're doing is
18 providing another little -- public schools with the
19 same standard.

20 And we can look at our -- our statutes.
21 The goals are high in the setting up the right to
22 have public schools in the authorizing. Then we
23 look at what they are having to -- the standards
24 they have. And it's the same as public schools.
25 And I -- and so when we look at the charter schools,

1 they're not living up to their mission; because
2 "mission" -- really, it gets watered down.

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: You know, it's
4 really hard. And since I began this journey, I
5 think my perceptions have changed a number of
6 things. As I mentioned, I've been a public
7 schoolteacher. I was also president of AFT and my
8 local. And so I am a public school person.

9 First of all, they didn't have charter
10 schools. But second of all -- but I can see a need
11 for them. There are students who need smaller class
12 size, which the public schools tend not to be able
13 to do. Some people have a different idea of how
14 learning can take place.

15 But for me, much like Carlos, actually, is
16 that in the end, you need to be able to do math and
17 write; you know, read and write and arithmetic. And
18 how you get to that end is what I see charter
19 schools as saying. If we add this to this, or we do
20 this, that would be a really great thing to do,
21 because we think it will work better. You know,
22 having project-based learning instead of having
23 memorization, those kinds of things which public
24 schools, for whatever reason -- and I don't know
25 that reason -- tend to not want to change.

1 And I think that's what inspires people to
2 try some other way. And with Carmie's comments
3 about SAM schools, I totally struggle with that;
4 because when you say someone graduates, is there a
5 level that that kind of -- it means something when
6 you graduate. Should you have certain -- should a
7 business or a job -- an employer -- have an
8 expectation that you are -- you are able to do X, Y,
9 and Z, because you are a college -- I mean a high
10 school graduate?

11 And I'm -- just as a background thing, I
12 grew up in Indianapolis, and I went to a school
13 called "Shortridge." Sounds like such a strange
14 name now. Very famous people went there: Kurt
15 Vonnegut, Eli Lilly, several Congressmen. so it was
16 a very high achieving school.

17 But we had different kinds of -- and this
18 was in the '60s -- don't write that down, Cindy.
19 No, that's okay. I'm just teasing.

20 But we had actually had -- it was a school
21 that was integrated. And so we had different kinds
22 of things. And I'm not going to talk about the
23 discrimination that went on; I'm sure it did. So
24 people that really wanted to work with their hands
25 and do those things were able to be and choose some

1 of the things they wanted to do. And people that
2 wanted to be in the academic track could do that.

3 I think there were three; but I can't
4 recall the other one. I don't know, because I had
5 to struggle with that, too.

6 Everybody needs different things now.
7 We're in a whole different world. I retired eight
8 years ago, and it could have been 80 years ago;
9 that's how different it is in just the eight years.
10 So I don't know the answer to that.

11 But I do hold the charter schools -- I am
12 one that does believe that they should be doing
13 better; because if they're doing the same, then
14 that's millions of dollars, could have given it to
15 the local schools around them, and maybe they would
16 have had smaller class sizes and done something
17 different.

18 But I'm not against them. I'm just saying
19 I do expect them to do better.

20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But, Karyl Ann, if
21 the kids get diplomas in a SAM school, they've
22 passed every single one of the tests they have to
23 pass, and usually more, as opposed to you can still
24 graduate from a high school in this state and be
25 illiterate. I still see it happening. There are

1 ways that the schools do fudge things.

2 And our SAM schools don't. They already
3 know they don't have the four-year graduation
4 numbers. They're never going to have a decent grade
5 in that stupid school grading system for their
6 graduates.

7 For those students graduate with -- and,
8 for instance, at the one school, Cesar Chavez --
9 they all graduate with a minimum of one, and usually
10 several classes, at CNM. They graduate either with
11 jobs, with enrollment at the community college, or
12 in some other kind of training school or into the
13 military. You know, they do that at that particular
14 school.

15 And so those kids at that SAM school are
16 prepared. And yet their school grade is never going
17 to be higher than a "C" because of the way the
18 grades are weighted; so...

19 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes, Katie, please.

20 MS. POULOS: Can I just contribute that,
21 in fact, Gordon Bernell Charter School, a SAM
22 school, has a "B" letter grade? And I think it's
23 really important to recognize -- sorry, Millie.
24 Gordon Bernell Charter School, which is a SAM
25 school, does, in fact, have a "B" letter grade. I

1 think it's important to recognize that, in fact,
2 those schools can, in our school letter grading
3 system, achieve high levels. And we're very proud
4 and impressed with that school for doing the work
5 that it took to get there.

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Gordon Bernell is
7 the one at the juvenile facility. And many of their
8 students transfer from there to Cesar Chavez and get
9 their diploma.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: So I'm going to move us
11 on, just because there's a lot we do want to cover.
12 But one reason we opened up with this question is
13 because it is fundamental to how you think about
14 your framework. And I think it was important to
15 understand where the Commission sits. And I would
16 actually say there's actually a lot of alignment
17 here.

18 I think one of the questions we'll need to
19 wrestle with is if you do establish rigorous
20 standards for measuring mission alignment, and
21 you're really looking to see that that school is
22 truly demonstrating a unique educational model, that
23 is a higher standard, to some extent. So that's why
24 I think there can be alignment in the two responses.

25 I would also say that by the very fact

1 that the Commission is holding schools accountable
2 for meeting the standards set by -- by traditional
3 public schools, that, too, in some respects, is
4 holding the higher standard.

5 So, you know, how the Commission chooses
6 and the Charter School Division chooses to implement
7 interventions and make authorizer's decisions, that
8 ultimately is how you're steadying this bar for how
9 high. But, again, I think noteworthy, and I think
10 we do -- I think it's encouraging that there is a
11 fair amount of alignment on what the system should
12 be for schools.

13 MS. LYRIA BOST: And we will talk more
14 about alternative models. So clearly, we get that
15 message, and that's definitely a challenge that
16 every authorizer we work with is grappling. No easy
17 answers there, but important questions. Yeah.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: So the next question on
19 the survey we asked is, "What should the PEC
20 prioritize in revising the charter school
21 performance framework and accountability model?"

22 I would say there was actually a lot of
23 alignment here, as well. We'll talk a bit about
24 these results. We'll talk about where there was a
25 couple of points of differing opinions.

1 But I would say -- what you'll see is a
2 lot of alignment here. More points of disagreement
3 and different perceptions when we talk about the
4 framework itself and what are the components of that
5 framework.

6 What I'll just note here is looking at
7 these results -- and, again, you have them in front
8 of you. Strongly Agree. 7 of you said Strongly
9 Agree. 2 said Agree for both the statement of that
10 when you're thinking about revisions to the
11 framework, timely and effective engagement with
12 New Mexico charter school operators to collect input
13 and communicate modifications was a real priority.

14 So that speaks to process, not so much
15 details of the framework. But I think whatever this
16 Commission is doing going forward, I think that
17 needs to be an important part of how you move
18 forward based on your survey results.

19 Establishing measures. This is the fourth
20 one down. Again, seven "Strongly Agree" that can be
21 reliably and accurately collected, which I
22 think has been a challenge. And I think, by
23 reflection, I would say, from the Strongly Agrees,
24 is that that is something that has to be a focus of
25 this Commission's work.

1 So just for those two statements, I think
2 a lot of alignment and a lot of reasons why it seems
3 like that should be a focus.

4 I'd go on to say that a lot of
5 establishing a single metric, or score, that
6 summarizes overall school academic performance
7 across a range of indicators, again, really strong
8 Agrees and Strongly Agrees on this response.

9 And then the last one on that list,
10 "Prioritizing use of unique school-identified
11 measures," a lot of agreement there.

12 My question for the group is, are there
13 any reasons why any of those statements shouldn't be
14 an important objective for the Commission in going
15 forward? We'll talk about the top one in a second
16 here.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I can tell you
18 that I think I put -- I don't even remember what I
19 put. But I wasn't sure what it actually meant when
20 you asked me about reducing the level of efforts
21 required by schools to comply with data submission.
22 I think that was the one.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: And next page, it's on
24 there, yes.

25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Sometimes I

1 wasn't sure what you were asking; so the answer may
2 not be as valid as you would like it to be.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: And that's why -- we'll
4 come to that question, because I want to make sure
5 that part of this is getting clarity.

6 The goal of this is actually to have you
7 all adopt a set of objectives that's going to direct
8 your work. And I think what we're seeing is that
9 the survey would suggest there's already a lot of
10 alignment. We're going to address those points
11 where there's maybe either uncertainty or
12 disagreement.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Or wasn't sure
14 what you meant.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: Exactly. So for those
16 bottom four, anything that people -- reasons why it
17 shouldn't be?

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: Actually, just for
19 clarification, you're saying the whole list. What
20 we have up here is the first five. So we're sort of
21 first focusing on the top half of your page, yeah.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: So hearing no, I think,
23 disagreement on that, I think this first one,
24 "Alignment between the New Mexico State
25 accountability grading system and the charter school

1 academic performance framework," there's a couple of
2 folks who disagreed. I'd love to actually first
3 hear from folks who disagreed with that statement.

4 Many of you strongly agree. How would you
5 interpret that?

6 "Alignment" is kind of a vague word. When
7 you said, "I strongly agree," what -- what was kind
8 of directing that response? Like, what does that
9 mean? What does "alignment" mean to you? Please,
10 Patty.

11 THE CHAIR: Well, I immediately looked at
12 and thought about anything that I've reviewed from
13 NACSA that the performance framework should be
14 aligned, for lack of another word, with the
15 accountability system. And we use that -- we use
16 that State Report Card. And I believe the statute
17 requires us to use -- I think, 22-8B whatever-it-is
18 requires us to use that State accountability system,
19 which gives us -- whether we agree with the PARCC or
20 not agree with the PARCC.

21 But there's a lot of other information
22 that's gleaned out of it, so that when we're looking
23 at the lowest performing quartiles and highest
24 performing quartiles and graduation rate and ELL
25 students, and SpEd services, all of that is gleaned

1 out of that report card.

2 So I feel that we have a statutory
3 obligation to keep those items in the performance
4 framework. And it's information that we want,
5 anyway. So it just makes sense to keep ourselves --
6 not only if we had to align ourselves; but we should
7 align ourselves with what the schools are being held
8 most accountable to.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Thank you, Patty.

10 Others -- again, for example, who kind of
11 strongly agreed with that statement? How did you
12 interpret? Anything that you would add to what
13 Patty shared?

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Pretty much I'm
15 going to stay with Patty. I'm not going to repeat
16 what Patty said, because I would agree with it. You
17 know, there was, I believe, when we started this
18 grading system, where charter schools were not going
19 to be included and have to take this PARCC testing
20 and not get the school grade. And there was a
21 lawsuit.

22 So that's why it kind of changed, that --
23 because, as I said, I'm a public schoolteacher. And
24 it never got to the suit -- they brought it, and
25 then it got settled, because they said, "Wait.

1 You're not evaluating the teachers in the same way.
2 You're not evaluating the schools in the same way.
3 So we think that that needs to be together."

4 And I do believe that it should; because
5 how would you know, you know? Whether you think
6 that this is the greatest system ever invented or
7 the worst, it's the same for everybody. And so I
8 think it gives you a picture. Are our schools doing
9 better? Yeah. Great. Because we can see the
10 grades.

11 But I also like the fact that -- and we
12 require this of -- of the accountability of charter
13 schools, but not public school -- traditional public
14 schools -- is that they're giving the NWEA or
15 Discovery or whatever the letters are this week.
16 And that gives them an edge, because now, they can
17 see where the kids are.

18 So if they did poorly on the PARCC, and
19 we're talking about renewing them, they could
20 bring -- which they haven't, but we're hoping to
21 get -- the actual raw data for each of the persons
22 in the school who took this test and see, "Wow,
23 these scores went up from X to Y," and you can
24 really see that, because it's an individual test;
25 it's a formative test. It's showing you data; it's

1 telling you what you need to work on for that child.

2 It's kind of down and personal, and it's
3 immediate. As opposed to the PARCC, you've already
4 had the kids, and you're not going to have them the
5 next year in that sense. One is summative and one
6 is formative.

7 So I like the fact that we hold them
8 accountable, in a sense, for something that they
9 have total control over, and they can see it. Does
10 that make sense what I'm -- I hope? Okay.

11 MR. TIM FIELD: So for those who --
12 Carmie, please.

13 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I'm one who
14 disagreed, mainly because the only thing I disagreed
15 on was the actual State grading system. I think
16 many of our charter schools are way too small for
17 that to be a reasonable system. Many of our small
18 school districts. Our large public schools, like
19 where I live, Albuquerque Public Schools, it works
20 fine. Statistically, you've got such a huge base,
21 it works.

22 I'm all for holding them accountable to
23 the standards. I just don't like the A-through-F
24 grades. So when you stick that in, I'm going to
25 almost always tell you I disagree.

1 MR. TIM FIELD: But what that means, that
2 the -- so the metrics that are in the A through F,
3 it's less that; it's more how it's rolled up and
4 presented; is that --

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, because
6 also, when you look at it, you get quite a huge
7 number range on what the grades are.

8 I'd just rather have those numbers and
9 figure where it fits in a scale than see somebody
10 who's 1/10 of a point above being a "D" is a "C"
11 school, you know. And yet somebody is a "D" school,
12 and they're a tenth of a point below.

13 So I'd just rather have those percentages
14 and let me see them, than see all of those grades
15 averaged into a grade that's what's put out to the
16 public.

17 So my disagreement has to do with the
18 A-through-F and not about an accountability system.
19 I'm all for holding them absolutely accountable.

20 And, Karyl Ann, it was the teacher
21 evaluation they were being exempted from, not the
22 PARCC testing and not the grading system for charter
23 schools.

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I could be
25 wrong.

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But the whole
2 ruckus was originally, they were told, "Well, maybe
3 you can do your own teacher evaluation"; and that's
4 what they were told, "No, you can't."

5 MR. TIM FIELD: And one thing that Lyria
6 will talk about in the next piece about trends is
7 how different authorizers, how they -- what
8 alignment is meant, because there's been different
9 versions.

10 MS. LYRIA BOST: Grapple with all these,
11 yeah. Yeah.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: There was another
13 "Disagree." Was it similar to what Carmie shared?
14 Or I just want to share kind of why -- and, people,
15 again, this is done a week ago. Maybe your
16 perspective has changed.

17 But for someone else who has a similar or
18 a different reason why they're concerned about
19 alignment with A-through-F system.

20 MS. LYRIA BOST: And you don't have to be
21 admitting to that second one. You can just add to
22 the conversation.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: Even if you said "yes,"
24 you might have your own concerns.

25 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I have concerns.

1 The -- and I'm kind of echoing Ms. Toulouse, in that
2 I -- I hear from parents -- and even way before
3 being a Commissioner, I'm involved in several
4 nonprofits. And what the reality is, is that when
5 you have the standards of A and B and C and depends
6 on whether you survive or not survive, there is a
7 tendency to push out, or not accept, students that
8 are going to weight them down.

9 And so when you look at the charter
10 schools that have a very low enrollment of at-risk,
11 primarily Hispanic, like me, do very well. But the
12 ones that have accepted are in areas where there's a
13 high percentage. And no matter what they do,
14 they're going to get that group, and probably in
15 higher numbers. They struggle through it.

16 And I would have to say that those folks,
17 if they want to survive another year, will be
18 pushing out those that they feel that cannot -- that
19 cannot make it.

20 And it goes with the whole education
21 system in the state, in that I don't think we have
22 accurate data from the charter schools and the
23 public schools concerning how many kids we actually
24 lose from the -- from the school system. I think
25 that the data is skewed, and we're not being

1 responsible.

2 I'm a Commissioner, and I want to be more
3 responsible to that data. What is the turnaround?
4 How -- if a -- if a low performing school that has a
5 high risk -- and that's what I think other -- other
6 Commissioners have said. And I see them at work
7 when we're rating schools. They're very tough and
8 harsh on that.

9 But I think we need to work it into our
10 system, where we -- there's either a bonus or we
11 look deeply into their -- how they retain the
12 students, and when the students leave, why do they
13 leave, and where do they go, to be able to either
14 determine where they're really doing bad, or just a
15 product of the consequences of having this system.

16 MR. TIM FIELD: And I -- one question I
17 would have for the group -- and I have to have --
18 it's a rhetorical question, perhaps. But it's to
19 what extent -- there's elements of an accountability
20 system that can help -- you know, that can account
21 for differences in student populations. There are
22 ways to -- you know, to focus on student retention
23 or things likes that.

24 I -- my question for you perhaps is, is
25 there -- is it a matter of the A-through-F system

1 doesn't do it adequately? Because every
2 accountability system is going to have that risk
3 of -- do you have -- are there perverse incentives,
4 essentially?

5 I guess the question is about alignment.
6 Is it your concern that the A-through-F system
7 doesn't adequately account for differences in
8 student populations?

9 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I don't think it
10 adequately accounts for it. But I rest all this to
11 that we're very young and still growing in the area
12 of charter schools and prioritizing and setting
13 systems. I hear the -- the -- disagreement, even
14 amongst the legislators, and they're very, very
15 concerned about charter schools.

16 And so I think that for -- in large part,
17 it's because we -- we still are not a mature system
18 in the charter school arena. And I think we just
19 grew too fast, too, too fast.

20 There was an effort to put a stop to the
21 growth. And my -- my feeling is, okay, we're still
22 letting in the charter schools. And I'm not
23 disappointed with the ones that are -- are being
24 considered.

25 But I think there's a great shortage of

1 resources. And that has put a strain, not only on
2 the public schools, but on the charter schools. And
3 we have a responsibility to the charter schools,
4 because we have a responsibility to learn from that
5 and -- and push it to the public schools.

6 But we're -- we're not meeting. And so
7 the challenge is, how do we get -- fix as much as we
8 can without having to throw so much resources into
9 it?

10 MR. TIM FIELD: So I want to move to the
11 next page. But have I summarized the two concerns?
12 One, Carmie -- if I understood it -- for you, it's
13 the numeric -- it's the scoring and the -- the
14 metrics that are perhaps in it are not so
15 objectionable as how it's rolled up.

16 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Have you seen our
17 summary page? This is where -- I don't look at
18 this. I look at this. (Indicates.)

19 MR. TIM FIELD: The raw data, what is the
20 actual -- yes.

21 Carlos, I understand you're as much
22 concerned as about making sure that a system is
23 adequately accounting for inconsistencies and not
24 creating incentives that don't ultimately serve the
25 students well.

1 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Exactly.

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: And we will definitely
3 get back to both those issues. Good. They're
4 coming up.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: Keep us moving.

6 So on this next page, what we saw was
7 quite a bit of alignment. There was -- and whether
8 it was disagreements or maybe it wasn't clear, the
9 question, this question about reducing the level of
10 effort required by schools to comply with data
11 submissions, we actually asked a similar question
12 about the existing framework.

13 What we interpreted here was that -- I
14 think the question here is, is that a primary
15 concern you have with the current system is that it
16 does create too much burden, and you want to reduce
17 that burden?

18 Some folks apparently would say "yes."
19 Others didn't think that was a priority. Again, the
20 question is what's a priority for as an objective?
21 So I think there's a question mark. Is this -- of
22 the things listed here, there are several priorities
23 about, you know, establishing financial metrics that
24 provide greater -- there are several things.

25 I think the question is, is this something

1 that actually is a core part of what you want to do
2 going forward is reducing level of burden? Or is
3 that less of a concern. And that's -- I think the
4 responses kind of raise that question.

5 So I'm -- maybe for those who would
6 disagree, what was the -- what was driving that
7 response to --

8 THE CHAIR: I was "Strongly Agree"; so --

9 MR. TIM FIELD: So maybe we can start with
10 Patty, then. What was your feeling?

11 THE CHAIR: I think it's always an
12 expressed concern from the schools. And I know the
13 Director has been working very hard to try to make
14 it possible that bureaus and agencies and entities
15 can communicate better electronically with each
16 other, so that if data is here, it doesn't have to
17 be re- -- and I think that's the concern. It's been
18 expressed by a number of -- I would say the majority
19 of the schools -- that they feel that they're
20 duplicating a lot of responses.

21 It's, like, "If I've already done this for
22 this bureau, why do I now have to come back for you?
23 And even if it as simple as clicking just the, 'Yes,
24 I've got this,' why do we have to keep doing this?"

25 So that I know there's been a valiant

1 effort to try to get all these entities
2 communicating to each other; because we do deal with
3 charters that have less staffing, so that our head
4 administrators, our -- you know, the cafeteria --
5 the head of the cafeteria and doing the
6 transportation -- so that there's not a lot of
7 personnel to be spending at a desk, when they'd
8 rather be out interacting with students and staff.
9 So that if it -- if it is perceived as burdensome,
10 I'd like to engage in that conversation so that
11 it -- that perception isn't there.

12 And I know, to some degree, it is. It's
13 duplicative. It's burdensome. And it -- you know,
14 it shouldn't be; because that's -- to me, it's
15 creating busy work and not work of value.

16 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And, again, I'm
17 one of your "Disagree," simply because I feel that
18 it's nothing this Commission has control over. So
19 it -- to me, it's not a Commission priority. We
20 have other things that should be -- it is a problem
21 with PED and with our Charter School Division
22 dealing with it. But we -- we've already been
23 trying. And we don't get through to the rest of
24 PED.

25 They're the ones who have to do it. So to

1 me, it wasn't a priority for this Commission to do
2 anything about, because our hands are tied. We can
3 ask and ask and ask, which we have for the whole
4 time I've been on the Board. But it doesn't mean we
5 still shouldn't have that data.

6 So to me, it's up to PED who has it
7 already to provide it in a way that the schools
8 don't have to keep entering their own, if it's
9 already been entered up here.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: To me, the sense is
11 operational data? Or is there a particular type of
12 data collection that is particularly is a burden,
13 when you think about the burden?

14 MS. POULOS: Madam Chair, if you don't
15 mind, I mean, I think for us on the end in CSD, I
16 think we probably know best what that is. I think
17 the work of the Commission in helping us be able to
18 do that is, again, establishing some streamlined
19 clarity in the performance framework. Because right
20 now, the organizational performance framework has
21 questions.

22 And you've seen it. Like, "Does the
23 school comply with all educational laws?"

24 And so then we're having to figure out,
25 "Which ones does that mean?"

1 And then the schools are saying, "Well, we
2 already reported this to the Budget Bureau, our
3 calendar."

4 But we're saying, "Yeah, but they only
5 look at what you report. They don't look at what
6 you implement."

7 And then they feel like they're having to
8 double-report.

9 We're saying, "No, you're not
10 double-reporting. You're reporting on different
11 things; because when we go out and look at the
12 implementation of your calendar, it's not what you
13 reported that you were going to implement to the
14 Budget Bureau. And so now we want you to report on
15 how you're going to handle that."

16 And so I think to -- in my mind, and in my
17 feeling, I think if we can get a clearer performance
18 framework that says, "We're going to look at the
19 report from the Special Education Bureau that is the
20 annual determination and any complaint letters or
21 complaint processes," then it's not my team going
22 out and saying, "No, we're actually digging into
23 special education files," and then the school
24 saying, "Well, we already reported on our overdue
25 IEPs to the Special Education Bureau. Why are we

1 again reporting it to you?"

2 And we're saying, "Because we don't -- we
3 don't have the clarity of what are we doing."

4 And so to the extent that we can build the
5 clarity into the performance framework that the
6 Commission does have control over, and then also
7 work with the Commission to develop the processes
8 and the procedures that they want us using, then we
9 can get further away from that duplicative
10 reporting.

11 But I think it's the lack of clarity in
12 all of that right now that's creating either the
13 reality -- the perception or the reality -- the
14 perception that is a reality -- for certain
15 people -- right? -- that we can get past that,
16 because we've all laid out with clarity what this
17 Commission expects, what this Commission expects us
18 to do, and what this Commission expects the schools
19 to do.

20 THE CHAIR: And I think that'll also
21 create greater clarity for school -- for site
22 visits; because then they'll know, "This is what
23 they're looking at, not just this" -- you know, I'm
24 not sure. And -- and it's also for CSD to know,
25 "This is what we feel is important."

1 And I think there are a lot of gray areas
2 where there -- you know, it was -- you know. And
3 it's -- right now, it's an old document. I mean, it
4 is.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: So I wonder -- again,
6 we're trying to get to a point -- one of the
7 handouts is kind of an objective statement for the
8 Commission to do.

9 I wonder if this would resonate more if it
10 was a little more targeted to this notion of
11 creating more clarity in the -- on the framework, so
12 that collection of data is streamlined or targeted,
13 or something about -- it sounds like fairly focused
14 on the organizational framework; but this notion of
15 creating clarity to --

16 MS. LYRIA BOST: The schools and staff and
17 for the Commission, in terms of, "This is what
18 you'll be receiving"; right?

19 MR. TIM FIELD: Maybe that would be an
20 objective that resonates more, I mean, to your
21 point. I understand, Carmie, that you were, like --
22 "Why is this an objective for us?"

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And sometimes
24 we're asking different questions, though, using the
25 same data somebody else does. And that gets

1 confusing to the schools, too; because that is a
2 double-entry. "We've already given it, but you want
3 it for a different reason, or in a different
4 format."

5 I was a bureaucrat for 30 years. And for
6 ten of them, I was up here being a central office
7 bureaucrat. But the first 20 was out where I had to
8 respond to people who -- whose time was dealing with
9 my numbers, as opposed to me dealing with the
10 necessity of the public.

11 So I know, when the school is busy with
12 their students with a smaller staff and all, that
13 they -- they want to give it to us; but they want to
14 give us what we really need and the way we need it,
15 and do it once.

16 MR. TIM FIELD: So, yes, please.

17 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Yes. I truly
18 believe that the Commission really should be
19 responsible for collecting its own data. And I'm
20 glad that we're going to discuss it. But something
21 has to be reported so that either Legislators pick
22 it up or -- or higher-ups, or within two years,
23 we're going to have a change of administration, that
24 this Commission should have the resources -- it has
25 the empowerment to collect its data, but should be

1 given the resources, independent of any other
2 Department, to be able to do that in order for the
3 Commission to -- to be able to service the -- the
4 charter schools as we should.

5 And then that data should be easily put
6 together and retrievable and not spend enormous
7 amount of time away from classroom and other stuff.

8 There's not enough resources. And charter
9 schools can't really hire all kinds of people. Even
10 though there's a -- there's a strong push to have
11 that, we just don't provide the -- the resources for
12 that.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Of the items that are up
14 there -- so I think -- I'm going to actually turn,
15 in a second -- but there were several, again,
16 important concepts in here where there was a lot of
17 alignment and agreement about the statement as a
18 priority objective for the PEC.

19 The one thing I would note, SAM schools,
20 this notion that alternative framework agreement,
21 not maybe -- a couple of folks who were unsure. You
22 already heard a lot about it this morning. I think
23 we raised it -- we wondered is it a Phase 2
24 objective perhaps? We'll talk about that in a
25 second.

1 The same with this notion of publishing an
2 annual school-level report. Again, it wasn't quite
3 as strong; but clearly agreement on that is an
4 objective.

5 I'm going to turn now -- and this is also
6 in the handout. In addition to the survey, there
7 was a separate handout. I think it was a color?

8 MS. LYRIA BOST: It's blue.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Blue. What we did here is
10 we essentially said, "Let's -- let's help the
11 Commission come up with an objective statement for
12 this work."

13 And we really relied heavily on the survey
14 responses, obviously; so we kind of put these words
15 in your mouth, to some extent. But we do think it
16 would be helpful for you all to think about what is
17 your statement about what you want to accomplish
18 with this work.

19 This was our attempt to kind of pull that
20 together, based on the survey responses. We did
21 float the notion of, you know, do you -- do you
22 table -- in terms -- this is a lot. This is not --
23 this is an ambitious agenda right here, these six
24 items. Do you think about creating those annual
25 reports? Is that kind of a Phase 2 work?

1 The same with the notion of SAM, a
2 separate SAM framework.

3 So, again, we put this for your
4 consideration. And what I'm going to do is give you
5 a minute or two to look at it and consider, does
6 this look like something -- I don't think we're
7 formally adopting anything in this meeting. But is
8 this something that really should guide the work
9 going forward? And do you have suggested
10 refinements to how some of these objective
11 statements are made?

12 And we just talked about this last
13 objective about reducing level of effort. And
14 perhaps you want a slightly different wording and do
15 want to make that point about reducing burden and
16 alignment and clarity of framework expectations.
17 Maybe that should be a part of the Commission's
18 objectives.

19 So I'll give you a minute or two to think
20 about that and consider, is this something you would
21 want to adopt in some way, and are there refinements
22 to how these statements are made that you would want
23 to propose.

24 So I'd love to invite, actually -- we
25 haven't heard from several Commissioners much. I'd

1 love to hear from Trish, Tim, Danielle, Millie --
2 I've been heavily on the right side. But I'd love
3 to invite the four of you -- everyone has got a
4 different approach to how they engage in this kind
5 of discussion.

6 But what are your thoughts? Do you have
7 refinements? Or what are your feelings about this
8 as being an objective statement for the Commission's
9 work?

10 COMMISSIONER CRONE: It looks pretty good
11 to me. I wouldn't have any additions.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Thank you, Tim.

13 Yes, please, Gilbert. Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: I mean, again, the
15 wording -- the objectives, as written, seem very,
16 very well done.

17 The one that sticks out to me is No. 4,
18 the financial metrics. That, to me, seems to be
19 when charter schools come before us, that seems to
20 be the big hang-up. That seems to be the thing that
21 really gets them into muddy waters. That is really
22 in my opinion, something that I think I would
23 prioritize. Of all the seven that I see here -- six
24 that I see here -- that's something that sticks out
25 to me as most important.

1 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. Okay. Great
2 insight.

3 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. 6, we already
4 do to a great extent. We work through the Charter
5 School Coalition, but we also put many things
6 online, request people to provide us feedback, you
7 know. And sometimes we get it; sometimes we don't.
8 But we at least work on that.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Okay. So a strength in
10 the Commission's work, overall.

11 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Right.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: But a commitment that we
13 will continue to do that as you look to revise the
14 framework.

15 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I think it's
16 integral in whatever our job is to always deal with
17 the schools, stakeholders, whatever.

18 THE CHAIR: I think I'd be more
19 comfortable if we had a statement about the
20 operational.

21 MR. TIM FIELD: Okay. Great.

22 THE CHAIR: That's important for us, too;
23 because that's, without a doubt --

24 MR. TIM FIELD: A key point.

25 THE CHAIR: -- a topic of conversation.

1 And we're finding challenges.

2 So I think we -- it is a priority for us.
3 I don't know if it's appropriate. But we don't
4 really have it in our current framework. But a
5 clearly defined intervention ladder, I think, is
6 critical, so that schools have a -- have an
7 understanding and -- of what will happen. So, for
8 me, it's important for -- for that to be in there.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: And I -- I think what's --
10 that concept, intervention ladder, may not be
11 familiar to some. But it's the notion of when you
12 hit a -- you know, a certain level of performance,
13 what are the interventions, what are the steps that
14 go from -- that eventually lead to some decisions
15 that the Commission makes.

16 THE CHAIR: Right.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: It's meant to be -- No. 5,
18 I think.

19 THE CHAIR: Was that part of it? Yeah.

20 MR. TIM FIELD: I think that's the idea,
21 that there's clear policies and procedures for what
22 happens when you take actions. And "actions" would
23 be interventions, and decisions would be renewal,
24 non-renewal, et cetera.

25 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: I think we're doing a

1 lot of this already, I mean, to a great extent.
2 It's something that from what I've seen from the
3 short time we've been on here, we do a lot of that,
4 except for what they added on there. But with the
5 guidance of Katie and the seasoned Commissioners, I
6 think we're addressing a lot of this already.

7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think we're
8 addressing it. But I think it's not as clear. And
9 I have to say, because I've only been here for two
10 years, that the work that the people who are on here
11 before did was amazing. Because you have nothing,
12 and you started something -- right? -- from scratch.

13 And so like anything anyone writes as a --
14 the worst thing to do is to get their initial rough
15 draft out. And then fixing it is much easier than
16 coming up with it at the beginning.

17 So I admire all the work that has been
18 done. I am not dissing this in any way. And now I
19 think we're to the point -- because we have way more
20 schools -- there's higher bars; there's, you know,
21 just all kinds of things that are different -- that
22 now, we need much more clarity.

23 So when someone reads something, we have a
24 policy, and we have a procedure, and it goes for
25 your school and your school and your school.

1 And sometimes there's -- it's so grayish,
2 and it makes it -- I'm sorry -- makes it -- you
3 know, it makes it confusing.

4 And I know that Katie has talked about
5 even getting data from those formative tests that I
6 mentioned that they give. We get -- sometimes she
7 gets a line that says, "Oh, look. They grew."

8 But I think we are responsible -- that's
9 what an authorizer is. We are responsible for
10 making sure that that data is real, and that it's
11 not the school's interpretation. Because
12 sometimes -- we're human. And when you put pressure
13 on people, we know what happens from psychological
14 viewpoint.

15 So that's where I want to go is that
16 there's a lot of clarity. Again, when Katie's team
17 goes out, this is what they can see; they can look
18 at it.

19 Danielle and I just went to a law
20 conference -- others did, too. But we went to the
21 one on special ed. And oh, my gosh, they are in
22 such deep trouble, such deep trouble.

23 Again, how are their IEPs looking? What
24 are they doing? What are they providing? How are
25 they providing it? That special ed can take you

1 right out of the school business.

2 These charter schools are small. They
3 don't have somebody directing special ed and
4 overseeing it. It's, again, at the school level.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: I think the point you made
6 about making sure they have that data, or the
7 question about having -- goes to Point No. 2, is
8 ensuring that measures can be reliably and
9 accurately collected, and that that needs to be a
10 focus.

11 Again, all this is about -- as you're
12 looking to refine the frameworks.

13 THE CHAIR: I think it was clear from
14 the -- the meetings that we had with the charters
15 when we started this first discussion, it was clear
16 from them that they were hoping, out of this, we
17 would be focusing more on their mission-specific,
18 because the State accountability system takes care
19 of so much that what they're created for was to
20 fulfill this mission.

21 And, to me, that also creates the greatest
22 focus; because as much as I've looked at, you know,
23 finding good indicators, it's -- you know, it's
24 challenging, as I'm sure you know, with the vastness
25 of the missions, to come up with. And that's what

1 they're hoping out of us, that there's this
2 guidance, I think, more than anything, to help them
3 be able to also adequately -- that they can show us
4 that they are doing what -- what they said they were
5 going to do.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: So we are going to break
7 in a second.

8 To kind of wrap this up, there's two
9 things I want to do. One is just to get the
10 pulse -- I think this notion of adding one about
11 organizational and kind of clarity in alignment and
12 reducing burden, this notion of kind of for this
13 immediate term -- and I don't know if it's six-,
14 12-month time framing -- but this notion of at some
15 point, it may be very important to think about these
16 annual school-level reports; but maybe that isn't
17 the immediate focus. I'm proposing as kind of what
18 Phase 2 means in your heads. It's kind of vague,
19 perhaps, at this point. And this notion of taking
20 on this SAM model as an alternative.

21 Are those things we are comfortable -- do
22 we want to put that as a future objective? Or is
23 that something you feel like needs to be tackled
24 now? Or are these sequenced differently than the
25 ones we just looked at before? Are you comfortable

1 with that notion?

2 THE CHAIR: I think -- personally, I think
3 the SAM schools need to be in there; because it is
4 a -- it's also an ongoing conversation with PED.
5 The Charter Coalition has been working with PED, so
6 that I think it's -- it's important to have it now.

7 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: The only item
8 that I think is ignored by everybody -- and I think
9 it's also ignored by the Charter Coalition -- is
10 best practices, or how to deal with making sure they
11 have the -- the required board -- parent-volunteer
12 boards. And I see it constantly at -- they're not
13 all together, or very few of them. And we do look
14 at that.

15 But there's very little emphasis by -- by
16 all of us. But I'm not sure what the Commission can
17 do or should be doing. I really don't know. I've
18 been trying to figure it out, and I haven't come up
19 with any idea.

20 MR. TIM FIELD: So one thing I would just
21 note -- we'll talk about this when we talk about
22 organizational frameworks and trends -- is that you
23 see actually a lot of variation across authorizers
24 and what they try to collect.

25 And probably it's a reflection of what are

1 their priorities. Because there is this issue of
2 how much data could you reasonably ask, how much
3 data can you reasonably collect and analyze, and how
4 much data gives us a meaningful indicator of where
5 that school is?

6 So the Commission, at some point, as part
7 of that work of refining that, is what are the
8 priorities? So if board governance and parent
9 engagement and participation on boards is a
10 priority, then that may be one of the things, as
11 you're kind of deciding what to streamline and what
12 to keep and what to -- that you want to -- for you,
13 that's a priority, and that's something the
14 Commission can work to decide: "What will be the
15 priority for the organizational framework," so
16 you're not collecting things that you don't -- that
17 aren't as important.

18 You've got to comply with the law; but you
19 can -- you can make that framework work for you and
20 work for the priorities you've set.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: The State law
22 gives us almost no control over governing councils.
23 The one piece we have is that they have to have the
24 minimum number of five, and if they drop below that,
25 then we can intervene. And we are now keeping a

1 list of that, because they haven't even been
2 reporting to us what their numbers are.

3 But what we need is a legal change to give
4 us more control over how governing councils recruit
5 members and how they work and whether it's a group
6 of cronies. Because my feeling is any of our
7 schools have gotten in trouble, it starts with the
8 governance council, because that's also where the
9 financial piece starts with the governance council
10 who is letting somebody else control it, not looking
11 at monthly, you know, financial reports and what
12 they spent, what they have left, what -- you know,
13 aren't doing the advance approval.

14 So all of our real problem schools start
15 with governing councils. And yet the law requires
16 them to have five hours of fiscal training, and
17 that's all the law requires. And then we don't --
18 we can't suspend a governance council the way the
19 PED can suspend the finance part and take it over.

20 MS. LYRIA BOST: To Tim's point, though,
21 it may be interesting -- that may still be
22 information you want to review and that can have
23 tremendous power.

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No, we request it.
25 But that's one of the things we can't actually

1 require, because our control is over the head of the
2 school and the school itself, not necessarily all
3 the details of a governance council.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: So I'm going to actually
5 have us break now. We were going to talk about --
6 one of the things we were proposing for these
7 objectives are what are the hopes and fears around
8 accomplishing these things? What are the things you
9 think can derail you?

10 We can revisit that during lunch, perhaps,
11 if you want to.

12 Otherwise, we're going to take a 10 minute
13 break now, and we're going to come back and talk
14 about trends. We're going to shift the focus --
15 yes, Danielle, comment?

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I apologize. I'm
17 just very passionate about this; so I've been
18 collecting my thoughts.

19 When we get back from the break, I'm ready
20 to -- to make my comments, if you'd like me to do it
21 when we get back from the break.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: That would be great.

23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Okay.

24 (Recess taken, 10:40 a.m. to 10:53 a.m.)

25 MS. LYRIA BOST: So, Danielle, did you

1 want -- we want to make sure you have opportunity
2 to --

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And thank you.
4 And really, after the break, I've calmed down; so --
5 I will not say anything now and do my best to
6 participate as the day progresses.

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: Are you sure?

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: No, I'm absolutely
9 certain.

10 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. All right.

11 So in the next section, we'll be talking
12 about trends in accountability. I'll be focusing
13 first on academic accountability. And then we'll
14 also -- so to spend a shorter period of time on
15 financial and operational, not that they are not as
16 important, but we have to start someplace.

17 And academic -- you know, there's a lot of
18 thought that that, of course, needs to go into any
19 authorizer's academic accountability framework.

20 So you should have a copy of the slides.
21 The reason I sent it is that we are going to be
22 doing a quick march through a lot of the sort of top
23 sort of topics, challenges, and trends in
24 accountability. And we're going to need to go
25 fairly quickly. And I want you to have notes that

1 you can go back to and take notes if you would like.

2 Tim, let me get to -- okay. All right.

3 Okay. So first of all, I want to preface
4 by saying it's always interesting when we work in
5 different states with different -- specifically with
6 authorizers, and we start to talk about sort of
7 what's going on across the nation in terms of
8 authorizer accountability. And there are times that
9 I'll get a warning -- they don't really want to know
10 what other states are doing, you know. They don't
11 really care, okay?

12 And then other states are very interested.
13 What are other people doing? We want to base it on
14 that.

15 So I'm going to start with a caveat that
16 this is not presented to tell you that this is what
17 you should be doing because this is what everybody
18 else is doing. This is really to give you sort of
19 information, ideas, a sense that you're not alone in
20 this boat, that many of these challenges are really
21 common to authorizers. And, then, of course, you
22 have your state-specific challenges.

23 So just sort of another background is that
24 I think we've now worked with 15 authorizers in
25 different states. And there are many common themes.

1 But they are always -- you know, the end result is
2 always different. There are so many state-specific,
3 you know, contexts that have to do with mission,
4 that have to do with data availability and, really,
5 priorities of both -- you know, of the schools and
6 the authorizers. So we are not trying to tell you
7 that you should be doing anything here. This is
8 really meant to be information.

9 So, again, as -- so the principle -- since
10 you have the slides in front of you. So it's
11 important, before we sort of dive into the topics, I
12 think it's good to just sort of be clear about some
13 basic principles that we at least are usually
14 assuming and starting from when we're looking at
15 academic accountability frameworks.

16 And the first is always keeping in mind
17 that charter bargain. And, you know, we had a good
18 discussion about that. It sounds as if there's
19 quite a bit of alignment here, that your charter
20 schools are given autonomy; but this accountability
21 piece is quite important.

22 Now, establishing and defining and clearly
23 communicating what you're holding schools
24 accountable is, of course, the challenge; but that
25 that is really the base and sort of the most

1 important principle in starting any of these
2 conversations.

3 The other two points that, you know, we,
4 at least, are always thinking about and keeping --
5 you know, sort of utmost importance -- and again, we
6 talked about these this morning -- is that not only
7 have you decided on metrics and indicators and what
8 you'll be collecting, but that you're communicating
9 clear expectations for performance on, you know, a
10 set of metrics or indicators, and that schools are
11 very clear on what those expectations are, and,
12 again, as we talked about this morning, that it's
13 clear how those results will be used.

14 So, again, we'll talk about some of these
15 issues. But I think in sort of seeing how
16 authorizers evolve, there was some conversation
17 earlier and comments sort of recognizing and
18 acknowledging that it's hard work, you know. The
19 first piece you're doing is saying, "What are we
20 looking at?" Then you're communicating that, "This
21 is our framework."

22 That's such hard work; and yet, you're not
23 done when you get to that point. Because having a
24 framework, then all sorts of questions about how you
25 use it, how you communicate it, and, really, how

1 schools are hopefully supported by the use of that
2 and the establishment of those performance criteria.
3 So just a little background there.

4 Okay. So we are going to go through about
5 15 sort of trends and challenges. And I want to
6 ease your mind a little bit. This is -- we're going
7 to keep things moving. But we're going to revisit
8 them about three times. So this first time, I'm
9 hoping -- I want to go through -- this first
10 pass-through, we'll be really talking about what we
11 see in -- across states, across authorizers, really
12 with a focus on the range of approaches taken and
13 the challenges that we see.

14 Then we'll come back to them and really be
15 wanting to get your input when we look at those same
16 sort of trends and challenges in the New Mexico
17 context.

18 Am I loud enough?

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Is it?

20 If you could put a book on it, so it was
21 higher, maybe that would be easier.

22 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. So we can't talk
23 about academic accountability without acknowledging
24 first that ESSA is really kind of creating a lot of
25 transition in many states. Now, that's not -- you

1 know, some states had very developed state
2 accountability systems that really didn't need to
3 change much through ESSA. But we had other states
4 that had lots and lots of changes.

5 That makes it sort of exciting in terms of
6 seeing new metrics, new approaches; but just a lot
7 of uncertainty right now. So we'll just acknowledge
8 that; that will be covered throughout.

9 We're going to talk about the growing use
10 of "Growth." I know that that is something you're
11 very familiar with here, and that is very important
12 to your frameworks.

13 The expanded use of college and career
14 readiness indicators.

15 Evaluating achievement gap closure, that
16 this is a priority more in some places than others,
17 but certainly something important.

18 The use of non-academic measures. Again,
19 ESSA has brought that to a head, the way lots of
20 people were thinking about those. Now, everybody is
21 thinking about them.

22 Rolling up to an overall score or grade.
23 So this is the question of do you or don't you?
24 That's going to be the first set.

25 Then we're going to dig into some

1 issues -- Millie, is that okay in terms of sound?

2 Then we're going to turn for some of the
3 more authorizer charter-school-specific issues,
4 really, challenges of authorizers; not that the
5 others aren't, but sort of everybody is dealing with
6 that.

7 So we're going to come back to this whole
8 conversation of alignments with state accountability
9 systems, talk about how do you evaluate schools
10 serving the most challenged students or populations.

11 We'll talk about mission-specific goals.
12 You have a lot of experience with that. There's
13 really a range of how authorizers are dealing with
14 those and using them.

15 We'll talk about using additional
16 assessments in addition to state assessments.
17 That's kind of a mouthful, but lots of different
18 ways that's being done.

19 Then -- then we're sort of moving into the
20 use of your academic performance framework; so, you
21 know, setting clear performance expectations for
22 renewal decisions, letting schools know, "How are we
23 actually -- these are the indicators; but how are we
24 going to use them?"

25 And then how will you communicate those

1 results?

2 And then, finally, we would really be
3 remiss if we didn't at least touch on evaluating
4 virtual schools -- virtual charter schools and
5 alternative schools, which has a lot of -- you
6 know -- is related to that evaluating schools
7 serving the most challenged populations. But there
8 are a couple of different ways that we look at this.

9 Those last two bullets could have an
10 entire, you know, two-day or weeklong session alone.
11 So we need to cover them; but, again, that's
12 probably something that you need to keep considering
13 as you go forward.

14 So any que- -- that's the summary. And
15 now we're going to sort of dive into each of them.
16 Anything that anybody says, "Wait. X or Y is
17 missing, and we need to" --

18 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Other than I'd
19 like to point out, we have only one virtual school,
20 and that's through a court order, because our law
21 doesn't actually allow for State-authorized virtual
22 schools. Districts can have them. And we have two.
23 But we have only the one. So if we're going to go
24 light on anything, that would be the -- the
25 alternative schools is more important.

1 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. So maybe we swap
2 those, and that's that. Okay. Terrific.

3 So this is the only -- you know, I
4 think -- I'd like to stop for a moment and, really,
5 we're going to talk about student growth and the use
6 of student growth. There are many ways that I
7 think, as in looking at some of the mission-specific
8 goals -- clearly, you all are dealing with lots of
9 different growth metrics.

10 So I want to make sure first that we're
11 just all on the same page about what we're talking
12 about when we talk about student growth. But that's
13 going to be very important, and already is, you
14 know, from what we know, a large part of how you
15 view your schools' performance.

16 So, of course, achievement. Often in
17 accountability systems, it will be called
18 "achievement"; but they're really talking about
19 proficiency, which is usually looked at as how many
20 students are at grade level. Of course, this used
21 to be the only way that schools were held
22 accountable under No Child Left Behind. We've had
23 lots of improvements with the addition of growth.

24 So what is growth? I think it's always
25 worth just defining this, because growth used to

1 mean, or be referred to, as how did the proficiency
2 rate change? And that's not what we're talking
3 about when we talk about school growth models.

4 School growth models -- sorry, I'm
5 repeating this, we are intimately familiar with
6 that -- is looking at for each student, where did
7 they start, where did they end. And those growth
8 models are really trying to evaluate the learning of
9 a student in a year, you know, or -- you know, in a
10 certain time period. And then usually, it's
11 reported out as aggregated for a group of students,
12 okay?

13 We'll sort of stop there, because I love
14 growth models, and anybody who wants to dig into
15 them, I'm happy to talk for hours, and we could
16 spend a whole day just on growth models, different
17 growth models. The one thing I will definitely say
18 is it is so important to understand what any one
19 given growth model, what is the question it is
20 actually answering, what is the model; because we
21 tend to think, oh, how much -- how much are students
22 learning?

23 And at the simplest, we would love to know
24 how many students are learning a year's worth of
25 growth. And, of course, you know, there are many

1 different ways to answer that question and lots of
2 the different answers that you will get from school
3 growth models.

4 So, again, we'll talk again later. You
5 potentially have schools using very different
6 assessments and modeling. It's going to be very
7 important that you understand what those different
8 results are telling you, because they can be very
9 different.

10 So other things about -- so achievement
11 versus growth. Again, we went from ten years ago,
12 no state accountability systems included growth, to
13 having, now -- I think it's now 60 percent of states
14 have adopted a growth model. And, of course,
15 they'll all be required to have them under ESSA. So
16 exciting.

17 Again, we've done some studies looking at
18 all the models being used across states. They tend
19 to fall into about five models. Again, a whole
20 other conversation. But growth is now important.
21 And it's clearly been acknowledged that you cannot
22 only look at proficiency and get a sense of the
23 school quality.

24 So in state accountability systems, we see
25 that how growth is prioritized, or the weight put on

1 growth compared to achievement, really changes quite
2 a bit.

3 Okay. We -- from as much as proficiency
4 is weighted in some state accountability systems
5 currently, with as low a weight as 20 percent and as
6 high as 100 percent. There are some states that
7 still don't include growth in their state
8 accountability systems.

9 On the flip side, because we're
10 acknowledging that growth and proficiency aren't the
11 only things included, so these aren't going to
12 totally add to 100, student growth, again, there are
13 some systems that have none. Many, many
14 accountability systems have an equal weight on
15 proficiency and growth. And then some states, such
16 as Colorado, have growth weighted as high as
17 75 percent.

18 So huge range. And what is behind that is
19 a lot of discussion, disagreement, different views
20 on how important is growth and how much should it be
21 considered when you are evaluating schools.

22 So, again, we're going to -- we'll come --
23 we'll swing back around and look at your specific
24 growth models, this state and your accountability
25 system; but everybody is dealing with this right

1 now.

2 So, again, in terms of just summing that
3 up, general- -- most systems will have an equal
4 weight. I would say that that's most common that
5 you see in most state accountability systems, and
6 also in authorizer accountability systems, with a
7 lot of range.

8 Okay. This is just some -- but, then,
9 also, big, big challenges these days, especially
10 with all the changes in state assessments, on the
11 ability to include growth for high schools.

12 Obviously, you know, you would want to
13 have growth for your high schools. Many states are
14 not able to do that right now. So any questions
15 sort of broadly on growth versus proficiency?

16 Again, we're going to hold for a moment in
17 terms of getting into your state-specific; but --
18 no? Okay.

19 All right. College and career readiness.

20 Over the past five years, it's been really
21 exciting to see the explosion of new -- both
22 measurement reporting and accountability around
23 college and career readiness. There are still some
24 state systems and authorizer accountability systems
25 that only look at graduation. But really, we're

1 seeing many, many more indicators as -- this is
2 often limited by what is collected in state systems,
3 because this can be difficult.

4 An authorizer who does not have access to
5 state system data will often be challenged to
6 collect some of these data. So we see college
7 attendance rates, ACT, SAT, CTE, dual enrollment, AP
8 participation, and pass rate. Sometimes those are
9 done separately. Sometimes they're indexes. Again,
10 we'll come to your example. Your state has a number
11 of these.

12 From authorizer perspective or approaches,
13 there are a number of authorizers who have
14 prioritized this for high schools, and, for example,
15 have gone directly to the National Student
16 Clearinghouse and set up a data-sharing agreement so
17 that they receive those data directly from the --
18 the vendor.

19 And so they're bypassing. They're not
20 having to request the data from schools. They're
21 not having to rely on state data systems.

22 Again, lots of the data availability
23 issues here; but we're seeing a lot of interest in
24 including, as far as possible, especially for high
25 schools. And this can also be really powerful,

1 again, when you have high schools request a specific
2 mission, that it can be really interesting to
3 consider new indicators here.

4 So the considerations or sort of the
5 challenges, again, are usually data availability.
6 Questions of, again, whether to ask schools directly
7 for these results, and the concerns there usually
8 are both on not wanting to add burden to the school,
9 but also having concern sometimes about data
10 reliability.

11 In cases where -- where authorizers are
12 requesting directly from the school, they're usually
13 setting up internal data verification processes that
14 require staff capacity. So, you know, data
15 accessibility is really the challenge, mostly with
16 college and career readiness indicators.

17 Another really interesting, more
18 philosophical question, though, that we've had with
19 a number of authorizers who wanted to include
20 college attendance or completion is the question of
21 how long are we holding a school accountable for
22 students after they graduate?

23 So we had authorizers that were
24 uncomfortable, for example, at looking at college
25 completion, because they said, you know, "Are we

1 responsible? Is the school responsible four years
2 later?"

3 So, again, interesting conversations
4 there.

5 Any questions, or general -- yes.

6 MS. POULOS: Have you seen states using
7 college --

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Katie?

9 MS. POULOS: Oh, sorry. Have you seen
10 states using college remediation?

11 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yes. And that should --
12 yes, yes. So college remediation, that is in
13 several states. There can be some tricky data
14 issues there.

15 You -- and we see authorizers, in one or
16 two cases, using it where there are strong systems
17 within the state to collect and report. Yeah.
18 Because in some -- for example, it's reported by the
19 universities themselves. It's not really done in a
20 statewide cohesive manner.

21 Any other --

22 THE CHAIR: I don't know if this is
23 appropriate. We've had schools, I know, as we've
24 done negotiations with them, trying to create
25 mission-specific goals that do track. We have

1 difficulty with them getting that -- you know, it's
2 a great -- while it's a great goal --

3 MS. LYRIA BOST: Remediation,
4 specifically?

5 THE CHAIR: No. Actually, both. Just
6 go- -- it's, like, they know -- they can tell us how
7 many students were accepted to a college. But
8 beyond that, you know, they wanted to negotiate
9 goals and say, you know, "We're going to have
10 50 percent of our, you know, students stay through
11 their freshman year, or to graduate."

12 And tracking, from what the schools have
13 told us, is -- it's them physically calling the
14 student and saying -- and who -- who can do that?
15 So at least here, I believe it's quite a challenge.

16 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. Great. We can
17 definitely discuss some ways to deal with that.
18 Terrific. Tim --

19 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I know at least
20 University of New Mexico sends their remediation
21 students to the community college. So theirs does
22 not show that student, because they're not on their
23 credit. And that way, you have to know to go and
24 check with CNM, even though they're an enrolled
25 student at UNM, and they're not -- they're enrolled,

1 but they're not really at CNM, because UNM is paying
2 them for it.

3 And they've been doing that for years and
4 years. And I would imagine that several of our
5 other colleges may be doing that, if they have a
6 community college close to them. So that's going to
7 be a challenge, always.

8 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yeah. Again, some of
9 these are really dependent on those state systems
10 and how different systems are linked together and
11 doing -- how much you can rely on the accuracy of
12 the data.

13 Okay. Tim is telling me I've got to keep
14 moving. Okay. Okay. And, again, we'll come back
15 to -- to evaluating achievement gaps. This, we
16 see -- obviously, incredibly important. It sounds
17 like this is important to you all.

18 We do see state systems and authorizer
19 systems where this is not addressed at all. And so
20 there are sort of concerns that whatever overall
21 rating, it probably is not fairly treating schools
22 that are enrolling and serving those most challenged
23 students.

24 From that, on the other end of the sort of
25 spectrum in terms of practice, there are actual

1 accountability systems that actually include a gap
2 measure. You know, they are actually measuring gap
3 and are schools closing gaps. In between those two
4 extremes, we have more detailed review of subgroup
5 performance.

6 This is, again, when -- and we have
7 some -- yeah. So you can spend a lot of time.
8 Really interesting metrics that are used and a range
9 of metrics and some challenges in those, because in
10 terms of the considerations, one of the biggest ones
11 for charter schools is that some of the measures
12 that might say, you know, "Gaps within your school,
13 how is the performance?"

14 Well, many charter schools are serving
15 100 percent students that are economically
16 disadvantaged or in some other student group.

17 So, you know, it -- we have worked with
18 authorizers who say, "We want an in-school gap."
19 We've had to look for other ways. So generally
20 making sure that there's disaggregated performance
21 reporting, but that the performance expectations are
22 not sort of across-the-board expectations that,
23 again, really disadvantage schools that are serving
24 those most disadvantaged kids.

25 So there's -- there are lots of resources

1 and lots of really interesting examples in terms of
2 the actual metric. So we won't get into that too
3 much. But depending on options that you want to
4 look at, there are really interesting different ways
5 that both state systems, but mostly authorizers who
6 are doing the more sort of innovative job of this,
7 looking to see -- how can we really see whether a
8 school is serving those students well.

9 And the last consideration here: Again,
10 it's one thing to decide, "These are the metrics
11 we're going to use," and then another to decide,
12 "Well, how do we set those targets?"

13 So, Carmie, a little to what you were
14 saying, you know, sort of are we setting targets
15 that either everybody will just pass, or everybody
16 will fail who is serving a certain student
17 population?

18 We'll come back to this.

19 Non-academic measures. We've had -- we've
20 been thinking about these and had specifically
21 authorizers asking about these and wanting to
22 include these for quite a while. But now, of
23 course, with the ESSA requirement that states
24 include at least one, initially, it seemed as though
25 it would be exciting, because all sorts of

1 interesting, you know, sort of metrics and modeling
2 and type of assessments were being considered.

3 We're seeing really most states are
4 choosing that chronic absenteeism and attendance,
5 and, in a much smaller subset, a school culture
6 survey. But the truly interesting sort of
7 assessments of these noncognitive measures, like
8 grit and persistence, honestly, we have done some
9 work with the folks that are developing those and
10 trialing them. The sense is those are not ready for
11 accountability yet.

12 So lots of interest and commitment to
13 schools, you know, having a mission towards that and
14 actually serving students. It's tough to measure
15 and include in accountability right now.

16 Yeah. So any questions on that? That's
17 also another one I think is just --

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Can you just
19 tell me the different -- difference between chronic
20 absenteeism and attendance?

21 MS. LYRIA BOST: You can? I'm going to
22 give that to Tim.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: So the main difference is
24 chronic absenteeism is usually looking at what
25 percentage of students are chronically absent. So

1 there's some threshold, and -- have missed 10 days
2 of school or have missed 10 percent of school days;
3 so, you know, 10 percent allows you to do a rolling.

4 And attendance is the -- you know, what
5 percentage of students, on average, are attending
6 the school.

7 But I think the reason chronic absenteeism
8 is being used more is I think a lot of schools are
9 seeing attendance does not differentiate schools
10 very well, that a lot of schools have a 96 percent
11 attendance rate; you don't see a lot of
12 differentiation. There is more differentiation on
13 chronic absenteeism. So I think they're saying
14 that -- that makes it a more meaningful
15 differentiator in the accountability system.

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So attendance
17 kind of talks about the school's percentage, and
18 chronic absenteeism is percentage --

19 MR. TIM FIELD: What percentage of
20 students are chronically having attendance problems.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Okay. Thank
22 you.

23 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. So the last in
24 this more sort of general set of characteristics
25 that we'll talk about is rolling up to an overall

1 grade or rating.

2 It's been really interesting, over the
3 past six years, to see how thoughts on this have
4 changed; because on the one hand, you know, Carmie,
5 as you said, a lot of folks are very uncomfortable
6 with this idea of an overall rating and would much
7 rather stay with, "Let's look at the disaggregated
8 metrics or indicators and sort of judge from there."

9 So that is one we're not going to say one
10 is better or not, because we have had -- I have had
11 many, many conversations with folks about this, and
12 had -- and authorizers come -- have made decisions
13 along the continuum.

14 So on the one side, there is discomfort
15 with rolling up and wanting to say, you know, "This
16 is the summative, what we say about the school."

17 On the other side, the case that I would
18 make for why many authorizers have moved to using an
19 overall rating is to provide more clarity in that
20 renewal in the "how do we use the results?"

21 And I would say that there is sort of a
22 middle ground, where there is some sort of large
23 tiering that, for authorizers, really is aimed
24 towards what are the thresholds or the performance
25 profile that would put -- generally, authorizers

1 would be thinking about three or perhaps four
2 categories.

3 The easiest are thinking about the highest
4 fliers, which are those schools that we -- you know,
5 are the indicators we've chosen, given our
6 framework, we really can say that are exceeding our
7 expectations. If you had an expedited renewal, or
8 you had processes for expansion or replication, it
9 would be clear that that could be sort of a fast
10 track; on the other side, which are the schools that
11 really, their performance warrants high-stake review
12 and possibly nonrenewal.

13 Okay. In the middle, then, some
14 authorizers just like -- you know, we need to have
15 sort of a tier in the middle that we know we need to
16 keep a look. And other authorizers want sort of a
17 breakout, the ones that are meeting standard and the
18 ones, there are some red flags, and maybe we need
19 more on an intervention ladder. We want to have a
20 higher touch point.

21 So when thinking about how to roll up,
22 first, it's whether to roll up or not. But then,
23 really, the more important question is, "What are we
24 rolling up to?" Like, "What do we need to
25 distinguish, and are those categories that we are

1 creating actionable?"

2 Because another sort of pitfall, or
3 challenge, that we'll run into here is, you know,
4 authorizers say, "We want to set a really high
5 standard. We want to make it really clear that this
6 is what we expect; and so this is where we're
7 putting our minimum expectation."

8 And then the conversation is, "Is that
9 actionable? Are you actually going to close any
10 school that is below that?"

11 And if the answer is, "No," then you have
12 weakened your position to actually take meaningful
13 action and to communicate to schools, "Here is where
14 we need to be having conversations. Here is where
15 you actually are in danger of nonrenewal."

16 So this really relates to theory of
17 action, authorizer mission. But I would say that
18 there is much more comfort, as state accountability
19 systems, in that same sort of six-year period, have
20 moved to having no roll-up, to many, many more
21 states, such as New Mexico, having some sort of
22 grade or rating.

23 So, again, this really depends on the
24 mission and what you want to use. So it's really
25 related to not only what are the expectations you

1 want to communicate to schools, but what is that
2 intervention ladder or plan that you need to make
3 clear to them.

4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Question.

5 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: What I'm
7 interested in is -- is how -- what are those
8 measurements, either grade or score or tier rating,
9 that has an impact on how students view themselves?

10 MS. LYRIA BOST: Uh-huh.

11 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I was sitting in
12 the Legislative Senate and House meeting. And one
13 of the senators gave his story of his son now being
14 a senior. And as a junior -- as a freshman and all
15 the way to junior, it was rated "A." Then now, as a
16 senior, it goes down to a "D" or an "F"; I can't
17 remember.

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But then this
20 young man started doubting himself, whether he can
21 actually do well in college.

22 And so I -- I still, to this day, remember
23 that story. And my question is, has there been a
24 view, a study, an analysis, on what would be the
25 best rating system on how the student views

1 themselves, and what is the best approach?

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. I have not seen
3 research. Most of what I've seen is anecdotal, as
4 in what you said. So that is very -- is an
5 important consideration. And I think the tension
6 for an authorizer is that concern, balanced with
7 your ability to have a clear intervention ladder.

8 So we do see, you know, the way that is
9 rated. You know, there are states and authorizers
10 who use a grade or a star system. There are others
11 that use something that's more neutral. I mean,
12 it's going to be hard -- Tier 1, 2, 3.

13 But still, you're going to need to be
14 calling out -- functionally calling out those lowest
15 performing schools. And that is a tension that's
16 going to be there, yeah.

17 But I have not seen research. I will
18 double-check. But it has been a while since I
19 looked for that. But more anecdotes, yeah.

20 Okay. So we're going to stop with that
21 first set. And Tim is handing out a little table
22 that we've put together as a crib sheet for you.
23 And you all will probably have lots to add to it.

24 But the attempt here is to look at, you
25 know, how do these -- how are these five -- we

1 talked about five aspects -- how are these playing
2 out in New Mexico?

3 Both -- so on this table, you'll see that
4 we've got -- and you want to be on Page 1. Okay?
5 Don't jump ahead to -- so we've got several columns
6 here. We've got anything that -- about any -- about
7 these aspects related to the -- or that is addressed
8 in statute; so in your charter law.

9 Then we look at how does the A-through-F
10 grade deal with this -- this challenge, or this
11 trend? And how does your current Commission
12 framework? Now, we know that you've done work on
13 sort of proposed -- but this is looking at your
14 current.

15 And just as a quick review -- this is
16 fleshing out your New Mexico A-through-F grades --
17 we've got -- you know, you have -- in terms -- so
18 let's look at -- if we first look at achievement
19 versus growth, you -- the A-through-F grade has, for
20 elementary schools, a 50 percent weight on growth.
21 And at high school, it's a 30 percent weight on
22 growth. So that's fairly typical in terms of what
23 we see across the state.

24 You have a number of several growth
25 models, school-level and student-level, as well as

1 this drill-down on growth in looking at the highest
2 and lowest performing students. So I would say,
3 compared to many other state accountability systems,
4 you have a -- this is good; right? You have a
5 growth model. You have it looking several ways at
6 student growth. And you also have sort of a
7 drill-down into these highest and lowest performing
8 students.

9 Yeah.

10 MS. POULOS: Does this take into
11 account -- and I should know this, but I just want
12 to make sure I know this correctly and everybody
13 else. Does this take into account the growth that
14 is also incorporated into our proficiency? Because
15 our proficiency measure --

16 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. Right. Yeah,
17 we're going to -- yes. Oh. So what we're counting
18 in the 50 percent is not that proficiency piece.
19 I'm going to talk about that -- the adjusted
20 value-added?

21 MS. POULOS: Right, yes.

22 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yeah, we'll talk about
23 that in just a, yeah, moment.

24 So the weight on proficiency is
25 40 percent. But what's really unique about your

1 system is that 20 -- half of that -- so
2 20 percent -- is what we would generally consider
3 proficiency, you know, how many students are
4 proficient. The other 20 percent is proficiency
5 adjusted for those school characteristics, which I
6 have to say is very unusual in state accountability
7 systems.

8 So I know you're here. It's the -- the
9 air you breathe, the water. And there are issues--
10 all systems are going to be different.

11 But, Carlos, to your earlier concerns,
12 obviously, this does not completely address the
13 school characteristics or student characteristics.
14 But the fact that it is there is very different.
15 Most state accountability systems are solely looking
16 at proficiency and making no adjustments or
17 considerations or modifications for the students
18 being served in the schools.

19 So I would say that is a plus. It
20 definitely sounds as though it is not going far
21 enough to sort of fairly portray those schools. But
22 that is a characteristic of your system that is
23 quite different when you look across the states.

24 Also, the fact that you have several
25 growth models, and all of them are taking into

1 consideration the starting point of the student,
2 okay? Because we talked a little bit earlier.
3 Growth models are very different. A number of
4 growth models -- in about 25 percent of the states
5 that have growth models are growth models that are
6 looking -- sort of tied to proficiency. So they're
7 evaluating how many students are moving up a
8 proficiency level. They're not taking into
9 consideration sort of the starting point. Yeah?

10 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: No.

11 MS. LYRIA BOST: Oh, sorry. Katie, did
12 you have a question? I'm seeing stuff.

13 Okay. So other things about your -- let's
14 see. Where did that go? Right. Okay.

15 So other interesting things: In terms of
16 your current Commission framework, of course, it's
17 highly -- you know, half of it is the A-through-F
18 system. But then in thinking -- it's a little hard
19 to say, "Oh, what weight does your framework have on
20 growth," because, of course, there are
21 mission-specific measures that could be different by
22 schools and could impact this.

23 So any questions here about sort of top
24 level of -- okay.

25 So then if we look at college and career

1 readiness indicators, it's up there. Okay.

2 So in statute, they're required; but it
3 doesn't actually name specific -- you know, what
4 needs to be required. So that seems to give you a
5 lot of leadership, or flexibility, if you wanted to
6 add more.

7 The current A-through-F grade includes the
8 grad rate, college entrance exams, dual credit, and
9 vocational education. And then, again, your current
10 framework would allow for the addition -- you know,
11 if you had a school that had specific
12 college-and-career-readiness goals, to add those.

13 Of course, you all know this more than we
14 do. So anything else that we've sort of missed here
15 in terms of how college and career readiness
16 indicators are playing out in your current
17 accountability sort of landscape?

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: My experience in
19 traditional schools, in charter schools, in
20 State-supported schools, is that the indicator for
21 college and career readiness is very accurate, is a
22 positive for high schools.

23 And, Trish, I would defer to you, too. I
24 don't know how you feel about that indicator. But
25 in my experience, when I look at that and see that

1 on a report card -- and I really appreciate the
2 positive things that are coming out about our
3 system. But that goes without saying. That's one
4 of the things I believe in.

5 So -- but the college and career
6 readiness, in every instance where I've looked at
7 it, it's a true indicator of what you're doing. It
8 gives you -- and the expert is sitting over here in
9 the white jacket. She does this all the time. But
10 she's not saying a word.

11 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. So Tim is telling
12 me I need to speed up. So non-academic measures.

13 THE CHAIR: Do we still have those
14 paddles? 30 seconds.

15 MS. LYRIA BOST: I need those. Okay,
16 great. So non-academic measures.

17 The statute requires attendance and
18 recurrent enrollment. The A-through-F grade, you
19 know, includes -- it has attendance, classroom
20 survey, which I would also say is a strength to your
21 A-through-F system that most state accountability
22 systems do not include any of that parent or student
23 voice. And then, of course, the pending ESSA
24 requirements may result in changes, but are
25 requiring non-academic measures.

1 Okay. And similar, your current
2 framework, again, would allow for any additional
3 non-academic that you approved.

4 And then overall score or grade: Of
5 course, you have one. But your current framework --
6 your authorizer -- your Commission framework does
7 not roll up; correct?

8 THE CHAIR: Right.

9 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay.

10 THE CHAIR: I think we're -- I think we're
11 all aligned with the fact that we're looking for it
12 to roll up; because we'd like some kind of
13 differentiated, you know, accountability system for
14 them.

15 And I put it on the survey. I -- I would
16 like a midyear -- a midterm report for the charter,
17 so that we have an idea, three years in, where the
18 schools that are up for renewal will -- you know,
19 what they're looking like. And it also could help
20 the schools to reflect to see they still have time
21 to maybe fix something.

22 MS. LYRIA BOST: Exactly. It's good to
23 have early warning. Okay.

24 So if you turn over this sheet that we
25 handed out, in the interests of time, we'll go

1 through and talk about them as we go.

2 Next consideration is alignment with state
3 accountability systems. And we talked about this
4 quite a bit this morning. You seemed to have sort
5 of worked that out internally and be fairly
6 comfortable with the level of alignment. And this
7 is something that really ranges -- do you have a --

8 THE CHAIR: Well, I thought it is
9 addressed. Alignment, statute requirements for
10 charter school accountability.

11 MS. LYRIA BOST: Do we want to hand out
12 that --

13 MR. TIM FIELD: We do have the statutes
14 here.

15 THE CHAIR: That's always been the
16 conversation that we've had. And that the statute
17 says what we will -- you know.

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: Well, it clearly names
19 out all the components of the state accountability
20 system. So by being aligned with it, you are then
21 meeting the requirements. But I don't think it
22 specifically says that you have to use the --

23 THE CHAIR: Correct. Yeah.

24 MS. POULOS: And I think -- I think what
25 we're talking about is Subsection E, where it says,

1 "Maybe report from the state assessment."

2 So I think in that way, we're talking
3 about having to align with where the data is coming
4 from.

5 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yes. It would be
6 difficult to meet all of those without using the
7 state -- yeah. Yes.

8 THE CHAIR: Right.

9 MS. LYRIA BOST: Okay. So we see -- I
10 don't think we need to spend too much time on this.

11 MR. TIM FIELD: Probably different
12 approaches. There are different approaches to what
13 "alignment" means, which was part of the
14 conversation this morning.

15 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. Right. And so we
16 see three sort of main approaches in terms of
17 alignment by authorizers.

18 One is to just use the state
19 accountability system with no additions.

20 The second is to use the results of the
21 state accountability system and then supplement it
22 with additional measures. Generally, what we're
23 seeing is those additional measures are ones that
24 really address charter context, things that really,
25 you know, aren't necessarily addressed in the state

1 accountability system. So that can include
2 geographic comparison. This can start debates for
3 days; right? Schools don't -- you know, you can --
4 even on one side is that schools should not be
5 compared to the districts that they're in, because
6 they're often serving different students.

7 On the other side, if you are in the
8 terrible situation of having to decide whether to
9 close a school or not, you know, non-renew, often it
10 is going to be important to know what are the other
11 options, and is this school -- how is it compared to
12 the schools that those students are going to attend?

13 So being able to actually quantify that --
14 and a number of authorizers that we work with, some,
15 in the best cases, actually go -- you know, in a
16 granular way, know exactly the percentage of
17 students that would be assigned to, you know, each
18 of the traditional district schools. And they can
19 see, you know, okay, on these -- on this -- you
20 know, whatever metric you want to see, how are those
21 assigned schools doing, and what are the
22 consequences of an action you might take as an
23 authorizer.

24 So the second option, sort of where you're
25 using the results of the state accountability system

1 with additional metrics, I would say that's sort of
2 your current system; although, you really haven't
3 defined them. They're mission-specific. Some
4 authorizers will see we're going to look at a
5 geographic comparison. We're going to look at
6 similar schools, and we'll have mission-specific
7 goals, for example.

8 And then in the third example -- and I
9 would say most authorizers are also in that similar
10 category where you are, where they're using the
11 state accountability results with additional
12 measures.

13 And then there are some authorizers -- the
14 Colorado Charter Institute is one -- where they sort
15 of pull apart components of the state system and
16 sort of reconfigure it. That can be a little bit
17 complicated, and, again, hard to make comparisons
18 when you're wanting to say, "How are the schools
19 doing compared to traditional district schools?"

20 So those are the three sort of the
21 approaches that we see. These depend, of course, on
22 the strengths of the -- or the quality and the
23 components of the state accountability system, the
24 authorizer's mission, and data availability often.

25 Okay. So any questions on that?

1 All right. Let's get to the next issue.
2 So -- okay. So evaluating schools equitably. This
3 is a really -- you know, we've had some conversation
4 today. This is often topmost, really important in
5 terms of authorizer priorities.

6 The way that they go about trying to
7 answer this question can be pretty different. But
8 often, we do see some type of comparison to schools
9 serving similar students, or a real focus on
10 subgroup performance with rigorous, yet achievable,
11 goals.

12 So, again, if you're expecting all
13 students in all subgroups to reach 80 percent
14 proficiency, that's probably not going to be a good
15 way of finding whether schools are serving students
16 well. You'll find schools adding regression or
17 value-added, which take school or student
18 characteristics into place.

19 So this is where we say -- and so we have
20 been recently working with the new Washington State
21 Charter Commission. And interestingly enough, their
22 schools really wanted a value-added analysis to say,
23 "Okay, you're looking at proficiency; but look at
24 taking into consideration who we're serving."

25 They really wanted that. It wound up

1 being included.

2 That's already in your state
3 accountability system. So, again, I know that there
4 are lots of problems with all systems. But you have
5 some qualities that charter schools in other places
6 are asking for and sometimes getting and sometimes
7 not. But this idea that you're not setting just an
8 absolute standard for everybody, but you're
9 adjusting or modifying for students served is often
10 how authorizers are dealing with this.

11 How do we, you know, equitably evaluate
12 schools and set our standards so they're taking
13 these considerations in?

14 Yeah. Any -- any questions here?

15 I would say the way that I usually -- the
16 thing that I think is actionable here is you want to
17 be able to address that concern, or claim, from a
18 school who might say, "We're serving the neediest
19 kids, and you are not evaluating us fairly."

20 As an authorizer, you want to have the
21 data and the analysis that allows you to either say,
22 "You're right, and you're actually doing well with
23 these students, with these students over-age and out
24 of cohort, and actually getting graduation rates,"
25 or, "Actually, you're not, because if we compare you

1 to other schools doing the same"; so the ability to
2 answer that question is what you want in your
3 framework.

4 Okay. Any other questions here.

5 Oh. In terms of looking to see -- again,
6 your A-through-F grade does have some of that
7 conditioning or taking into consideration the
8 student characteristics. So that's a strength that
9 you're starting with.

10 Okay. Mission-specific goals.

11 You have a very high weight -- and I would
12 say in terms of looking at authorizers across the
13 country, you have much more of a focus on those than
14 others. At the other -- and there are many
15 authorizers who do not provide the opportunity to
16 have mission-specific.

17 There are some that require them. I would
18 say that's a much smaller group. And then there are
19 many authorizers who offer it as an option. So
20 they're not required.

21 When they are used, they go through a very
22 rigorous process that I know you're familiar with in
23 terms of making sure that it is valid, it's based on
24 data you can collect, that you trust, and that the
25 targets are established well.

1 So we really see quite a range in this.
2 And I will also say that generally, where they are
3 included, the weight is not very high. This is,
4 again, on average. You know, it's more in the 5 to
5 10 percent of the framework range. Hawaii is one
6 other place where it's a much larger -- I think it's
7 25 to 40 percent.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: And just -- I mean,
9 considerations are important in this challenge of
10 reliable data sorts, you know, the ability to
11 actually access the data, to verify the data, and
12 just the capacity to do that review and approval.
13 So that's one of the challenges that I think a lot
14 of authorizers face.

15 MS. LYRIA BOST: Great. So next is,
16 again, one that I think you tend to do much more
17 than the average authorizer, which is the use of
18 additional assessments, aside from the state
19 accountability system.

20 So there are two -- we put this into two
21 categories to sort of talk about the trends. So
22 there are a number of authorizers who are using
23 end-of-year nationally normed assessments, other
24 than their state assessments. So, for example, most
25 commonly, that's NWEA MAP.

1 They use -- we talk about the end-of-year.
2 You can also use MAP for interim. We're going to
3 start by just talking end-of-year.

4 Three different sort of situations that we
5 see: The use in accountability for non-tested
6 grades. So D.C., the charter board there is a good
7 example, where they require their K-2, or their
8 early education schools, if they don't have tested
9 grades, to choose from a list of pre-approved
10 assessments that are in that age -- that apply and
11 are valid for that age.

12 They receive the results, and the results
13 are actually used in the accountability
14 determinations and reports for their K-2. That's a
15 little unusual that those -- that they're used in
16 accountability.

17 Even rarer is to be used in place of the
18 state assessment. And the only example that we know
19 of is Chicago Public Schools Charter Office who uses
20 NWEA MAP. They pay for it to be administered to all
21 of their schools. They receive data directly from
22 the vendor. And they use that in their charter --
23 in their accountability, actually, for all schools
24 in the Chicago district. Very unusual.

25 And then another way that we see that

1 end-of-year sort of another assessment used is for
2 growth. And predominantly, we saw this originally
3 in states that did not have growth models and
4 authorizers who really wanted to be able to evaluate
5 their charter schools on growth.

6 So a number of the Indiana authorizers,
7 NWEA MAP is used -- I think at one point, it was --
8 it was paid for for all schools. So there's not an
9 issue of asking schools to do something they're not
10 already doing.

11 But a number of the authorizers there
12 using NWEA growth [verbatim], because they didn't
13 have a growth model. They now have a growth model,
14 so they usually will now use it for informational
15 purposes.

16 So that's the end-of-year.

17 In terms of the short-cycle interim
18 assessments, we do not see this used by authorizers
19 in accountability. We couldn't -- I note that that
20 is something that you are considering -- have done
21 in certain -- we do see that used for general
22 monitoring and support by some authorizers who --
23 for example, the Indianapolis Mayor's Office has a
24 number of schools -- I think they have 30 schools.
25 They have -- they meet with schools three times a

1 year.

2 I would say they are heavy on the meeting
3 and support end of the spectrum, which is definitely
4 a spectrum, because there are many authorizers who
5 don't even do school visits.

6 So they meet three times a year. They
7 receive NWEA MAP results directly from the vendor;
8 so they are not asking schools for the results.
9 Schools, every year, sign a release allowing NWEA to
10 send data directly to them. They have it. They use
11 it in their monitoring and support. It is not used
12 for accountability. It is meant to be a support and
13 feedback from the schools to highlight performance
14 issues early on for the authorizer.

15 And then there are some authorizers who do
16 that same sort of process, but only as an
17 intervention step. So if schools -- if something is
18 triggered, then they would then require -- you know,
19 "We are going to need to review with you interim,
20 short-cycle data," and set up a cycle for that.

21 So, again, considerations here. Really,
22 we see a preference for data being reported directly
23 from the vendor, both for ease, less burden on
24 schools; it's more reliable.

25 A big issue that comes up here is that

1 often these assessments are not aligned with the
2 state accountability system. So we have had --
3 we've talked to authorizers who have said, "We were
4 looking at that, but then we found that those
5 interim were not giving us a sense of how -- they're
6 not aligned with our state assessment, and it hasn't
7 been useful."

8 So that's a really important
9 consideration.

10 And then really tough to set appropriate
11 targets. Each of these assessments are different.
12 It's very different to say, "80 percent of kids are
13 hitting -- meeting growth targets on NWEA," versus
14 another assessment. So it takes -- this is a large
15 capacity. And then there's also the internal
16 capacity. Yeah?

17 MS. POULOS: So I had a question about.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Katie.

19 MS. POULOS: Sorry. I had a question
20 about when you were saying monitoring support
21 intervention.

22 We are one of the states that has the
23 "meet or make substantial progress" language in our
24 statutes.

25 Is there anything you've seen, when it

1 comes to that "substantial progress" piece, that
2 maybe is coming out of these tests? Or -- and I
3 know this is probably opening a whole other can of
4 worms. But is there anything you can tell us about
5 how other states handle that "substantial progress"
6 language?

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: Tim, do you have any -- I
8 think we're digging into the intervention ladders
9 and processes. So we would definitely have to dig a
10 little deeper. We could definitely answer that
11 question for you, because we know a number of
12 authorizers where they're using this for this
13 process. And what might be useful is to get for
14 them what are their sort of -- how do you move out
15 of this category and -- yeah. We'll have to follow
16 up on that.

17 MS. POULOS: Okay.

18 THE CHAIR: I just have a quick question,
19 because I don't know how we would be able to do it.
20 Because you said it's certainly easier if the
21 test -- the reports directly to the state. But if
22 our schools are paying for it, not the State, would
23 they be able to do that?

24 If -- when they're using NWEA and things
25 like that, could they sign that waiver so that we

1 wouldn't have that challenge that the -- that the
2 information would go directly to CSD instead of
3 having to have the school be that?

4 But I don't know if that's possible,
5 because the State is not paying. In theory, the
6 State is, because it's State monies; but -- you
7 know.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: Lyria may be able to
9 answer this better. I think typically, the state is
10 paying in those cases. I think also important, I
11 think in most cases, they're picking one assessment.
12 I don't know if there's examples where there's a lot
13 of differentiation.

14 THE CHAIR: In our case, it's multiple
15 and --

16 MS. LYRIA BOST: I actually had an
17 in-depth conversation with the Indianapolis Mayor's
18 Office just last week, to get more detail about
19 this. And they do not pay for their schools'
20 assessments; but they do require the schools to sign
21 that waiver.

22 Most of them do NWEA, and a couple of them
23 have some other ones. So that creates some issues.
24 But it's definitely a conversation with the vendor.
25 And I know -- yeah, there are some things to work

1 through there. But obviously, you can establish
2 those agreements.

3 THE CHAIR: Okay.

4 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Two quick
6 things: So I actually grew up in Indianapolis, but
7 that has nothing to do with this.

8 But when you -- we were earlier talking
9 about how much data the charter schools have to
10 send, and it's excessive, whatever. And I don't
11 know that it is or isn't.

12 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But -- so one
14 thing is if we got, or suggested to them that they
15 could do this, then that's a whole thing that they
16 wouldn't have to do. Does that sound right, Katie?

17 MS. POULOS: Uh-huh, it does sound right.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And you would
19 just get it, and they wouldn't have to do anything,
20 which would get you and us what we want and relieve
21 them from having to figure it out.

22 Do they just get the end, and then they
23 get, like, three test scores? Like, beginning,
24 middle, and end? Do they get all of that in the
25 data?

1 MS. LYRIA BOST: So they are getting --
2 the Indy Mayor's Office is getting the fall, winter,
3 spring. Now, I should point out that they are not
4 using them for accountability. So in terms of a
5 review audit process, they're not having to go
6 through that.

7 The D.C. Charter Office, who is using some
8 of these assessments for their K-2, are just using
9 the end-of-year. And there is quite -- there's a
10 definite capacity issue, because you imagine -- what
11 the State is doing to do [verbatim] with the State
12 assessment, they are verifying. There has to be a
13 back-and-forth with the schools, still, to say --
14 the schools are going to say, "These students
15 shouldn't be included."

16 There is quite a -- using for
17 accountability, there's going to be quite a
18 substantial verification process.

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And do the
20 schools -- I mean, when you give the NWEA, you
21 immediately get the results from that. So the
22 schools have that to use for data to -- to drive
23 instruction.

24 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But the other

1 part would just be that --

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: There's often quite a bit
3 of finagling of which students should be included,
4 but shouldn't, which is just a time consideration.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Thank you.

6 MS. LYRIA BOST: I think we can go clearly
7 through the next two categories, because, really,
8 these are now -- once you have your performance
9 framework, how are you communicating back to
10 schools? So it -- you know, how are you using the
11 results?

12 So, again, we talked about overall ratings
13 or tiers or some type of just categorizing, letting
14 schools know. The worst thing is when schools don't
15 know until they get to renewal that they're in
16 trouble; right? Obviously, that is not useful, and
17 that is not -- so, you know, how -- how do you
18 annually communicate red flags, concerns, and,
19 again, build that sort of intervention ladder?

20 So the second accountability policies,
21 we're seeing more and more authorizers not just
22 publishing a framework, but an accompanying
23 accountability plan or intervention ladder. It's
24 called many things in many places.

25 Louisiana has a particularly nicely

1 formatted one that goes from performance on
2 academic, organizational, and finance, and what
3 performance on different levels then means in terms
4 of increased school visits or non-renewal, so on and
5 so forth. So that's a whole piece of work that is
6 really communicating what are the processes.

7 And then there's communicating, then,
8 which really is more about annual reports and
9 communication with schools and are you, you know,
10 publishing reports publicly? What is the process
11 of -- you know -- and if you're doing that, what is
12 the process of, again, back and forth with the
13 schools, allowing them to give feedback, doing sort
14 of an audit process and having that be a supportive
15 process that, again, let's them know where they
16 stand; clearly, you know, what are red flags, or
17 what areas of performance are of concern; and then
18 also, reporting to the public.

19 So we're march -- okay. So virtual
20 schools. We'll go really quickly on this one.

21 This is a really big challenge for a
22 growing number of authorizers. I would say if
23 you -- if you -- if you have more, or if the
24 enrollment is up, very often what authorizers are
25 needing to do is take a hard look and do one of

1 three things: Either strengthen or add certain
2 measures to existing frameworks that will take into
3 consideration the high mobility. Usually, what
4 you're talking about at virtual schools is high
5 mobility, low participation on assessment, and a lot
6 of data issues.

7 From the school's perspective, you know,
8 they are often saying, "We are getting these
9 challenged kids. We're getting out-of-cohort kids.
10 Well, you know, we are being penalized by the
11 framework."

12 So the approaches that we see are, again,
13 either modifying the existing frameworks to
14 strengthen some of those to be able to look at
15 mobility, to -- using mission-specific goals.
16 That's a way that authorizers can address -- often
17 address both alternative schools and virtual
18 schools.

19 And then a couple of authorizers who
20 actually are working to create a separate
21 accountability framework for virtual schools.

22 And then there are one or two states who
23 have actually set up separate authorizers at the
24 state level that are solely responsible for virtual
25 schools.

1 We won't go here; but there are lots of
2 resources here.

3 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I would just as
4 soon not deal with that.

5 MS. LYRIA BOST: So I understand that.
6 Okay.

7 So one thing -- I can't help but add one
8 thing, because we've looked at a lot of data.

9 One big thing that often isn't talked
10 about here is that test -- that participation in
11 accountability systems. When we've dug into some of
12 the data, there are times when whatever
13 accountability metrics are reporting can be
14 including as low as 10 percent of a virtual school's
15 population. So, you know, this also sort of -- so
16 we'll move into -- yeah. Did you --

17 MS. POULOS: And I just want to say, I
18 think we -- I think that's probably stuff we maybe
19 want to talk about and discuss; because we've seen
20 that with not only our virtual schools, but some of
21 our brick-and-mortar schools, where maybe only
22 30 percent of their student population was
23 incorporated into those assessment results, even
24 their school-specific measures.

25 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. And then you have

1 a concern, because, you know, in terms of holding
2 accountability and being responsible for that
3 public -- you know, you're only seeing 30 percent of
4 the students. That's results for 30 percent of the
5 students. That's a concern; so...

6 Okay. So finally, alternative schools.
7 Again, what we generally see -- this is a -- you
8 know, obviously, a huge concern for authorizers
9 across -- from -- you know, on the one hand, there
10 is the equity issue of are you fairly assessing
11 these schools?

12 And then on the other hand, from a, you
13 know, sort of a performance monitoring or a
14 portfolio approach, if all of the schools that are
15 your lowest performing schools are alternative and
16 are taking the attention, the argument could be that
17 then you're really not being able to address the --
18 you know, your lowest performing non-alternative
19 schools. They may look like they're doing --
20 relatively look -- so being able to separate these
21 out and sort of fairly assess them is powerful from
22 a portfolio approach.

23 So generally, we see authorizers doing one
24 of three things, actually: Either nothing, which is
25 tough; or actually trying to establish separate

1 frameworks that address either specific types of
2 schools -- so the most extreme example is Colorado,
3 where they sort of say, "If you are alternative
4 because your dropout -- okay, here are the measures
5 you can use." They really have broken that down.

6 It can almost be too complex then. So
7 you -- so there are -- you can either go this
8 separate framework route. Really, what happens in
9 practice is that many authorizers will use the
10 mission-specific option to address specific
11 performance aspects of an alternative school.

12 So, for example, if you have a dropout
13 recovery school, it might be appropriate to
14 calculate an adjusted graduation rate that, you
15 know, considers those out-of-cohort or over-age kids
16 and is a more fair reflection.

17 Or it might be something that's more
18 focused on job training, or whatever the metrics the
19 school is using to define success. So that really
20 in practice, is how most authorizers are addressing
21 this. But it is a big challenge.

22 So -- sorry, Tim.

23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I have a
24 question. So in New Mexico, anyway, they have
25 five-year contracts. And I think before, we would

1 evaluate the performance framework every year. And
2 then it got to, "No, we're writing the performance
3 framework for five years," which is a long time.

4 And so I wanted to know, one, is that, in
5 general, what people do? Or do people evaluate
6 those performance frameworks all the time? Because
7 if you leave it for five years, do you not look at
8 two, and they're an "F" school, and they're not
9 graduating, or -- I don't know -- whatever metrics
10 you want to look at. Because you don't want schools
11 failing for five years. Or at least I don't.

12 THE CHAIR: In theory, we would close them
13 if they -- failing, then we would close them.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right. So --
15 but the performance framework, when they were
16 writing, sometimes you can't evaluate it because
17 it's written for what will happen in five years.

18 THE CHAIR: No, no, no. There are yearly
19 indicators that they would have to provide for us so
20 that they would be scored on a yearly basis, not
21 scored at the end of five years; so that they get a
22 report at the end of the year of, "This is -- this
23 is how you stand for this year."

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: The intent was to

1 do that. But if you remember, we asked for, "Where
2 do you want to be in five years," and, then, "How
3 are you going to get there?"

4 We had enough lawyers that came at us,
5 saying, "Well, it's a five-year thing. They only
6 have to be there."

7 I know when Charter School Division tried
8 to get the data to calculate those, they were being
9 denied it, because, "We don't have to give it to
10 you, because it's five years."

11 So in practice, where the intent was never
12 to not score it till the end, we've had schools who
13 have managed to successfully refuse us the data to
14 do it. And yet, the intent was, "Yeah, we want to
15 know where you're going and how you're going to get
16 there; not just one year and one year and one year."

17 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yes, yes. So we
18 generally do, yes, see that there's annual
19 reporting. And I think in the best cases of
20 performance monitoring, there is an annual report
21 that's shared with schools. Ideally, it's also
22 shared with the public. But it's very clear how --
23 you know, how the school is going. And in some
24 cases, also some informational metrics that are
25 included, as well.

1 So as we said, for example, growth. We
2 work with some authorizers who will allow schools to
3 provide information that they think is important,
4 and it's included for informational purposes. Yeah.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: I was just going to add, I
6 think what's key to this question of how do you --
7 how do you plan for five years is that notion of you
8 have annual -- an annual report or score. And the
9 policy would say something like, you know, "If a
10 school scores blank, you know, for two years
11 straight, or what have you," then that becomes the
12 mechanism for intervening earlier; but also giving
13 the school a very clear indication in year three
14 that things aren't looking good for renewal for
15 them.

16 So -- and so that's how you kind of get
17 around that, "How do you set a five-year
18 expectation," you know; but -- with clarity for all
19 parties.

20 So I actually think we should probably
21 take a lunch break. What we didn't get into, and
22 we're going to have a shorter conversation on
23 financial and organizational, again, not because
24 they're not important; partly because, frankly,
25 there's just too much to cover -- we wanted to

1 prioritize.

2 There are some important messages I need
3 to talk about here. We could -- one option is to
4 maybe include it during lunch. But I'd love to give
5 folks a break. So let's get lunch. It's in the
6 other room.

7 MS. POULOS: So lunch is provided. It is
8 in Room 128. And I would propose maybe we do take a
9 15-, 20-minute break, and then come back, and you
10 can finish as a working lunch.

11 THE CHAIR: If we want to have a
12 conversation, we can. We're trapped in here; so --

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Give your brains peace, if
14 not your stomachs.

15 We'll break now, get food, and maybe we'll
16 try to come back at 12:25 or something, and we'll
17 start up and talk some about organizational and
18 financial frameworks.

19 (Luncheon recess taken, 12:03 p.m.
20 to 12:34 p.m.)

21 MR. TIM FIELD: All right. We're going to
22 come back together.

23 THE CHAIR: Before you continue, I need to
24 let the record reflect that Commission Ruiz had to
25 leave, and Commissioner Pogna had to leave.

1 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Did you want me to
2 go look for them?

3 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Conyers is coming
4 in.

5 He's thinking we're taking volunteers.

6 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: I was going to go
7 look for them.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: So we're just a little bit
9 behind. We're going to be fine. We're going to --
10 I do want to come back to the financial and
11 organizational framework discussion, which is not
12 showing up at the moment. Let me see now.

13 So this will be a shorter conversation
14 than the academic framework, just because we had to
15 kind of prioritize what we covered. But there are
16 some important concepts we want to discuss. And we
17 will talk kind of about trends and kind of
18 challenges and options, I would say, in this, as
19 well.

20 So financial framework. So a few things
21 to note that I think are important as you all think
22 about how you want to approach revisions.

23 One is, I'd just say that there's --
24 there's a pretty widespread use of NACSA's
25 recommended financial framework, which has a

1 series -- and I'll flash up kind of what it looks
2 like.

3 And I was thinking those are also metrics
4 that aren't actually specific to charter schools,
5 but actually are specific -- they're kind of
6 cross-sector for for-profit, non-profit
7 organizations.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. Maybe I'll just stop
9 you here. Because I think we've found that the
10 NACSA financial framework doesn't, in any shape,
11 form, or manner, work for us.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Sure. So we'll talk about
13 why -- why some people struggle with it.

14 So what I'll say is that folks have refind
15 it for a whole bunch of reasons. I think
16 oftentimes, they -- either it's related to states --
17 maybe state statutes that affect kind of how schools
18 have to run. There's issue of data and capacity.
19 There's just complexities to some of those measures.

20 What we do see is authorizers' trends
21 oftentimes do make some kind of refinements,
22 oftentimes streamlining, actually, which would be
23 what they use. The reason, I think, in terms of how
24 it's used, oftentimes, the metrics are -- really
25 provide early warning signs; so -- of financial

1 distress.

2 So some of those metrics, when looked at
3 holistically, I think authorizers try to use them in
4 a way that gives them a heads-up of something going
5 on. Where there's smoke, there's fire. So it
6 prompts further investigation is how a lot of times
7 authorizers use those metrics.

8 The -- what else you often see, which you
9 all have certainly in your financial framework, is
10 looking at financial practices and oversight
11 practices of finances. Oftentimes, that's
12 incorporated into the organizational framework. But
13 obviously, it's an important measure, as well, of an
14 organization's health, is they have strong financial
15 oversight and control measures.

16 The other trend and practice that you see
17 is that even where authorizers have these metrics
18 that they're tracking, recording, and reporting,
19 there oftentimes is this back-and-forth that happens
20 first, where they're sending to schools, you know,
21 based on their audit review and their document
22 submission. They're giving -- they're reporting
23 back what they're seeing, what their metrics are
24 saying.

25 And there's this chance for schools to,

1 you know, correct or provide additional information.
2 So there is this back and forth to understand the
3 data and ensure that whatever is reported and
4 understood by the authorizer has a chance for school
5 feedback.

6 So I'm going to flash up what you all may
7 be familiar with. But here is an example of what
8 NACSA does put out here.

9 For example, these are the metrics I'm
10 talking about. I'd like to have a discussion about
11 why it's been challenging for you, why some other
12 authorizers find it challenging to use, what you
13 found.

14 But these are the measures that are used.
15 As I said, I won't try to explain every one of them.
16 Some of you here may be familiar. Some of them,
17 this is finance talk; it may not be as familiar.

18 Again, many authorizers do take a subset.
19 They might say, "You know what? We're not going to
20 track, you know, cash flow, because we already
21 know -- we're already tracking days cash. We know
22 the operating margin, so we don't need to have a
23 separate measure for cash flow."

24 So that's an example of where you see some
25 authorizers kind of deviate from this and make

1 refinements.

2 Some of the challenges authorizers kind of
3 point out, even if they use them, the things they
4 struggle with, one is snapshots. So these measures,
5 these metrics, saying a current ratio is 1.1, or
6 days of cash on hand is they have 90 days of --
7 that's an easier one -- days of cash on hand.

8 So a common target is, "We want to see
9 schools have at least 90 days of cash on hand."

10 Well, a snapshot measure, that can
11 fluctuate a lot over the course of a year. Revenue
12 comes in, not always consistently, depending on how
13 state systems work. So take a snapshot may not
14 actually give you an accurate sense of what the true
15 health is. That's one challenge.

16 Context matters. There's reasons
17 sometimes why certain targets may not be -- why a
18 school doesn't meet a target. For instance, one of
19 the measures on here is the notion of operating
20 margin. So, you know, did -- so operating margin is
21 saying, "Were your revenues above your expenses this
22 year?"

23 Well, there could be a very good reason
24 why revenues are below expenses in a given year.

25 With a school that has a high cash balance and has a

1 reserve fund, maybe this is a year they were
2 investing a lot into programming, and they had a lot
3 of expenses that year. That could even happen for a
4 couple of years in a row.

5 But the challenge, if you just take the
6 metrics and don't dig deeper, they don't always tell
7 you the right story.

8 Another challenge is just time delays.
9 When audits come in, when reports come in, when you
10 want to report out a score for a school may not
11 always correspond to when the data is actually
12 available.

13 A fourth bullet is certainly -- is
14 authorizer expertise can be challenging to look at
15 audits and look at financial reports and come up
16 with accurate measures, according to those metrics.

17 And then last, I think, is just -- is the
18 challenge of when you have organizations,
19 multi-school networks that have multiple schools --
20 and I don't know how it works -- maybe you don't
21 have that in New Mexico. But this is a common
22 challenge, whether you have an organization that has
23 multiple schools and how do you sort out
24 school-level reporting versus network reporting.
25 That can be a challenge.

1 So those are some of the challenges even
2 for schools that use this, or authorizers that use
3 this, things they wrestle with. There could be
4 others; but these are the ones we've seen.

5 I think an interesting conversation for
6 this group are what are some of the challenges
7 you've experienced? What's noteworthy about the
8 New Mexico framework, which is different than a lot,
9 is the financial framework really focuses primarily
10 on this piece -- whoops -- wrong direction -- on
11 oversight practices.

12 So, really, the focus is on protocols and
13 procedures for how is the school doing the work of
14 financing and measuring and tracking. It's not
15 looking at specific metrics of what's the financial
16 position of the school. And that's somewhat unique.
17 It's very unique for New Mexico, and that's the
18 focus of the framework.

19 So with that, open it up to kind of
20 comments, questions about what's been challenging
21 for New Mexico.

22 MS. POULOS: If you don't mind, I'll
23 start. And I was hoping that our Director of
24 Finance would be able to come in. But he's probably
25 taking a lunch, which is a perfectly reasonable

1 thing to do.

2 Our -- our charter schools are components
3 of the government; right? They are government
4 entities. And so I think that's the challenge for
5 us is these tend to be frameworks and measures that
6 can work with a corporate entity, whether it's
7 for-profit or non-profit. But when you're talking
8 about a government accounting system, it doesn't
9 appear that those are built to work within the
10 government accounting system and how accounting
11 works in that system -- right? -- when money flows,
12 how money flows, how you're allowed to either carry
13 or not carry money.

14 And so I think that's been our struggle is
15 finding measures that work in a government --
16 government accounting system that can take into
17 account how our -- our schools are structured and
18 the requirements for handling cash in that system.

19 THE CHAIR: It's -- historically,
20 certainly before I was on, when the frameworks were
21 first being created, they -- it was through a grant
22 with NACSA. And it was mostly the NACSA model that
23 was used. And there was tremendous pushback from
24 the financial people, because they said, "We -- you
25 know, it just doesn't work."

1 So then there was a redo of that piece.
2 But that piece doesn't adequately give us that
3 snapshot of how healthy -- and we have been
4 fortunate that the Deputy Secretary has engaged in
5 that conversation, so that we can -- you know, we
6 can ask the question, "What do we need to know?"

7 Because some -- as Katie mentioned, you
8 know, there's -- you know, cash balances don't
9 really play in as much, you know. Our schools,
10 because they're part of that public school system,
11 in theory, aren't going to run out of money.

12 That was from David Craig, you know.

13 So that's -- that's not as big a concern.
14 And, of course, they had their reserves greatly
15 wiped out this year through budget issues, you know,
16 that that -- a lot of schools don't want to have big
17 reserves; because it's, like, "If I have this
18 reserve, I could end up losing it." So that's --
19 you know, it's -- that's quite a balancing act that
20 the school -- so that's not necessarily something
21 that we may want to look at, because there's other
22 reasons why they may not want that.

23 So it's -- it's challenging for us to --
24 to find what's -- what's going to work to give us
25 that information that we -- that we need.

1 MS. POULOS: Yeah. And one that I was
2 specifically thinking of, debt-to-income ratio,
3 right? They can't think about that. That's under
4 the law and the Constitution, right? So it's always
5 got to be a zero or 100 percent -- whatever -- zero,
6 I guess, right?

7 So I think that's -- and I don't know. I
8 don't know. And I should know this, but I don't.
9 Are there other states that have the same structure,
10 where the schools are actually units of the
11 government, and how are they dealing with that? How
12 are they measuring that financial health so that we
13 can kind of look at what's happening there?

14 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm curious to hear from
15 Gilbert, because you raised this. We were talking
16 objectives. You talk that this is a particularly,
17 like, the financial framework would be a particular
18 priority for you in thinking about the -- you know,
19 the work of the Commission.

20 What's your thoughts on -- and maybe one
21 way of thinking of this is what's been the
22 challenge? There has been financial -- what has
23 been what you haven't seen soon enough, where you've
24 had -- when you've had crises, you know, what would
25 have been -- what would have been the trigger?

1 You know, if it wasn't cash on hand, what
2 would have been the trigger to say, "Whoa, this
3 school has really fallen off the tracks?"

4 THE CHAIR: Cindy can read back her record
5 from yesterday.

6 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: A lot of those
7 things come abruptly, you know. Because we don't
8 work coinciding with the Audit Bureau or the Budget
9 Department, what have you.

10 But a lot of times, it just seems that
11 either they don't have the right people in place,
12 not licensed people, people with good strong
13 background in financial management, governing
14 council, lack of oversight, those kind of things.
15 It's just -- it just seems to be an ongoing dilemma,
16 more so with -- in that area than in any other part
17 of the framework, again, you know. So...

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If governing
19 councils aren't trained as far as finance in a way
20 that --

21 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: Very minimally
22 trained.

23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And in government
24 accounting problems. And one of the first things
25 that we would know is the State generally requires

1 quarterly reporting, as far as financial analysis.
2 If you don't do that, then you get on monthly
3 reporting. If a school is not doing that -- and we
4 will have charter schools that don't even do that
5 monthly reporting.

6 Procurement procedures, how you purchase
7 things. That's a huge indicator, if they're not
8 going through the procurement process.

9 But they're small, just like Gilbert says.
10 They're little things that can slip by us if we
11 don't --

12 COMMISSIONER PERALTA: But they add up.
13 If the problem gets way too big --

14 MS. POULOS: There's a couple of examples
15 that I can think of from this year; right?

16 So if we talk about -- I'm going to use
17 names. If we talk about Cariños Charter School.

18 So they had estimated, I think, 150 kids.
19 So they got funded on 150 kids. And then the report
20 came in after their 40th day, and they had
21 substantially lower.

22 So I think that's a measure that we
23 probably could incorporate in; right? The ratio of
24 anticipated versus actual. And that would give us a
25 good thing; because what we then would know at the

1 40th day report, and what -- if we had this kind of
2 updating framework, they would have known that
3 dropped right down into red. They're in trouble.

4 And their governing board would have been
5 able to see that dashboard come up and say, "Whoa,
6 this is an issue. What do we do about this?"

7 Then they didn't make adjustments; right?
8 So they ended up continuing the same expenses and
9 making no financial adjustments for staffing,
10 resources, any of that.

11 And so they're continuing to fund -- spend
12 like they've got the funds for those 150 kids that
13 they anticipated; but they didn't make any of those
14 budget controls that they should have done.

15 One of the other ones I was thinking of
16 that didn't come to us, La Resolana, they decided to
17 apply to a different authorizer for renewal. I
18 think a fairly similar circumstance; right? So,
19 again, early in the year, those numbers didn't come
20 through, and were they able to react quickly enough?

21 So I think, certainly, for me, one of
22 those things that we want to be talking about is
23 that one of our measures should be budget to
24 actual --

25 THE CHAIR: Right.

1 MS. POULOS: -- enrollment. There may be
2 some budgeted to actual expenses. There may be some
3 ways to think about -- and I don't know if this is a
4 measure. But -- I don't know if it would be
5 restricted expenses. But the expenses that are
6 coming out of reimbursement funds, federal funds
7 that are reimbursed and timeliness of collecting
8 those reimbursements.

9 But it may not be that we want to measure
10 timeliness. We may want to measure ratio, ratio of
11 expended versus reimbursed funds, which is really
12 getting to the timeliness; but it's forcing that to
13 be an actual health measure.

14 THE CHAIR: I had put -- actually, I had
15 put in my notes that if there is a significant
16 variation in the actual budget compared to their
17 projected budget, you know, so that we have -- and I
18 had put it, I think, more in operational -- but it
19 could be financial -- that the ratio between
20 administration and staff, that they're not -- you
21 know, overly-burdened.

22 And I don't know how to create that -- I
23 don't want to stymie a school to stay, "You -- it
24 has to be this exact."

25 But there's got to be some measure to know

1 that, you know, they've got a healthy balance there
2 and that administration isn't eating up too much of
3 the budget and that could effectively be draining
4 instructional staff and programming and other
5 things, that that was -- and I guess also making
6 sure that grant monies, be they federal or state,
7 that those monies are being appropriately handled.

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And that's that
9 reimbursement. That's part of that reimbursement,
10 also; that's that flow-through.

11 THE CHAIR: And they're paying their
12 taxes.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes, and their
14 benefits.

15 THE CHAIR: It unfortunately became a huge
16 issue for us, that they're paying their taxes and
17 benefits, that we got caught quite off-guard that a
18 school hadn't been paying in. So it -- you know.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: So I think the main
20 message -- go ahead, please.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, one of the
22 things that -- we don't have to so much to use the
23 microphones -- is that there's so much
24 responsibility on the governing council. And I'm
25 not sure people realize what it is. And I believe

1 we've just changed from five to ten hours of
2 training.

3 But this whole financial thing, of which I
4 would never ever be a part of, is so complicated.
5 And I don't know if there's a list that tells you
6 how to do this and know this, or, just, the people
7 who are -- because now we're talking about community
8 members. We're not talking about a business
9 manager, even. We're talking -- which is another
10 whole issue.

11 THE CHAIR: A parent volunteer.

12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But a parent
13 volunteer -- and, predictably, it's New Mexico, it's
14 a very rural state -- they're lucky they can find
15 five people. So those aren't always the people you
16 can find.

17 So I don't know if there's a little how-to
18 book -- and I know that we've talked about more
19 training, and specifically in that area. But it's
20 not just like one thing, it seems to me, just from
21 the schools who are in trouble. That's how we
22 usually find out they're in trouble is from
23 financial.

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I think we have
25 several issues going on, one of them being since

1 they are a component here, for ours of this
2 Department, and the others are components of their
3 school district, we don't see their budgets. We
4 don't approve their budgets. They all go through
5 the financial side of this Department and through
6 those analysts. And we don't know -- Katie, do you
7 folks see their budgets?

8 MS. POULOS: Well, what I would say is the
9 reason you don't is because we haven't put it on the
10 agenda and said, "Every June, or July..." -- let's
11 say every July meeting -- "...we want to dedicate a
12 four-day meeting" -- and that's what it would take
13 you --

14 THE CHAIR: It would. Oh, yeah.

15 MS. POULOS: -- to review those and have
16 conversations about it. And if you put it on your
17 agenda, I promise you it'll be in your book. You've
18 got to do that.

19 THE CHAIR: I think we have to do those
20 electronically.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I think we need to
22 do that at least once, for everybody to see we mean
23 business. Because, you know, we get hit in the
24 newspaper about one of our schools is paying huge
25 amounts of money to an executive director, plus a

1 principal that we don't -- again, it's the
2 governance council that sets the salaries; we don't.

3 So here, headlines in the newspaper -- and
4 it's a school in my district. And I'm getting phone
5 calls, and I'm saying, "I don't know any more than
6 you do, because the governing council does it." But
7 then we look bad.

8 That one is particularly egregious.
9 But -- because they happen to be husband and wife
10 who hired their daughter in a capacity. But
11 that's -- which we don't --

12 MR. TIM FIELD: You're not alone,
13 actually, unfortunately.

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I'm saying there's
15 that piece of it. The other piece is before Katie
16 got here, we never saw the audit findings. They
17 went, again, to here (indicates), because they're a
18 component of the Department audit, not ours. And
19 then this Department, over and over, had the largest
20 number of audit exceptions of any State Department,
21 because most of them were the charter schools, and
22 many of them were repeat, because nobody was making
23 a big deal about fixing those.

24 It was, "Well, they're charter schools.
25 They go over here."

1 And when I first got on this Commission
2 four-and-a-half years ago, I asked about it, and
3 they said, "It's a charter school audit. It goes in
4 this pile, and we don't look at it."

5 Now, they look at it, and Katie makes them
6 give us a -- but that was the answer I got when I
7 actually went to where the audit is and asked them
8 that question.

9 So when we don't get the audits, unless,
10 again, it's something that pops up and gets in our
11 agenda because it's become a crisis, I mean, that's
12 where I think -- I mean, if I could redo this, I
13 would change the structure of the Charter School
14 Division and have at least one or two financial
15 people full-time there, where they would be able to
16 review it and get us the information quicker.

17 If we ask, David Craig will bring us in a
18 list of who's on quarterly reporting, who's on
19 monthly reporting; but otherwise, it's not an
20 automatic thing, because, again, that's them. This
21 is us.

22 And we need some kind -- because we do
23 have an MOU with the Department. We just need
24 something spelled out is what we would like to.
25 Because they've been good at getting us stuff. But

1 it's -- knowing what they have to provide and then
2 what we can ask for has been the problem. I would
3 like to see us on the financial piece, work on that.

4 The other thing is I agree, but I
5 disagree, that the financial stuff is difficult.
6 It's difficult when you look at it as a whole.
7 Because I know when I first -- again, management in
8 State government, and I was thrown -- but once it
9 got into my head, I figured out it's not really that
10 difficult, because these are the parts of it that
11 apply to me.

12 But you have to go through that difficult
13 part -- I don't know. Danielle, would you agree
14 that once you get through the difficult part and you
15 know what's your piece of it, then it's a snap?

16 And we don't get people through. We show
17 them this huge stack of regulations, and we don't
18 help them work through to the point they say, "Oh,
19 this, this, this, and this apply to me. I can
20 handle it."

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Where Carmie and I
22 differ is the head of school at each of the charter
23 schools is duly instructed in this. And internal
24 controls are imperative. And that head of school --
25 Carmie is trying to do the work for the principal.

1 And it should never even get to us.

2 It -- that's -- charter schools, in my
3 experience in the State of New Mexico, the ones who
4 flounder, are the ones who don't recognize the
5 responsibility that comes with leading a charter
6 school.

7 And the Board of Finance is, yes, the
8 governing council or the school board, but they are
9 the people who are to be informed by that head of
10 school. They're not there to inform the head of
11 school about the budget. Each month at the meeting,
12 the head of school is to bring that budget to them
13 and to go over with them detailed information.

14 The majority of the charter schools do a
15 good job of it. They're okay. Everybody has
16 slip-ups. This is a state with small school
17 districts. And so small charter schools are not
18 treated any differently from House or Jal or Eunice,
19 or -- they face those -- Lake Arthur. They face
20 those same challenges. You just have to step up and
21 take control.

22 And if you don't, these folks end up
23 looking at you, going, "Why haven't you done it?"

24 And that's where we need policies and
25 procedures that we can shut a school down when

1 they've really fiscally messed things up.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: I think the issue of
3 complexity and the notion of a four-day meeting here
4 on your budget is where you get into the power of
5 metrics. And if you can find meaningful metrics
6 that give you -- and these are not -- these are
7 the -- this is the warning sign. This is the smoke
8 you see. And then you go investigate the fire.

9 And I think that's the work. I don't
10 think we need to go any further in trying to stop it
11 right now, like saying, "Let's adopt 1B, C, D, E.

12 What's clear is you want more financial
13 rigor to the frame- -- more rigor to the financial
14 framework. And I think it's that desire to have the
15 appropriate level of visibility that you all don't
16 feel like you're surprised when all of a sudden a
17 school in your region has a big financial meltdown.
18 And no one wants that.

19 MS. POULOS: And to add to that -- or to
20 highlight it -- I think what we should be thinking
21 about when we get to this -- is what is the
22 dashboard we can create that facilitates a governing
23 board being able to look at something and say,
24 "We've got a problem." Right?

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So that Carmie

1 doesn't have to do the work of the principal.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm going to keep us
3 moving. I do want to try to keep it somewhat snappy
4 with the financial organizational frameworks.
5 Organizational frameworks -- and, clearly, I think
6 from this morning, we took out the -- I think
7 recognized the need to bring clarity and the
8 appropriate level of burden on both the school and
9 on the -- on the authorizer. And that's something
10 they struggle with.

11 I think trends we see is that we're -- as
12 we saw, a lot of alignment in financial frameworks.
13 So I would, like, you know, across the authorizers,
14 using those NACSA measures, pretty consistently --
15 again, some refinements -- what you see in
16 organizational frameworks is there's alignment. But
17 you see a lot of authorizers streamlining, you know,
18 picking measures they're going to focus on,
19 modifying categories, or to reinforce the priorities
20 they've identified as an authorizer.

21 You know, part of this really reflects,
22 you know, capacity. It's influenced -- obviously,
23 it's influenced by what state regulations require
24 that's being monitored by the authorizer.

25 The other thing I think it's important to

1 understand is that the frameworks that you see that
2 NACSA put out there, where there is some alignment,
3 they may be clear about saying, "This is the topic,
4 and this is the question we're asking." What's
5 really customized is what is the evidence an
6 authorizer is using to answer that question.

7 And that really depends on different --
8 like, what regulations say, what data you have
9 available, the decisions about burden on schools,
10 how much capacity the office has to track this
11 stuff.

12 So we look at things -- just as an
13 example -- this is, again, how it -- this is the
14 NACSA framework again. You see variations of this.
15 This is actually pretty similar to what you all have
16 in terms of the indicator and measures. You have
17 similarities.

18 And then things like Education Program,
19 there's four measures. Essentially what happens,
20 for each measure, there's a question asked. And
21 again, this is very similar to what your current
22 framework does. And what I'm saying is that what's
23 really different, "Is the student protecting the
24 rights of students with disabilities?"

25 "Well, what's the evidence you're

1 collecting?"

2 That's where you see a lot of variation
3 and what you have to work for.

4 I think in the work you all did I think
5 with the refinements and proposed revisions, I think
6 you were trying to get clarity towards, "What are we
7 going to look at?" And that's the right focus of
8 the work.

9 I think to just echo some things we talked
10 about this morning, there's going to be some -- I
11 think, some important work you all can do to decide
12 what are your priorities that you want to be
13 tracking with the organizational framework.

14 We've heard a lot of talk about governance
15 and concerns about governance. So what are the
16 things -- what are the things you're going to go a
17 little deeper on, beyond just compliance on, like,
18 hours: Do boards do training for ten hours a year
19 or two hours?

20 MS. LYRIA BOST: And just the other, I
21 think, real distinguishing factor is whether this
22 question is answered with just a yes-no. So pass-no
23 pass sort of concern? Or no concern? Does it meet
24 our standards? Not? Versus a desire -- you know,
25 there are some cases where authorizers want to know

1 more than that.

2 So, for example, a board may want to know
3 more than just, okay, is the board meeting just
4 minimum functional characteristics that we've
5 established? Or do you want to know, okay, where
6 are the highfliers, where are the -- where almost
7 you're judging on a matrix. And you want to be able
8 to kind of distinguish further than just sort of
9 concern or no concern.

10 So it's sort of a compliance? Yes. No.
11 Recently, a lot more focus by some authorizers on
12 equity issues and a desire to dig in and not just
13 say, like, "Okay, yes, they have open enrollment."
14 But, "Let's rate them," you know, wanting to kind of
15 see who are our best exemplars, because then we want
16 to hold those out, or, you know, influence.

17 Obviously, there are a lot of capacity
18 issues there, because it takes much more effort to
19 get in and rate a certain capacity or
20 characteristic, than to just say, "Okay, we have no
21 evidence of concern here."

22 MR. TIM FIELD: And just to echo that
23 concept, this probably isn't challenges; it's
24 options. There is -- what I would characterize the
25 area she's describing is kind of this idea of

1 compliance versus measuring quality. And compliance
2 may be more of a "check the box." We're going to
3 make sure there aren't any red flags.

4 And some -- and a lot of authorizers kind
5 of stay, that's kind of what they focus on. But you
6 do see this movement towards, "We're going to assess
7 quality. We're going to assess the quality of how
8 the board is doing financial oversight. And we're
9 going to assess the equity of student enrollment."

10 So the question of, like, "Are students
11 being kicked out?" Like, we're going to go into it.
12 We're going to see your retention rates. We're
13 going to see the reasons for kids leaving.

14 So there's -- that gets into this
15 continuum of compliance, only, or we're going to
16 look at quality. Even, like, we're going to look at
17 supports, the extreme end, not just to assess where
18 you are, but then to target how we support you.

19 And, again, all that continuum applies in
20 more or more capacity at the authorizer level, which
21 goes into resources, also goes into your philosophy,
22 what is your role as authorizer.

23 So systems for data collection. I think a
24 lot of authorizers have -- deal with the compliance
25 issue by having just good systems for collecting

1 documents and resources, so they can kind of get the
2 compliance work done, a little bit easier by having
3 electronic financial management systems.

4 This -- this question of do you -- how you
5 do site visits, versus how much you're just
6 monitoring, using -- at your desk, desk-monitoring
7 looking at reports. And this question of minimizing
8 burden; that's a big driver.

9 This gets us back to that notion of you're
10 prioritizing what you want to spend resources on in
11 tracking the organizational framework.

12 MS. LYRIA BOST: And, often, you know, in
13 some cases, there were some conversations earlier
14 about what does this state have? What are schools
15 reporting?

16 So there's almost a sense -- we've worked
17 with a number of authorizers who wound up doing what
18 I would call an audit of their data, sitting down
19 and listing, "Okay. What are we asking them for?
20 What are our different requests to them? What is
21 the State asking them for?"

22 You know, where -- where are all the
23 requests, and seeing, you know, where streamlining
24 can happen there. And that's time-intensive, but
25 can be useful in terms of streamlining requests and

1 making sure that -- because a big concern that we
2 always hear from schools is, "We want to know that
3 whatever we are reporting is actually being used."

4 And so that's that horrible feeling of
5 just sending things off and not knowing what's
6 happening to it. So I think that's a universal
7 concern on schools. Yeah.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: That's all we wanted to
9 share with that. Again, we're going to prioritize
10 academic framework in this next part of our agenda.

11 But any comments or questions about this
12 organizational framework before we shift gears?

13 Okay. So we're going to change -- we're
14 going to shift it up. We're going to go back --
15 kind of look at the survey for a little bit. So you
16 should have -- the survey results should still be on
17 that -- somewhere buried in all that paper. We're
18 going to add what Lyria is calling "The Place-mat."

19 MS. LYRIA BOST: I asked for a legal-size,
20 and we got place-mat-size. You all can take it home
21 or use it for the rest of your lunch.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: So we're going to -- our
23 next goal, when it gets to this objective of, like,
24 aligning on what strengths and weaknesses of the
25 system, current system, and options for refining it.

1 Because we want to -- we're going to dig in a little
2 bit into the survey results about the frameworks.

3 And then we're going to actually have you
4 do some breakouts into groups and start to think
5 about options you want to consider for a refined
6 academic framework.

7 And we're going to talk later about kind
8 of process steps and -- but our recommendation is
9 that you come up -- obviously, come up with some
10 kind of options for a revised framework, and then
11 you test it out. Because that testing of, like,
12 what does it look like if we use these weights and
13 incorporate that measure, that's an important step
14 to making your framework work.

15 But first, I want to actually spend a
16 little time talking about perceptions of the
17 existing framework, perceptions about the New Mexico
18 A-through-F system. And I'm -- this is what folks
19 responded to a week ago. There may be -- and in
20 contrast to the "Objectives" question, there's
21 actually a fair amount of differing opinions
22 about -- these are the more aligned responses,
23 actually. But the next page has things that are a
24 little more -- a lot of disagreements.

25 Some of those opinions might have changed,

1 actually, from this morning's conversation. In some
2 cases, we don't fully understand the frameworks and
3 there's -- like, there's information that can help
4 us better understand it.

5 But I want to start by just talk- -- some
6 of the statements, there was a fair amount of
7 alignment, and check on those, and then talk about
8 where there were some disagreements.

9 First, being this notion of there should
10 be a roll-up measure. And we've talked a lot about
11 this. And I think, actually, there's been previous
12 conversations -- Patty made this point. But there
13 actually was -- we only had seven responses to this
14 question.

15 But everyone was saying, "Yes, that is a
16 priority, and that's something that the framework
17 needs to have a roll-up measure on the academic
18 side, at least."

19 A couple of folks said "Unsure, no
20 opinion." I'm just curious. Is this something
21 we're fully committed to, or are there any lingering
22 concerns about the notion of creating a roll-up,
23 which is a big departure from the existing
24 framework, obviously? Is there any concerns or --

25 MS. LYRIA BOST: And underlying, Carlos,

1 that's always a concern, the perception, how you're
2 labeling, how many categories you need, what the
3 consequences of the categories are, are important
4 parts of designing that.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: Second point, where I
6 think there was consistent disagreement, the
7 question was about the academic framework. But
8 there was this question, "Does the academic
9 framework place too much burden on schools to
10 report?"

11 Interesting is, actually, we've heard a
12 lot of conversations about burden today. But in the
13 survey, at least, this was not something that people
14 flag as a concern about the current framework and
15 the amount of burden it placed on schools.

16 MS. POULOS: Now, knowing that you can get
17 the data right from the vendor.

18 THE CHAIR: Because I think -- and I think
19 there's also a difference between the conversation
20 that comes to us that it's burdensome and whether we
21 truly understand that it is, you know?

22 So it's easy to say, "Oh, that's just too
23 much work for me to have to do." But, you know, if
24 we're -- my response often is, "But we're giving you
25 all this responsibility and all this money to

1 educate these children; so asking for you to provide
2 feedback to us on how you're doing that shouldn't be
3 all that burdensome."

4 But I understand the time involved; but,
5 yes, if it's possible that this information can be
6 seamlessly sent to CSD, then I think it kind of
7 answers that question.

8 And I needed a "Somewhat agree" category
9 on a lot of these.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: It forced you to --

11 THE CHAIR: I thought, "Yeah, sort of, but
12 I don't disagree."

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And having lived
14 spending nine years leading two separate charter
15 schools, I'm one of the "Strongly disagrees,"
16 because I think there's a resistance to
17 accountability to anyone. It takes a courageous
18 group to start a charter school, people willing to
19 walk the line, people willing to -- and that breeds
20 independence in people.

21 And the recognition and the acceptance of
22 the fact that you're still accountable to the Public
23 Education Department -- and you can kick and scream.
24 It's like breaking a horse. I mean, you can kick
25 and scream. And the data is valuable, once you get

1 there.

2 So I was one of those "Strongly
3 disagrees." It can be done, or, from my perspective
4 in my experience where I worked, we did it. And you
5 just do it. So I don't understand -- but that
6 doesn't mean that the people who are concerned with
7 it have any less valid point than I have. It's just
8 my experience.

9 THE CHAIR: And there's also -- I think
10 part of the concern comes as schools are
11 transitioning out of just the charter and then going
12 on to the contract. There was -- there's a
13 significant difference between the old charter and
14 even the current new contract that we have that
15 we're looking to change.

16 So that was -- I think, also, people were
17 looking and saying, "You know" -- it was a whole
18 different world for them. And they were being asked
19 for a lot more information. So it was -- it was
20 tougher.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, I went
22 through a number of the negotiations with schools
23 who had not been on contracts. And the first group,
24 in particular, were absolutely adamant. They didn't
25 have to do any of this, and they weren't going to.

1 And those were difficult ones, because, "We hadn't
2 done it in the past. Why should we do it now?"

3 I'm another one that strongly disagreed on
4 this, because, to me, if you're doing your job on
5 the academic stuff, you should have that already.
6 You should be collecting it on every student, and
7 your individual teachers at least ought to be able
8 to give you what each of your students is doing. So
9 it should not be a burden to collate that and use
10 it.

11 It's just if you're not doing it
12 regularly, then you're not teaching the right kind
13 of school, anyway. But I'm somebody that likes
14 data.

15 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, and
16 oftentimes in this transition, charter schools see
17 themselves in an adversarial position with the
18 Public Education Department. And they see it as a
19 sign of weakness on their parts to have to ask for
20 help.

21 But never ever once have I reached out to
22 the Public Education Department in 40 years here in
23 the State of New Mexico and been turned away or
24 ignored or rejected or treated rudely, with the
25 exception of when the Charter School Division was

1 given birth to ten years ago. There were -- there
2 were some people there who were very difficult to
3 deal with. But you just kind of worked with it.

4 That is no longer. All you have to do is
5 pick up the phone. If you don't do that, then
6 you're setting your own limits without asking for
7 help.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: The other item here, where
9 there was consistent disagreement, was this -- the
10 current framework places too much burden on staff.

11 This was an interesting finding, because
12 actually, there were quite a few written comments
13 that talked about kind of challenges of staff
14 capacity. So this actually was an interesting
15 response.

16 Again, the current academic framework
17 places too much burden on PED staff to collect and
18 analyze data throughout the year.

19 Folks did not agree with that. There was
20 a few folks -- three -- who were unsure or no
21 opinion.

22 But, again, this contrasted, again with
23 some of the written comments. So I'm curious what
24 people -- how people feel about that question, and
25 this question of burden on staff to do the

1 framework, the academic framework.

2 THE CHAIR: I think it's a yes-and-no. It
3 should be a "no." The problem is it becomes a "yes"
4 because the information's not what's really being
5 looked for.

6 So there's time being spent on stuff
7 that's coming in that becomes burdensome, and it's
8 not going to be useful. So that it's a "no" if it
9 was the accurate information, you know. That's
10 where we -- and that's the -- the path we're trying
11 to take, to get the schools -- we can better
12 communicate the information that we want from the
13 schools so that they're not just sending in, you
14 know -- we've received some of it, you know.

15 We get a thousand pages, because we're
16 going to send you every chart and every -- you know.
17 And it's, like, "What does this all mean?"

18 And so when it goes to CSD, and you have
19 to take staff time to filter through to see if
20 there's anything of value in what came in there,
21 that's burdensome.

22 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. It sounds to me
23 as though the responses in both of these cases are
24 more sort of a reflection of ideally, how you want
25 the process to be, and that what you're asking for

1 doesn't feel as though it should be a burden on
2 schools, if they are properly collecting, and then
3 reported in a way that can -- is useful.

4 THE CHAIR: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I think there's a
6 resentment out there in a certain percentage of
7 schools about, "We don't have time," or, you know,
8 "You're getting in our way." Those are the people
9 who flood you with data and say, "It's their job.
10 Give them all the stuff and let them sort through
11 it."

12 THE CHAIR: It's like the attorney sending
13 boxes and boxes of discovery material. "Now, it's
14 up to you to make sense of all that."

15 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: "Here's the
16 information. You find what you want."

17 And I think that's a smaller percentage of
18 schools; but there is that percentage, and the ones
19 who don't want to be bothered. So just, "Okay,
20 we're doing our own thing. Here's what we've got.
21 It's in there somewhere. You find it."

22 MS. POULOS: And I think, just for me --
23 and I think I'm speaking for my team who work
24 incredibly hard. I tell everybody the hardest
25 working division in this bureau, and I really, truly

1 believe that.

2 And it is burdensome, because we don't
3 know with clarity what evidence, what criteria.
4 Because we don't know, do you want us to rely on the
5 special education annual determination, or do you
6 want us, when we know that there's problems and
7 we're seeing them, to do that; right?

8 So sometimes we're feeling like we have to
9 do the work of other bureaus; right? We have to
10 review the safety plan, because the Safety Bureau is
11 not out actually reviewing the implementation of
12 that plan on site, which is fine, if that's what
13 we're going to do. But we've got to come to clarity
14 on what is it that we do, so that we can do that.

15 MS. LYRIA BOST: This is sounding again
16 like mostly focused to the organizational. To what
17 degree --

18 MS. POULOS: And also academic, too.

19 MS. LYRIA BOST: Because they're sending
20 just reams of --

21 MS. POULOS: What we get is very
22 different. The formats -- again, the lack of, like,
23 "This is what we want; this is what we do; and this
24 is how we look at it," would be helpful.

25 MR. TIM FIELD: It seems to me that I do

1 think that the organizational challenge is common
2 across authorizers. What is certainly unique is the
3 amount of struggle on the academic side. And I
4 think the obvious answer seems like it's the leeway
5 on the school-specific measures that are driving
6 that.

7 So there's a strong commitment in this
8 Commission to allowing those school submissions to
9 be an important part of the framework. But it does
10 seem like you've got to find a way to make it
11 manageable and meaningful in your framework.

12 THE CHAIR: And, honestly, I think one of
13 the struggles that we have is the fact that several
14 years ago, there was, at the very least, a list of
15 interim assessments that could be used. That list
16 no longer exists. So now, the world is out there.

17 And that -- and, you know, I don't -- I
18 don't believe we have any authority to say, "We're
19 only going to accept A, B, C, D"; you know, shorten
20 the list and say, "These are -- these are the ones
21 that we can get that data from the best."

22 We're -- if that could be, then I think
23 we'd be -- I think we'd be okay with that. Not to
24 say it has to be only this one; but to -- because
25 they do have autonomy. So we -- we don't want to

1 step on it. But to be able to narrow it down to
2 say, "Okay. We know what we're looking for. These
3 are the assessment tools that could most likely best
4 give us that information," and say that to the
5 schools: "Here's your -- here's your list."

6 I don't know. I think that's -- we'd have
7 to explore that, because I don't think we have the
8 authority to do that; but I'd have to check that
9 out.

10 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Patty, we have the
11 authority to request the Secretary to do a
12 rule-making to require that.

13 THE CHAIR: That's true. That's true.

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: We don't have
15 rule-making authority. But we go through the
16 Secretary. And we've seldom asked for any rule.
17 But the couple of times there have been any rules,
18 it's gone through, you know, 'cause -- so I think
19 that could be done if we chose to.

20 THE CHAIR: That certainly becomes a
21 channel; because as we do negotiations, there's such
22 back-door conversation that has to go on to try to
23 figure out with those assessment companies, to be
24 clear on what the school's going to receive from
25 them, and then to get the school to fully understand

1 what they're really looking at with this, which is a
2 challenge.

3 But when you're looking at -- oh, you
4 know, we'll always come up with a school and say,
5 "We're using this," and it's like I never even heard
6 of that. So now it's very difficult.

7 MR. TIM FIELD: Katie, do you want to
8 chime in? And, Carlos, do you want to say
9 something, too?

10 MS. POULOS: A couple of things. One I
11 want to say -- I have -- we've talked about the need
12 that I would need a data analyst on my staff. I've
13 been advocating for that. Even with having
14 conversations with our Assessment, Accountability
15 and Evaluation Bureau, the Director has looked at
16 me -- Cindy Gregory -- has said, "Look, if you're
17 doing different goals for every school, you're going
18 to have to let them self-report. You're going to
19 have to trust that," which, again, is my struggle.

20 So I've asked my team to look at every
21 school's data. I don't think we can. We can't
22 trust that, especially if that's being used more
23 heavily weighted than the objective measures that
24 have security, and that we're not trusting that
25 that's objective data.

1 The other thing I want to say is I
2 personally think you do; right? Because what the
3 statute says about having alternate goals or
4 additional goals, beyond the kind of State
5 assessment data goals, is that it says, "Approved by
6 the Commission" -- or "the authorizer" -- "to be
7 valid and reliable." And I think you do.

8 In my mind, if I'm reading that, that's
9 what I read, and that's what I say to the schools;
10 right? We're going to agree to these; otherwise,
11 you don't have them. Your other option is stick
12 with the State's assessment system and that data.

13 So that's what I would put forward.

14 THE CHAIR: Right. And I'm -- I'm
15 certainly fine with that. It's another whole
16 project.

17 MS. POULOS: Fight.

18 THE CHAIR: -- in terms of --

19 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I can think of a
20 couple of lawyers who would immediately come after
21 us.

22 THE CHAIR: You know what? I'm not
23 concerned about who's going to come after us. If
24 we're clear in what we want, and we're clear that we
25 have the authority to do it, someone's always going

1 to push back and say, "No, you can't."

2 But I'm not going to not do something
3 because I know someone's going to push back on us.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I would
5 think that the interim assessment -- I'm not sure
6 which ones they're talking about. I know the NWEA,
7 and I don't even know what the other ones are. But
8 we would want them to get data from those
9 assessments to change instruction.

10 Some of those can show, "Oh, they're
11 here" -- I guess, here -- and then, "They're here,"
12 and that's fine. But how do they get from here to
13 there? What was happening that gave you that? And
14 what is it they still need to know?

15 And things like -- and the only one I know
16 anything about, which doesn't mean it's the best, by
17 any means, is NWEA. But I know when you get the
18 printout, it says, "Needs help on drawing
19 conclusions. Did fine on finding the main idea."

20 So you note where to go, at least,
21 hopefully.

22 But I think some of the things that some
23 of these schools talked about -- when we were in
24 Albuquerque, particularly, they said, "Well, can we
25 choose different ones for different things? Can we

1 choose this one for math and this one for reading?"

2 And I'm not sure. I just want them to
3 have data to go on, if they're going to --

4 THE CHAIR: But what we're saying is we
5 would create -- we would populate a list. And I
6 don't have a problem if they think that, "This does
7 math best, and this does reading best." That's up
8 to the school to decide what they need, as long as
9 we know that --

10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That we'd see
11 growth.

12 MS. LYRIA BOST: I think what's really
13 important -- of going back to sort of trends are,
14 that puts you -- my immediate question, or what's
15 different about the way you are using
16 mission-specific or school-specific goals, is that
17 in most other frameworks, those are designed to
18 capture or deal with aspects of performance not
19 already covered in the current frameworks.

20 So I understand -- so I think there's
21 probably a lot we could talk about. So it sounds,
22 though, as though most of the -- and this is a
23 question to you. It sounds as though most of the
24 school-specific sort of measures that you're
25 approving in terms of these short-cycle assessments

1 are actually covering math, reading, or -- as
2 opposed to another -- and so that just puts you at a
3 very, you know, definite end of the spectrum in
4 terms of getting involved in the educational program
5 of the school.

6 So you've probably had a lot of
7 conversations about that. But I think that's
8 important to acknowledge; because you're
9 essentially -- I mean, I know that there are
10 concerns from the response about PARCC and its
11 quality. But you're essentially duplicating some
12 accountability there.

13 THE CHAIR: Right. But that was -- and
14 it's before I was on. That was because the schools
15 expressed concerns about just relying on a single
16 testing measurement; so that we gave them -- because
17 they felt that they would have a better chance in
18 staying alive by showing us that they are showing
19 growth with -- through the interim assessments.

20 I think what we're looking at is still
21 allowing that flexibility for the schools to have
22 that; but we also -- that isn't -- and I think it's
23 been viewed as mission-specific, and it really
24 isn't. So that we need that; but we absolutely need
25 to focus attention on different measures for

1 mission-specific.

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: One other thing that you
3 might consider, also, or perhaps reconsider, is I
4 can understand that concern that, you know, this --
5 they might not trust those standards or want another
6 assessment. Most other authorizers who are doing
7 something of that case are doing it once in the
8 year.

9 The fact that you are looking three times
10 a year, I mean, just increases all of these issues
11 that you have threefold; right? If you're
12 collecting it three or four times, as opposed to a
13 single -- as, for example, saying, "We want your
14 spring NWEA. We want to know what those results
15 are, and we want to know what your fall-to-spring
16 growth is, but we don't need to also look at your
17 fall results and your winter results and your" --

18 MS. POULOS: Well, here's what can happen.
19 And so I think there is truth to that -- right? --
20 is that they can get credit for hitting a student at
21 their growth target, or proficiency, on any test
22 during the year.

23 So we do have to look at all three
24 reports. And -- and I've expressed this concern
25 many times. And a student could, Test 1 is your

1 baseline, Test 2, hit, and then go way below the
2 baseline on Test 3 and 4. And that still counts as
3 a student that did exactly what they needed during
4 the year. And I have a fundamental problem with
5 that; right?

6 MS. LYRIA BOST: And that's a
7 philosophical issue. Those are very valid. On top
8 of that, the capacity required to not only look at
9 one at a time, but three on a year, that makes my
10 head spin. We do a lot of data; but I would be
11 concerned about the validity and the ability to do
12 that well.

13 THE CHAIR: But I think the reporting
14 part, we've always looked at as being at the end of
15 the year.

16 Did you do this?

17 And then the data comes in to support
18 that, that there -- I didn't anticipate CSD having
19 to review quarterly. We expect the schools to do
20 it. So hopefully, it's helping to drive their
21 instruction. But I'm not looking -- I didn't see it
22 as CSD doing this.

23 MS. POULOS: But what we do have to do to
24 validate their report is we do have to look at three
25 or four reports and actually validate, based on all

1 of those. And it does take a lot of capacity;
2 right?

3 And -- and we have asked them to report
4 twice during the year, to hit and report in January,
5 and then hit and report at the end of the year;
6 because a lot of them weren't, or even getting to,
7 the end of the year, and they didn't administer any
8 of the assessments; so...

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Carlos?

10 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: So I see -- I see
11 contradictions in what we do, because the statute
12 said something, and maybe five years of
13 philosophical positions was such, and we move from
14 the charter to the contract. And there's a lot of
15 times, even now, the charter schools are saying, "We
16 can't change midyear, because we're locked into this
17 contract that we put there that we were going to use
18 this model and that model, or this testing or that
19 testing."

20 So there is no flexibility. And we're so
21 locked in on -- on contract violation that the
22 charter schools really don't have a choice. I don't
23 think they have the autonomy, unless we redo those
24 contracts and make it to the point that they do have
25 that.

1 And so my question is, is there clarity
2 out there in what charter schools are doing, whether
3 there's a need for so much testing, two, three, four
4 times a year? Or could -- can we get away with
5 maybe two -- two testings or one? And would that be
6 valid?

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: Well, I would say -- what
8 most authorizers are doing, actually, is leaving
9 that to schools to do their data-driven instruction,
10 to be, you know, using interim testing to inform
11 their instruction, you know, which you would hope
12 that they would be doing. But the authorizers
13 mostly are taking the position that is on the
14 responsibility -- that's the school's
15 responsibility; that's part of their autonomy.

16 MR. TIM FIELD: Because all we're looking
17 at is we're looking at the state testing. We're
18 looking at the state assessment because we're
19 authorizers.

20 MS. LYRIA BOST: And then you do have some
21 cases where authorizers are either reviewing summary
22 reports provided, not for accountability, but for
23 support and monitoring; or, in an intervention
24 situation, are looking more closely at those.

25 But, again, I have -- only one other

1 authorizer we can think of who includes those other
2 tests in accountability. It's mostly that's the
3 school's responsibility.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: To your point, I think
5 what the school struggles with, or gets frustrated
6 with, is they pick a formative assessment system.
7 In other words, they are going to test a few times a
8 year, because we want to have a meaningful formative
9 way to see how students are doing. Are they
10 learning what we're teaching them? They want to
11 react to this, or provide instruction or remediation
12 or, et cetera.

13 Where they get frustrated is they're doing
14 that and find it's not aligned with the state
15 assessment. And that's really frustrating, because
16 they -- they're working on this one testing system
17 that's giving them information, and, lo and behold,
18 the kids they thought were doing well don't do well.
19 So there's this misalignment issue, which is a
20 challenge. And that's probably some of the pain
21 points schools speak of.

22 And they -- but, you know, I think the
23 notion that you can solve that by giving them
24 infinite number of tests they can choose from --
25 they're always going to have that state assessment.

1 At some level, they need to pick a formative
2 assessment that aligns better to the state
3 assessment; otherwise, you give them a choice -- I
4 don't want to go on too long.

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: A few years back,
6 all schools were required to do the interim testing,
7 the Short Cycle Assessment. When PARCC came in,
8 that was eliminated as a requirement.

9 All we have done is given them the option
10 of continuing to do that and having us use that, or
11 us using the PARCC scores, or whatever came through.
12 So most of the schools say we -- you know,
13 especially the first year of PARCC, and even the
14 second year, people -- "The kids are getting used to
15 it. Many of us and many of our parents have not
16 approved of it." So that was the school option to
17 do.

18 And, you know, you could make a change in
19 your contract by coming to us for the charter -- for
20 the charter amendment or the --

21 MS. POULOS: We --

22 THE CHAIR: No, no.

23 MS. POULOS: We've been pretty staunch on
24 reviews.

25 THE CHAIR: We don't renegotiate the --

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well -- but we've
2 done it a couple of times when they've gone out of
3 business, or those -- that's what I mean.

4 THE CHAIR: That's a different story.
5 They're going out of business. They're not
6 choosing.

7 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Or in the case of
8 DIBELS, where the schools eliminated DIBELS and went
9 to Istation. I'm saying those changes do get made.
10 Bottom line, it's the school's choice of whether
11 they take that one yearly assessment of whether
12 they --

13 MS. POULOS: I think schools would
14 disagree with you on that; because I think most
15 schools feel like they're forced.

16 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I've negotiated 35
17 or 40 contracts. And it certainly made it clear in
18 the negotiations that it's their choice.

19 THE CHAIR: Oh, absolutely. Having been
20 in negotiations in those rooms for maybe 20 of them
21 now, there is -- we don't make any suggestions as to
22 what -- the school comes to us with what they choose
23 to do, that there's -- now, maybe they feel that
24 they're being forced into doing the assessment; but
25 the actual tool that they're using, there has never

1 been any conversation --

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: You mean doing PARCC
3 assessment?

4 THE CHAIR: No, no, no. But the interim
5 assessments, there's never been any conversation
6 that, "You have to use this, or these," or --

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: But they have to use
8 something.

9 MS. POULOS: That's where I would say they
10 do feel like they are forced to have those
11 additional goals. I think some of them -- I think
12 to Carlos' comments and to some other comments, some
13 of them feel like, "We don't want to have this built
14 in."

15 They would just like to have the regular
16 system, and they feel like they have to; not that
17 they feel like they have to use a particular
18 assessment.

19 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Again, at least
20 the ones that I've been in, they were told they
21 don't have to make that choice, they make it. But
22 from our side, there has been no pressure. I don't
23 know where the pressure is coming from. It is not
24 within the negotiation.

25 MR. TIM FIELD: Keeping you off the -- the

1 choice or not the choice, is it -- if you're going
2 to use the word "accountability," can you truly use
3 the system, where it's, "Take whatever assessment
4 you want."

5 If you're going to commit to a notion of
6 an alternative to the state assessment, having a --
7 a meaningful -- a very big impact on your
8 accountability framework, I think there's -- I think
9 there's opinions we have that you have to narrow it
10 down and -- or else abandon it altogether and say,
11 "We're sticking with PARCC."

12 I think you have to manage -- you have to
13 create some guidelines, because -- in order to
14 maintain validity and also make it a manageable
15 process. You know, one of the things is, like --
16 you made the comment about every system has a
17 different growth model, different tests. And you
18 can't use -- you have to modify and rethink your
19 targeting for a different assessment; so there's
20 some real challenges, and I think that's something
21 you have to wrestle with, how well you rethink that
22 flexibility and freedom.

23 MS. LYRIA BOST: It's that targets that
24 provide consistency across your framework for
25 whatever assessment is chosen. That can be done;

1 but that's a very big lift. I mean, from thinking
2 about our experience testing frameworks, where we're
3 just trying to get one assessment consistent with
4 the rest of the framework, the thought of doing it
5 for -- I mean, that's -- yes, is just a lift. So,
6 again, it's just sort of knowing what -- what -- the
7 capacity that you're committing to.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm going to keep going.
9 I'll entertain one question. I do want us breaking
10 out in groups and working on some options for
11 refinements.

12 Karyl Ann, I'll take a last comment from
13 you, and then I'll --

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So Patty came on
15 at the same time. She knows much more than I do. I
16 was kind of astonished when she said, "They only
17 have to have two goals -- two objectives and goals
18 on the performance framework in the academic area."
19 And so it was always math and reading.

20 But that wasn't, in my mind -- which could
21 be incorrect -- when you say "mission-specific," I
22 thought that meant like what your mission was. And
23 mission-specific, in my mind, again, wouldn't have
24 been reading and math, even though I think those
25 should be the two -- two of the ones that are

1 included. And there may be something about the
2 missions.

3 But some of the missions are so difficult
4 to -- to measure.

5 "Our mission is that all students will go
6 to continuing education after high school, whatever
7 that might be."

8 But when they start out, and they only
9 have sixth and seventh grade, that's a long time
10 until you know that.

11 And the other thing was -- and I don't
12 know this at all -- but when they say, "Expected
13 growth" -- let's just say the NWEA. "This is the
14 expected growth." I don't know if that tells you,
15 if you're a sixth-grader and you're reading on a
16 third-grade level, is your expected growth more than
17 a year? Or is it just a year?

18 Because I know Patty and I have talked
19 about that, that we can't -- you can't have your
20 expected growth be a year, and then you ring the
21 bell, so to speak; because if you're a sixth-grader
22 reading at third-grade level, now you'll be a
23 seventh-grader reading at a fourth-grade level.

24 So you really haven't changed, so to
25 speak. So we were saying that they had to just --

1 lately, we were doing that on that last one -- they
2 had to grow their kids who were below grade level --
3 I don't know, say, two years below -- more -- they
4 had to be like 1.5. Isn't that what we said or
5 something?

6 Again, that was just a shot in the dark.
7 I don't know that that's a realistic one. But one
8 year clearly wasn't okay, because then they'll never
9 be any better.

10 So I don't know how that is determined or
11 how we can. But clearly, it's very confusing for me
12 to look at those -- the PARCC scores and the report
13 cards that you've seen, and then you look at the
14 proficiency level. So some schools are "B" schools
15 and they are 62 percent proficient. And then we
16 have "A" schools who are 47. Again, populations. I
17 get all that. But there's just so much in there.

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: Those are really great
19 questions. Of course, I would love to talk about
20 that. But I will restrain myself. But the bullet
21 point I would give you is both of those growth
22 models you're talking about, both what's used in
23 your state accountability system and the NWEA growth
24 model, is saying, "For that student, based on where
25 they are starting, are they showing better than

1 average growth for other students at the same
2 place?"

3 So if they're two years behind, it's
4 saying, "Compared to all the other two-year-behinds,
5 are they doing better or worse than them?"

6 And your point is very valid, because that
7 could mean that they are very far from being
8 proficient, and the growth may or may not be enough.

9 So those are great points. I'd like to
10 talk to you offline on that. We could get derailed
11 pretty quickly. But that's an important
12 consideration.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: When we're
14 writing them, we can't just say they got -- they met
15 their expected growth, because that expected growth
16 is different for each child.

17 MS. LYRIA BOST: Exactly.

18 MS. POULOS: Sorry. And I also think you
19 can't even say more than their projected growth,
20 because they may still be above average. But the
21 average student at that level is still not growing
22 enough to get anywhere near close to proficiency; so
23 it's doing the exact same thing.

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And some of our
25 schools, I know that they've said -- MAS, for

1 example, are saying, "Well we get these
2 sixth-graders, and they're at second-grade level.
3 In two years, we've gotten them to fifth-grade
4 level, but now they're eighth-graders."

5 They've made a lot of growth.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: Part of the comments we
7 had this morning was recognizing what about your
8 existing A-through-F system? Like, putting the A
9 through F aside, the metrics in there, to what
10 extent is it addressing some of those things?

11 Just replaying some of the conversations
12 and some of what Lyria shared, there are many things
13 about the system that actually are helping. One is
14 there is growth. You are looking at that. You are
15 looking at the bottom quartile, so you can isolate
16 and prioritize how the bottom quartile students are
17 doing. You also do have proficiency; but it's
18 adjusted for characteristics of the school.

19 There's not going to be a perfect system.
20 But in terms of what's in place already, there are
21 ways that your system, you know, where that --
22 there's validity and value to some of those measures
23 that are currently in place.

24 I'd love to shift gears here, probably to
25 avoid listening to us the whole time.

1 Again, there are some interesting things
2 in the survey. I'm not going to go into any more
3 depth. There's quite a bit of stuff where there was
4 -- half split. Some folks felt like the current
5 framework does provide a reliable, meaningful
6 assessment of health, and others didn't, you know.
7 So I think there's different opinions out there. It
8 may be the case that today's conversation, maybe
9 there's more alignment. Maybe we do feel
10 differently after listening more to each other and
11 hearing some of the things we've shared.

12 But that's where the group was. What we
13 want to do now is you've got your place-mats. What
14 we'd like to do is what's on there -- the only thing
15 new on there is two columns. There's a column on
16 the far right which is your notes, which kind of
17 says, "What are the options we should consider?"

18 And we've organized this by the same
19 topics you've been talking about. So you can choose
20 to prioritize whatever topic you want to. If you
21 want to talk about growth, talk about growth. You
22 want to talk about mission-specific indicators, make
23 that the focus of your conversation.

24 The other thing we've added, actually,
25 is -- I know back in -- was it March or April, there

1 was, I think, a group of Commissioners were together
2 talking about potential revisions? And there was a
3 document written up about some of the revisions that
4 are being considered.

5 And I would say that a big goal of that
6 reviewed framework which we've seen was, one, to add
7 a score; so there was weighting to some of the
8 metrics. And then, two, I think there was an effort
9 to clarify short -- short assessment -- short cycle
10 assessments, separating those from mission-specific.

11 So there are several, I think, really
12 useful things that were discussed there. We've
13 tried to characterize those in that column, you
14 know, second from the right.

15 So it says -- I don't have the thing in
16 front of me. But it says, "Previous Commissioner
17 Proposal."

18 The one thing I would note about that that
19 we found noteworthy. Part of what you did, of
20 course, is that you -- in that discussion -- was
21 taking the A-through-F, weighting that at like
22 12-and-a-half percent, I think, for elementaries and
23 7-and-a-half for high school, and then bringing in a
24 bunch of other indicators and putting weight to
25 those.

1 The implication of the weightings that
2 were put there were that in that -- again, kind of
3 revised for consideration kind of document -- is
4 that you had 5 percent proficiency for elementary
5 schools and 2 percent for high schools. And that's
6 just because of the way, you know, you -- A through
7 F was a very small weighting. Then you had a bunch
8 of growth measures essentially that were kind of
9 added.

10 I only highlight that, because, obviously,
11 when you start kind of bringing in the A through F
12 and adding things, you do want to be conscious of
13 how that's affecting --

14 MS. LYRIA BOST: The overall weight of
15 things. So that's why -- it essentially means
16 proficiency is not really a part of -- of your -- of
17 your framework, essentially, your overall rating.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: We're not going into
19 percentages now. Right now, what we want to do is
20 take some time. We're going to have you kind of
21 work in groups. Maybe you want to stay up here.
22 Maybe you want to grab the table. Maybe we can
23 have -- from Patty over, you all can work as a
24 group, and this side can work as a group.

25 And maybe, actually, folks -- I don't know

1 if you want to also join the discussions; we can
2 have two groups. But to think about, based on
3 today's conversations, based on the comments you've
4 had, what are some options you want to consider for
5 refinements for the framework that should be
6 incorporated into kind of a revised test model?

7 We take about 15 or 20 minutes in our
8 groups. And then we'd love to have folks share out
9 the things they want to see incorporated. Let's do
10 a group share. Then we're going to take a break and
11 switch gears.

12 Are those directions clear enough?

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Say it one more
14 time.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: We're going to work with
16 your place-mats, and we're going to have two groups.
17 So we'll have Patty over, and then Gilbert over. I
18 mean, you can reflect on it on your own, but then
19 have a discussion about what options would you want
20 to consider for revisions to the framework.

21 And you can use those categories you've
22 been describing to kind of guide your conversation.
23 You can pick. You don't have to go through every
24 one of these. There's too many of them to go
25 through there. Narrow down the topics most

1 important to you and consider options. And these
2 are options you can think about in your new revised
3 framework.

4 (Group discussions held.)

5 MR. TIM FIELD: So I'm going to bring us
6 back together. Then we'll have a short break. Then
7 we'll have another 50 minutes or so left of our
8 meeting.

9 I think -- I was with this group. Lyria
10 was with the other group. A lot of -- I'm curious.
11 Two things. It is kind of a voluntary share-out.
12 Either was there something from the discussion today
13 that you feel like advanced your thinking about
14 changes you thought need to be made? Or do you
15 find -- or did you find yourself -- what was your
16 question? Prioritizing or --

17 MS. LYRIA BOST: Right. Are there certain
18 issues that you either already knew, or now say,
19 like, "This is what we really need to make
20 modifications to address or solve for," because
21 there are probably some pressing priorities that you
22 might think need to be addressed that aren't
23 currently covered, you know, in your framework.

24 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I know that I
25 learned a lot of areas where I had no idea we could

1 do that would achieve some of the things that I was
2 groping with. And so it did bring to light that
3 today.

4 Also, to hear that mission-specific
5 charter schools is important, and we can tie in
6 everything to that. And that can be achievable.

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: Come on. My group. Make
8 us look good over there.

9 THE CHAIR: I think we -- we agreed that
10 there are challenges to -- and our focus needs to be
11 on growth, that that's of utmost importance to us,
12 and that we need to continue to look and focus on
13 disaggregating those groups that are challenging and
14 identifying them and creating measures that we can
15 make sure that they are also growing those
16 populations of students.

17 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: We're tired.

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: It's 2:30.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: Let's take a break. What
20 we have left to do on your agenda -- and if we can
21 maybe end a little early, even. But what we have
22 left to do is reviewing -- we have kind of a draft
23 proposed time line of activities for the Commission
24 to kind of work towards that we want to get reaction
25 to, and, also, you know, dates to. That's one piece

1 that we're thinking might take 20 to 30 minutes.

2 And then we have some wrap-up and next
3 steps. We also want to actually have you giving us
4 feedback on today, a feedback form.

5 But I think we will easily get out by
6 3:30, if not sooner. Let's take a ten-minute break
7 and come back at 2:40, and then we'll -- we'll
8 wrap -- we'll have a last push.

9 (Recess taken, 2:28 p.m. to 2:41 p.m.)

10 MR. TIM FIELD: I have great news. Last
11 session, we passed out a -- a place-mat with, like,
12 six columns. So this next table has only two, which
13 is good; right? It has less columns, less to
14 overwhelm you.

15 So the kind of objective -- one of the
16 objectives of the day was to essentially develop for
17 the PEC, develop a time line of activities to
18 revise -- implement a revised kind of voting model.
19 And so what we've done is -- and this is really just
20 us thinking about what have we seen other
21 authorizers, kind of what the process has been for
22 them to revise a framework.

23 And we pulled together just this set of
24 activities and a time line. What you have --
25 actually, I lied to you. It has four columns,

1 actually. I forgot your version is a little
2 different.

3 So what is important is the third column.
4 We're going to talk about owners and needs and talk
5 about time lines. Our goal here is to look at these
6 activities, and you all reflect, is this the right
7 set of actions for the Commission in partnership
8 with CSD to devise a framework? Is this the right
9 time line? And how should we think about ownership
10 and responsibilities for some of these actions?

11 So that's what we want to do right now.

12 A couple of things I want to highlight --
13 and we can make this pretty much a group
14 discussion -- is what we have found that's really,
15 really, really important is that once you start
16 identifying a new set of metrics is the need to test
17 it; because you will find -- one, you'll realize
18 what is actual meas- -- can you actually measure or
19 use that metric in that way. You're going to kind
20 of validate whether or not certain measures are
21 feasible.

22 You're also going to determine if certain
23 weightings create unexpected results. It's also a
24 chance to see what did the data say, and what do I
25 actually know and believe about my schools. It's a

1 chance to see that.

2 MS. LYRIA BOST: I think -- this is
3 something that we have always done. In the
4 beginning, we would work with an authorizer. We
5 would say, "Yes, these are all the indicators we
6 want. Let's go forward with it."

7 What we found is that in addition to the
8 aspects that Tim just mentioned, finding out how
9 difficult is it to access these data, and what do we
10 actually have when we have them. Another thing
11 that's really important to test is are one or more
12 of these indicators telling us the same thing; and
13 if they are, is it worth the effort to be
14 collecting, you know, four things that are
15 essentially telling us the same thing?

16 So there's that sort of correlation
17 between different indicators and measures. And as
18 Tim said, when you bring them all together, does it
19 give you the picture that -- the importance of a
20 trial run is you know your schools. And so to do a
21 test where you just have a test report, and you see,
22 and you're also testing a roll-up, you want to see,
23 like, does this match what we know about the
24 schools?

25 And that can be a really useful point to

1 say, you know, "This isn't quite matching up what we
2 know about the school; so are there more
3 indicators -- other things that we need to include?
4 Or, again, are there things that are telling us the
5 same thing, so we maybe want to eliminate some of
6 the indicators or measures?"

7 So it tells you many things that -- that
8 you don't know by just looking at a set of
9 indicators that make sense to you as, "Yes, this is
10 what we want to look at."

11 MR. TIM FIELD: So we've baked that into
12 the suggested activities.

13 Outreach to operators and other
14 stakeholders who care about this is an important
15 step. We think that actually, that outreach is
16 actually more effective when, one, you can actually
17 show some of those -- the implications of these
18 sample metrics; and also, when you can be clear
19 about not just the metrics, but how the metrics will
20 be used.

21 So you'll notice in here, we talked about,
22 under the fourth item, August 2017, we say,
23 "Generate draft framework reports." We also say,
24 "Draft accountability plan that details proposed
25 protocols for use of frameworks."

1 Because when operators see a framework,
2 they're going to have a reaction. But they're going
3 to want to ask, "How is this going to be used?"

4 So if you don't come to stakeholders with
5 both those things laid out, it's difficult to have a
6 meaningful conversation and get meaningful feedback.
7 So we crafted, you know, these activities with this
8 in mind.

9 I think what I'd like to ask you to do now
10 is take a minute or two, look at it, and then we'll
11 kind of just go around the room, and we can talk
12 about revisions you might want to add, or
13 activities. Or we can also discuss just the right
14 time line, and then assign maybe some owners, if you
15 think this is the right kind of activity.

16 Any comments before we do that? So let's
17 take a couple of minutes to individually review and
18 make notes.

19 THE CHAIR: So I guess I have a question,
20 because I was out for a couple of minutes there.

21 When you're -- when you're asking for
22 recommended updated metrics to incorporate --

23 MS. LYRIA BOST: I think that how we see
24 this -- because you did some work, you know, to --
25 you know, you have this document that we were

1 looking at, the work that you did.

2 THE CHAIR: Right.

3 MS. LYRIA BOST: What we would imagine is
4 you would -- you would take thinking from today, any
5 other information about there are some things that
6 it sounds like you want to check to see if they
7 would be available, and, essentially, update this to
8 a final revised version that you would then try.

9 THE CHAIR: I'm just looking at July being
10 the date, because I -- you know, between now and --
11 and when.

12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: We can add three
13 more months to the year.

14 MS. LYRIA BOST: So it feels too soon.

15 THE CHAIR: We will have already -- it's
16 only a half a day, and we've got, on the -- we've
17 got an agenda item for that. So I don't know
18 whether we have sufficient time to finalize that at
19 the July -- at a July meeting.

20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's why I asked
21 Katie to come over here when you started talking
22 about this, because -- and I'll see if I can -- I
23 don't really know all that I don't know. I don't.
24 And we've had -- we've had some Work Sessions, and
25 that's where we did this work.

1 THE CHAIR: Correct.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But now we need
3 kind of a restart point. And that's why I was
4 saying, "Katie, can you kind of direct me or help me
5 see where I need to go with this exactly?"

6 THE CHAIR: See, my -- and I have a
7 similar concern, in fact, that -- not that I don't
8 know. But I'm -- I have a concern about how much
9 backtracking, for want of something else, that we
10 need to do, now that we've done this; from the core
11 that we already did, how much revisiting do we need
12 to do, so that my concern is, even if it's -- I
13 don't think half of a Work Session would be
14 sufficient.

15 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What do you --

16 MS. POULOS: So if I may?

17 THE CHAIR: If you say the word
18 "subcommittee" --

19 MS. POULOS: I won't; although, it's on
20 this worksheet.

21 THE CHAIR: I saw it there. I put my hand
22 over it.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: I just made that up. I
24 had a question. "Do you want a subcommittee,"
25 question mark.

1 THE CHAIR: That's the catchall to
2 everything. "Let's just create a subcommittee and
3 let them do it," you know.

4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I agree with you.
5 It has to be everybody.

6 THE CHAIR: Yeah. I think it should be as
7 many as -- yeah.

8 MS. POULOS: So here's -- and here's what
9 I think. And this is just my thoughts.

10 Number one, I think -- and I think we all
11 recognize this. But we have to recognize, this is
12 an incredible amount of work. And so -- and I think
13 why these dates are probably making people feel
14 uncomfortable, in addition to this incredible amount
15 of work, we have a renewal application that needs to
16 be revised. We have a contract that needs to be
17 revised. We have amendment processes that need to
18 be created.

19 THE CHAIR: We have new applications that
20 we're looking -- that are coming in. So there's --
21 you know.

22 MS. POULOS: And I also think that -- that
23 this Commission, while we have incredible knowledge,
24 experience, and background, we also, probably, as a
25 Commission, you need -- I would say additional

1 support that I don't think my team can provide,
2 necessarily.

3 And so when I see this, and I don't see,
4 you know, Public Impact or somebody else on here
5 that can come back and help the Commission dig
6 through some of this, I think, well, that's
7 something we want to talk about is where do -- where
8 do we have this Commission getting additional
9 support, and maybe even establishing, "Okay, we
10 really want to talk about proficiency."

11 And that's going to take us about four
12 hours. And we need somebody to talk with us about
13 it who has the expertise in developing these
14 systems.

15 THE CHAIR: And we really need somebody to
16 talk to us about mission-specific indicators.

17 MS. POULOS: Right. Right.

18 THE CHAIR: Not that we're going to draft
19 all of them for those schools. But we need guidance
20 in the language it's going to look like, even some
21 examples of what they may look like, which will
22 guide us in the contract language, because we'll
23 have a better sense of what we're looking at.

24 And that, to me, is our greatest
25 challenge, when you say, "Who's going to do that?"

1 MS. POULOS: Right. And so what I would
2 say is I think July is obviously, in my mind, and I
3 think in all of your minds, way too early to have
4 recommended updated metrics to incorporate into
5 draft frameworks.

6 THE CHAIR: I'm even saying August is --
7 is -- possible; but I think it's still a long shot.

8 MS. POULOS: You know, I agree. And what
9 I do think we need to do -- and I know we have tons
10 of work and Work Sessions and people who are retired
11 and want to enjoy retirement --

12 THE CHAIR: That's out the window.

13 MS. POULOS: But I think we need to
14 schedule a block of -- I don't think a day; I think
15 two days, where, hopefully, if it's Public Impact,
16 whoever it is, that we have somebody. And then
17 during those two days, we have time broken off for
18 the potential priorities we've talked about today to
19 say, "This is our four-hour block that we're going
20 to be talking about this," or it's three hours;
21 right? "Here's our three-hour block where we're
22 going to be talking about this."

23 And during that three-hour block, the
24 Commission really gets to work together with the
25 support of outside experts to come to -- "Okay, this

1 is what we think is the right metric. This is what
2 it looks like. This is the right language. We're
3 comfortable trying this out. These are the
4 decisions we're making about what assessments are
5 coming in or staying out or not incorporated."

6 And that's a lot of things; right? It's
7 proficiency; it's growth; it's grad rate; it's
8 attendance; it's mission-specific goals; it's all
9 those pieces.

10 And I don't know if it's two days or three
11 days. And then I think from that, we've then built
12 out maybe another -- another month, where there's
13 another day or two, where, again, we have experts
14 who are coming in and working with this Commission
15 to say, "Okay. If we're talking about identifying
16 the accountability plan..." -- right? -- step one,
17 step two, and really breaking those out and helping
18 us work through it.

19 And I think we've got to figure out when
20 we're comfortable with those two days. The great
21 thing about August is we've got no meeting, because
22 it's at the very end of the month, except that we're
23 preparing for the end of the month.

24 THE CHAIR: That's also because I kind of
25 promised people that they could have August off,

1 because you're also talking with some people -- not
2 here -- but that way, when the Commission only met a
3 couple of times -- a couple of times a year. So
4 that this is -- you know.

5 MS. LYRIA BOST: Feels like a lot more,
6 yeah.

7 THE CHAIR: It's significantly more. And
8 we have not had a month where we haven't met
9 recently. And when we had the discussion about the
10 calendar, we had agreed that we technically wouldn't
11 have an August meeting, because that's when most --
12 some of the folks that do work in schools,
13 they're -- they're -- have a little time off, and
14 then they're starting back up. So it's also tough.

15 So I hesitate. And also on a personal
16 level, I can't go home if I -- if I say I'm gone for
17 the next four weeks again.

18 MS. LYRIA BOST: But in terms of where you
19 can push, I think this ending point is where you
20 want to be, that in fall of 2018, when schools would
21 be, you know, receiving the results of the year,
22 that you would potentially have the new framework in
23 place; right? That feels like an important target
24 date there.

25 I think you have room within that, then,

1 to push forward; because what you -- just in terms
2 of thinking about the parts that take the most time,
3 a trial run, you probably want to give that two
4 months, because there's a lot of collecting --
5 testing different options.

6 A lot of the decision points, you can
7 perhaps shift to after, because in the trial run,
8 you can try Option A and B; so you can see both. So
9 you're not having to sort of commit to it before the
10 trial run.

11 So the trial run, you need a good two
12 months. That can be -- that can be pushed back.
13 But after that, you really need a good two months
14 for -- I would say for the stakeholder engagement;
15 because this is going to be a big cha- -- you're
16 sharing with them. You're giving time for
17 back-and-forth.

18 So I think you can push some of this
19 forward and really kind of attack it, you know, with
20 commitment in the fall, and just make sure that
21 you're giving that time for the trial run and the
22 time for engagement.

23 THE CHAIR: The problem is the -- if we
24 push back much, we're looking at our engagement time
25 as being either during PARCC season, you know, which

1 becomes nearly impossible for schools to, you know,
2 really get away, or, if it goes any further, then
3 they're out of school, you know.

4 MS. LYRIA BOST: So you need to do that,
5 like, early spring is really ideal? Is that --

6 THE CHAIR: It would mean we'd really have
7 to hold to this schedule, you know.

8 But December is renewal time.

9 MS. POULOS: Yeah.

10 THE CHAIR: So that's multiple days
11 already, you know, depending on the renewals. So
12 December is usually pretty packed. We usually don't
13 have a work session in December, because we have our
14 renewal hearings.

15 So...

16 MS. POULOS: So here's what I -- like, my
17 initial thought is that potentially, in September --
18 so we have them -- the meeting that's at the very
19 end of August, very beginning of September, it's on
20 that Friday. That is Labor Day weekend. So I think
21 everybody wants that off.

22 But then maybe sometime in the middle of
23 September, we plan -- I don't know what you're
24 thinking. But I would say if we can plan for three
25 days, which is a lot, to have the Commission having

1 a really in-depth, intensive Work Session for three
2 days to work through, again, with these blocks of
3 time, these different things that we're thinking
4 about, to come up with a draft framework and
5 potentially maybe the -- the reports and the
6 accountability plan -- maybe not. Maybe that has to
7 wait until October, and that's a day and a half, two
8 days. And so we are pushing and then kind of seeing
9 a crunch of these time lines within that period.

10 THE CHAIR: And you're looking at --
11 well -- I'm just -- when you're looking at October.
12 I'm thinking we have our regular meeting in October,
13 the national conference -- NACSA conference. And
14 usually, the charter Coalition Conference is in
15 October.

16 MS. POULOS: Uh-huh.

17 THE CHAIR: Kevin, do you know what the
18 LESC's agenda is for September? Or that's not set?

19 MR. FORCE: We haven't gotten to
20 September's agenda yet.

21 THE CHAIR: Do you know where it is?

22 MR. FORCE: September, I think is in
23 Artesia.

24 THE CHAIR: So that puts -- you know.
25 Without knowing that --

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, can I
2 ask that at least that first meeting, we still
3 request Paul to provide a transcript for us, so that
4 we can go back and look at it and what was
5 discussed, if we're doing that long and in blocks of
6 time, when we go back and do the final?

7 MS. POULOS: Yeah. Absolutely.

8 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And that way, your
9 notes can come off of the transcript and not -- I
10 don't know if we'll need it after that. But at
11 least that initial meeting, I think would be very
12 helpful. I know Cindy is glaring at me.

13 THE REPORTER: No, I'm not. I'm smiling
14 at her.

15 THE CHAIR: The LESC is the 27th, 28th,
16 and 29th of September.

17 MS. POULOS: I was thinking maybe we do it
18 the middle of the month, the 15th.

19 THE CHAIR: Well, the 15th --

20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's a Friday.

21 MS. POULOS: Well, middle of the month.
22 13th through 15th? 12th through 14th? 11th through
23 13th? I think -- again, one of the important things
24 I think is now you have at least everything you've
25 talked about today, and then you have about two

1 months -- right? -- to really process that and be
2 thinking through this, knowing that nobody should
3 come unprepared for those intensive discussions that
4 we're going to have in September, because you've
5 gotten a lot to think about between now and then.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: I think that makes it -- I
7 mean, today we maybe a little bit overwhelmed you
8 with the amount of concepts and ideas. We also
9 tried to also connect it to what currently exists.

10 When you're getting into the decision
11 making process, ideally, you're not -- you're
12 looking at a series of options. So, I mean, it
13 would be great -- I think that would be the goal, I
14 think, of the conversation you're having in the
15 future is that you're being steered a little more --

16 I think the input that came from today
17 start to set out some options. But I think part of
18 making these work sessions successful going forward
19 is getting some more clarity.

20 But I think part of today was getting --
21 building the knowledge base, and, again, the
22 objective, like having a shared awareness of
23 weaknesses and strengths of the current system.
24 That was part of the objective.

25 So I would hope that in the future, you

1 would be better prepared to look at options, discuss
2 them, and efficiently come to some -- at least some
3 initial decisions.

4 THE CHAIR: Right. And I don't think it's
5 the amount of work. I think it's just trying to
6 find the time to do the work. I don't think we're
7 overwhelmed by what we're going to do. But I
8 think --

9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Oh, I think we
10 could go there, too.

11 THE CHAIR: I mean, I'm not overwhelmed by
12 the work. It's -- it's trying to fit in the time.

13 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And, Madam Chair,
14 remember, we're so highly paid. But we will be
15 close to the beginning of the fiscal year. The
16 money should still be there, whatever the State
17 budget looks like.

18 THE CHAIR: Well, I'm not concerned about
19 the money. I'm concerned about the time, you know.

20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So September,
21 middle of the month, three to four days, to look at
22 the draft framework?

23 MS. POULOS: Creating a draft framework.
24 And I think, potentially, again, if we could have
25 options kind of built up for us, I think that might

1 be a good place to start; so we could work with,
2 again -- I'm making the presumption that we would
3 want to continue to work with Public Impact. That's
4 obviously going to be the Commission and
5 Public Impact making that decision, if that's a
6 conversation.

7 But potentially coming with some options
8 built out, if that's something that could help us,
9 so that maybe, as a three-day meeting, we could get
10 a draft framework, and also a draft accountability
11 plan into a pretty good place to move forward from
12 there to, next, thinking about any revisions, you
13 know, that came out of those options and drafts.

14 MS. LYRIA BOST: And three to four days.
15 I'm wonder- -- not that -- I'm wondering if -- if it
16 could be done in a shorter time period, if -- I
17 mean, if we continue to work with you, part of what
18 we would be expecting to bring as value was taking
19 the feedback, get- -- taking the knowledge that we
20 have of the commitments that -- where there are some
21 differences, and bringing you, again, options of --
22 that represent the different viewpoints we see, so
23 that, again, you shouldn't be having to start from a
24 blank slate, but have something that you're
25 responding to, and not that -- that we would say,

1 "Here's what we think you should do; but here are
2 options."

3 Because I find that that's always the best
4 for having good conversations and allowing people to
5 really think about what the pros and cons are and
6 that type of thing. That's why I think it could be
7 less time, because I hope you wouldn't be starting
8 from scratch. And you shouldn't have to start from
9 scratch, yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So how do we move
11 toward putting that in place? I mean, can you --
12 with Public Impact?

13 MS. POULOS: So do we think that's two
14 days, and then are people able to say, "Okay, let's
15 pre-plan, say, two days in the middle of September?
16 14th-15th? 11th-12th?

17 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Whatever works,
18 yeah, 12th-13th.

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: 13th-14th.

20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I don't know what
21 your schedule is like.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: For those specific dates?
23 Probably.

24 MS. LYRIA BOST: I think that that is --
25 that is fine. So, I mean, if you wanted to --

1 great.

2 THE CHAIR: The meeting is the 31st and
3 1st.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: We don't have
5 anything the rest of September.

6 THE CHAIR: LESC is the end of the month.

7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm ready to
8 commit.

9 MS. LYRIA BOST: You'll need to have
10 conversations. But just to let you --

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And here's my
12 sense. We -- I have a sense of urgency about
13 getting these things in place for the school. And
14 we, as a Commission -- and, granted, I fully
15 understand. And I'm the same way. I've got two
16 calendars over here I've got going.

17 But at some point, we have to -- we have
18 to do this, one way or the other, and get it done.
19 And if we put it off until October -- is that what
20 you're looking at?

21 THE CHAIR: Well, I'm looking -- I'm going
22 to see if I have to change vacation.

23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, that's what
24 I mean, yeah. Well, we don't have to look at the
25 11th. Are you going for the whole month? I mean,

1 you've earned it.

2 THE CHAIR: No. We have a meeting at the
3 beginning of the month, and we have LESC at the end
4 of the month.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: In October, we've
6 got the NACSA conference, and we've got a meeting.
7 So...

8 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: But August is
9 still open, is it not?

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And we need to do
11 this for the schools.

12 THE CHAIR: And I understand that; but --

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And we're looking
14 at two days. Do you think two days would be
15 sufficient?

16 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I think that
17 three days was said over there.

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But then you guys
19 thought you could lead us in two days.

20 MS. LYRIA BOST: What we would assume is
21 the work we would be doing is probably sending you
22 information. We'd be researching some of the
23 options that came up, and then coming back with
24 essentially a revised framework with options in
25 places. So, again, not prescribing, but since you

1 have that ahead of time -- and so I think two -- two
2 days.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: Two days.

4 MS. LYRIA BOST: And the accountability
5 plan, as well. I think that given that, you would
6 be -- you would be introducing that over -- again,
7 trying to implement that for the next school year,
8 essentially, having a draft -- we have some great
9 examples. And, again, can show you sort of options.

10 And that, you wouldn't be trying to
11 finalize that day, because that would be when you
12 were first starting to think about it. And I would
13 think you would want to sort of get a first revised
14 that then would be finalized, perhaps, when you
15 reviewed the draft.

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But the
17 frameworks, we would be working on getting something
18 in place. Because I just have a sense of urgency.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: The frameworks, I imagine
20 you'd walk away with a clear set. "This is what we
21 want," but with a few variations which would then
22 allow you to do the test run, while you start doing
23 trial runs. Then you'd have a way to confirm, you
24 know, "Is this the right model for us? And what are
25 the results -- what do our schools look against that

1 model?"

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I was wondering,
3 Team -- Team -- since we're going to be up here on
4 the 31st of August, because, you know, this is a
5 very big state -- this is one of the largest states
6 of the United States -- we still are the
7 United States, aren't we?

8 But, anyway, if we did it, like, the 29th
9 and 30th, because we'd already be up here, some of
10 you? Some of us would still be driving and
11 increasing our Social Security. I should say that.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And those who are
13 still working will be going back to school. I'm
14 thinking about Trish and about Tim and Gilbert.

15 They may be already back in the swing,
16 because we generally start about the 14th.

17 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: A lot of the
18 charter schools are starting the 1st. And my
19 grandson's school starts the 31st of July.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, we're
21 going to run into the same problem in terms of our
22 working members.

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No, I'm just
24 saying -- if you're worried about the working, they
25 will have been past the first couple of weeks of

1 school. I do -- I kind of agree with Patty, though.
2 We need a break. There's been an awful lot going
3 on.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, this is
5 August, though.

6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But my concern is
7 for the schools.

8 THE CHAIR: I'm not unconcerned for the
9 schools.

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I know you're not.
11 And I apologize if that was the way it was taken.
12 I'm just saying that that's my feeling.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So if we're in
14 July, and we're going to do that -- where are we?
15 The 19th and 20th; right? And then we don't do
16 anything until the 29th and 30th of August, that's
17 a --

18 THE CHAIR: Well, the 26th, 27th, and 28th
19 is LESC.

20 MS. POULOS: Of September.

21 THE CHAIR: July. So the 26th, 27th, 28th
22 is July.

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And then August?

24 THE CHAIR: You know, I don't think I put
25 the August date down. I didn't put the August date

1 down for that. But it would probably be.

2 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Same.

3 THE CHAIR: -- the end of the month,
4 except that's Labor Day weekend. It heads into long
5 Labor Day weekend. So I don't know what they did
6 with that one. Maybe they're not doing an August
7 meeting.

8 Kevin, they're not doing an August
9 meeting, are they?

10 MR. FORCE: I believe we are, in Taos.

11 THE CHAIR: So I guess it would be the
12 23rd, 24th, 25th? Because the 30th, 31st, and 1st
13 heads into Labor Day weekend.

14 MR. FORCE: They wouldn't do it right
15 before Labor Day. As I mentioned, Madam Chair, I
16 was out of the room. And the Legislative server is
17 down. So I can't get to it. I'm sorry.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: July 26th, 27th,
19 28th. August 30th through September 1st.

20 THE CHAIR: That's why I didn't put it in,
21 because that's our meeting, so I knew I couldn't go.
22 That's why.

23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: September 27th
24 28th, 29th. October 25th, 26th, 27th.

25 THE CHAIR: Just do the 12th, 13th, 14th

1 of September. I'll figure it out.

2 We promised people August off when we did
3 the calendar. So I know Gilbert makes vacation
4 plans, because he knows he's starting school; so he
5 makes vacation plans with the family for August.

6 We have to have our meeting before he goes
7 back to school, you know. And, Trish, I'm trying to
8 remember -- I know she's going back to family in
9 August before she goes back to school.

10 MS. POULOS: And I think what Karyl Ann
11 was proposing -- I think Karyl Ann was proposing
12 adding to the beginning of our, quote, September
13 meeting, which is on September 1st. And I do think
14 we're only going to need one day for that, even
15 though I kind of thought two, because we only have
16 the two applicants.

17 So if we added two days to the beginning
18 of that, it would technically be an August meeting.
19 It would be August 30th, 31st, September 1st.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So just do the
21 applications on the 1st.

22 MS. POULOS: And do the applications on
23 the 1st. And then you wouldn't meet again until
24 October. So technically, you would have had those
25 as off, the rest of the week.

1 THE CHAIR: September.

2 MS. POULOS: Right.

3 THE CHAIR: But they're already back
4 working. That's why we took August off, because
5 people aren't working half the month. That's why it
6 was August.

7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So now we're
8 only adding one day, though. We're adding
9 August 30th. Granted, it is a work thing for them.
10 I got that.

11 THE CHAIR: But you're adding the 29th for
12 Trish, because she has to drive.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yeah, well we
14 need a helicopter for her, and you. We'll pick you
15 up, too. But, again --

16 THE CHAIR: Doesn't matter to me. Do it
17 that way, or do it in September. I'll figure it
18 out.

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: No. You should
20 have a thing in September.

21 MS. POULOS: Is there a consensus from the
22 other members who have been silent on either doing
23 it in the middle of September or tacking it on right
24 to the beginning of September; so it would really be
25 August 30, 31, September 1, would be a three-day

1 meeting that you have in between August and
2 September? Or would you like an additional two days
3 added in the middle of September?

4 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: I would prefer in
5 the middle of September. But I'll go with whatever
6 you guys -- you guys want to -- I'll adjust my
7 calendar.

8 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Yeah. For me,
9 it's -- the thing that matters are the days of the
10 week. I have classes on Monday and Wednesday. I'm
11 off Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday.

12 So if I can come to meetings, I will; but
13 if I can't, I won't.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So August, that
15 works, because it would be Thursday Friday --
16 Wednesday, Thursday, Friday; so --

17 THE CHAIR: He teaches Thursday.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I know. I'm
19 saying no, it's not. Wrong days.

20 COMMISSIONER CONYERS: Monday-Wednesday
21 are the days I have classes. And that starts in the
22 end of August.

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I don't care
24 either way.

25 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: Yeah. Count me

1 as whatever you guys decide. I'll adjust.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: All of the rest of
3 us are flexible. August/September.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I just thought
5 since we were giving up August, one more day
6 wouldn't -- we only have two schools; so we would
7 only be adding one day to what I was already having.
8 I was already saving the 31st -- right? -- and
9 September 1st. So now I would just add one day,
10 instead of adding two days later on.

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So we're going
12 with August the 30th, 31st, and September 1st for
13 the meeting and the whole -- and Jim can come down.

14 MS. LYRIA BOST: So which would be the
15 days that you'd be working on -- the days you would
16 be working on the framework?

17 MS. POULOS: 30th, 31st.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I don't know
19 what Gilbert's going to have. We don't know Millie,
20 and we don't know Trish.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I wouldn't count
22 Millie. If she's here, she's here. If she's not,
23 she's not.

24 THE CHAIR: I don't see where Gilbert is
25 going to be able to make three days in a row. I

1 don't see that.

2 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And really, the
3 most important thing for him would be the Friday for
4 the approvals.

5 THE CHAIR: I think Gilbert will come for
6 the renewals -- for the new apps. But I don't
7 know -- unless he's here for something else. But I
8 don't think he'll come three days in a row, because
9 he'll -- school's --

10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's a lot. I
11 remember those days.

12 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: He's working for a
13 new superintendent.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That would be
15 the other reason. So the thing is to find the time
16 when ten of us can come to a Work Session isn't
17 going to happen. It never does, for any number of
18 reasons.

19 So, you know, looking at -- I mean, I
20 can't think of a good time, actually. I've just
21 sort of given up my life here, for this salary. So
22 for me -- like, yeah, I can do September. I can do
23 whatever. It just seemed like since people were
24 already going to be here -- I was really thinking
25 more about you, Patty, to be honest.

1 THE CHAIR: I'm thinking in the back of my
2 mind that we'll have a hearing somewhere in there.

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Oh.

4 THE CHAIR: Not that I'm saying how people
5 are going to vote on it. But we have a hearing that
6 we have to schedule. I mean, we do. We already
7 voted for the hearing. So we have a hearing we have
8 to schedule that -- right -- probably sometime in
9 September. August. Probably maybe August.

10 COMMISSIONER CABALLERO: This is -- this
11 is a good time to do the performance framework and
12 just leave it at that and then work on whatever else
13 comes up.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, we can
15 have Beverly send out -- somebody can --

16 MS. POULOS: Tim, did you have something
17 that might help?

18 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm just going to suggest
19 that part of what -- we can facilitate and do
20 things, so that we can get input in advance, like
21 whether it's through survey-type mechanisms or even
22 conversations or ways that people can give feedback,
23 probably just getting materials in advance.

24 I know you want to hear -- you want
25 Gilbert's voice in this. So we can help facilitate

1 that. So it's not -- it's going to be hard to find
2 a day when everyone -- I understand that, of course,
3 the entire state. It's not like you're in the same
4 city you're coming from.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yes.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: And it's a big sacrifice,
7 obviously, to do that; so --

8 MS. POULOS: So it's sounding like we
9 potentially had unhappy consensus on a date.

10 THE CHAIR: With the qualifier that if we
11 have to have a hearing and that -- you know,
12 there's -- you know, because we're going to have to
13 have a hearing.

14 MS. LYRIA BOST: We will revise this just
15 to reflect so that you can see that, give us any
16 other feedback on it, and then we can provide sort
17 of a scope for that work and a proposal for those
18 meeting dates. And then you can let us know the
19 finals.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Send us a rough
21 draft to edit to make it ours?

22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes, that would
23 be -- and then what we're looking at is the 30th,
24 the 31st, and the 1st. And some of that is meeting,
25 and some of that --

1 THE CHAIR: The 1st is a meeting; that is
2 it. That's the only meeting is the 1st, because
3 that's when we do the new applications.

4 MS. LYRIA BOST: And in terms of
5 expectations, what we would be planning to bring,
6 then, is drafts of all three frameworks and an
7 accountability plan, or what you would call that,
8 with lots of options, you know, parts -- you know,
9 discussions that we know we need to have, but also
10 mechanisms, so that anybody that is not there would
11 easily be able to feedback on those proposed; so...

12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right. We would
13 get those before that, the meetings.

14 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yes, yes. Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Get things and
16 we'll have time to look at them.

17 MS. POULOS: What Public Impact is saying
18 is they will build actual mechanisms, so that that
19 is not, "Oh, if they want to, or if somebody gets to
20 talk to somebody."

21 But they send out one that says, "Which
22 are your preferred choices? Why?" That's --

23 MS. LYRIA BOST: If it's a phone call
24 interview and saying -- making sure that there's no
25 feedback there, we can do that, as well, schedule

1 calls with anybody who can't make it, which might be
2 good in terms of making sure that we have their
3 voice.

4 MS. POULOS: I think, based on that
5 September date, can you kind of revise this
6 schedule?

7 MS. LYRIA BOST: Yes. We'll send that and
8 make sure you're comfortable with a revised schedule
9 and -- yeah.

10 MS. POULOS: That makes sense.

11 MS. LYRIA BOST: Wonderful. Great.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: We're going to wrap --
13 that's all we had, really, to cover. We are going
14 to ask for -- if we are especially working together
15 in the future, this is feedback. It's fairly
16 simple. But it's helpful -- it's great to get
17 feedback on the day to inform how we have future
18 conversations with you.

19 Please take a few minutes to fill this
20 out. We appreciate that.

21 THE CHAIR: Once again, for those of you
22 that didn't take your orange folders home, please
23 make sure you --

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Gilbert left his
25 here.

1 THE CHAIR: I'll --

2 (A discussion was held off the record.)

3 THE CHAIR: We all outed ourselves on all
4 our answers on the survey. You know what? I need a
5 motion to adjourn.

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Madam Chair, so
7 move.

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Second.

9 THE CHAIR: All in favor?

10 (Commissioners so indicate.)

11 THE CHAIR: Opposed?

12 (No response.)

13 THE CHAIR: Hearing no opposition, we are
14 adjourned.

15 (Proceedings adjourned at 3:23 p.m.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION

2 STATE OF NEW MEXICO

3
4
5
6
7 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

8 I, Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR, CCR #219, Certified
9 Court Reporter in the State of New Mexico, do hereby
10 certify that the foregoing pages constitute a true
11 transcript of proceedings had before the said
12 NEW MEXICO PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION, held in the
13 State of New Mexico, County of Santa Fe, in the
14 matter therein stated.

15 In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my
16 hand on June 30, 2017.

17
18
19 _____
20 Cynthia C. Chapman, RMR-CRR, NM CCR #219
21 BEAN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
22 201 Third Street, NW, Suite 1630
23 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

24
25 Job No. : 8158L (CC)

SANTA FE OFFICE
119 East Marcy, Suite 110
Santa Fe, NM 87501
(505) 989-4949
FAX (505) 843-9492



MAIN OFFICE
201 Third NW, Suite 1630
Albuquerque, NM 87102
(505) 843-9494
FAX (505) 843-9492
1-800-669-9492
e-mail: info@litsupport.com