

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
WORK SESSION, VOLUME ONE
August 30, 2017
9:05 a.m.

Jerry Apodaca Education Building - Mabry Hall
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.: 7855L (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

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

A P P E A R A N C E S

COMMISSIONERS:

MS. PATRICIA GIPSON, Chair
MS. KARYL ANN ARMBRUSTER, Secretary
MS. DANIELLE JOHNSTON, Member
MS. TRISH RUIZ, Member
MS. CARMIE TOULOUSE, Member

STAFF:

MS. KATIE POULOS, Director, Charter School Division

FACILITATORS: MR. TIM FIELD, Public Impact
MS. LYRIA BOAST, Public Impact

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: No. This is a work session;
2 so we -- you know, we don't do anything. We --

3 Cindy can just note the record; because we
4 rarely -- like, almost never -- have a record of it.
5 Beverly usually just keeps notes.

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Some of us wanted
7 this kind of a session, to have a transcript.

8 THE CHAIR: We wanted people to be able --
9 those people that weren't here and people that are
10 here, for our addled brains, to be able to go back
11 and really look and not rely on just our notes.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Great.

13 THE CHAIR: So, Cindy, I guess, can just
14 note that Commissioner Caballero, Commissioner
15 Peralta, Commissioner Crone are absent -- and
16 Commissioner Conyers -- are absent.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. So we'll jump in.

18 We had a chance to speak to most of the
19 folks at this table in advance, to kind of prep for
20 this meeting, did a lot of thinking about how to
21 cover all this material, sent out pre-reads.

22 The fact that we have a slightly smaller
23 group and that we're at a round table, I think will
24 make it actually -- we're excited about that. The
25 drawback is we don't get the variety of inputs. I

1 do think we probably can go a little deeper into
2 some topics than we're --

3 (Reporter requests clarification.)

4 THE CHAIR: And I will ask that we be a
5 little more cognizant; because normally, in a work
6 session we jump in and -- but for Cindy's sake, that
7 we --

8 THE REPORTER: Wait your turn.

9 THE CHAIR: Yeah.

10 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

11 MR. TIM FIELD: And we'll also -- we have
12 slides; we'll use them some. But I think the fact
13 we're at a table and we have some handouts, we'll
14 try not to use them too much, but we will use them
15 some and organize us.

16 I think you all remember what
17 Public Impact is. We had a couple of slides here.
18 But, again, we're based in North Carolina, do a lot
19 of work across the country on a range of topics; but
20 a lot of work with charters and a lot of work with
21 authorizers, both on the authorizer side, helping
22 authorizer practices, but also we do a lot work,
23 frankly, on the supply side.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: This might be a little
25 bit easier for you all to take notes. This is the

1 exact copy of what's up-top; so we wanted you to
2 have some examples of [inaudible].

3 MR. TIM FIELD: Thank you, Lyria.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: So, yeah. I don't have
6 much more to say than that. And, again, Tim Field
7 and Lyria Boast. And we're so pleased to be here
8 again. It's a beautiful state, and we feel lucky
9 that we get a chance to come here. In fact, Lyria,
10 you're spending the weekend visiting relatives.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes, in Albuquerque;
12 so...

13 THE CHAIR: And it's a fabulous time of
14 year. And it's actually turned nice, I know down by
15 me.

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's cooler.

17 THE CHAIR: It was 59 this morning down in
18 Cruces, which is, like, unheard of this time of
19 year. It's just gorgeous. And we've had so much
20 rain that it's scary green.

21 MR. TIM FIELD: So objectives for the
22 session -- these are on your agenda. So you have --
23 the handout here has the agenda; so the objectives
24 are here.

25 We've identified seven objectives, which

1 we've pulled together, based on Patty and Katie's
2 input for the day. The first few are actually very
3 simple and pretty short. And then the meatier ones
4 are really -- 4, 5 -- 4 and 5 especially, I would
5 say.

6 First, is just kind of reaffirm objectives
7 for this overall work of revising the accountability
8 model for performance frameworks for the PEC.

9 We will look at the project timeline,
10 which is revised like we saw before, but we'll look
11 at that and, again, just kind of confirm what's the
12 work ahead of us for the coming year.

13 We do have some -- a few highlights -- we
14 spoke to quite a few -- Lyria actually spoke to
15 quite a few operators, five or six charter school
16 operators. Who else?

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I think seven, actually,
18 and also the authorizer in Albuquerque and -- sorry.
19 I forget names very quickly -- and --

20 THE CHAIR: Joseph Escobedo.

21 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And the current head of
22 the Coalition.

23 THE CHAIR: Kelly Callahan?

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. [Inaudible.] And
25 then also one of the financial contract that works

1 with many of the schools.

2 THE CHAIR: The Vigil Group?

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: It was a woman and

4 she --

5 MS. POULOS: Deanna? Yes, yes.

6 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Deanna.

7 THE CHAIR: Oh, okay.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: So we'll just do a very
9 brief highlights of what we have from that, and I
10 think -- maybe we can use that time to talk further,
11 and you can ask questions. We've got some
12 highlights there.

13 Then we'll get into the meat of things.
14 We're going to talk about an academic side. No. 4
15 is just having a discussion about roll-up
16 categories, and what are different approaches for
17 the academic framework, rolling up the measures into
18 a --

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: An overall academic
20 category or -- we'll talk about it, what you want
21 that to look like and how you want to use that.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: And the fifth objective is
23 really the meat of the next two days, which is
24 approving performance indicators for academic,
25 organizational, and financial for a trial run. So

1 this -- we'll reemphasize as we talk about this.

2 So this is -- we're not voting. This is
3 not the final version. But we do want to get enough
4 input to have a pretty good set of measures we want
5 to kind of kick the tires on and create some sample
6 reports. So that is the main goal of the next two
7 days.

8 We'll talk a little about a master
9 schedule for reports; so that that actually is
10 less -- I think a part of our -- we have time
11 tomorrow. We have an hour set aside. That can be
12 on whatever you want to spend time on.

13 Then we'll have next steps.

14 That's the objectives for the next two
15 days.

16 Any questions or anything that you think
17 that is not on here that needs to be on here?

18 THE CHAIR: Don't.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: We do everything for you.

20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Remember. Speak
21 slowly for Cindy.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: I'll try, Cindy.

23 (Reporter request.)

24 MR. TIM FIELD: Okay. Agenda. So if you
25 have the agenda there. It's on the screen; but the

1 one in front of you is much more detailed. We'll
2 quickly get through introductions.

3 I don't know if we need a half-an-hour for
4 this next piece. We do want to talk about goals for
5 the revisions to the performance framework. We'll
6 talk some about the feedback we got.

7 The big chunk of this morning is on the
8 organizational framework. And we're going to talk
9 about proposed revisions. And then what we're going
10 to do is we have, like, this exit ticket, where
11 we're going to ask you to kind of say what you
12 think, kind of vote. You can call it the taco menu,
13 where you say, "Oh, I like this one with a side of
14 avocado," or whatever.

15 So we're going to have you -- before we
16 hit lunch, we're going to have you turn those in.

17 And then tomorrow, what we'll have is,
18 we'll, like, present that back and kind of say,
19 "What does that mean? Like, all six of you said
20 this," or, "We had a split."

21 So that's how we're going to do that for
22 all the frameworks. So we'll take the morning and
23 get the organizational framework. I hope we can get
24 done by 11:30. I think we'll be able to. We'll
25 have lunch. Lunch will be on your own out in town.

1 We'll come back and then spend the afternoon on the
2 academic framework, which will be a longer
3 conversation. We have more time for that. There's
4 more to get into.

5 But the same thing. We'll end with an
6 exit ticket, where you will, again, fill out the
7 taco menu, and we'll have a chance to look at it
8 tomorrow.

9 That's the big picture.

10 Day two. Just briefly, we'll start by
11 reviewing exit ticket feedback. We'll also think
12 about how we adjust for some more members tomorrow.
13 So we may have to think about how we do some kind of
14 review, or how we think about how we integrate the
15 new members, maybe, here.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And Tim and I will be
17 very busy tonight, because -- and that's why we're
18 going to make sure to get one of those exit tickets
19 from all of you; because we're really -- it feels
20 really important that we get all of the viewpoints,
21 all of the concerns, all of the priorities, and pull
22 together sort of what we'll be bringing back to you
23 tomorrow is a draft of -- "Okay, here's what we want
24 to test," and, you know, from what you've said.

25 So we will be sort of making sure you each

1 give us one of those exit tickets for both the
2 organizational and the academic by the end of the
3 day.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: The financial, we'll cover
5 tomorrow morning. We plan to have a pre-read to
6 send out end of day; you can read tonight. We may
7 have to wait until tomorrow for that; but we will
8 have it ready for tonight's homework.

9 The plan is to have lunch and then do,
10 again, a debrief of results. So we'll use the
11 lunchtime to kind of compile feedback, and then
12 we'll have a chance to look at it in the afternoon.

13 We have an hour set aside for TBD, if
14 there's other topics. And if we don't have a TBD,
15 then we'll wrap up early, which no one will complain
16 about. But we don't -- we'll use that time if
17 there's something to be addressed. We may find we
18 need more time to talk about one of the frameworks.

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Or to get input from the
20 members maybe joining us tomorrow; so it'll be nice
21 to have a little flex time there.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: And that is our two-day
23 agenda.

24 Questions?

25 Great. Meeting norms. I think they're

1 not on your handout; so look up here.

2 MS. POULOS: They are.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: They are. They are.

4 Great.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: The print is
6 larger up here.

7 MR. TIM FIELD: If you want to read it,
8 then you can look up there.

9 I'd say -- I'd really emphasize this piece
10 about No. 3 and 4, is we really want to hear --
11 especially when we have this nice smaller group --
12 everyone's voice and not -- and let's engage where
13 there's points of disagreement in a respectful way.

14 But I think one of the challenges in all
15 this situation is, like, we're not going to always
16 get to complete, unanimous, probably, opinions about
17 some things. We want to identify where there are
18 points of total alignment or there's points of
19 disagreement, and then maybe find ways to kind of
20 accommodate the minority view on things.

21 So we'll address that as we get to it and
22 tomorrow morning will be a good chance to get into
23 that.

24 Any other norms people want to add to this
25 list?

1 Great.

2 Lyria, do you want to talk about
3 objectives for the --

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. So both -- many of
5 these come from our June meeting and hearing from
6 you what were your goals, you know, why was there
7 this interest in reviewing the framework and making
8 revisions or possibly changes. So, again, we want
9 to be sure that everybody sort of agrees with these
10 objectives.

11 The first is that we did hear that you
12 want to establish, and at least consider and test,
13 having a single roll-up and overall rating or
14 category for the academic portion of the framework.
15 We're going to talk about a variety of ways that
16 that can be done and -- but today, we'll really want
17 to talk about the purpose and how that will be used,
18 so that we can then look at options.

19 We definitely hear that it's very
20 important that there are mission-specific goals; but
21 a lot of what we'll talk about today, and especially
22 in No. 3, feedback from schools, as well as from all
23 of you, is really kind of stepping back from the
24 framework and thinking more about the larger, what
25 we call "accountability plan" as a short term; but

1 so not only what are you using to evaluate schools,
2 but how do you then use that information to make
3 decisions, to make clear expectations to schools, to
4 give clarity to schools.

5 So that will actually be a little bit more
6 of the work after the trial run. But we will
7 definitely be wanting to talk about that and bring
8 that into the conversation today. We'll be focused
9 today more on the actual components of the
10 framework, but always thinking, "How will this be
11 used?" You know, "Is it actionable? What is that
12 action? What is the intent of that?"

13 So that's very important.

14 That sort of segues into No. 4,
15 establishing clarity about the process time line.
16 Again, we sort of think about that -- and we have
17 shorthand talking about the accountability plan; but
18 sort of how is the framework used and making sure
19 that that's clear and that communication that you
20 are -- that the Commission is getting what it needs,
21 schools are getting what they need, Katie's
22 department has the clarity they need, so that
23 everybody has clarity about what is included and how
24 it's being used.

25 And then, finally, that there's sort of a

1 special bullet about the financial. I know that
2 there has been a lot of, sort of, conversation about
3 what should those be, how -- how can those be
4 framed, given that you have a different -- some
5 different legal structures here. So that is sort of
6 on its own to reconsider those and think about not
7 only how the framework might be changed, but what
8 are some of those important leading indicators that
9 you need to know, so that you have confidence that
10 you know about potential hotspots or concerns with
11 schools, yeah.

12 Okay. So in terms of the revisions, we --
13 especially in -- for that issue of clarity, you
14 know, we really will be using that lens on the
15 organizational framework; because the feedback that
16 we got is that's one where there's just a lot of
17 uncertainty all around in terms of how are those
18 measures evaluated and what exactly are the criteria
19 and the evidence used. We'll talk a lot about that
20 this morning.

21 "7" goes back to accountability plan, you
22 know, clear policies and procedures, so that when
23 you come to renewal or even high-stakes reviews, you
24 have a clear set of interventions and also bases for
25 decisions.

1 We are going to hold off on the SAM
2 schools and an alternative framework. We discussed
3 last time that that really makes sense as a Phase 2.
4 We'll definitely be thinking about that. And when
5 we talk about some of the components of the academic
6 and making sure that they fairly evaluate schools,
7 we will be thinking about that; but I think it is
8 definitely a Phase 2 to think about once you have a
9 strong framework and a process in place, is there
10 then the necessity to do something additionally for
11 SAM schools. And I think that'll be an important
12 conversation.

13 And then, finally, we hope that the
14 clarity, the revised framework, the -- a new sort of
15 accountability plan that puts it all in perspective
16 will also include sort of annual reports for
17 schools; but, also, probably periodic reports for
18 the Commission that you know that you will
19 consistently get on a timely basis.

20 So that'll be, again, sort of a Part 2
21 after the trial run, looking to see, you know, what
22 are the things that would make sense to be in a
23 school report, versus a Commission report.

24 And so at various times, we will ask you
25 to prioritize. And that's why we'll be asking, kind

1 of thinking ahead, towards, you know, what are the
2 things that you need for monitoring.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: A lot -- a lot of
4 objectives.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: It's a lot.

6 THE CHAIR: It is.

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. So anything else
8 on that? Because I'm going to launch into sort of
9 what we heard from schools.

10 Okay.

11 So it was a really valuable exercise and
12 engagement with the schools. Again, I think we
13 spoke to seven or eight schools and then the
14 additional stakeholders. They were very gracious in
15 giving us time and really talking through the
16 framework, but, also, their feedback on how that
17 framework is used and sort of their perspective.
18 And so we had great conversations, I have to say.
19 It was very useful.

20 The first thing that was really notable is
21 that very few of them had actual feedback or
22 requests or suggestions in terms of changing
23 indicators. So, you know, for the most part, they
24 seemed -- you know, here and there, there would be a
25 little bit -- and I'm not talking about the schools,

1 because they all have their own school-specific
2 goals. But you have a very straightforward -- they,
3 for the most part, had nothing to suggest in terms
4 of changes to the financial or the organizational,
5 you know, as written, the measures, the academic.

6 They -- you know, they had things that
7 they prioritized over others. But in terms of the
8 content of the framework, it was interesting. They
9 wanted immediately more to talk about what we group
10 under that accountability plan, how the information
11 is collected, who collects it, how it is used, the
12 clarity of that. So we had some really great
13 conversations with them in terms of that.

14 So, really, the rest of the list are sort
15 of details or specific requests. And I'd like to
16 think of it is -- a lot of it was sort of -- I think
17 of it as requests. There are things that they would
18 like to have clarified or toned [ph] up.

19 So the first that we have on the list is a
20 request for more clarity and guidance on
21 mission-specific goals.

22 So many of them just expressed the sort
23 of -- or related the experience that when they went
24 in, they weren't quite sure what they should be
25 bringing as a proposed mission-specific goal, and

1 that they would just appreciate sort of guidance or
2 some pre-direction on how to think that through to
3 come to those meetings. So I think that will settle
4 in nice with the work that we'll be doing.

5 There was definitely a concern -- and I
6 think this will be important as we talk through the
7 organizational framework today -- that there was
8 more of a -- that there was -- they often said an
9 over-focus on compliance, and that -- that they
10 would be interested in some support, as well, you
11 know.

12 So that, I think, was more of a context of
13 a relationship, you know, their experience that many
14 of them said, "We're having to report this. We're
15 having to report to many different bureaus, to
16 different place, and we feel like we're constantly
17 just on compliance." and would love to have -- now,
18 it was interesting, though, when we dug in a little
19 bit. Like, are there specific technical assistance
20 or support that you would like, there was some
21 mention of finance. But I don't know that -- that's
22 probably --

23 THE CHAIR: There's not a lot of
24 specifics.

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: -- worth follow-up

1 conversation. Yeah. Yeah.

2 Let's see. So then desire for more
3 streamlined data submission/collection process.
4 Almost all of them said this. I think that there's
5 an acknowledgment, and I think everybody knows, and
6 Katie has mentioned this, as well, that there are
7 different departments that are requiring them to --
8 where they are required to -- to be submitting data
9 to many places.

10 I'm not sure that we can do much about --
11 you know, they are required to submit what they can
12 require. Some things that may help them are time
13 lines, again, sort of a clarity about who, where,
14 when, how that will be used together, and some trust
15 on their part that there's going to be coordination
16 with those data.

17 THE CHAIR: Well -- and I think that's
18 coming with better communication and with NMDASH and
19 things like that.

20 MS. POULOS: I mean, we hope, right?

21 THE CHAIR: Right.

22 MS. POULOS: And part of the work that --
23 I think part of the work that was included in the
24 work that we sent to Public Impact on our
25 recommendations was some of the identification,

1 like, "This reporting should come from X bureau."

2 THE CHAIR: Right. Right.

3 MS. POULOS: And it's still going to take
4 work. And I'm probably going to lean on you guys
5 and say, "I need your support for you to go tell
6 so-and-so."

7 THE CHAIR: Because that's been the
8 difficulty, that when we're waiting for this
9 division to give us the information, it can be
10 "Nevuary," you know; so...

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And I think the schools,
12 really --

13 THE CHAIR: Absolutely. And we get caught
14 up here. And we forget that it's the school that's
15 really sitting there saying, "Wait a minute.
16 They're going to ding us for this." And they can't
17 even get the information. So what's going on here?
18 And that's -- you know, and it's -- you know, we're
19 a small state.

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes.

21 THE CHAIR: And I don't know if that is
22 good or bad in terms of there's less staff. I don't
23 know. But it's a bureaucracy. I mean, that's the
24 bottom line, you know. And the kids get kind of
25 caught in the middle of it all.

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think it's --
2 I don't know. Maybe this is on here, and I wasn't
3 paying attention. But I think there's some -- what
4 word do I want to use? -- confusion, maybe, or
5 uncertainty about what is the job of the CSD, not
6 from me so much as from -- from the charter schools;
7 because a number of times when schools have been in
8 trouble, they'll say, "Well -- but CSD didn't help
9 us."

10 And I'm not sure. I don't know the answer
11 to this. What is CSD's -- are you supposed to help
12 you run the school, or are you saying, "I'm opening
13 this charter because I'm able to do a better job
14 of -- whatever-ing -- than the public school, the
15 traditional public schools."

16 So I think that's why sometimes they're
17 confused -- at least that's the impression I get
18 when they come. But, remember, when they're coming,
19 they're usually a problem. So I don't know that
20 everyone says that. I could not -- I wouldn't say
21 that. But I just think maybe somewhere in this
22 thing, that might be clarified, if, actually, we
23 know.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And -- I'm sorry. Go
25 ahead.

1 THE CHAIR: you know -- and I think you're
2 right, that the -- you know, schools think that
3 they're doing additional stuff that a traditional
4 school may not be. And I don't think that's
5 necessarily true with -- you know, the SPAN [ph] and
6 ELL and all that, you know; everyone's doing that.

7 There may be a bit, because they've got
8 the contract and so on. So there may be a touch
9 that is extra. But I think they feel -- and you're
10 right. I think they feel that they've got this
11 onerous burden that a traditional school does. I
12 think it's more, honestly, staffing, that a
13 traditional school district just has a lot more
14 support staff that can do that reporting out, as
15 opposed to the head administrator, who is the data
16 person, the head of the cafeteria and all of that.

17 So that's -- I think that's where that
18 burden is felt. It's, like, 'Oh, my gosh. This is
19 just one more thing that you're asking me to do, and
20 no schools have...' -- and that's true. That's the
21 nature of, you know, unfortunately, charters, that
22 the flexibility, really, is that you get to do a
23 whole lot more.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, I hope that
25 you'll --

1 THE CHAIR: That's really what it is.

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. So in the
3 morning's engagement, when we're walking through the
4 organizational, you'll see that we really are trying
5 to address this; because the work -- the pre-work
6 that has been done is starting to try to pull these
7 apart, what -- not only what is the evidence,
8 where -- which are the departments, what are the
9 sources, that'll be -- go with this.

10 THE CHAIR: Right.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And then, hopefully,
12 when that's more clear to schools, perhaps,
13 hopefully, an accountability plan with sort of a
14 time line, we're hoping that clarity will go to a
15 certain point. They're still going to have to
16 report all this; but if we can, as much as possible,
17 avoid duplication. Clarity goes a certain way
18 towards the frustration of, "Why am I having to put
19 this all in?"

20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I think, though,
21 there's another piece in this that is the
22 bureaucracy. Everybody owns their own data up here.
23 I found that working in human service programs,
24 where the feds wanted certain data, and people in
25 central office wanted certain data, and other

1 agencies that you worked with -- and nobody wanted
2 to stop and look at where they were overlapping and
3 where they could share it.

4 And I think there's another piece of this
5 as we get down into a further process, that this
6 group needs to just sit down with PED folks and say,
7 "What are you collecting and why, and how can we get
8 it without making them give it to us again?"

9 And when I ran county welfare offices, and
10 I get a report, "So-and-so in Santa Fe wants you to
11 stop everything and provide this information," or,
12 "Somebody in D.C. wants it," my first question was
13 always, "What do they want it for?" Because they
14 didn't always understand how an office works and
15 what I would have to do to gather -- and maybe I had
16 another way to tell them exactly what they needed
17 that I already had, or somebody else already had.

18 And I think that's the step that's missing
19 here. Everybody isn't claiming what they need it
20 for, just, "Give it to me." So I think that's a
21 step we need to take outside of this group here.

22 MS. POULOS: And I think, as part of the
23 process on the development of that initial draft, my
24 team actually met with every bureau who would take
25 the time to meet with us, which was not every

1 bureau.

2 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: See, that's -- the
3 Commission -- the Commission can ask the Secretary
4 and make it formal enough that if we don't get it,
5 fine. But then we have something to show. We ask,
6 as a Commission in the State constitution, and --
7 you know what I'm saying? If we use that piece --

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And coordinate with
9 Katie to try to get --

10 THE CHAIR: Try to be respectful and not
11 step on the toes of those divisions.

12 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And say, "We're
13 not trying to do anything but find out what it is
14 you're collecting and what you're using it for and
15 what maybe we could use it for," not asking them to
16 do anything extra, other than to take some time with
17 us; but if we maybe go through the very, very
18 official, official process.

19 MS. POULOS: Well -- and, again, we did it
20 with most. There were only a few. And even with
21 those few, I knew what else to get. I knew what
22 they're getting. So that is reflected in the longer
23 version, not necessarily --

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And I think it makes
25 sense to have that be a coordinated effort.

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But, Katie, we
2 don't always know it. And I'm the one who gets lots
3 of phone calls, because of all the schools in my
4 district. And I do my best, having been a good
5 bureaucrat for years, to explain this.

6 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So I think you'll be
7 really happy -- I don't want to jump ahead into
8 Tim's organizational. But we really are trying to
9 map that out so that it's clear for everybody, for
10 each indicator, what other departments are involved,
11 what other -- where do relationships need to be in
12 place or forged. So we'll have lots of --

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Yeah. And the biggest
14 challenge will be -- and the work that needs to
15 happen, probably, today -- is it's probably too big.
16 Like, I think the intent was, like, what's the --
17 what's the range of things that could be important
18 to track, and how would we actually track them in a
19 clear way?

20 But, like, we probably need to, like,
21 reign that in a little bit for the schools' sake,
22 for the Department's sake, for your sake. I mean,
23 so that's something we [inaudible] today.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And make sure we can dig
25 into that. The last two that's on the agenda -- the

1 last two pieces of feedback we heard pretty
2 consistently was the desire for more timely
3 feedback. I think that hopefully, that will be a
4 result of clarifying the systems and sort of
5 streamlining the framework.

6 And then, finally, request for more
7 clarity about the site visits, sort of what to do to
8 prepare for them, that sort of thing.

9 So much of this is requests for clarity,
10 streamlined process, and, in some sense, sort of
11 more communication.

12 So we are -- yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Observation,
14 having lived it.

15 Many of the charters in the State of New
16 Mexico are formed in the larger districts, not in
17 the smaller districts. The folks who establish
18 these charters, many of them are products of the
19 larger districts.

20 Knowledge of the work that is done in the
21 small districts across the state might clarify;
22 because we are asking for no more accountability
23 from a charter, because what they're doing is
24 creating a small district. When you say "charter,"
25 and when you create a small district, your

1 accountability level for each individual rises.
2 There is no support staff like you have in a big
3 district.

4 So the experience of the small districts,
5 anyone who starts a charter may benefit from a part
6 of the training for -- before -- if you're going to
7 create a charter, listening. Because working in
8 small districts and working in charters, I think the
9 thing that really prepared me and helped me
10 understand, all of the things we've been talking
11 about are the things that the traditional school
12 districts face in the small districts.

13 It's -- it's that lack of clarity of who
14 gets this data, or how is this data used, or I've
15 presented it twice, or who do I talk with?

16 And when you're in a small district, you
17 have to be a stronger self-advocator than you have
18 to be in a large district; unless you're the
19 superintendent of that district, and then you have
20 to orchestrate those people.

21 But I don't see state charters being very
22 much different from small districts. And there are
23 some excellent superintendents and school boards who
24 run small districts, who -- who meet with these same
25 difficulties with interactions with PED that might

1 be valuable to people to help clarify.

2 That's an observation.

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Wonderful. I'm putting
4 that on our parking lot for Phase 2. One thing that
5 I certainly hope is that, as the framework is
6 revised, the accountability plan is set in place,
7 you know, there's more clarity and streamline. I
8 hope that clears the way, then, for more support.

9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yeah, for more
10 clarity. I really believe that.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And a conversation, What
12 are the supports that would make sense? But I think
13 that we need to deal with that -- the issues.

14 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I think as we go
15 through the first parts of it, that will clarify.
16 That's just an observation.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I hope it will. I
19 think it will.

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Anything else on that?
21 So that was -- okay.

22 The -- okay. Before we, again, dive into
23 the organizational, we thought it was -- would be
24 useful just to review our larger project time line.
25 So, again, you have that here in very teeny-tiny

1 print.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's in the
3 packet.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: It is, yes.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Is it in the back
6 towards?

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So our main -- but we'll
8 be talking a lot about potential revisions to the
9 framework today and tomorrow. But, again, our main
10 objective is to leave this meeting with the list of
11 indicators to test in the trial run.

12 We are hoping that that takes a little bit
13 of the pressure off in terms of having to make a
14 final -- you know, we are not trying to make a final
15 decision about a revised framework. We are trying
16 to identify the set of indicators and measures that
17 has the most agreement.

18 It may be that in some cases, there is not
19 agreement on final. We may be able to test two
20 options, or -- you know, we'd like to get as much to
21 a final. But we -- we want you to be able to
22 engage. We want to hear everybody's input, so that
23 we can really then go and test a set of indicators.

24 So over the next two months, September and
25 October, we would actually be doing the trial run to

1 say, "Okay. With these indicators, what are the
2 results that we get? How do they work together? Do
3 some of them contradict or repeat -- you know, are
4 they duplicative"; so that what you're looking at
5 is, okay, here is the set of indicators, the full
6 framework that we would look at annually and at
7 renewal. Is this what we need? Does it tell us
8 what we need to know?

9 We'll test a roll-up, as well. Is that
10 telling you what you need to know? Is it
11 actionable? Is it giving you what you need?

12 So that will be -- you know, fall, and
13 into that October-November, that will be -- we'll be
14 doing a lot of work pulling that together, bringing
15 that back to you, so that you, again, are looking at
16 that, Here are the results. Is it meeting our
17 needs?

18 Then we really will be looking at what is
19 the accountability plan that fits with that? So not
20 only here are the results. How do we use them?

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Feels like this
22 is the dumbest question. When you say "trial run,"
23 who's running this trial? I mean, are three schools
24 trying it? Or what does that mean?

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So I can speak more to

1 the academic piece. What we will be doing is
2 actually pulling the academic data for all of your
3 schools. Now, there will be some limitations,
4 probably, on the supplemental and mission-specific,
5 if some of that is collectible or not. But we will
6 be -- so, for example, if you decide that you want,
7 you know, to use the A-through-F in a certain way
8 and subgroup performance in certain ways, we will
9 actually run that for all of the schools and show
10 you.

11 "So here's the portfolio view across all
12 of these indicators on how the schools are doing.
13 Does this look right to you?"

14 So we'll be testing a lot of things. Are
15 the measures right? Are the indicators -- you know,
16 are they right? Are the targets that we're using
17 correct?

18 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Just in September and
19 October, you're going to --

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: We'll be doing that
21 September and October. We'll be --

22 MR. TIM FIELD: And we'll also be
23 engaging, I think, Katie and her team, as well.
24 You'll assume these data is coming from them,
25 obviously.

1 And org side is a little different. So
2 that's probably the academic. So the schools won't
3 see that, in answer to your question. I don't think
4 the schools -- we're going to -- at some point, the
5 schools are a part of the feedback; but we're not
6 going to be harassing schools for that.

7 THE CHAIR: That's smart -- that's my
8 question. If schools are part of the feedback, when
9 are they getting this information, so that -- so
10 that they can provide feedback?

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. So our plan is
12 that this would be really focused with the
13 Commission through the fall. You would see the
14 trial run; you would then have to have another
15 review of that, and there would be another
16 conversation, what revisions, what changes, what
17 worked, what didn't.

18 And I have gone through this process
19 many -- about 15 times in the past four years. And
20 it is a very useful thing. Probably most of what
21 you see will come out, "Yes, that tells us
22 what..." -- there will be a couple of changes.
23 There will probably be some tweaks, where you say,
24 "That's not really what we wanted, so we want to
25 change this."

1 At that point, we would then produce some
2 sample reports. You'll need to decide whether
3 you're actually wanting to give schools, "This is
4 your school"; that's a much higher level. Or you
5 want to provide a sample, sort of an unnamed school
6 or sort of a mock report thing: "These are the
7 indicators. Here's the revised framework that we're
8 considering. This is what the performance report
9 would look like. Give us your feedback."

10 And schools very often are willing to
11 engage with that. Now, I will say often, they don't
12 really care to tell us theirs. But they do want to
13 know. What is it? How are you holding me
14 accountable? You know, what does it mean if I, you
15 know, wind up here in this chart?

16 Or -- and those are the conversations you
17 would then be having with them with actual measures,
18 metrics. And, again, some authorizers have decided,
19 Yes, we're going to run reports for the schools and
20 actually say, "Here are your results on this
21 framework. Let's talk."

22 And then -- so in terms of sort of
23 opportunities for revisions, after the trial run, I
24 would hope that you all would look and, say,
25 consider, Do we want revisions? There would then be

1 school and other stakeholder feedback in the spring.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: December-February time
3 frame.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And then you would,
5 hopefully, again, come together as a Commission,
6 consider that feedback and decide what the final
7 framework would be.

8 THE CHAIR: Okay. Because I think -- you
9 know, personally, I think instead of just asking the
10 schools for feedback, I think it would behoove us to
11 go out there and do another, you know --

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Listening?

13 THE CHAIR: Yeah. Because I think we
14 would engage -- I think it would be great if the
15 schools had their own individual reports at a -- you
16 know, in a really perfect world, it would be great
17 to be able to sit down with every individual school,
18 one-on-one, and, say, "Look-it. This is -- now give
19 us your feedback."

20 That's not as much reality. But I think
21 prior to the meeting, it would be great if the
22 school actually saw what -- you know, how it truly
23 did impact them.

24 At an input hearing, we're not going to be
25 able to dig into the roots of that individual

1 school, specifically. But they can give us, you
2 know, general feedback as to what they feel the
3 overall impact would be, and we can take that.

4 But I think it's -- 'cause I think you're
5 right. I think if we just ask schools for feedback,
6 it's -- you know, it's at the bottom of the pile for
7 their to-do list. But if we make the effort to go
8 out to the schools, I think they feel engaged a
9 little bit more; because it's not just this, you
10 know, anonymous, in a way, e-mail that came out.
11 This is, "Here. We really do..." -- you know,
12 because they send it back and it's, like, "Oh, how
13 do we know that they're even going to look at this
14 e-mail?"

15 But if we're out there one-on-one with
16 them, it's a -- you know, we're showing that we are
17 listening.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: We've done webinars,
19 also. So you may want to offer a variety of
20 opportunities. So we've done webinars, you know, on
21 separate -- academic, financial, organizational.
22 Because they may have different folks who would be
23 engaged in the different parts. So that's a very
24 good idea.

25 THE CHAIR: Right.

1 MR. TIM FIELD: So reconsider, yeah,
2 surveys, webinars, [inaudible]. It's that winter
3 time frame.

4 We then make another round of revisions.
5 You would look at the results from the feedback.

6 I think hard to understand is we're -- our
7 plan then is that there be sample reports. We
8 have -- "Okay. We've got the feedback. Here are
9 the reports. This is it."

10 So in the spring -- now, it's based on
11 '16-'17 data. But this is not yet -- you know, this
12 isn't going to inform decisions quite yet. This is
13 kind of like this Version 1.0. They're going to get
14 their reports. They're going to probably have more
15 reactions to it, some more thoughts.

16 So it's not on here; but I'm sure you're
17 going to get some feedback. But then the plan is,
18 really, next fall, 2018, that you're producing
19 reports based on 2017-'18 data. And that's going to
20 start being used for your accountability model.
21 Your plan is then in place, and these new reports
22 are being used for decisions.

23 So that's -- that's really how we've -- we
24 think it can work.

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And we didn't check --

1 obviously, there's a whole contra- -- you know, as
2 your contracts are rolling, I know that that's
3 always a consideration. We have a new framework;
4 but how -- that's why I think the annual reporting,
5 the annual school reports, your review against a
6 framework, even if schools are slowly having to
7 transition into it, you're setting a clear
8 communication:

9 "These are our performance expectations.
10 This is what we consider to be, you know,
11 successful. These are schools that we're going to
12 want to" -- you're being very clear there will be no
13 surprises.

14 So even if they're not up for renewal for
15 three, four years, they're very clear whether, you
16 know, they would be potentially having a
17 revocation -- you know, a non-renewal consideration
18 or not.

19 So we know that there is a rolling in and
20 there's the whole contractual issue. But I think
21 that the point of setting the expectations and
22 consistent expectations is very valuable, and then
23 probably would be easier, I would think, during
24 contract negotiations, because you've been very
25 clear for a number of years. "These are our

1 expectations."

2 THE CHAIR: Right.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: So just a couple of more
4 slides for the organizational framework, and I'll
5 try to be quick for these last couple.

6 So one is -- I mean, I think you've
7 mentioned this. [Inaudible.] One is just like to
8 just like put a pin in this concept of the
9 performance framework, versus the accountability
10 plan or accountability model.

11 The way we think about it is the framework
12 establishes the standards. It clarifies how
13 standards are measured. And it also really
14 clarifies, you know, what data is collected, and
15 what gets into the what plan. I mean, that's the
16 framework. That's kind of the focus of today, and
17 it's been the focus so far of our engagement.

18 The accountability plan, or model,
19 describes how those standards will be applied to
20 evaluate school performance, the consequences in
21 authorizer interventions and how decisions are made
22 against those standards.

23 So although it makes sense to kind of -- I
24 think it can make sense to kind of chunk these out,
25 schools are going to care about both of those.

1 They're going to -- the standards aren't going to
2 mean too much. They're going to mean something; but
3 they're really going to want to know how those
4 standards are applied. That's another reason why
5 going out to the schools after there's been more
6 work on the accountability plan will be important.

7 Because they're going to be, like, "All
8 right. I don't care how you score me. What are you
9 going to do once you..." -- like, so -- so that's
10 just something --

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And sometimes -- and
12 we'll also work with you about how you want this
13 formatted? How this would live in terms of
14 documents. Because sometimes this is one very large
15 document that authorizers have. It has the
16 framework indicators and then rolls right into here
17 is what -- here is what the actions are. And
18 sometimes they're actually two distinct.

19 So there's a framework document that is
20 just the indicators, the -- you know. And that's
21 separate from a sort of -- what is called various
22 things, but has the plan. What are the
23 interventions? What are the consequences? What is
24 the timing? What is that?

25 So, you know, you'll decide what works

1 best for you in terms of how to present it. But I
2 think having both of these parts, whether it's one
3 document or two, very clear, you know, schools know
4 what it is, they understand what's in it, will be
5 really valuable.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm raising my
8 hand; so I'm not -- I'm trying.

9 Two questions, I think. One is when we're
10 talking about clarifying about what data will be
11 collected, I think we've had that issue about how
12 that data gets to CSD; not to me, personally.

13 Because they'll say, "Oh, yeah.
14 75 percent of our children exceeded" -- whatever we
15 said. But we don't really see the little numbers
16 that go with that. So I don't know if that's
17 included in that.

18 And the other thing is -- and, Katie,
19 probably, I need your answer on this -- is so when
20 they -- all the charters are also doing New Mexico
21 DASH; is that right? I know the --

22 MS. POULOS: Not all.

23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But they haven't
24 quite all done that yet.

25 MS. POULOS: No. So our team is actually.

1 That's where Icela is today. And I was out there
2 with them yesterday doing the training.

3 We encouraged charters that had -- we
4 invited all charters. We encouraged charters that
5 had earned a "C" or lower letter grade. We highly
6 encouraged -- so we encouraged charters that had a
7 "C." We highly encouraged charters that had "D"s
8 and "F"s to attend the training to do NMDASH and to
9 use that for their planning process.

10 So, no, not all charters are required to
11 do. Not even all "D" and "F" charters are required
12 to, because you still have your improvement plan
13 that you have approved. We haven't had a discussion
14 about do we want to adopt DASH; but we are
15 encouraging.

16 THE CHAIR: Right. Because when -- and I
17 forget her name.

18 MS. POULOS: Elizabeth.

19 THE CHAIR: When Elizabeth came, when
20 NMDASH was starting, charters weren't in that early
21 conversation.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right.

23 THE CHAIR: So it wasn't required. But I
24 think -- you know, personally, I just think it would
25 be easier if they could -- you know, why use our

1 improvement plan thing? If it's already in the
2 DASH, then that should -- that should take -- and
3 that does take them through the steps of -- so why
4 not do it?

5 MS. POULOS: Feedback, also, which is
6 really nice.

7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That was
8 actually my -- what I was trying to get clarified.
9 Because if you are doing New Mexico DASH, what it
10 sounded like to me when Elizabeth was presenting it,
11 is that we are now, in a sense, making traditional
12 public schools do what we're requiring charter
13 schools to do, which is to make an improvement plan
14 along the way, not at the end of the year.

15 THE CHAIR: Well, the traditional schools
16 were already required to do an improvement plan
17 with --

18 MS. POULOS: "An educational plan for
19 student success."

20 THE CHAIR: Exactly. Whatever. It
21 just -- it's in DASH. But we weren't asking the
22 charters to do something different than --
23 traditional schools have to do an improvement plan.

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right. But from
25 what -- this is my interpretation; I'm not sure this

1 is exactly what was presented. But my
2 interpretation was it was more of an ongoing kind of
3 plan.

4 MS. POULOS: Continuous.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So this wasn't
6 working. And only the three of us would be talking
7 about our fourth-grade class, because that's the one
8 having the problem. And these two are talking about
9 the eighth-grade thing. So it was a little bit more
10 timely and with teacher input.

11 I don't know who's doing the EPSS.
12 Honestly, I don't know who does that.

13 MS. POULOS: Nobody does that. We have
14 not required charters to do it. Three years ago --
15 I don't know when it was -- your charters law said,
16 "We don't want to do it," even though all
17 traditional public schools have to do it. And
18 somebody caved and said, "Fine. We'll call your
19 performance framework your EPSS." So we have not --

20 THE CHAIR: I can't own that.

21 MS. POULOS: I think it's a fault of us.
22 Right. And I do, I think it's a fault, because then
23 charter schools were told they didn't have to have
24 continuous improvement plans. And we've now seen
25 the results of that.

1 MR. TIM FIELD: And we'll see. I mean,
2 you know, NMDASH is in our organizational framework;
3 right?

4 MS. POULOS: It is.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: It is one of the
6 indicators. So that's a good question that will
7 come up in a little bit here. Like, should that be
8 an indicator? So where you're saying, "Yes, we
9 think a good strong organization that's -- and
10 there's a criteria, C-or-below -- should be using
11 that tool."

12 THE CHAIR: Right.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: And is that statute? No.
14 But we're going to get into this question --

15 THE CHAIR: We could make it policy.
16 Absolutely.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: Make it policy, yes. So
18 that's the stuff we're going to get into in a second
19 here with the organizational framework. That's just
20 one example of many. But that could be a criteria
21 statement.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: My brain just
23 gets full. And then I hear all these words, and
24 then I can't remember who's doing what when. You
25 know what I mean? It's, like, okay.

1 MR. TIM FIELD: I think it's -- we're
2 going to dive into the organizational framework. A
3 note. We're scheduled -- we're more or less on
4 time, 9:45 to -- I think it's 11:30. We're going to
5 have a break in between. So it could be a break
6 right now? Are we all doing all right? Or do you
7 want to just jump in? But we are -- we do need a
8 break sometime between now and 11:30.

9 So we feel like we're ready? Or do you
10 want to take a few minutes, or however you --

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Another
12 half-hour or so?

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Probably keep
14 going until somebody says, "I need to take a break."
15 And it will come; but --

16 MR. TIM FIELD: All right. So --

17 THE CHAIR: Or we'll just get up and
18 leave.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: So wait on those for a
20 second. But we are going to have -- in this
21 handout -- this has the pre-read. So this version,
22 which you have, your binded materials -- and who had
23 a chance to review the pre-read?

24 (Show of hands.)

25 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I read it.

1 Whether that's a review or not, until you have a
2 discussion, it's very hard for me not to -- or for
3 me to figure out what is it we're really looking at,
4 just because it's words until we all flesh it out.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: Yeah. And that's kind
6 of -- we weren't approaching this assuming you folks
7 are ready to, like, you know, fully engage what we
8 send you. But hopefully, you got some flavor of
9 what's in here.

10 The slides really, more or less, fall --
11 follow this. So, again, I'll walk through them.

12 But pretty much, I think you can actually
13 follow along -- I would say follow along actually
14 with your packet is probably the best way to
15 approach this for now. I'll let you know if we want
16 to look at something else.

17 So the first thing to highlight -- and
18 this is on -- I'm looking at this page right here;
19 it's on the screen -- are kind of goals or
20 objectives for revisions. And this is what we're
21 always setting out to do.

22 This partly comes, really, from the
23 overall objectives that we looked at before. But
24 one is to clarify criteria and data sources for
25 evaluating indicators and to prioritize indicators

1 that are most critical to the Commission.

2 To ensure all measures can be reliably and
3 accurately collected;

4 And to establish clarity about the process
5 and time line for collecting data;

6 And to streamline data collection across
7 departments.

8 We've already heard several comments about
9 this kind of need. And Katie is working to -- how
10 do we get more coordination around data sharing?
11 And that's especially important to the
12 organizational framework.

13 Comments there before we move on?

14 So I think what's really important, these
15 next three bullets, "Summary of planned changes" is
16 really going to frame how we attack the
17 organizational framework.

18 This is what we've kind of proposed and
19 have done and it is reflected in this handout. One
20 is that we -- there was a little work done -- and we
21 worked very closely with Katie on this, in getting
22 her input -- is looking at the language around the
23 different -- like, meeting standard, not meeting
24 standard, or working to meet standard or falls far
25 below.

1 We looked at that, some suggested
2 revisions as to how we kind of define these
3 categories and how they relate to indicators in the
4 framework. So that's one thing that we're going to
5 look at; I think that'll be a quick review.

6 Second -- and this is the meat of what
7 we're discussing today -- is modifying the
8 indicators. And we're going to, in a second, define
9 some of these terms. But modifying the indicators
10 so that there are very clear criteria statements
11 that say, "If this is the indicator, if, like, is
12 the school serving special education students
13 well -- that's the indicator; that's one of the
14 indicators -- what are the five criteria that PED
15 and PEC is looking at to say, yes, they are. They
16 are serving special education students well," and
17 get very specific about that.

18 And I think the earlier framework is kind
19 of in there. It's not always as clear as it can be.
20 I think the work here is how do you have really
21 clear statements. And that's what a good chunk of
22 today is about, is, like, you know, do we have the
23 right criteria statements?

24 The third piece, which we've started to
25 do -- and there's a kind of a snapshot of what it

1 looks like -- is then, okay. So if one of the
2 criteria statements for special education students
3 is, you know, are you meeting the Special Education
4 Bureau's compliance report -- I don't know if that's
5 the right language -- well, that comes out annually.
6 The Special Ed Bureau does it, and they submit it
7 to -- you know, actually, so there's clarity about
8 how that's being evaluated.

9 Another one in there is, like, is the
10 school properly staffed to serve special education
11 students?

12 So that's going to be based on the site
13 visit, where we're looking at -- and it's, like,
14 being very clear about how we're going to measure
15 that. So there's no question about what is being
16 evaluated and how it's being evaluated. So that's
17 No. 3.

18 So those are the three things that are the
19 focus of the organizational framework revisions. I
20 personally feel like that this seems solid. It
21 makes sense. I think it's [audible] not a whole lot
22 of input. I think where there's great work to be
23 done near today is, again, I think we probably have
24 cast a very broad net of what could be those
25 criteria statements. There's a lot of criteria

1 statements. I think we found -- we counted them --
2 like --

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: 49.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: Something like -- a very
5 large number. And the question is, like, is that
6 the right -- you know, do we need to -- and we're
7 going to be asking your opinion on like, no, let's
8 get rid of this one, or, hey, what's -- and this is
9 a real priority for me.

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Or we forgot one.

11 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes. Or why aren't we
12 looking at something that's not on here?

13 So questions on that before we walk
14 through each of these a little bit.

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And the point about
16 No. 3 that -- you know, Point No. 3, which is --
17 we're going to be focused on the criteria today.
18 We're not going to get so much into 3, not because
19 we don't think it's incredibly important, because
20 that is really going to answer, I think, many of the
21 school concerns. Where is this -- Who's talking?
22 And your concerns: What are the departments that
23 are involved?

24 But we want to get the criteria set down.
25 And then you'll be -- the next phase would be you

1 would be getting more expanded. Okay. Here are the
2 departments. Here is the timing. And that all --

3 MR. TIM FIELD: And that's the focus
4 that's on the handout of the trial run. So part of
5 this is, like, when Katie's team is starting to do
6 the work, like, okay, how much evidence would we
7 pull? Well, there's some work -- is that really
8 feasible? Like, is that department going to play
9 ball with us? Or, Is that really measurable? Or,
10 Are we putting too much into the site visit?

11 So I think that's part of the trial run is
12 kind of a way of kicking the tires on, like, yes,
13 these are the right collection of evidence. We
14 collect them. They're reliable. They're not --
15 they're manageable. And that's how the trial run
16 works, frankly.

17 So that. So that first piece about
18 meeting standards. So on this page, what we had
19 here -- what we've got in this first page is the
20 suggested, kind of, language revisions for how
21 "Meets standard," "Working to meet standard," and
22 "Falls far below standard" is revised. This already
23 exists in the current framework. And there are some
24 revisions that are proposed here.

25 I would say -- things that I would

1 highlight in terms of what's different -- take a
2 pause and comment -- is, one, is in the "Meets
3 standard" language, there is -- this, essentially,
4 is saying, as a default, "You're meeting standard,
5 unless there is evidence to the contrary," which
6 wasn't, I don't think, explicit before. So the
7 burden is really on the Commission and the PED to
8 say, "You're not meeting standard."

9 MS. POULOS: And I think it's also about
10 clarifying what the hope is, is we're only -- we're
11 only rating you this way, because we don't currently
12 have evidence. If evidence exists, and it uncovers,
13 that protects us -- if we're sitting in front of a
14 judge -- right? -- and the school is saying, "Well,
15 we shouldn't be revoked, there were no problems,
16 they kept saying we met for year after year after
17 year."

18 And we get to say, "No. We clarified in
19 our language that it wasn't that you weren't -- that
20 you were meeting the standards; it was that we
21 didn't have evidence to demonstrate otherwise."

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And now we do?

23 MS. POULOS: And potentially, now, we do,
24 right?

25 MR. TIM FIELD: Yeah. Maybe you're

1 uncovering special ed compliance issues that go back
2 years or something.

3 The second comment, which gets to the
4 "Working to meet standard" -- and I think the
5 concept here that I interpret is, like, if the
6 school -- there is evidence the school is not
7 meeting the standard, then what is implied here is
8 that there's been this opportunity for the school to
9 submit a Corrective Action Plan, to describe what
10 they're going to do to correct that. And if a
11 school is doing that and is kind of following
12 through with that, they're "Working to meet
13 standard."

14 The "Falling far below" is that they
15 didn't hit it. They're not really taking action to
16 fix it, and it's a repeated offense or repeated
17 [inaudible].

18 But there's language in the statute that
19 it is really incumbent upon the PED to provide
20 written notification; so we're kind of clarifying
21 that. And to whether that's part of the annual
22 framework or some other notification, you know, part
23 of it can be defined in the accountability plan, you
24 know.

25 So a lot of [inaudible] can say, "We write

1 a notice of concern when the school" -- and then,
2 like, if they don't respond, there's a notice of
3 warning; or, this could be an intervention ladder.
4 So that's new. And I think also language in here
5 that really does point -- talks about evidence. So
6 there really is this focus on evidence in this new
7 language.

8 And the last comment is that in the
9 current framework, for each indicator, essentially,
10 the language for "Meeting standard" is modified. So
11 it's, like, for special education, the "Meeting
12 standard" says, you know, "The school meets the
13 standard if it does X and Y and Z and A and B and
14 C."

15 And this new approach, this language
16 doesn't change. What's happening is that each
17 indicator, there are a series of very clear criteria
18 statements.

19 So, essentially, you're kind of
20 simplifying, I think, kind of how these "Meeting
21 standards," "Working to meet standards" is defined,
22 if that makes sense.

23 THE CHAIR: So I guess my question here
24 with the language with the "Falls far below" is, to
25 me, it's saying that you are -- you didn't do the

1 Corrective Action Plan within the 30 days.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Or you didn't
3 implement it.

4 THE CHAIR: Right. I guess I'm -- I guess
5 I'm having difficulty seeing when that -- when that
6 30 days -- because the "Working to meet standards,"
7 we gave you 30 days, and you submitted it.

8 Now "Falls far below," you didn't do it
9 within the 30 days. So I guess I'm having
10 difficulty with the -- when it's this --

11 MS. POULOS: When is the 30 days?

12 THE CHAIR: Right.

13 MS. POULOS: Yeah. I mean, what I --

14 THE CHAIR: You know, I'm trying to wrap
15 myself around how that's -- how that's taking place.

16 MS. POULOS: Yeah. So if we were to take
17 an example. Licensure; right? So they've got an
18 unlicensed teacher, or we went out to the school
19 visit and discovered that they purposely weren't
20 reporting teachers, because they were unlicensed,
21 and they didn't want to get dinged on that; right?
22 Both things that have happened.

23 So we could take the approach that within
24 30 days of that is from the date of that notice,
25 which would come from the Licensure Bureau; right?

1 A licensure discrepancy at 40-, 80- and 120-day
2 reporting, or a notice from the site visit.

3 Or we could take the approach that that
4 30 days is from the time that we finalize the
5 performance framework. The performance framework is
6 finalized. We've said, "Hey, you're out of
7 compliance. You haven't... -- and it maybe happened
8 at the beginning of the school year. We still
9 notified you at the beginning of the school year,
10 and you haven't either corrected that immediate
11 concern, or you haven't told us how you're going to
12 prevent that immediate concern from occurring again
13 next year," which right now is the situation we're
14 in.

15 Every year, every school continues to have
16 licensure discrepancies and not implement a process
17 for getting waivers in a timely manner, making sure
18 they're right, et cetera.

19 So I think there's two approaches, and we
20 would want to clarify which one we take -- right? --
21 is, is it from the date that they are notified of
22 the issue, which will then make this more
23 complicated, because that will be very different,
24 depending on which of the indicators you're talking
25 about; or do we want to take the approach that makes

1 it easier to implement, which is, "We always try to
2 get these finalized by, let's say, September 1st."
3 Our goal this year is October 1st? Some challenges;
4 right? And then they have the 30 days from that
5 date.

6 Or is it -- and actually, probably, we
7 could do a hybrid, right? From the date that
8 anything is part of the site visit, they have the
9 30 days from the site visit, which is currently in
10 your contract. And then anything that's not
11 evaluated as part of the site visit, then they have
12 till the end of the contract.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Definitely I would mention
14 that you see some-- is that you -- there's reasons
15 why that kind of [inaudible] into the publication or
16 the release of the report can make a lot of sense.

17 THE CHAIR: It makes more sense for me.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: Yeah.

19 THE CHAIR: I see it better, and I think
20 it would be far easier for --

21 MR. TIM FIELD: And the only drawback to
22 that is if there's something that's out of
23 compliance -- it's a real serious issue. It's a
24 student safety issue, you know, you could -- you're
25 obviously not going to wait.

1 THE CHAIR: Oh, no. No, there's always
2 that caveat that if it's health and safety issue or
3 whatever, that Katie can always bring those issues
4 to us, you know -- yeah.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: That can be described in
6 your accountability plan. Like, there could be
7 certain things that rise to a level of notice of
8 concern, or some kind of like -- and then you can
9 define that, you know, and that can be something
10 that you can, on a case-by-case -- you know,
11 something that can be in your accountability plan.

12 THE CHAIR: Right. Yeah.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: So maybe we need to modify
14 this to clarify the 30 days and --

15 THE CHAIR: Yeah. Because I think for the
16 schools, that's, also -- I think they're going to
17 have difficulties. "Well, when exactly is this
18 going to be?" Yeah. Yeah.

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I have one question
20 about the end, the "Falls far below." So what if a
21 school gets the notice, does not submit the plan in
22 45 days, but then corrects the issue? As spoken,
23 they would still, even if they correct it, would
24 still be in "Falls far below," because they didn't
25 do it in the time.

1 THE CHAIR: So they didn't do it within
2 the time? Right.

3 MS. POULOS: I kind of like it, because I
4 feel like they're not taking it seriously.

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: To me --

6 THE CHAIR: You know, to me, you know, it
7 is -- you know, this is -- this is what you had. If
8 you didn't do it within --

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Just want to make
10 sure.

11 THE CHAIR: Unless they've got --

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That's good.

13 THE CHAIR: -- an extraordinary
14 circumstance, where something happened at the
15 school, and it's, like, "Look-it," you know. "The
16 school burned down, and we couldn't get it to you,"
17 or -- you know, that -- but I think -- and that's
18 always within our discretion if there's that --

19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If the school
20 floods, yeah. If the school floods.

21 THE CHAIR: You're not going to sit there
22 and say, "No, you should have taken care of this
23 first."

24 But that's where we come in, that we have
25 the ability to -- to give them that leeway. But I

1 think bottom line is they need to know that this is
2 what it is and --

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's
4 accountability. And that's that difference. We're
5 talking about accountability. There's that
6 confusion: Is this accountability or is it support?
7 This is accountability. And every school in the
8 State of New Mexico has that accountability, and it
9 kicks in when you get that formal notice, just what
10 you all are talking about. "You have this long.
11 And it's important, and you better get it done."

12 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: "If there's a
13 legitimate reason it can't get done on time, it's on
14 you to report as soon as you know that issue to
15 request an extension."

16 I mean, when I was running welfare
17 offices, I always had workers who came to me at the
18 end of the month and said, "Well, I really didn't
19 get any of my work finished because I was having a
20 problem at home," or something.

21 And my rule was, "If you came to me the
22 day that problem occurred, we'll talk about it and
23 we'll work our way around it. If you wait until you
24 haven't done anything, sorry, you're accountable."

25 And I think it's the same thing with any

1 of this. If you know you've got a flood, you call
2 and say, "We're flooded."

3 Everybody's got a cell phone now. They
4 don't need to call on the school phone. They can
5 call up here on the cell phone and say, "We're
6 flooded. We can't do it."

7 And that is accountability. If they don't
8 do that, and they're just late, then they're not
9 doing it. That's it.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: So process-wise, thinking
11 about the actual report -- so I can imagine a
12 scenario where -- it actually refers to this target
13 date -- you're collecting your data, and you're
14 sending out to the schools how they've done this
15 framework. There's going to be these issues that
16 you don't know if they're "Working to meet standard"
17 or "Falls far below" until you know how they respond
18 to the deficiencies.

19 Oftentimes, you do see a process where
20 authorizers kind of send out a preliminary -- or
21 "Here's your scores." People can, kind of like,
22 say, "Wait a minute. Here's our Corrective Action
23 Plan."

24 So I can imagine, from the process
25 standpoint, there could be this October 1 kind of

1 preliminary reports are given out to schools. They
2 have another 30 days to, like, whatever, respond, or
3 like that. And then you are finalizing the annual
4 framework that then goes to the world and goes to --

5 THE CHAIR: Right. Because if it was
6 something that could be easily corrected, then it
7 doesn't have to -- and I guess I have some concern
8 with semantics; because they've always -- we've
9 always looked at your first little concern is an
10 Improvement Plan. When you go to Corrective Action
11 Plan, it's a way more serious thing.

12 So I don't know if -- if it's a schooling
13 of the new language, so that schools don't feel
14 like, "Oh, my God, I've got a Corrective Action
15 Plan," that this may be something really serious;
16 but it may be something that's easily fixable.

17 So I don't know if -- I guess I have a
18 concern that they're going to feel that if --
19 because we're labeling it "Corrective Action Plan,"
20 that they're going to think it's a bigger deal. It
21 could be a big deal; but it may not be a big deal.

22 And we've always had that -- those two
23 levels, that you've got this problem. You can do an
24 Improvement Plan to fix it; but now you haven't
25 really fixed it; so now we have to impose a

1 Corrective Action Plan. So that it's been two
2 different levels of concern on our part.

3 So I don't know if that's -- you know, and
4 I'm okay with the terms. But I think for the
5 schools, they may have some --

6 MS. POULOS: And I think -- I mean, I
7 think it would be helpful to have clarity, because
8 we don't have a policy on that; right? And I've
9 always thought of Improvement Plans as that
10 continuous improvement academic piece, and then
11 Corrective Action being, like, "Hey, you've got
12 noncompliance issues."

13 So I think having clarity, whatever way we
14 go, will be helpful.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If the S.T.A.R.S.
17 data that the State submits, when you do your first
18 40 days, what happens is you get a preliminary
19 report back from PED. Every school gets it; every
20 charter, every state school. That gives you an
21 opportunity to review their report; so if you see
22 any errors in what they're reporting, or if you need
23 to go into S.T.A.R.S. and correct codings and do
24 things like that.

25 And you have -- you're given a time frame.

1 And if you don't correct them, I can't think of a
2 school where I've ever worked where we ignored it;
3 because you don't ignore things like that, because
4 then you get into statute problems.

5 THE CHAIR: I can list you --

6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I mean, yeah. But
7 if you have a quality school, even if it's a small
8 school district, and you have three people reviewing
9 data, you're going to get that fixed. And if it's
10 licensure -- that's the one that we always think of
11 first -- you've got to get that taken care of,
12 because if you don't, you are out of statutory
13 compliance, out of Administrative Code.

14 So I think Corrective Action Plan -- I
15 don't have any -- you do have that preliminary time;
16 you have that window you were talking about. And
17 then it's done. And if you don't get it done, then
18 it is Corrective Action Plan.

19 THE CHAIR: I'm just saying for the
20 schools, for their mindset.

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I understand. I
22 agree with you, what's Improvement and what's
23 Corrective Action.

24 MR. TIM FIELDS: The accountability plan,
25 the model will clarify. In the title language, the

1 Corrective Action Plan is going to mean something
2 specific. And an Improvement -- whatever plan
3 you're using, you're going to define [inaudible].

4 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: My problem as a
5 Commissioner is I shouldn't have a problem if the
6 school overreacts because we said it's a Corrective
7 Action Plan. I mean, my job is to see that they're
8 doing it, not that they're going to -- "Oh, I have
9 to do a Corrective Action Plan."

10 That's their problem. I'm serious.

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I agree with you.

12 THE CHAIR: And I'm just saying it's just
13 a -- I have no issue with the term. I think the
14 schools, it's just -- it's incumbent on us, so that
15 the schools are clear, because I think the schools
16 are going to see it in a different manner. And I --
17 but I've got no problem with -- I think it's just
18 part of the education process with the -- with the
19 schools, so that they don't feel that they're at a
20 level of concern --

21 MR. TIM FIELD: Yeah.

22 THE CHAIR: -- that's different than what
23 it had been before.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: [Inaudible.]

25 (Reporter requests clarification.)

1 MR. TIM FIELD: Sorry. So we'll want to
2 address that in the accountability plan, the clarity
3 and language. Sounds like the main change here is
4 going to be around just clarity around that
5 timing --

6 THE CHAIR: Right.

7 MR. TIM FIELD: -- and really tying it to,
8 I think, what will be the release of the framework
9 scores.

10 I'm going to keep us moving. My thinking,
11 actually, is that maybe we can get through, like,
12 clarify what was done for 1, 2, and 3, take a break,
13 and we'll come back and we'll kind of dig in to the
14 exit ticket. This is my thinking.

15 So the next -- three recommendations. The
16 first is revising this language. We've covered
17 that.

18 The second one -- this is really the meat
19 of what we're going to be doing as team here -- is
20 this notion of modifying the indicators -- or,
21 again, we'll clarify the language in a second, what
22 is indicator, what is criteria, what is evidence --
23 and clarifying the criteria or criteria statements
24 for evaluating those indicators.

25 So a few notes, and we'll -- and that's --

1 the big part of the work has been, like, what are
2 these criteria statements? But some high-level
3 about what we've done.

4 One is we've done -- we have added and
5 refined some of the indicators, and within
6 categories. So categories are those five things:
7 Educational plan, financial oversight and reporting.
8 Those categories that are on the -- we'll see them
9 later.

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And they start on Page 3
11 of your bound handout.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Starting on Page 3.
13 Some of those indicators are actually new.
14 There's a few that are actually, like, new. This is
15 a new concept. And some of them are actually --
16 they used to be kind of buried in, like, another
17 indicator. But the thought was, you know what?
18 This is important enough, and there's enough
19 components to that, that it actually deserves its
20 own indicator.

21 So not anything that looks like it's new
22 is actually new in terms of content.

23 Second is that for every indicator, you've
24 got specific criteria statements. Most criteria
25 statements are connected to a legal or contractual

1 obligation of the school.

2 In a different version of this that's a
3 little more messy, we've actually worked with
4 Katie's team to identify what are those statutes.

5 And then some of these really reflect best
6 practices, or, you know, PEC, PED policies, you
7 know. So I think there's a mixture. And the -- the
8 framework can be explicit about that; so...

9 And then the third point here is that
10 we've started working in case -- and we've started
11 the work of connecting criteria statements with
12 specific sources of evidence.

13 Again, that's more the focus of the trial
14 run. We'll show a picture of what it looks like.
15 But that is an important step, because it also helps
16 you kick the tires in the criteria statements. It
17 helps you kind of get more tight about what the
18 criteria needs to be, because you're having to now
19 think, Okay, how would I actually even measure that?
20 What's the evidence I would use?

21 That's what's been happening. That's what
22 we've done to kind of build out the organizational
23 framework.

24 Just to clarify a few concepts. So what
25 we're using right now, I think this will be -- we

1 can modify this language some if you want to. But
2 this will be reflected in our conversation today; it
3 will be reflected in the framework.

4 We're using the word "category," I think,
5 fairly consistently; although, not entirely -- it's
6 called "topics" in some cases -- to refer to those
7 five different -- educational plan, you know,
8 governance and reporting, and -- so there's five
9 different catego- -- within each category, there are
10 several indicators.

11 So, for example, 1.d is, "Is the school
12 protecting the rights of students with special
13 needs?"

14 Each indicator statement may have one or
15 even, like, seven or eight criteria statements.

16 So as an example, again, under Special
17 Education, "The school is properly identifying
18 students with disabilities, maintaining required
19 records, timely completing evaluations and IEP
20 meetings." So that's a criteria statement.

21 So it's then the burden on the PE- -- you
22 know, CSD and PED to, like, what's the evidence to
23 evaluate that criteria?

24 Then the evidence is listed here, as an
25 example. So in this case, how do we measure if

1 they're identifying students and maintaining records
2 as to the annual site visit? And "Filed all its
3 IEPs, Review of RTI SAT documentation, Review of
4 diagnostician reports."

5 So that would be -- and there's some work
6 to, like, clarify those things; but we're trying to
7 get very explicit about how is that criteria
8 statement evaluated.

9 So that's the framing. Again -- and I
10 don't think this is on the screen now. But -- yeah,
11 go ahead.

12 THE CHAIR: I guess -- and maybe I'm
13 digging into the roots of something. But when it
14 says, "School does not deny students the opportunity
15 to enroll because of special education status," how
16 are we going to prove that?

17 MS. POULOS: I mean, that's where we get
18 to some of the evidence. And there's that longer
19 more intense version.

20 So some of them, we did say, "Assurances."
21 I don't think that was one. One is it would be
22 verified based on complaints. So, again, it goes
23 back to what we said at the beginning, which is if
24 it meets -- it doesn't necessarily mean because
25 they're not doing that. It means because we don't

1 have information; right?

2 But we may come on information from
3 complaints from when we go and review their
4 enrollment policies and look and see that they're
5 requesting that information; right? That gives us
6 an indication that maybe they are using it, and
7 we'll tell them that's unacceptable.

8 So it goes to trying to get more clear,
9 but also recognizing there are limits.

10 THE CHAIR: Right.

11 MS. POULOS: But that's why we put that
12 qualifying language there, and still also say
13 complaints, reports, court cases, those types of
14 things, can then bring that information to us.

15 THE CHAIR: Okay.

16 MR. TIM FIELD: Great question. Actually,
17 you'll see -- we'll take a glance at the criteria
18 against evidence. And for that, we mentioned,
19 [inaudible] Informed documentation and complaints.
20 That's the source of evidence. So we're trying to
21 be explicit about how we actually measure that
22 criteria statement.

23 THE CHAIR: Right.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: So what you'll see, then,
25 is -- so, really, we're going to dive into this

1 document in a version of this, to, like, go through
2 these criteria statements.

3 The last thing before we do that is just
4 that -- you know, this piece about sources of
5 evidence, on Page 10, 11, and 12 of your packet,
6 shows -- this is -- Katie has referred to kind of
7 the big -- the monster version of the organizational
8 framework. And this is where we've taken an
9 indicator, identified evidence, and put against it
10 What are the sources of evidence? What is the
11 source? Who collects it? And when is it collected?

12 Now, we're going to have to work through,
13 like, what -- work to make this -- you know, refine
14 this.

15 What is, you know, publicly shared? Or
16 what's on the website -- I don't know if this is
17 what you're going to publish as the framework, all
18 this detail. It probably is something you will let
19 schools have access to; so there's no surprises.
20 But this is the hard, deep work. And this --
21 clarifying this and refining this is the work of the
22 trial run.

23 So we're not going to make this as much of
24 the --

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: You just have a snapshot

1 of one indicator here.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes. 29 indicators.

3 So -- which gets also to the comment about there
4 probably is too much, frankly, in here. And part of
5 this is prioritizing and deciding what doesn't seem
6 necessary or appropriate.

7 So that will be the work of the trial run.
8 And we'll be floating this out further.

9 We're going to turn back to the earlier
10 pages on the indicators and the criteria statements.
11 But we're going to give you a kind of exit ticket,
12 form where you can, like, mark up, cross out, say,
13 "Yes," "No", and, "This is a high priority for me,"
14 when we return from break.

15 So before we go to break, any kind
16 clarifying questions or comments about how we
17 structured this? And we'll give some more
18 directions on the exit ticket, once we come back
19 after break.

20 Great. Can we take ten minutes? Is that
21 enough?

22 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Have a cup of coffee.
23 We need you sharp.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: So it's 10:23 right now,
25 according to my -- so at 10:35, come back from

1 break.

2 (Recess taken, 10:23 a.m. to 10:42 a.m.)

3 MR. TIM FIELD: So I'm going to ask you --
4 we're now going to now focus on one document, more
5 or less; so if you could, like, just for personal
6 feng shui, I'd say, like, put stuff away, because
7 you're going to be working and writing on it. Does
8 anyone not have a pen?

9 I'm going to pass something out. Get your
10 space clean. I'm going to pass --

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We don't need any
12 of this.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Nothing you have in front
14 of you, you really need. We are responsible for all
15 these papers.

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Is it all right if
17 we do it in pencil? I'm much more comfortable in
18 pencil.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes. So this is actually
20 the same document, more or less -- it's the same
21 sort of information, just legal-size, so you have
22 space to write. I think you're good.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: She has the blue
24 version, which is exactly the same. I messed up the
25 blue; and so we reprinted it. You get the good

1 ones.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: The reason is -- we were
3 planning on dividing you up into two groups. We
4 were thinking we had nine Commissioners, and we were
5 going to be up -- I think we're going to see how it
6 is.

7 This may take -- we have an hour -- not
8 even an hour yet. We're going to try to get through
9 this efficiently. We may decide after Page 2, we
10 need to split -- it's not ideal, because there's
11 only five -- that we need to split, and maybe we
12 will, and essentially divide up half-and-half,
13 because we're going to walk through every indicator.

14 So what we're going to do is, in the
15 directions at the top, we're going to ask you to, as
16 we go, complete the right two columns and ask --
17 answer the question of, like, "Should this indicator
18 be included?"

19 So this is -- so if I look at the first
20 one, like, 1.a, should we be asking if the school is
21 complying with the material terms of the approved
22 charter, as defined in the charter contract? So you
23 can kind of say "Yes," "No."

24 And you'll also kind of have to, at the
25 indicator level, decide, is this a high, medium, or

1 low priority? You decide. I don't know have much
2 guidance on what you think. But I think we want to
3 get that input; because it'll help inform -- when
4 we're kind having to, like, prioritize, "This is too
5 much."

6 It also would help -- and we think about
7 what are some of the -- if this is the overall
8 framework, are there kind of quarterly reports? Or
9 what would you want to see even more frequently?

10 So when you think about high priority,
11 think about, like, what's important, and, also, what
12 do you want to maybe have a closer eye on?

13 The other thing I want you to do is, as
14 we're looking at these criteria statements, if
15 there's something you think is, like, "No, this is
16 not appropriate," or, "This is, like -- I don't
17 think -- this doesn't seem necessary," cross it out;
18 just, like, draw it out. And there's obviously
19 space, too, to write ideas about, "I think we should
20 be also tracking this indicator."

21 So we're going to be talking about these.
22 You know, I think we'll try to be efficient; but,
23 like, if there's comments or questions or -- and we
24 can go through it. But I do want everyone to fill
25 out those two right columns. And we'll collect it,

1 and tomorrow, we'll have some additional insights,
2 both from the conversation, but also from what you
3 fill out. Does that make sense?

4 THE CHAIR: It does. I'll just make a
5 comment. I think it's difficult for me to include
6 the second, third, and fourth bullet in 1.a with the
7 mission. To me, it's like two very separate and
8 distinct entities, you know, just from -- you know,
9 for me.

10 I think it's a singular question: Are
11 they meeting the mission?

12 Because, to me, they can be doing 2, 3,
13 and 4, and still not doing, you know, the mission;
14 so that I think it's really important that they do
15 the mission, but also those others. And I think the
16 whole mission can get lost in the second, third, and
17 fourth bullet.

18 MS. POULOS: So it sounds like you're
19 thinking we need to not say, "Is the school
20 implementing material terms, as defined"; but
21 instead, "Is the school implementing mission? Is
22 the school implementing other material terms?"

23 THE CHAIR: Yes. I agree. I'd be more
24 comfortable with -- I think it's easier for me to
25 answer -- because if I answer just "Yes" on that,

1 it's, like, "Yeah, but it's..."

2 MR. TIM FIELD: So consider separating
3 out, you know, the indicators. That's a good thing
4 to put on there. I'm also writing this down.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I mean, to kind
6 of follow up what you were saying, Patty, is that,
7 you know, even the new schools -- or at least one of
8 them -- I remember something like, "We're really
9 preparing our kids for school -- for college."

10 And they're K-5. And I'm not saying
11 that's a bad thing; I'm not. I'm just saying it's a
12 very difficult thing for me to say, "Is their school
13 mission being implemented?"

14 THE CHAIR: I think it's a difficult
15 mission to show in that grade level. I think you're
16 absolutely right. Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And even other
18 ones who have not yet graduated a class, because
19 they were six and other -- you know, and that kind
20 of thing.

21 THE CHAIR: They can show through
22 programming, I think, better, if you're in the upper
23 levels, if you're preparing them to go to college,
24 as opposed to how are you preparing a kindergarten
25 kid to go to college?

1 MR. TIM FIELD: Let's just focus on 1.a.
2 Any other questions? And, again, if -- in terms of
3 time, I want to be sensitive to how much you're --
4 and I want you to write things down. But other
5 questions or overall comments as you're thinking
6 about responding to this first one?

7 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I agree that the
8 last two don't belong -- I'm not as sure that the
9 second one doesn't belong with the mission. I can
10 go either way with that one. But I do think that if
11 they're meeting their educational programs, that is
12 within their mission.

13 MS. POULOS: So this is just if you take a
14 look at the contract. Here's how we did this. We
15 actually -- for that one. All of these are listed
16 under the material terms. And so that's why we had
17 said, "Is the school implementing the material
18 terms?"

19 It's kinds of an all or nothing, right?
20 You must have a "Yes" by every single one to get a
21 "Yes," right?

22 And so that's why they're all grouped
23 together. But if you look at the contract.
24 "Mission," and then there's a bunch of stuff. And
25 then "Educational Program," and then underneath

1 that, "parent-focused terms," "student-focused
2 terms," "teacher-focused terms."

3 So we were trying to get every part of it
4 is what we were trying to.

5 THE CHAIR: Right. Because the
6 educational program, at times, they can meet --
7 we've had schools, like -- what was it? -- two years
8 ago, J. Paul Taylor. They didn't realize that they
9 were supposed to be a dual-language, I think it was.

10 That was in their mission. So they were
11 accomplishing educational programming; but they
12 weren't -- their mission wasn't being focused on.
13 So, you know, to me, their primary responsibility is
14 the mission that they identified for us, and that's
15 why we authorized them.

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that's the
17 whole thing with the -- not experimental -- starts
18 with learning --

19 THE CHAIR: Expeditionary.

20 MR. TIM FIELD: Other comments on 1.a.
21 before you go to 1.b. I'm going to try to move us
22 somewhat efficiently.

23 So 1.b is a comment about 1.b., 1.c., and
24 even like 1.f., these used to be under what was
25 formerly 1.b. in our current framework. And

1 essentially what's happened here is we've broken out
2 this into several different indicators.

3 So this first one, 1.b. is on
4 instructional hours. And the criteria statements
5 have several specific statutory, I think,
6 requirements.

7 1.c. is more about the assessments that
8 are required. And these are all statutory. So the
9 criteria statements for 1.c. relate to what
10 assessments they administer.

11 THE CHAIR: Now, we always wanted to --
12 hours issues. So I hope this clarifies for the
13 schools what is -- what they count. That's --
14 because there's -- we have that back-and-forth all
15 the time with them about, you know, they think
16 they're doing their hours; PED doesn't, you know.

17 And, you know, we thought we could do --
18 it's -- it's just this little gerbil wheel we're on
19 all the time with their hours. So I hope this does
20 clarify for them what --

21 MS. POULOS: There's a lot more detail,
22 actually.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes, there is. There is a
24 lot more detail.

25 MS. POULOS: Under, "The School meets the

1 instructional hour requirements," because, like, you
2 know, if you've got students that are off-site for
3 part of the day, you've got to have some process for
4 actually taking attendance -- right? -- and
5 verifying.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: That's a good point. Some
7 of these indicators, we've cut -- we've cut short
8 all the detail; because, just to kind of digest it.
9 Like, there are several where there's more stuff.
10 But we're trying to highlight what --

11 THE CHAIR: Right.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: Can we go on to Page 2?

13 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And make sure to
14 prioritize.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes.

16 So l.d. is not a new indicator. It's --
17 and we've had a couple of -- this is special --
18 special needs, special education students, quite a
19 few criteria statements there.

20 And l.e. is -- criteria statements are
21 actually quite similar; but they're related to
22 English Language Learners. [Inaudible.]

23 (Court reporter requests clarification.)

24 MR. TIM FIELD: Sorry. I'll try to slow
25 down.

1 Actually, don't be shy about crossing
2 things out if you think -- if you have questions,
3 just because there is a need to cross some things
4 out. So, you know, we're going to crowd-source
5 this; so...

6 THE CHAIR: I think, unfortunately, with
7 almost every one of these bullets, we can reflect
8 back to a meeting where it's become a concern. So,
9 you know, it's --

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: When I read this,
11 I told Trish, "This is -- this has been" --

12 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: They're all
13 high-priority.

14 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: -- "standards for
15 excellence. We are statutorily required to do all
16 these things."

17 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: So I don't see how we
18 can delete.

19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm highlighting
20 where they're important; because I'm not reading
21 anything I can cross out.

22 THE CHAIR: So I have one that has an
23 eraser on the other side, so in case I -- "Oh, no,
24 no."

25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I want to

1 say that "enrollment" is spelled incorrectly.

2 (Commissioners speaking concurrently.)

3 MR. TIM FIELD: You may find a few typos.

4 (Commissioners speaking concurrently.)

5 THE CHAIR: I was wondering if there was
6 just some way they could combine, you know, like the
7 last bullet with the ELL and the special ed, so that
8 it's -- you know -- you know, so that it's just --
9 yes, they --

10 MS. POULOS: That may actually be
11 repetitive of something that is in --

12 THE CHAIR: And even with, you know, the
13 one statement, where parent -- parent contact is
14 appropriate? Parent notifications are appropriate?
15 I would think that would have to -- that should be
16 in "c." So if we could have an -- you know, like an
17 all-encompassing statement that they're not denying
18 access, and all parent notifications are
19 appropriate; because I think there's a lot of areas
20 where parent notifications are necessary.

21 MS. POULOS: That's challenging, though,
22 because they're all different; right? Like, the
23 45-day substitute is a very different context from
24 communications with ELs. It's very different.

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And you're

1 obligated in each of of those cases.

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: As often as
3 regular ed has report cards.

4 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: You know, too,
5 this one on both of these, "School did not deny
6 students the opportunity to enroll." That's often
7 done in such a subtle way. We don't get it as a
8 formal complaint. There's a discouraging approach
9 to it, you know.

10 I mean, I can say one school that's not in
11 my district, where -- had a parent -- you know, a
12 new parent kind of thing. A cousin of mine was
13 taken aside and said, "You know, I'm not sure" -- by
14 another parent -- "I'm not sure your daughter would
15 fit in well with these other children here."

16 It wasn't the school doing it; but it was
17 another parent. And so they didn't enroll; but they
18 didn't make complaints.

19 It's hard to know that you need to
20 complain. Or somebody says, "Yeah. Maybe your
21 child would fit better over here."

22 And there's a lot of that going. And
23 plus, once a child is there -- again I know from an
24 example with a grandson -- they're nudging them out
25 without really ever really getting rid of them

1 formally, but making it more and more difficult to
2 stay.

3 THE CHAIR: And I think it's unfortunate.
4 And I don't think there -- we can create a mechanism
5 to --

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. And that's
7 why I say I'm not sure if those are ones we can
8 really gauge.

9 THE CHAIR: Right. But I think if they
10 understand that it's an important issue for us, at
11 least the overt will be avoided.

12 MS. POULOS: Yeah. And again, I think
13 that's where that -- the next phase, maybe, that
14 comes into play, which is which ones are actively
15 monitored, how are they actively monitored, which
16 ones are passively monitored, in that they come via
17 complaints. This has happened, right? And then,
18 again, that's why that statement in "Meets" is so
19 important. Or we don't have evidence to
20 demonstrate, right?

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And why we also
22 need staff that can go, at least randomly, when they
23 do lotteries.

24 MS. POULOS: Yeah.

25 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm going to move us to

1 Page 3, starting at 1.f. If I'm way ahead, let me
2 know.

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: The thing that I
4 appreciated about this, as an administrator, if I
5 were a head of school in a charter school, even
6 though some of these things are repeated in blocks,
7 this is very clearly, step by step, a checkoff list
8 that I can go through. It's very simple, very
9 direct, and I can check it off. And I know when
10 I've met that box, and I can move on to the next
11 box. And I know that that's what the site visit is
12 going to look for and what I have to document.

13 It's straightforward language. It's
14 active verbs. It's all those -- makes it -- right,
15 and you just click it off.

16 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: It does. Well -- and
17 when I do testing or anything like that at school,
18 it's the same thing. You have to have a rubric, a
19 guideline, a map. And I have to go straight down.
20 So I want that same thing for schools.

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: This simplifies.
22 When I read this at home, I thought, "Oh, yeah. I
23 like this."

24 THE CHAIR: Well, then, it also acts,
25 hopefully, as a source for the conversation at

1 governance council meetings, you know, for them to
2 share this. It's a -- you know, some of it can be
3 an easy, quick, "Yes, we di- -- oh, great. Yes, we
4 did this," and they don't have to dig in where they
5 don't need to. But there -- it's right there.

6 MS. POULOS: We've actually already shared
7 this with two sets of trainings, the long version.
8 I said, "I just want you to see this."

9 And it was, like, to them, very
10 enlightening. "Oh, wow. We're responsible for
11 making sure all of this happens."

12 THE CHAIR: All of this.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'll mention it,
14 and then I wrote it. But, you know, under special
15 ed -- that's my thing. Just get used to that.

16 I remember one school where kids might not
17 be doing well, and -- but they have a prescribed
18 curriculum. So if you have special ed kids, and
19 they can't do the "Toulouse" math, I'm just saying,
20 then I think, as a special ed teacher, that you need
21 to find the "Gipson" math and try that and see if
22 that works. But they were seemingly -- and I could
23 be wrong -- like, "Well, this is what we're going to
24 use, and this is going to be it."

25 THE CHAIR: "We're going to use Singapore

1 math, and this is going to be it," whatever program
2 it is.

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And so I wrote a
4 little comment about that, because I don't think,
5 you know, you can -- if you didn't get it the first
6 six times, I don't know, maybe you will get it the
7 seventh time. But maybe you ought to try another
8 approach? Is that a possibility?

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Good. And it may actually
10 be reflected in some of the detail, like -- but
11 write it down.

12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm writing it
13 down as I go.

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, I think
15 having this kind of a list, too, let's you tell your
16 subordinates who -- like, on this one, they maintain
17 attendance records for every period. You may have a
18 teacher who's lax. And here it is. And I'm not
19 going to suffer -- you know, you're the one who's
20 going to suffer if I suffer, because it's here.

21 That's a very good way to motivate people
22 who don't see the reason for doing certain things.

23 THE CHAIR: Right. But it should be --
24 you're right -- that just because you said you were
25 going to do this, it's not appropriate, then, to

1 say, "Well, this math program isn't meeting your
2 child's needs; so maybe you need to look elsewhere."
3 See, that's what -- that's what we're trying to
4 avoid. Right.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that's why I
6 wrote it. And I will also kind of reiterate, I
7 guess, that, you know, we're -- I don't -- other
8 than the sign language school -- I know that's not
9 the proper name -- but other than that that school,
10 most of the schools that I've heard about seem to
11 have inclusion-type kids; whether they have two
12 teachers in there, and one is really working with
13 this group of kids, and that's fine.

14 But they haven't had what we would call
15 these days living skills -- which sign language does
16 have, by the way; that's why I'm excluding them.
17 And so if you have those students, they can still go
18 to any one of those -- any charter, and they need to
19 have totally different everything.

20 MS. POULOS: Yeah. Where this comes up is
21 our charters all tell all families, "We're
22 inclusion-only." And then they tell us that. And
23 then they get mad at us when we say, "No, you cannot
24 say that."

25 And that's when they come to you guys and

1 say, "Katie and her team are just being awful."

2 Right?

3 And you guys have to stand that firm line.
4 But I think this is your opportunity to say that,
5 right? Because you look at it, and it says, "The
6 school provides a continuum of services to students
7 with disabilities based on individual student needs
8 as identified by the IEP."

9 When my team goes in, or I go in and say,
10 "Here's why we're talking about the fact that you
11 can't use the phrase "Inclusion-only," because the
12 PEC has very clearly said it's important to them.

13 THE CHAIR: Because when you're looking
14 at, especially with new applications, I don't
15 think -- and they look at their possible budgets, I
16 don't think they realize what the impact could be
17 when Student A and B now enrolls in your school.
18 They think it's going to be this model, and we're
19 going to be able to do this. But now, that whole
20 budget is thrown off, because now, we have to do
21 this.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's why I
23 wrote that.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: That's fine. That's fine.
25 This is all very great input.

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: We're on Page 3 of 9,
2 though.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: On Page 3 -- some of you
4 are moving ahead, which is also fine. In No. 3,
5 1.h. on Page 3 is maybe one example of what I think
6 is new content. This probably is not statutory.
7 Correct me if it is.

8 MS. POULOS: It is, actually.

9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Oh, yeah.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: This is new -- I don't
11 think it was reflected --

12 MS. POULOS: It was under 1.b., which is,
13 "Does the school comply with all educational
14 requirements?"

15 MR. TIM FIELD: So this is an example --
16 so probably isn't new, per se. Probably is more of
17 a -- formerly under 1.b.; but it's one that's much
18 more explicit. There is a lot more detail under,
19 "What does Tier 1, 2, and 3 mean?" That's what that
20 one is.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I have
22 another question, Tim.

23 So if you have a K-5 school, where the
24 kids are in this classroom all day long, is the
25 teacher -- are we saying that the teacher has to

1 take attendance -- I mean, do they have periods?
2 K-1 -- I understand this totally in middle school; I
3 understand this totally in high school. But I'm
4 just saying -- I don't -- they don't have, like --

5 THE CHAIR: Periods at the beginning --
6 and I guess some may take another attendance after a
7 lunch hour.

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That I can get;
9 but this is talking about every period, every day,
10 for each student.

11 MS. POULOS: And this is direct language
12 from the statute. It's not us making up language.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Then I guess
14 I'll shut up.

15 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And my experience
16 with elementary schools is they do it at certain
17 times of the day, and they have to do it on the
18 computer; so it goes into the report. And that's a
19 requirement. It doesn't matter whether you're --

20 THE CHAIR: So I think the period is
21 determined by the school, what their period is. It
22 could be the morning session, the afternoon session;
23 or it could be, like, in the high school and the
24 middle school, more actual periods.

25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: That's the word

1 that -- and I'm sorry that it was law; but I don't
2 know all those laws. But I -- every 40 minutes,
3 they're not taking attendance at elementary school,
4 you know. They're not.

5 THE CHAIR: In the morning. And if they
6 go off to a special, and maybe when they come back
7 from that. That depends.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: The top of Page 4 is the
9 last indicator under the educational plan and
10 NMDASH -- came up earlier. And here, we -- the
11 language in NMDASH is for -- actually, "C" or
12 better, but "C" or lower, it should say there.
13 Right, Katie?

14 MS. POULOS: Actually, it would probably
15 be "D" or lower. I think that just got transcribed
16 wrong. We were saying it's excluded for "C" or
17 better.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: But let's try to get to
19 that point, because we're going to change gears to
20 financial management oversight. And I want to make
21 a couple of comments about that, because it does
22 connect to the financial framework. So try to wrap
23 up through 1.h.

24 MS. POULOS: Sorry. But there were a
25 couple of things that we did remove from this, but

1 that were in our previous ones -- right? -- like
2 next steps, that we just thought, you know, we're
3 spending too much time looking at this, and they're
4 not high-yield. So we really tried to focus in on
5 what was high-yield and what we thought was really
6 important to student success -- in school success.

7 MR. TIM FIELD: And Lyria passed out
8 [inaudible] --

9 (Reporter requests clarification.)

10 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm sorry. Lyria passed
11 out the second sheet, which is just the last
12 three -- we aren't there yet. So stick with the
13 first sheet, still. And we'll transition to
14 financial management oversight.

15 And my comments here are just that the
16 financial framework, the separate from
17 organizational, it consisted primarily of what I
18 would call kind of financial monitoring activities,
19 rather than kind of financial health metrics, or,
20 like, you know, what is the sustainability or
21 financial health of the school.

22 What we have done is some of what's in
23 here is pulling in some of those -- used to be in
24 the financial framework -- pulling those into the
25 organizational framework, which just -- and what

1 we're going to see in the financial framework is an
2 attempt to have more truly financial metrics.

3 So, again, some of this stuff, we'll
4 see -- you may recognize because it formerly lived
5 in the financial framework. And if you have
6 thoughts or comments, we should have that now, or
7 you can put them in here.

8 But that's what you see reflected here.
9 Some of this used to be in the organizational
10 framework and some if is in the financial framework.

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What I appreciated
12 about this is it outlines, again, very clearly, the
13 accountabilities. It doesn't -- you know,
14 everything; that I have to have a good audit, that I
15 have to pay things on time. And that gives that
16 head of school, who says, "Well, I don't know
17 anything about finance." But you know about this.
18 It's organization. And you better be able to ask
19 the business official if you don't know.

20 THE CHAIR: It gives you questions. I
21 need to know -- I don't need to know the ins and
22 outs of it. But I need to know that it's been done.

23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And that it's
24 clean.

25 THE CHAIR: And done appropriately.

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And another
2 question -- a clarifying question, that's all -- is
3 on 2.f. I'm just going to -- and I -- I got that
4 one, by the way, on 2.f., the first one. But if
5 they, say -- Katie -- for example, someone retired,
6 and we hired somebody else, and this person's
7 husband moved to someplace else, or wife moved, do
8 we just kind of want to know the reason? Or we're
9 just like automatically dinging them?

10 THE CHAIR: I'm sorry. Where are you?

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: 2.f.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: 2.f. on the first
13 one, at the end of, "No more than one change... ."

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: "Does the school
15 have a Licensed Business Manager at all times during
16 the school year and demonstrates stability in the
17 position..." -- which I got -- got that one --
18 "...and no more than one change."

19 And I'm just saying, if there's a reason
20 for more than one change, do they just tell you,
21 "Someone died," or whatever?

22 MS. POULOS: If they keep hiring business
23 managers that keep leaving; like, more than one
24 leaves in a nine-month period, we've got a problem
25 with that school.

1 And I understand, like, "Oh, so-and-so" --
2 and then their husband. It still raises flags for
3 me that they can't -- because we have very few
4 business managers operating in this state. They are
5 pretty stable. They're all here; right?

6 And the ones that are moving, especially
7 the ones where the -- it's moving -- school is
8 losing in multiple years, it's never because, "My
9 husband got stationed in Timbuktu, and I got
10 transferred."

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But they can
12 tell you, and, "Oh, she died."

13 "Well, okay."

14 (A discussion was held off the record.)

15 THE CHAIR: Because if it was the Vigil
16 Group, it would be the Vigil Group. If the person
17 that was assigned -- that would be -- so it's still
18 their hired business management is the Vigil Group.

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm definitely
20 fine with it. I'm just saying, if they say to you
21 we're sorry; but "X" happened or whatever -- I don't
22 know -- then you consider it. It's not like
23 automatically, you're dead in the water.

24 THE CHAIR: Well, that's always where they
25 have the opportunity to say, "Hey, look-it. This

1 was this extraordinary circumstance." And --

2 MR. TIM FIELD: The other thing here is
3 this ultimately is raising concerns and -- or it's
4 smoke. So just because someone gets -- maybe they
5 get dinged. Maybe they get a "Approaching
6 standards" because they missed this. It's not going
7 to get closed.

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We're looking at
9 it.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: But it's the reality that
11 they don't have stability in the position this year.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Right. And that
13 continuity is imperative. With the way the system
14 runs, you're going to be starting over again.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: So it's not an indictment
16 on the school or it means there's going to be
17 consequences. But it does mean --

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: They know this.

19 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Our schools that
20 have gotten in financial trouble have gotten there
21 because they fired an individual; not somebody who's
22 part of one of the groups or who's been trained.
23 And those people often disappear without a trace
24 when we catch them at it. So I think that's one
25 to --

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And let me be
2 clear. I'm not against this. I just think -- you
3 know, it's an indicator. It's an indicator.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: Schools will probably come
5 and say, "Wait a minute. That's not fair."

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Then we also look
7 at their hiring practice. Why are you hiring this
8 way? Because that becomes an important issue, too.
9 People know that there are several of these -- at
10 least two or three groups -- that are more than
11 willing to take them on.

12 MR. TIM FIELD: So wrap up -- wrap up the
13 financial -- if there's any other comments, let's
14 have them. But move on to your next sheet, which
15 starts with governance and reporting.

16 And I see Commissioner Ruiz has already
17 started.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: She's the one to catch
19 there.

20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, these
21 things -- this is a lady who works in a school
22 district where, right now, she sees those checklists
23 every blinkin' day; right?

24 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Yes, ma'am.

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Every blinkin'

1 day.

2 MS. POULOS: And things may jump out at
3 you to distract you. Things like 2.b. This is not
4 required. This is good practice. And, honestly,
5 this was one of those meetings with head folks, who
6 said, "This would be helpful"; right? It would be
7 helpful to force them to submit 10 percent of the
8 RFR in each quarter. It's not required.

9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, it should
10 be; because by the end of the year, that last
11 quarter, the last 90 days of the year, they are
12 inundated.

13 MS. POULOS: Well, it's about cash flow,
14 too; because our schools aren't managing their grant
15 funds very well, because they're not doing things
16 like this.

17 THE CHAIR: And I'm just going to ask,
18 because it might be here, and I'm just not seeing
19 it. The issue of paying their taxes and their
20 retirement.

21 MS. POULOS: Probably, that's -- the
22 school does not have any invoices. But there was
23 more there that we could add back in, probably. So
24 we should probably add the taxes and other
25 liabilities.

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And retirement?

2 MR. TIM FIELD: So add that in your form.

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Good question.

4 Because I went to a charter school that had not paid
5 IRS. The first time I ever met an IRS official, I
6 was principal of a charter school in Albuquerque.
7 And she was a lovely lady. And then I met the fraud
8 investigators; and they were so nice. And they must
9 have thought, "That woman"? Because I was brand
10 new. I didn't know.

11 We had to hand-deliver checks to the IRS
12 office in Albuquerque. They made us bring them in
13 and hand them to them.

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: We closed a school
15 that had not paid FICA or withholding for two years.

16 THE CHAIR: And the school local, to me,
17 hadn't paid into the --

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: ERB? That's awful
19 for teachers.

20 THE CHAIR: No, their annuity, what they
21 refer to -- no, it's not their retirement. It's
22 a -- well, it is. But it's an individual
23 investment. And they hadn't paid -- they took it
24 out of their pay; but they hadn't made the payments
25 to the -- to the annuity funds. Yeah. So --

1 MR. TIM FIELD: Governance and reporting.
2 I think there are a couple of [inaudible]-- there
3 are some new items here. But -- or maybe before,
4 they were embedded in something else.

5 MS. POULOS: No. I mean, I think we've
6 never -- we've never been explicit, for example,
7 about the nepotism; right?

8 THE CHAIR: They just had to check that
9 they had a policy.

10 MS. POULOS: Right. Right.

11 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Or that they had
12 waived the policy, or --

13 THE CHAIR: Right.

14 MS. POULOS: The self-evaluation, I don't
15 think has ever been explicit in this.

16 THE CHAIR: No.

17 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Self-evaluations
18 are so hard to get a board to do, though.

19 MS. POULOS: Well -- and, actually, the
20 additional detail is not really so much about
21 self-evaluation; because what we've been trying to
22 encourage boards, in our trainings, and trying to
23 encourage boards to do is dig beyond that, "Oh,
24 let's just evaluate ourselves. But can we gather
25 information from the public, from our parents, our

1 families, our students, our school administrator,
2 our teachers, to figure out how we can do a better
3 job?"

4 THE CHAIR: Because I guess my question
5 is -- yeah. They could easily say, "Yes, we
6 self-evaluate"; but if there's not any quality to
7 that self-evaluation, it's just --

8 MS. POULOS: Well -- and the same thing
9 with the head administrator evaluation; right? I
10 mean, Analee's were glowing. Glowing. And I mock
11 the board members every time they come to one of my
12 trainings. "Why did you do that?" Right?

13 THE CHAIR: And I know some of it is
14 expense; because some do contract out, and maybe not
15 every year, but every four or five years, do a
16 complete 360 with an outside firm.

17 MS. POULOS: And is there something you
18 think should be in 3.b. that maybe we encourage
19 that?

20 THE CHAIR: I certainly would. Because
21 any -- I've spoken to a number of schools. And
22 they've certainly felt it was, you know, highly
23 effective, especially those that hadn't done annual
24 monitoring; so that when the 360 came in, you know,
25 and they saw a lot that they probably should have

1 picked up on earlier --

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm sorry,
3 Patty. Which one are you working?

4 MR. TIM FIELD: 3.b. So this gets into
5 this question of are you just checking if they did
6 it, or you checking the quality? I think the
7 quality thing is a real challenge.

8 MS. POULOS: Yeah, it is.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: And I think -- maybe it's
10 also -- first, you want to make sure they're
11 evaluating their -- before you get into quality is
12 just make sure they're doing evaluations. That's
13 what's implied right here. This is not getting into
14 quality right now.

15 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: This is another
16 place that the governance councils need training;
17 because so many people --

18 MS. POULOS: We've had, actually, two
19 really good sessions, where they're going, "Oh."

20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: They have not.

21 MS. POULOS: They haven't, no.

22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: They have not been
23 doing it.

24 THE CHAIR: I did four hours in Cruces
25 with a governance council that Katie did, you know.

1 And fortunately, they were all people that knew what
2 they were getting into. And it was nice to see the
3 gentleman from J. Paul. He's been on a while. But
4 he's very -- he's very engaging, and came, I guess,
5 to keep the other new person -- maybe wanted to make
6 sure she was coming, you know. But now, they've got
7 two; so...

8 MR. TIM FIELDS: So governance is on
9 Page 6, and it ends on Page 7. So try to get
10 through that. Add any additional comments.

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I think they
12 switched.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes. Yes.

14 THE CHAIR: Can I go -- can I just go
15 briefly back to 3.c.? Because if we're looking at
16 the nepotism issue, if they've -- if they've waived
17 it, then it's --

18 MS. POULOS: It's the more detail; because
19 that detail is in here. Is there a waiver? Is it
20 on file? That's -- yeah.

21 THE CHAIR: Okay. All right. As long
22 as --

23 MS. POULOS: That's the detail.

24 THE CHAIR: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: On 1.g. --

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Ooh. Good for you.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I mean, not
3 l.g. -- I'm sorry. 4.b. I got the wrong -- on 4.b.

4 THE CHAIR: You're not even going to
5 dinner.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: 4.b. is a good one to talk
7 about. What's your question?

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Just as a
9 clarification for me, if -- these are pretty
10 stringent.

11 MR. TIM FIELD: They are. Let's talk
12 about that.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And so if I'm not
14 meeting them, is there a place -- this is the
15 indicator -- in the Corrective Action Plan is where
16 I tell the Commission what I'm doing to improve this
17 and give them a history? Is that my opportunity
18 with that?

19 MR. TIM FIELD: Yes. This is a great one.
20 Because we actually flagged this, and we kind of --
21 when I saw these targets, I was, like, that's hard.
22 Because I know in some communities, like a retention
23 rate of 85 percent or 90 percent is really high.
24 This is really high turnover in some communities.

25 So this is a question of is this too high?

1 Do you need to modify it? Or do you say, "Let's set
2 a high target, and be ready for schools to meet it,
3 but to kind of have to address -- we aren't there.
4 But we're arguing X, Y, and Z to help them.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: This is what we're
6 trying to do. And like you said, it's not punitive;
7 it's informational. If you're not meeting standards
8 there, it could be it's a chronic issue that you
9 have to work on forever. It may take three years to
10 address it or change it.

11 But if I have that opportunity -- that was
12 my question, is how do I let you know I really am
13 working at this? But those are high numbers.

14 THE CHAIR: Or there is -- you know, if
15 you're a school that deals with a lot of kids in the
16 foster care system, there could be just a lot of
17 movement out that you have no control over; so --
18 you know.

19 MS. POULOS: But that also goes to the
20 fact that with those foster care kiddos, or homeless
21 kids, our charter schools actually don't quite
22 realize their obligations to provide transportation
23 for those kids. And so trying to get them to
24 understand that, they can do a better job.

25 THE CHAIR: You know, down by me, it's

1 more the transition between foster care and
2 detention home; so that's where it gets -- you know,
3 you're lost, and they don't have to worry about
4 transportation then.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But I also think
6 some of that 85 percent, it's a K-8 school, but
7 they've lost a lot of kids in fifth grade because
8 they wanted them to go to middle school, rather than
9 stay. Maybe that's what they're telling us. And I
10 don't disbelieve that, either.

11 THE CHAIR: Well, the traditional middle
12 school is quite a social draw for a lot of kids.
13 There's certainly far more programs that are
14 available to them; so...

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And the same
16 thing from a K-12 school. They may lose them after
17 eighth. But we have that kind of, already. And
18 they just say -- they've come, and they say, "This
19 is why we lose kids." Except that MAS just had --
20 they didn't lose them; so they had to come change
21 their enrollment cap.

22 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But I also have to
23 say that I have a couple of schools in my district
24 who may lose considerably if ICE continues to do
25 their raids on the parents, where the kids are

1 citizens and can be there, but they have no place to
2 be, and they end up in foster care or other places.

3 I have at least three schools where that could
4 become an issue if they continue to go after people.

5 THE CHAIR: The same thing is true down by
6 me, yeah.

7 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And there may be
8 more. I'm just aware --

9 MR. TIM FIELD: So I think it's worth
10 contemplating -- even if you lower these targets,
11 they're still going to be high targets. Unless you
12 really lower them, any target you set, you're going
13 to have this challenge of there's some additional
14 reasons why folks really struggle.

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Aren't they able
16 to iterate that, when we put this, "This is where we
17 want you to be."

18 "And you know what? Here's why we can't.
19 Because ICE just came and took 12 of our kids."

20 THE CHAIR: There was an issue that came
21 up at the school boards conference, where they were
22 talking about legal responsibilities of schools in
23 dealing with the privacy matters, and that are -- so
24 I don't know if that's something that needs to be
25 identified here; because there's -- you know, that

1 the school is aware of their -- the rights of the
2 students and the responsibilities of the school in
3 dealing with immigration issues; so...

4 MS. POULOS: So is that under 4.a.?
5 Immigration issues? Protecting the rights of all
6 students?

7 THE CHAIR: Yeah. I think it needs -- I
8 think -- to me, it almost needs to be a separate
9 entity, so that the school knows that it's -- you
10 know. Because I think -- I don't think a lot of --
11 I think schools, especially now, are very unsure of
12 what they can do, should do, with -- and, you know,
13 we've got a number of schools that don't have
14 contracted lawyers, so that they're concerned about
15 having to make that \$200 phone call to get the
16 answer.

17 And let's be honest. School -- some
18 lawyers who are experts in education law aren't
19 necessarily experts on immigration law; so that
20 it's -- it's an area -- but I know down by me, it's
21 a huge issue when we're looking at truancy issues,
22 because folks just aren't sending their kids to
23 school because they're afraid. It's a big problem
24 by me.

25 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Or when parents

1 have been picked up dropping their kids off at
2 school, the kids don't want to go to school, then,
3 you know.

4 THE CHAIR: Right. Yeah.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: So the students and
6 employees -- which is on Page 2 and 3 of your
7 handout. I think what's -- some of that -- I think
8 the student items were kind of pulled from
9 previously under educational plan. The employees
10 were always in this category.

11 But try to get through that, at least.
12 And the last topic is school environment.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So, Tim?

14 MR. TIM FIELD: Uh-huh.

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: On 4.a. -- maybe
16 I just haven't gotten to the other one. So I may
17 have just not read ahead yet again.

18 So, "The school enrollment practices are
19 fair, non-discriminatory, and legally compliant."
20 You're talking about students. How do employees fit
21 in this group?

22 MS. POULOS: Well, students/employees is
23 the big category. So there are indicators for both
24 in that. It's more about rights, individual rights,
25 or individual responsibilities.

1 THE CHAIR: "Organize collectively or
2 otherwise"?

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right. But,
4 you know, they usually have that one. And I know
5 this is a State law about sex, blah, blah, blah.
6 We're not stating it; but that's -- I know that's a
7 State law.

8 THE CHAIR: Well, it's going to be in the
9 larger one; right? For the staff, that they're not
10 discriminating --

11 MS. POULOS: Yeah. Or they're
12 respecting -- "Does not have any verified complaints
13 regarding violation of teacher rights under the
14 School Personnel Act -- and -- yeah, FMLA, ADA,
15 IDEA. I don't know, whatever --

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Alphabet soup.

17 MS. POULOS: Whatever else is there, yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So on the
19 schools -- on the 4.c.? "All employees of the
20 school are appropriately licensed." So do they --
21 are they supposed to, or do they -- whichever word
22 works; because I know this is true of every
23 school -- do they, on day whatever, send into PED,
24 "This is how many teachers we have who are not
25 licensed, but are currently seeking licensure or

1 getting waivers," or --

2 MS. POULOS: No. On 40th day, they report
3 other teachers and what they're teaching. Then the
4 system identifies discrepancies.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It checks it
6 against.

7 MS. POULOS: Because they're hiring and
8 filling positions without, themselves -- and this is
9 where, again, that Corrective Action Plan idea needs
10 to come in. They're doing that without themselves
11 checking or ensuring that teachers have the
12 appropriate endorsements and all of that.

13 So then PED's system kicks it out. And
14 then they're supposed to fix that by doing any
15 number of things, right? But, again, we keep seeing
16 over and over, every single year, that they don't
17 implement a long-term plan to not have that, right?

18 So day one, we're hiring teachers. We
19 know what they're qualified to teach. If they're
20 teaching outside of their qualified area, they have
21 a waiver. We have a process for checking up on the
22 actions they're supposed to be taking under their
23 waiver. They're not; because we go and check up on
24 their waiver, and they get mad, right?

25 They need the waiver to get the

1 discrepancy cleared, and they don't actually do
2 anything under the waiver to clear it long-term. So
3 that's what this is about.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I mean -- and I
5 mean, just any school district, a traditional school
6 district, has gazillion openings -- particularly in
7 special ed. And they have nobody -- no body -- in
8 the room. Two words. And so they just find a warm
9 body to put in that room, right? Because they don't
10 have a body, who probably doesn't even have a
11 credential to teach, period, not just not a special
12 ed credential.

13 So are you saying -- and I don't know this
14 answer, by the way. So do charter schools have less
15 difficulty finding someone in special ed than, say,
16 Albuquerque?

17 MS. POULOS: I'm saying charter schools
18 should be doing a better job, because they have more
19 flexibility; they have more autonomy; they can have
20 better practices that recruit teachers. And I think
21 our charter schools aren't doing that right now.
22 And so we're thinking about, do we want to encourage
23 different schemes? Yes.

24 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know whether
25 they have an easier job in filling those positions.

1 I think it depends on where you are, you know.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But there are a
3 variety of ways; because every school district faces
4 that same problem. You can't just put a warm body
5 in a classroom. PED is going to be all over you.

6 I mean, you can say to the public, "We're
7 hiding it."

8 But let me tell you that phone is ringing
9 off the phone every day. And a school district is
10 not going to get closed; but it's going to be on the
11 list for practices. And it's going to show up
12 everywhere.

13 But there are a variety of ways that you
14 can put someone in there. You can write a waiver;
15 you can intervene; you can support them as you're
16 supposed to. And it becomes long-term. you have to
17 do that, particularly in hard-to-serve --

18 MR. TIM FIELD: One thing you're going to
19 think through is -- we talked this notion of you
20 release a preliminary, "Here's your score in the
21 organizational framework," and you're giving them
22 time to correct and submit a plan for how they're
23 going to correct it, one of the questions you're
24 going to have is that there are some things that
25 are, like, long-term fixes.

1 Like, so take student potential. Like,
2 that, you're not going to fix that. But you might
3 say, "Oh, we've -- we're interviewing -- every
4 student who leaves, they do an exit interview.
5 We're trying to understand why kids are leaving."
6 That's great.

7 There's other things that you probably
8 could fix like that. And the question is going to
9 be, do they then get "Meets standard," or do they
10 get, "Working to meet standard"?

11 But I mean, there are some places where
12 maybe it was just a matter of, "Oh, we forgot to
13 submit that," or there was some simple thing. And
14 it may -- and, Katie, that's going to be for the
15 Commission.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And one other thing that
17 I think you're going to need to check is in that
18 type of case, something that may take three or four
19 years, understandably, to change, they're actually
20 in the second year [inaudible] "Falls far below",
21 because it needs two years. That may be smoke that
22 there is a chronic issue, and -- you know, and then
23 it's -- but that's --

24 MR. TIM FIELD: But there are some things,
25 like, take the student retention thing. If you set

1 a high bar -- I mean, I think it's one thing to say
2 "Working to meet standard." When you're saying
3 "Falls far below" and you have a bunch of reds or
4 whatever on your -- that start becoming irritating.
5 So I don't know how you -- that's a tricky one, how
6 you interpret that.

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: There may also be one,
8 that, because you want rigorous yet attainable. I
9 mean, what about a school that actually is doing a
10 better job than the surrounding area, but still is
11 far short? I mean, that's one to consider.

12 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I also think it
13 depends on the location of our school. Some of ours
14 in more rural areas have very different problems.

15 Now, in Albuquerque, Albuquerque Public
16 Schools tends to continue to steal away special ed
17 teachers. And so -- I mean, I'm saying. So, you
18 know, that's a different problem than a school
19 district, you know, say, like, in Taos, who may have
20 trouble finding one, period, you know. Whether
21 they're a school district who have fewer schools,
22 you know, may steal them. I don't think that's the
23 same problem as in Albuquerque, where they have so
24 many schools and so many vacancies, they're doing
25 all kinds of enticements, particularly special ed

1 teachers, all the time.

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think I just
3 read a report that's saying -- which I thought was
4 interesting -- that we are actually producing more
5 teachers than we have students.

6 THE CHAIR: In New Mexico?

7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: No. But the
8 caveat was --

9 MR. TIM FIELD: Not the right kind of
10 teachers.

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Special ed is
12 still a difficult thing. And, of course, it is,
13 because they're getting evaluated.

14 MR. TIM FIELD: High school science, the
15 stats.

16 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well -- and a lot
17 of teachers who graduate from New Mexico schools are
18 recruited by states around who all pay higher
19 salaries.

20 THE CHAIR: You can easily commute to
21 El Paso every day. So we have a lot of staff that
22 goes into El Paso.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: I want you to finish the
24 last page, the environment, Page 4, school
25 environment. I think -- and the last point, Katie,

1 maybe there are some indicators that you end up --
2 maybe there is a slightly different way of criteria
3 for what's "Falls," what's "Working to meet" and
4 what's "Far below." And maybe you can work it out.

5 THE CHAIR: We had -- in the old contract,
6 we had teacher retention.

7 MS. POULOS: We did.

8 THE CHAIR: And I think that's -- we've
9 never --

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's true.

11 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think we
12 should -- I liked it. I'm glad Patty brought it up;
13 because --

14 THE CHAIR: It's just one of those --

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It wasn't like
16 we dinged you.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: It's an indicator.

18 THE CHAIR: But it's a hallmark of is
19 there something going wrong in that school, because
20 staff is fleeing like crazy, you know.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It was kind
22 of -- you know, you had to have an explanation. If
23 you only have five teachers, and one leaves --

24 THE CHAIR: Yeah. Because five people
25 retired, well, great for them, and I understand

1 that. So that's why you had that big move. But if
2 it's -- if it's not retirement or --

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Because it was a
4 couple of schools who have had a great loss of
5 teachers.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: I think we're at time. So
7 we'll note -- I'm noting that one, as well, a
8 different indicator or a different criteria
9 statement.

10 But we're at time. So I would say it's
11 our lunch break. If you're done, please pass it in,
12 and then you can go off to lunch.

13 (A discussion was held off the record.)

14 MR. TIM FIELD: We're going to resume at
15 12:30. Start five minutes late. I'd like to start
16 at 12:30, because we have a lot to cover on the
17 academic framework. So is that enough time? I know
18 you've got to leave the building.

19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I don't know
20 whether -- would getting served in downtown --
21 there's not a drive-through or anything downtown.
22 It's almost like you have to go and sit down.

23 (A recess was taken at 11:36 a.m., and
24 reconvened at 12:43 p.m., as follows:)

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. So I think -- I

1 have a slide that just has too much information. I
2 have a slide deck, and I'll be going through those.
3 But I think, really, we're going to follow through
4 these options that you have in your handout. So I
5 think in terms of you sort of keeping straight, that
6 will be very useful.

7 And we have another handout for you; so
8 we'll be working through this. I think I've got way
9 too many.

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I can't tell you
11 how much I appreciate the work that you all have
12 done with all of the --

13 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: And I knew I couldn't
14 meet with you all, because I was at work. You all
15 have daytime hours. And I was working till 8:00 or
16 9:00 at night.

17 (A discussion was held off the record.)

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Academic
19 framework.

20 So we have two main goals for this
21 afternoon, and tomorrow -- for this day. This is
22 not all the work we'll do on the academic framework.
23 There's a lot to do in tasks. But first, we want to
24 talk about the roll-up. You know, there's the
25 desire to have an overall category for the academic

1 framework.

2 So I really am going to want to get your
3 feedback, your thoughts on how you want that to be
4 constructed, how you want to use that, because then
5 we're going to bring back options to you with the
6 trial run, okay? And there are lots of sort of
7 weeds that you can get into about creating roll-up,
8 aggregate things.

9 So I'm happy to talk to any of you about
10 that. It seems as though that it would be good for
11 today, anyway, to keep it sort of high-level in
12 terms of how you want to use it. And then we'll
13 give you lots of detail when we come back to -- you
14 know, with the trial run.

15 And then the second objective for today
16 is -- sort of similar to the exercise we did with
17 the organizational -- is to actually decide which
18 indicators do you think you want to have in the
19 revised framework so that we can test them?

20 It's a little bit of a more difficult
21 question than the operational, because it sounds
22 like there's a lot of agreement already on what they
23 should be; it was more clarifying them.

24 What we're going to be doing is actually
25 looking at some pretty different options. And, you

1 know, we tried to bring you different ways to look
2 at the different components of academic performance.
3 And we're going to want to hear, you know, what you
4 think of the strengths, concerns. And we anticipate
5 there are going to be some disagreements; that's
6 great; because we're going to -- I mean, that's
7 fine. We're not trying to get everybody to agree on
8 one thing. We're trying to just get everybody's
9 thoughts on the table and really have a good sense
10 of what the options are.

11 So those are the two. And any sort of
12 questions -- I think this goes back to that
13 conversation about the time line through the year.
14 There will obviously be a lot more revisiting of the
15 academic framework; but we're trying to sort of
16 piece it out in a logical way.

17 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Now I have a
18 question.

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It has been
21 determined -- I'm looking at these -- that we will
22 have a roll-up grade.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That is what -- that is
24 still -- that will be tested. But it has not been
25 determined, because I think you all would have to

1 vote on it with the final revised framework; right?

2 MR. TIM FIELD: I would say a grade.

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: A roll-up -- well,
4 it says, "Include an overall grade as a single
5 indicator. Roll up..." -- we would have a roll-up
6 rating? Is that a better word?

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Rating, category. And
8 one of the things we're going to talk about is how
9 you want to use that; because some of the -- what we
10 got loud and clear is you do not want to stigmatize
11 or label schools. So that is not the intent. I do
12 not think we will wind up having a letter grade, for
13 example, what -- or some type of grade.

14 My understanding from hearing from you all
15 what you do want, though, is a way to distinguish
16 highest performing schools that you might want to
17 recognize, and then, again, schools that you have
18 concerns about that you need to be able to
19 categorize, so you can say, "Okay, these schools
20 need to take a deeper dive. There's possible
21 nonrenewal, or revocation, or interventions."

22 So that is a grouping. So it gets -- it's
23 a little tough there; because we're not -- we want
24 to be careful of the concerns that you all have of
25 the A-through-F grade. That's not what we're trying

1 to reproduce. We're trying to give you actionable
2 categorizing of these schools in the academic
3 framework.

4 THE CHAIR: And then we're rolling up over
5 years, so that when they get to renewal, we have a
6 better snapshot of what they --

7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And it's a rating.
8 Okay. I'm good. Thank you.

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, it's a rating or a
10 category. Again, part of what we're going to talk
11 about is what do you not want to call it? What do
12 you want to call it? What do we need to be careful
13 of? What needs to be prioritized?

14 THE CHAIR: You're right. Because we
15 don't want to stigmatize them and say, "You're
16 failing." And so -- yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Okay. Thank you.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. So we'll
19 definitely have -- great. Any other questions about
20 the goals for today? Okay. Terrific.

21 So let's go right into this question of
22 the roll-up. And where I'm going to be hoping to
23 get your feedback, as we go on -- is actually, this
24 is a little out of order -- but Page 2 of your blue
25 feedback. As we go through, we will -- we'll be

1 putting your notes here, so as you have thoughts.

2 So let's talk about the roll-up. What we
3 heard is that you would like -- or there is a desire
4 for a type of roll-up to help with that renewal and
5 intervention process; right? And we talked again
6 about my second point here; it's not intended to
7 stigmatize.

8 So the important question that I have for
9 you -- and this is going to sound like just a
10 mundane question -- but really how we get at that
11 first is thinking about how many categories do you
12 need; right? We're going to be using this roll-up
13 methodology, which will be some type of taking the
14 results across the indicators and doing sort of an
15 averaging up. That's in the weeds; but we'll do
16 that.

17 Where we want to arrive at is I need to
18 know, how many categories do you need? And, really,
19 how I would hope, or I would like you to think about
20 that question, is what are the actions that you need
21 to be able to either justify or be led in; right?

22 So automatically, you can sort of think,
23 you need to be able to know who are the schools that
24 are concerns to you; right? And that could be
25 either you want to have a clear sign, "This is the

1 level at which we are considering non-renewal."

2 You want to have some discretion left
3 there. So we're not suggesting that you say, you're
4 going to set this line. Anybody in this category,
5 automatic closure. That's, I don't think, what you
6 want or need. But you want a category that a school
7 is very clear, "If I am in this category, if I've
8 been in this category for several years, or land in
9 one, I'd better start talking to..." -- you know,
10 it's not going to be a surprise when you start to
11 say -- or if you start to have non-renewal
12 conversations.

13 Now, you might want another category that
14 is perhaps not that level; but you would want an
15 intervention of some type. And I think you already
16 have some of these types of actions. But being able
17 to kind of clearly point out and highlight that
18 group through your framework is a powerful thing.

19 And then the other part that most
20 authorizers are thinking about are those highest
21 performers. Some have actions. Some authorizers
22 will say, "If you are in this larger category,
23 there's an expedited renewal," or, "You get a longer
24 process." Even if you don't want to have an actual
25 action, it may be that you want to highlight and,

1 you know, publicize them or highlight -- you know,
2 give them recognition.

3 So those are generally sort of the three;
4 so, you know, recognition, rewards, intervention,
5 high-stakes review, and then sort of a clear
6 guidance for, you know, we are headed for a
7 revocation or a non-renewal, pending review; again,
8 not a given.

9 Is there any other type of action that you
10 want; because, again, the key word here is
11 "actionable." We don't want the bottom category to
12 include half your schools; because you are not going
13 to potentially non-renew half of -- or -- you
14 know -- or we don't want to -- you know what I'm
15 saying?

16 So because an important part here -- I
17 had, several times, conversations with authorizers
18 where they said, "We want to set that bar really
19 high, because we want to be very clear that our
20 standards are high."

21 And then the follow-up conversation always
22 is, "Well, I -- I'm totally behind that. We would
23 agree with you. But are you going to be able to
24 take action?"

25 And so if you set a really high bar, but

1 then you don't take any action on it, it becomes
2 really a meaningless gesture.

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Unless we take
4 action.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. But you've said
6 so far that you're not going to --

7 THE CHAIR: We're not going to close
8 three-quarters of the schools.

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. Exactly.

10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And that
11 reflects back -- I don't know. And you sent it to
12 us in an e-mail before the telephone conversation,
13 that one.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Where, like,
16 half the schools are "F"s.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. Right. Exactly.
18 So any other types of -- does this correctly -- does
19 this sound right to you? Or what are the types of
20 actions that you would really like a category to
21 support you in your decisions and your --

22 THE CHAIR: Well, I think we've had the
23 discussions. And I think we've come to the
24 agreement that we're certainly supportive of an
25 expedited renewal, that that's no -- that that's no

1 question, that that's -- for those -- you know,
2 besides just the -- you know, the intrinsic, "Gee,
3 we've done a really good job," there should be
4 something.

5 And why should we -- you know -- we -- and
6 this is always what happens with education. You
7 know, the top kind of gets sort of forgotten,
8 because you're doing really good, so we don't have
9 to focus on you.

10 So you don't want them to just feel like,
11 "Okay, no one is recognizing us." So that's at
12 least a way that we can recognize them.

13 But we do need to spend more of our time
14 and focus our attention on helping schools to --
15 that are just "Working to meet standards," that they
16 meet those standards. So what can we do there? But
17 that we should be having probably a yearly
18 conversation with those bottom schools to say,
19 "Look-it. This is where we're at. What can we do
20 to help support you? What can CSD do to support
21 you? Where's the -- you know, tell us what it is,
22 you know, and we can -- hopefully, we can help lead
23 you in the right direction."

24 But that it's not just this, "Oh, you
25 know -- oh, we got all these cautionary letters."

1 And I think there has to be an actual conversation
2 by us, so that they know that it's not just, "Oh,
3 we're only coming before them when, you know,
4 there's this big concern"; but that there's a --
5 that there's a constant dialogue that's going on,
6 and that we can hopefully help.

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And is that just -- do
8 you see that being a conversation with just the --
9 the, really, ones that are in danger of renewal? Or
10 also that kind of second one, where there's --

11 THE CHAIR: I would like to see it that
12 second tier; because I think that truly is a lost
13 group.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right.

15 THE CHAIR: Because they languish in
16 that -- there's your "C" student, you know. "Oh,
17 they're average, so that's okay." And it is, you
18 know.

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah.

20 THE CHAIR: But what -- maybe there's just
21 this simple fix. Maybe there's a way that we can
22 hook them up with this school and say, "Look-it.
23 This is where your problem is." Or, "This is where
24 you've identified. This school does a bang-up job
25 doing this, we know. And so maybe we can, you know,

1 stimulate a conversation" --

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: For support.

3 THE CHAIR: -- "to help you out."

4 And I think that's where -- I know it
5 greatly expands what we do; it does. But I think we
6 have a moral obligation to help those schools try to
7 be the best that they can be.

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. Great. Any
9 other thoughts on the types of actions?

10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I do have
11 a couple of things, and I think they're based off of
12 you reminding me of these things.

13 And I'm not sure about how this works,
14 Katie. But we were talking about the New Mexico
15 DASH, and you had us informed about it and
16 everything.

17 So even if these schools are "C" schools,
18 they can have "F"s in very significant areas. And
19 I'm always the one who says it the other way. But
20 if they're lowest performing kids, they're always
21 "F"s. And they're a "C" school, which is quite
22 possible, and an "F" in their graduation, if they're
23 high schools, those are of concern to me.

24 And so at one point somewhere on some
25 piece of paper a minute ago, we said they had to be

1 a "D" or an "F" school. Remember where we just
2 wrote that down? "D" or "F" have to do New Mexico
3 DASH?

4 So this is -- I just wasn't thinking about
5 it when we said it before, but now I am -- is that
6 well, maybe -- maybe you -- the schools who are "C"s
7 need to be a part of that, too; because they're a
8 "C" for a reason. And it's probably not because
9 they have all "C"s is what I'm saying. It could be.
10 It could be.

11 THE CHAIR: Right.

12 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And maybe in a
13 sense, differentiating those things might be
14 important; because it's really not okay with me to
15 continually have "F"s and say you're a "C" school;
16 or an "A" school, for that matter, or a "B" school.
17 Usually, the "A"s don't have "F"s; but they could,
18 because I found that one that did.

19 But regardless -- so maybe it's something
20 like, really, we're looking at charters as special.
21 You know, there's always antagonism towards
22 charters, because they're taking money from public
23 schools, which is true. And so I guess in my
24 mind --

25 THE CHAIR: But they're a public school.

1 So they're not taking money from public schools,
2 because they're a public school.

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right. They're
4 just redistributing it is a better way of saying
5 that, except for a couple.

6 But -- who are private.

7 So I think that they're -- the people's
8 expectation is that they are better than that. If
9 you're a "C" school with three or four "F"s or
10 whatever -- I don't know how many you could have --
11 but you have some "A"s, you know, or whatever, and I
12 am a "C" school, also, then the reason to have you
13 may not be as strong.

14 And I think that we're looking at keeping
15 away from vouchers in the state -- at the state
16 level. We are looking at giving people choices,
17 because this is 2017; it's not 1970, when I began
18 teaching, where one size did fit all -- or maybe
19 not; but more so than it certainly does now.

20 So I think that one thing is I'm talking
21 about the "C" with the New Mexico DASH. And that's
22 what we've already, I know, talked about; but I'm
23 changing my mind.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay.

25 THE CHAIR: I think the conversation with

1 the New Mexico DASH in the earlier part was the
2 requirement for an Improvement Plan -- or Corrective
3 Action Plan; because they're -- by their contracts,
4 they're only required now if they have a "D" or an
5 "F", to do that. And I think that was -- it was
6 they'd have to do the Improvement Plan or the
7 Corrective Action Plan if they have the "D" or "F."
8 I thought that was part of that conversation from
9 earlier.

10 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: I think so. But I'm
11 inclined to agree with you; because I see that. If
12 we're talking about what you said, that, you know,
13 those "C" schools, that even if it's going to mean
14 more time, I mean, that's exactly related to the
15 that; because they do have --

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It said "C" or
17 better, or "C" or worse. Remember that?

18 MS. POULOS: It used to be that the PEC's
19 performance framework said, "If you got a 'C' or
20 lower, you had to do an Improvement Plan." The
21 Commission voted about a year ago to change it to
22 "D" or "F."

23 THE CHAIR: To change it to "D" or "F."

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I changed
25 my mind.

1 THE CHAIR: Well, that's where I think
2 that conversation comes in. You know, if we sit
3 down, and we have that conversation with them --
4 because I don't know how viable it is right now to
5 put everyone in DASH. I don't know.

6 MS. POULOS: I don't know.

7 THE CHAIR: Yeah. So, see, that's just
8 that little gray area. But I think if we come to an
9 agreement that we're going to sit down, and we're
10 going to speak with these schools, I think that has,
11 to me, more benefit than them going off and doing
12 something on a website that I don't get to see;
13 because they're not hearing from me.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. So we are putting
15 the note on the deadline that definitely, there
16 needs to be a revisit of the NMDASH. But I also am
17 hearing a real desire to focus in. So I'm going to
18 show you a couple of examples of category systems
19 that two authorizers are using.

20 We will test whatever you like. If you
21 tell me, "We want two, or we want ten," we will do
22 that. But I came pretty much thinking that you
23 would go with either three or four, okay?

24 THE CHAIR: Just as an aside --

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: If you tell me eight, I

1 will do eight. We will do it.

2 So I want to show you two examples, and
3 just see your feedback. And I'm, sorry, Patty,
4 having you to turn around.

5 So this is taken from a presentation from
6 the Washington State Charter School Board, another
7 statewide authorizer. They're very new, though. So
8 they have, in the past two years, been putting
9 together their framework. They only have about five
10 schools.

11 And did a lot -- we were involved with the
12 development of their framework. And they did a lot
13 of outreach with their schools. They only have six
14 of them, and they were starting from nothing. And
15 so this was part of a presentation to the schools,
16 explaining sort of, "This is what we will be --
17 where you will be placed annually."

18 And they decided on four tiers, starting
19 with the highest. They do not yet have any specific
20 actions, like an expedited renewal; but they think
21 they may want to in the future, and they really
22 wanted to highlight high performance.

23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: How old is their
24 oldest charter? One?

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: One, I think. I don't

1 know if you remember, they had that whole lawsuit;
2 so not charters, and now they're charters. So
3 they're now charters again. So a little bit of a
4 mess there.

5 So this year will be -- they're just now
6 doing their first year of real results, and they'll
7 be implementing them.

8 Tier 2 are sort of the ones -- these are
9 the ones that would probably be just left alone.

10 THE CHAIR: They're just okay.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: They're meeting
12 expectations. You could argue that there should be
13 something else done with them, because they are
14 meeting the expectations.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: And probably there's a
16 range, right? In that group, there's probably some
17 great schools, and there's also some "aah" schools.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Now, Tier 3 is where I
19 think what we've just been talking about. These are
20 schools that are unlikely to be closed; but there
21 are concerns. And these are the schools that they
22 will probably have interventions. They
23 definitely -- especially, since they have so few
24 schools, are planning to have periodic meetings in
25 person with them.

1 Again, they have many fewer schools than
2 you. But there was a desire to pull out this group.

3 THE CHAIR: Those are schools that would
4 most definitely be in the DASH system.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. They might be --
6 they would probably be low "C"s, high "D"s.

7 THE CHAIR: Right.

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Exactly. Washington has
9 a slightly different state accountability, and they
10 have a different framework.

11 THE CHAIR: Right. I just think it's
12 easier for us to think in A-to-F. We lived in the
13 A-to-F world for too long.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. Right.

15 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: I'm still in there,
16 girl.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And then Tier 4, or the
18 fourth category, really, this is -- these are the
19 schools that should know, coming in, we may be
20 closed. If they have an annual report that places
21 them here, they, you know, need to be thinking about
22 actions. The authorizer definitely is in
23 conversation with them. Not all of these schools
24 will be closed.

25 So, again, this is not trying to set up a

1 trigger system, but a very clear line, "Below this
2 line, we need to be considering non-renewal."

3 Right?

4 So this is sort of where I was thinking.

5 So then one other example. It doesn't
6 have as pretty a graphic, so I'm sorry. But this is
7 the D.C. Public Charter School Board, very well
8 respected authorizer, high-quality portfolio. They
9 only have three tiers.

10 And they recognize, you know, their
11 Tier 1. And they have various ways that they
12 support expansion of their Tier 1.

13 And then Tier 3 is very -- the schools are
14 clear that if they're in Tier 3, they need to be
15 showing improvement, or they're likely to be closed.

16 So you could say -- this is a
17 prioritization. I also happen to know -- I know
18 that the D.C. -- that this authorizer has a lot of
19 interaction with schools. So that middle tier, you
20 could think, oh, the Tier 2 are just sort of lumped
21 and all there. The authorizer is having a lot of
22 interaction with them; but they are not
23 distinguishing these Tier 2 and 3.

24 THE CHAIR: Right.

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And these are generally

1 the two types of -- I think the two options you
2 should consider.

3 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: I like the first
4 example.

5 THE CHAIR: I like the first one, as well.

6 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: I like that. It's
7 very clear.

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I just looked at
9 the test results for about the twelfth time. The
10 school grades -- I beg your pardon -- the school
11 grades. And no schools who received "A"s had any
12 "F"s this year. You found one; but...

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I found one.

14 THE CHAIR: We did. We found one.

15 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: But there aren't
16 any now. The "B" schools, a few of them have one
17 "F." But when you get down to the -- if I quit
18 calling them that, to the Tier 3 and the Tier 4, and
19 you focus, you're going to find academic weaknesses
20 that I would think -- I like the four tiers, because
21 I think it would be easily interchanged with what
22 PED -- what's already happening; is that true? Am I
23 making -- am I being too surfacy?

24 MS. POULOS: What's already happening.

25 Sorry?

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: The grades, the
2 system that's in process. If we looked at these,
3 and then -- it's an extra step by doing this, right?

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, now, remember that
5 this won't only be based on the A-through-F grade.

6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's one of the
7 factors that would go into the roll-up. And so it
8 would be --

9 THE CHAIR: I think we get a better
10 distinction with the four; because we can -- we
11 can --

12 MR. TIM FIELD: It does -- I don't know --
13 you already have the four, like the "Meets" -- the
14 "Exceeds," "Meets"; so you already --

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: It's consistent with
16 your --

17 MR. TIM FIELD: You already -- so
18 (indicates).

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Perfect. Okay. Great.
20 Anything else on -- I'm sorry. Did you have --

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: No. I'm just
22 checking it out. I'm trying to absorb all of this
23 stuff, and I don't have -- okay.

24 THE CHAIR: So are we --

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So I guess I have the

1 answer to your que- -- I mean, this, essentially is
2 the final box, No. 4. I'm really going backwards on
3 this.

4 But Question No. 4, where it says, "We
5 discussed roll-up options that would identify three
6 or four tiers." So it would be good. And if any of
7 you have any other thoughts of, "Well, but maybe not
8 in this," it would be great to have your thoughts
9 there.

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So we're looking
11 at those three options, then?

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. But if you're --
13 really, if you like the four -- so it's -- these
14 Questions 3 and 4 --

15 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm lost. I'm
16 sorry.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's over here.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: On the back side.

19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Oh, on the back
20 side.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yeah. But she's
22 talking about this.

23 MR. TIM FIELD: So look at these last two.

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Can I refer back
25 to this picture? So I guess, in my mind, a Tier 2

1 school has weakness in one -- one to three, or one
2 to two -- one or two areas, but not everything.
3 They're not all "F"s or whatever.

4 THE CHAIR: It would be three.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: The Tier 2 schools would
6 be -- again, we need to test it and talk to you all
7 about where you want. But when we've done these,
8 the Tier 2 schools are either going to have very
9 consistent "Meeting standard" across all the
10 indicators; they might have one or two "Meets" that
11 would have to be balanced out by an "Exceeds"
12 somewhere, or they wouldn't be winding up above --
13 kind of above your expectation level. So these
14 really are schools that they're meeting your
15 expectations. They are --

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And still grow
17 if they're -- they could be a "B" school and have an
18 "A" in something and an "F" on something. So we
19 want them to spiff it up.

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: The way I want to build
21 this for you is you would feel confident that those
22 Tier 2 schools are solid performers. They're, on
23 average, meeting your expectations.

24 THE CHAIR: And once again, this is not
25 just based solely on the report card.

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: No. This is just
2 one component. That's what I'm --

3 THE CHAIR: Right. But it's possible that
4 they could be "Working towards standard" in some
5 area that's in the framework.

6 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Most -- in order to --

7 THE CHAIR: Well, no, that's the rating.
8 "Working towards standard." They haven't met --
9 they're not --

10 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, it also
11 seems to me some in this group don't have to have
12 weaknesses. They just aren't at the top. You know,
13 they're the ones who are getting their students a
14 little above; but they're not getting them all the
15 way up there yet.

16 So what you want them to do is continue
17 the upward push, rather than working to improve
18 something else. Because a lot of schools, to me,
19 that get to that point don't have any major
20 weaknesses; they just maybe aren't working as hard
21 as they could to improve those areas.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, where it
23 said in Tier 3, "School shows weakness in one or
24 more academic areas," I would think that Tier 2
25 might show a weakness in an area; but, basically,

1 they're pretty good schools.

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: All schools and
4 all kids are not going to be "Exceeds standards."
5 That's just reality.

6 So I like the words -- this just my
7 personal thing -- is that where this -- where Tier 3
8 says, "Shows weakness in one or more areas," I think
9 they probably show weakness in more than one; so
10 that I would think that Tier 2 would maybe show
11 weakness in one or two areas, and those are areas
12 where they need to -- whatever they need to do:
13 Concentrate, work to improve, blah, blah, blah.

14 Whereas, Tier 3 -- this is just my
15 opinion, guys; so we can all disagree -- would show
16 weakness in, say -- I don't know -- three or more,
17 or two or more, or something like that. And it
18 could be a possible intervention.

19 But I think they're pretty close to not
20 being renewed, also; because if they are
21 continuing -- if they're -- they could be "D" --
22 we'll just use --

23 THE CHAIR: Or they could be a "C."

24 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: They could be a
25 low "C". I wrote down "low 'C,' high 'D'." So

1 they -- I think not only should we say "possible
2 intervention," it could be possible -- possible
3 revocation. I think it's --

4 THE CHAIR: I don't think we -- I don't
5 think we can really talk about closing a school
6 that's got a low "C."

7 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Right. That's
8 the issue.

9 THE CHAIR: I'd be hard-pressed to do
10 that, you know. That's pretty --

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: These could be schools,
12 though, that are heading down. And the reason to
13 have this category is to be able to have
14 conversations with what's happening, and you're
15 catching it earlier than when things really fall
16 apart.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So it could be
18 more than --

19 THE CHAIR: We're sending a message that
20 if you have a "C," you could possibly be revoked.
21 And that's not a --

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: No, I don't want
23 to say that. That's not what I want. But I guess I
24 want more than -- I guess I want Tier 2 to say
25 something more like, "One or two weaknesses," or,

1 "One weakness," or something like that.

2 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I disagree. If
3 we're doing four tiers rather than three, I don't
4 think Tier 2 should have a weakness.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I think they
6 might.

7 THE CHAIR: I think that they'd have to.
8 If they don't have a weaknesses, why aren't they a
9 1?

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But they could; because
11 they could be right above average on every single
12 indicator. They're "Meeting standard" on every
13 indicator. That makes them "Meeting." They're not
14 "Exceeding." Because "Exceed," you have to be
15 exceeding on almost every indicator; so...

16 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: To me, the word
17 "weakness" doesn't belong -- at that point, it
18 belongs farther down; because you can do everything
19 fine, and you're still not at the top. But as soon
20 as you aren't -- because you really are not doing
21 everything you can do, that drops you down.

22 THE CHAIR: So you don't want to -- they
23 can't have a "Failing to meet standard."

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Right.

25 THE CHAIR: Got you. They can be "Working

1 to meet standard"; they haven't "Met." But they
2 can't have a "Failing to meet standard." I can see
3 that. I can see that, in the Tier 2, that you can't
4 have -- you can have "Working to meet," which means
5 you haven't met it yet. But if you have a failing
6 the standard, that's a little too much, maybe, for a
7 Tier 2. I got that. Yeah, I see what you mean.
8 Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And you're
10 thinking -- I just want to clarify what -- so I
11 understand what you said. So you're thinking about
12 not necessarily the grade they got on the report
13 card --

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Right. That's not
15 a part of what we're talking about.

16 THE CHAIR: No. We're just talking about
17 overall, their assessment total. So that I think
18 that's fairly reasonable to say, "You can't be not
19 meeting the standard -- failing to meet."

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Or the "Falls far
21 below." Perfect.

22 THE CHAIR: You can't be in that bottom
23 for Tier 2; but that language be there.

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Tier 3, you want
25 to work to move up.

1 THE CHAIR: Right. It's possible, in
2 Tier 3, that they haven't -- they "Failed to meet
3 standard" in an area -- yeah, I got you.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I'll just give you a
5 little preview of the weeds; because you guys are
6 getting in there anyway.

7 There are basically two ways that are
8 generally used to aggregate up; right? The first is
9 to do sort of an average of points that you take
10 from; that's how your A-through-F is, right? The
11 weighted average. Some are going to count a little
12 bit more. But you're doing an average up; right?

13 And then the other approach is sort of to
14 say -- more of a conditional. If you have -- so --
15 and that's sort of the way that you all have been
16 talking about it. Like, if you have one "Falls far
17 below," you can't be above Tier 2. It sounds like a
18 logic pattern, right? Like, if you have two or more
19 "Falls far below" or four or more "Does not meet,"
20 you would be in Tier 4, kind of a conditional type
21 of thing.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: And you could do both.
23 You could say -- we roll it. Up, we use these --
24 but if you have these conditions --

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Triggers or safeguards;

1 so that even if you have an average that puts you in
2 Tier 2, if you have one or more "Falls far below."
3 That's what we'll come back to, those tier kind of
4 options. So you wind up coming out. Because
5 actually, when we were doing Washington, we did it
6 both ways; because they thought they wanted to start
7 out with a conditional, if-then if-then. So we did
8 it; but we tested it there. And then we also did a
9 point. And they came out pretty similar.

10 The schools understood -- or somehow,
11 there was a general sense that they liked the
12 average better. And that's what they went with.
13 But that doesn't mean -- again, we can do that for
14 you, kind of show it both ways.

15 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But that was six
16 schools, as opposed to 60 schools.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: We did a trial run on
18 statewide schools.

19 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: You know, we have
20 as much -- and some of them newer than others, some
21 of them older. We don't have any of that are --

22 THE CHAIR: They're not all on the same
23 playing field, yeah.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And you have different
25 situations. So for that Tier 2, you might have some

1 that have green all the way across; so they're
2 green. You might have some half "Exceeds" and half
3 "Falls far below"; that might not be okay with you
4 for them to average to the middle.

5 So that's what we'll discuss when you come
6 back. But what I definitely have now is that you
7 like the idea of four. That's what we'll test.

8 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I tend to like the
9 fewer, three; but everybody -- I can certainly live
10 with everybody else's idea of the four. But to me,
11 three makes it a little clearer to people; you
12 either are cutting it or you're not.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So name three.
14 I'm not putting you on the spot to name; but I just
15 want to write it down. So if three would be -- what
16 would we call that group?

17 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, it was what
18 was on the --

19 THE CHAIR: It was on that other slide.

20 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: It's right there.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Oh, here it is.

22 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I would recommend,
23 though, that you stay with a neutral 1, 2, 3, as
24 opposed to -- because it's so important for you not
25 to --

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I certainly can
2 live with the four; it's my own preference. But,
3 again, you folks are more educators than I am. I'm
4 the bureaucratic. And I tend to like things a
5 little simpler for me, in -- where something fits.
6 But schools are probably -- I don't know. Kelly is
7 back here. Schools might like four rather than
8 three.

9 MS. CALLAHAN: I would tend to probably
10 have them have four.

11 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: So I have no
12 problem with that; but I just wanted to say that --

13 THE CHAIR: Because the "B" schools and
14 the Tier 2 schools are still mostly safe. And if
15 we're looking to engage and do more of those
16 conversations, I think it's easier to factor those
17 schools out if we have that third tier; because
18 they're the ones that we really want to now start
19 focusing a little more attention on, not ignoring
20 the 1's the 2's; but I think it would get muddled.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Yeah. And I'm
22 fine with whatever people want to go with. I just
23 wanted to say that was my personal --

24 MS. CALLAHAN: May I just say that the
25 four tiers also might be a helpful benefit, as we

1 look at the SAM schools, once that's defined in
2 PED -- you know, because the Tier 2 is not the
3 end-all be-all, but it also is allowing, you know,
4 that there might be some possibility in there that
5 it doesn't create a negative stigma. So I just --

6 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That's a good point.

7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So overview.
8 We've agreed on the four tiers. We have not spoken
9 yet about the components.

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. And we're about to
11 get into that.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Thank you. I was
13 confused. Thank you.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And so we will move.
15 Thank you. I am just looking at my -- what is my
16 time?

17 MR. TIM FIELD: We're ahead of schedule.
18 We probably want to be.

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Good. We have
20 about half-an-hour per component.

21 So now we're going to talk about the
22 components.

23 All right. So from the last meeting, and
24 also the conversations in between, we're focusing on
25 four components. If another -- if a fifth comes up

1 in this conversation, we can certainly add it into
2 the mix. That's why we want to really get your
3 feedback on this.

4 So those four are the, "State
5 Accountability System, that A-through-F grade. And
6 each of these, we're going to talk about options;
7 right? So this is -- we're just talking about the
8 broad categories.

9 At the last meeting, there really seemed
10 to be a desire to include something about subgroup
11 performance or achievement gap. So we'll talk about
12 some options for that.

13 Then the other two components that
14 currently are in your framework that we'll want to
15 talk about ways to either shift how those are
16 evaluated, or, you know, just talk about options,
17 are the mission-specific goals and then those
18 supplemental assessments, you know, that are short
19 cycle.

20 So those are the four. And so we'll dig
21 into each one. I just want to say ahead of time,
22 it -- I think sometimes in the conversations with
23 schools -- and then, also, it has -- often, the
24 supplemental assessments and the mission-specific
25 goals sort of get lumped into one -- people seem to

1 sort of consider them all, you know, just as one big
2 category.

3 And so for this conversation, at least,
4 I'm really going to challenge us to really think of
5 those separately. What does each one give you in
6 terms of accountability and information about
7 schools? And what's the intent of them both? And
8 so we'll consider those separately.

9 Are we missing anything in terms of broad
10 categories?

11 Okay. Great. So if we dive into the
12 State Accountability System.

13 In your handout, you have the sort of
14 broad -- this, I think, is at the end. You have the
15 color; you know, just the summary of the most recent
16 results from last year to come out. So I know
17 you're all very familiar with this. I will just
18 take a moment to talk about what's in the
19 A-through-F and then talk about the options.

20 So we have -- you know, this first chart
21 that you have here just shows the percentage of
22 schools that are falling into each of the grade
23 categories. This is that table at the top, and it's
24 up on the screen. And we are looking at the
25 percentage of, you know, the State charter schools

1 and then all schools, statewide. And --

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I'm sorry. Just
3 one question; I just want to clarify this.

4 So I see that the second column here -- or
5 the first column, whatever -- is the 16 percent.
6 Those are just State-chartered schools. So in the
7 "All schools statewide," those are also local
8 charters, as well as traditional public schools; is
9 that correct?

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. So that's all
11 public schools in the state except the State charter
12 schools. So we took them out. They're in the first
13 column, and all the other schools are there. So you
14 can just sort of compare, and you see that there
15 are -- you know, the distribution is fairly similar.
16 You know, that's just a broad view of it.

17 The -- let's see. So then if we che- --
18 now, what you don't have in this printout which I'm
19 showing up on the screen and you have on your slides
20 is just the weighting, you know, sort of talking --
21 because this will be important as we start talking
22 about options.

23 So you have -- let's see -- one, two,
24 three, four, five, six, seven components of the
25 A-through-F, plus the possibility of bonus points.

1 So I'm just going to do on a quick run-through. And
2 stop if there are any questions on anything. I know
3 you all are familiar with these.

4 But 40 percent for elementary and middle
5 school goes to what's called "Current standing."
6 This is, essentially, proficiency, but looked at in
7 two views. A 20 percent weight goes to straight-up
8 proficiency, you know, how many students are at --

9 MS. POULOS: It's gone up to 25 now.

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Oh. Has it gone up to
11 25?

12 MS. POULOS: It's gone up to 25 now.

13 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Oh. My weights aren't
14 correct. Sorry. Okay. So wasn't it 15 for
15 Value-added? Oh. So the slide is still correct.
16 It's just my talking points aren't.

17 MS. POULOS: Yeah.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. So 25 percent
19 is -- of that 40 is just straight-up proficiency,
20 how many students are at grade level.

21 Then another 15 percent is value-added
22 conditioning.

23 So this should make you happy. It's
24 actually saying who are the students who are in that
25 school, and given our expectations for these

1 students, are they at the proficiency rate that we
2 would expect?

3 Still a lot of issues that I know people
4 will have with proficiency. But this is fairly
5 unusual in state accountability systems, that they
6 would even take a look that way and do any kind of
7 value-added conditioning on the proficiency rate.

8 So that's 40 percent of the weight to
9 proficiency. Again, I know we talked about this in
10 July. But when you look across the country, that's
11 a fairly low, compared to average, weight on
12 proficiency. So I know lots of issues with the
13 A-through-F; but you do have a system that is a much
14 higher weight on growth, comparatively to other
15 states.

16 So then the next three are growth
17 measures. You have that school-level growth. And
18 then a look at the top 75 percent of students and
19 then the bottom 25 percent of students. So taken
20 all together, you know, 50 percent of the grade is
21 based on growth.

22 And I know there was some confusion as we
23 were talking to folks. And even when I initially
24 looked at this, I thought it was looking at the
25 bottom quartile and the top quartile. But it's the

1 bottom quartile and then the top 75. That was a
2 good clarification.

3 Great. Then 10 percent is on what's
4 called "Opportunity to Learn," attendance and class
5 graduation; in high school, graduation looked at
6 three ways, and, again, with the value-added
7 conditioning on it, which, again, I actually don't
8 know of any other state that does that, sort of look
9 at it, taking into consideration who they serve.

10 So, again, that doesn't make it a perfect
11 system. There are issues; but you have much more in
12 your system that is taking growth and the students
13 served into consideration than most accountability
14 systems.

15 Then you have College and Career
16 Readiness, and then the bonus points.

17 So just before we start digging in --
18 because we are going to talk about, like, which
19 components would you prioritize, which you
20 wouldn't -- are there any questions about them that
21 I or somebody else can answer about, you know, what
22 are these measuring? What are these? Does
23 anybody -- okay.

24 All right. Finally, we'll take -- you
25 know, we have this bar chart. I hope it's not too

1 dizzying; but good to just sort of, again, look at
2 all the State charters compared to all the schools
3 statewide. And this one is in your printout, as
4 well. It's easier to look at there, just sort of
5 seeing how do the grades on each of the components
6 break out when you look at the charters, versus all
7 the rest of the schools in the state.

8 Two things to sort of note here that will
9 be important, I think, when we come back to think
10 about how you want to use the results, some of the
11 components may be more useful to you than others, or
12 you may prioritize more highly than others.

13 When I look at this, the first -- the
14 concern that I have is why is it that, you know, not
15 just charter schools, but, you know, 60 -- I don't
16 know -- 60 percent of schools in the state are
17 getting an "F" on this growth of the lowest
18 25 percent of students.

19 That may be the case; but it doesn't do
20 much to help you distinguish between schools. Like,
21 there's probably some range; but then there's "F"s,
22 and how would you know, again, if you're trying to
23 look at a Tier 3-4, should some of those really be
24 3-4?

25 So the ability to distinguish using a

1 metric is always a good question. Can you
2 distinguish between schools using a metric? And
3 almost everybody is failing this.

4 MS. POULOS: Yeah. Can I just -- I think
5 context is helpful. We set our expectations in 2012
6 on performance at that time, on average performance
7 at that time. So interesting, what we have --
8 interestingly, what we have then seen is -- because
9 that would not have been the reflection of the data
10 in 2012; right? Because there was a bar. The bar
11 to a "C" was the average performance statewide in
12 2012.

13 So on a whole, across the state, schools
14 are scoring lower on that indicator than they were
15 in 2012, which means maybe they're not serving those
16 students as well. Maybe the gaps are getting bigger
17 between their other students.

18 And I think it's important to have that
19 context to know that it could be -- if it had been a
20 real area of focus, it could be that that green is
21 actually flipped with the red; right? And so it may
22 still be something you want to put a lot of value
23 on, because you want to say to schools, "We actually
24 don't want to see it look like this."

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. Yeah.

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So you're saying
2 that it's low -- I want to make sure I heard this.
3 So the yellow bar that goes across those things was
4 set at this. And our schools are performing lower
5 than that, more than lower now than they were.

6 MS. POULOS: The "C" score was set based
7 on average performance across the state in 2012.
8 And now, there's more people below -- or more
9 schools below that "C" benchmark -- right? -- which,
10 if the distribution had stayed the same, there would
11 be an equal number, right? But because we've set
12 that bar and left it where it was, and now we see
13 more under the "C" performance, that means, as a
14 whole, the State is earning fewer points.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: And I don't know. It's
16 complicated. I think you could get a statistician
17 in here.

18 But I know, like, when I was in
19 Philadelphia, Philadelphia, also, like all states,
20 Pennsylvania, changed the state assessment. I know
21 some charter schools there that were high-performers
22 who serve really high-percentage low-income
23 students.

24 When the assessment changed, they had a
25 hard -- they, all of a sudden, were -- so I think

1 sometimes the assessment changes do have a harder
2 and tougher impact on students who are
3 lower-performing, because the rigor is higher and,
4 like, that bottom -- so I don't know if that's
5 what's going on here at all. Or is it, like, the
6 fact that 2012 it was based on a different
7 assessment, a different kind of assessment.

8 So that also may be why you see such --
9 because that used to be a more normal -- you know,
10 more spread-out distribution. That's changed. And
11 there's reasons why it could change. Schools aren't
12 doing as well even though it's not even four years.
13 You'd be kind of surprised if schools would go like,
14 (Indicates).

15 It could be that the assessment is proving
16 harder. Anyway, whatever it might be.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So the reason to keep
18 this in mind is, again, definitely, we want schools
19 to be improving. But I also want you to be able to
20 distinguish between schools. And, again, if they're
21 all failing, yes, that's something; but on a
22 particular indicator, we have to ask how helpful is
23 this going to be for you and -- that's the point to
24 remember.

25 Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So it would seem
2 like in the same sense of what you're saying, it
3 would seem to me to say -- because I would say in
4 New Mexico, with a few exceptions -- there are --
5 that the population of traditional schools and their
6 charter schools are pretty much the same. They have
7 a high ELL; they have a high special ed; they have
8 high disadvantaged; they have high free lunch,
9 reduced lunch, you know, all those -- there's not,
10 like, this difference between them.

11 So I guess my question would be, from the
12 opposite direction, is, so what are the schools who
13 are doing at least a "C" in lowest quartile, "C,"
14 "B," "A," doing that the other ones are not doing?
15 Did I say that backwards? I mean --

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: No. We get that -- one
17 other thing to think about on this one -- and this
18 will be important when we talk about the subgroup or
19 achievement gap -- another thing that could be going
20 on is that this is looking at the bottom quartile
21 within a school.

22 The bottom quartile -- and I think I wrote
23 this in something -- of a suburban wealthy school is
24 going to be very different than the bottom quartile
25 for a rural school, right?

1 So some of this probably also has to do
2 with how students are distributed among schools.

3 So this gets complicated. But, again,
4 we -- I'm worri- -- since that is the only component
5 in the A-through-F that addresses this achievement
6 gap issue, and that's really important for you, I'm
7 just a little worried about this. And that's why
8 we're considering adding other measures for you to
9 use, right?

10 THE CHAIR: Right.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Great.

12 So let's jump into, then, the options. So
13 we've identified three options. You may --
14 certainly, we're open to discussing more; Option 1
15 being -- and this is both on the screen, but you
16 also have this in your handout.

17 Option 1 would be to continue as you are
18 And one of the components of your framework would be
19 to use the overall A-through-F grade. So that's,
20 you know, sort of what you have in your current
21 framework, right?

22 The second option would be to actually use
23 the disaggregated grades and to say, you know, we're
24 going to kind pull it apart, perhaps prioritize some
25 of them over others, okay?

1 And then the third is really going off on
2 your own and saying, we're still going to look at
3 proficiency, growth, graduation rate and college and
4 career readiness, but we're not going to base our
5 overall rating or our performance evaluations and
6 renewals on the grade. We're actually going to dig
7 into the proficiency rates, and, you know, make a
8 decision about what do we say the bench- -- you
9 know, the thresholds are for meeting our standards.
10 We're going to look at the growth. We're going to
11 look at graduation rate. This, obviously, requires
12 much more work, but has some benefits, you know,
13 that we should discuss, okay?

14 So we'll sort of walk through these one by
15 one. I'm flashing up just your current targets that
16 you use for using that overall grade. Option 1,
17 you've got an "A" as the "Exceeds," a "B," "C," "D."

18 This would -- I would assume you would
19 continue to use these targets; but we could rethink.
20 Do you want to be splitting any of that "C"? You
21 know, there are ways that you could perhaps, you
22 know, change it a bit. But I'm assuming you would
23 stick pretty closely to this.

24 One change from your current framework is
25 that right now, you have some interventions written

1 into this first framework. Those would actually
2 sort of be removed to those tiers, instead of being
3 tied to this. So that would be one change.

4 But, you know, basically, it's the system
5 you have now. The strengths for each of these, we
6 kind of talked about. We want to talk about
7 strengths, concerns, and have you add any.
8 Obviously, this is the simplest approach. You're
9 using what's already being calculated. There's not
10 an additional calculation, aside from just assigning
11 the rating. You are aligned with the State
12 Accountability System; so your schools are being
13 evaluated, at least on this component, the same way
14 all public schools are.

15 On the concerns side, definitely what
16 we've heard from you is there is some confusion on
17 how A-through-F is calculated, some sort of distrust
18 of the system; also, concerns that if you are only
19 looking at that overall grade and don't have a sort
20 of a guaranteed system to be looking at those
21 components in each of them, that you lose a lot of
22 detail that you need -- you know, that is valuable
23 to see; and then, also, that concern that there
24 aren't -- there's not an achievement gap measure in
25 the A-through-F. And so at the June meeting, there

1 was a lot of concern that the schools that are
2 serving the needs of students are -- you know, are
3 not being sort of fairly evaluated.

4 Anything to add to this?

5 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: I have an issue with
6 that. I'll just tell you. Because I'm still in the
7 schools. And what you said a while ago about the --
8 the differences between -- you know, that's true
9 anywhere in the state. You know, we have kids --
10 and I've said this before -- that one of my dearest
11 friends is a math teacher, and the kids that live on
12 the north side of town can afford to pay her \$50 an
13 hour to tutor them.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: And, I mean, the north
16 side is a different -- it's a completely different
17 population.

18 We only have one high school. And so all
19 our kids go to that same school. And I have a
20 problem with just simply looking at that. This is
21 not a true picture. I will tell you I'm an advocate
22 for doing away with some testing that our state
23 does; because I think we over-test the heck out of
24 our kids.

25 That's my personal opinion; probably not

1 shared by everybody in the room. But I have to just
2 tell you, because I'm on that front line. And I
3 could tell you horror stories involving kids and the
4 over-testing of kids that we do and the amount of
5 excessive time that we spend, you know, testing our
6 children, and the lack of -- you know, we had kids
7 that didn't attend music and choir and -- because
8 it's just months of testing.

9 And then that whole connection of you're
10 going to base a teacher's evaluation, you know,
11 contingent on a student's test scores. And you have
12 kids -- I'm a counselor. Within my school, I see
13 kids that, you know, don't have parents, that their
14 parents are in jail. And so I have a real issue
15 with just saying, "We're going to grade everybody
16 like they're all, you know, the same. They're not
17 the same. They're not the same. And we have to
18 somehow take into account those differences.

19 And so I'm just going to tell you I'm
20 not --

21 THE CHAIR: And I'm the caboose on that
22 train.

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I agree. Because,
24 also, if I look at this one, where you've given a
25 "C" to our schools, and you take that column of

1 lowest 25 percent of students, the only ones in the
2 green shades are our ones that are our elite
3 schools. They've already got a different population
4 of students. There are others that are in the other
5 colors.

6 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: And you're exactly
7 right. I just think about Hobbs. Like, you know,
8 College Lane, certain schools that are on this side
9 of Sanger, they're always going to -- and I will
10 tell you, Hobbs did pretty well this year. But even
11 still, the kids that are right here on this side of
12 town always do better than the south schools;
13 because those kids tend to come from, you know,
14 low-income apartments. And, I mean, there's just a
15 lot of variances there. They don't have the
16 support -- yeah -- they don't have the support
17 system that, you know, these kids do. Not always,
18 because some do; but I just --

19 THE CHAIR: Las Cruces is very similar
20 that way. You know the neighborhood that these
21 kids -- you know.

22 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And the only
23 school that isn't one of our elite schools is
24 Mission Achievement and Success. And that is a
25 very, very specific educational approach to those

1 students that the others don't use. And they're a
2 "B." But all of our other schools are our elite
3 schools.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: They're an "A."

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: They're "A"s or
6 "B"s overall, I mean -- but the kinds of schools we
7 consider: Cottonwood, you know, AIMS, you know,
8 those schools, that they're going for a certain kind
9 of students. Cottonwood is, you know, International
10 Baccalaureate, and AIMS is a STEM school, you know.

11 And so you're getting a different
12 population in those schools. And so you're not
13 going to have -- that their percentages -- or their
14 quartiles are going to squinch up so that it's hard
15 to really say who's your lowest performing, because
16 they're still going to be up there.

17 THE CHAIR: I'm a fan of disaggregating.

18 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Me, too. Because we
19 have -- we are fortunate to have -- Dr. Sarangarm
20 work for us. And he -- Dr. Suchint Sarangarm. And
21 we know that he is this amazing statistician. And
22 he has worked with people here in this Department.

23 And -- you know, and we have people from
24 Los Alamos that I know, too, that still can't
25 explain how that entire process was calculated.

1 Tell me how you get to that.

2 So if you have all these people telling
3 you that there's issues with that, I mean, at what
4 point do we determine there's issue with that, and
5 we can't --

6 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Fabulous. So I'm
7 going to -- I want to be just very clear. These
8 issues, we are going to address, and we are going to
9 have to address them in the second component we
10 talked about. Because -- because of the way the
11 system is, these -- we can't address through any of
12 these three options. And that's why we are adding a
13 second component. So hold some of those thoughts
14 for a moment. And that's why we are --

15 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm hanging on for
16 dear life with this. But I don't know that I really
17 understand --

18 MR. TIM FIELD: I think it's helpful to go
19 through -- keep on going through this.

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: We are going through the
21 options.

22 THE CHAIR: I want some clarity. Do I put
23 any of this down here now, or not?

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes, please do.

25 THE CHAIR: So that's where I -- I just

1 need to --

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Put them, because we're
3 going to want to -- yes. So just to let you know
4 what we are --

5 THE CHAIR: And I didn't mean to interrupt
6 you. I'm just --

7 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Oh, no. That's
8 all right; because I'm just --

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. We're not --

10 THE CHAIR: I just didn't want to not do
11 something.

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: On Page 1 of this, which
13 has the little "1" at the bottom, this is where
14 we're going to want you to indicate, for each of the
15 components, which of the options you like, and maybe
16 that you rank them, because you think, "Oh," or
17 maybe these two would be okay, and you're giving us
18 your notes, okay?

19 At the end of it, we're going to talk a
20 little bit -- come back around to that, essentially,
21 then, what we will do with the components. But you
22 can focus on Page 1 right now.

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: One is the best
24 option. What's the worst option?

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Let's talk about

1 the other two.

2 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: You told us here.
3 Right here, it says, "Rank options. Each Component
4 1 is the best option."

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Oh. I didn't give the
6 other, because some of them have two options; some
7 have three; so...and one has four. So 4 would be
8 the worst, or 3 or 2 -- put them in order -- oh,
9 yes. If you would like to -- yeah, yeah. So we
10 were thinking 1, 2, 3, 4; but if you want to --

11 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I wanted to
12 indicate there's more -- yeah.

13 MS. POULOS: Sorry. I'm just going to add
14 one note, which is, obviously, letter grades are
15 still going to add to all the schools. They're
16 still going to be held accountable to the ESSA
17 requirements, which letter grades will do that.

18 So by creating a dual system, you're now
19 creating more uncertainty, creating, again, a dual
20 system, which I think is important to know, should
21 we decide that that's what you want to do. But I
22 think you need to know that that's what you're going
23 to do, and then schools are now going to be held to
24 two different systems. And that creates some
25 uncertainty and some challenges for the schools,

1 both in their interactions with you and in their
2 interactions with PED.

3 THE CHAIR: Well, I think if we create
4 clarity with what we're doing, then schools will
5 know. And it may be -- I don't think -- I think
6 right now, we have a dual system; because we've got
7 the short-cycle assessments in there. The statute
8 requires that we take into consideration the State
9 Accountability System. And I don't think anyone's
10 arguing that piece, because we can't do anything
11 else.

12 But the schools, right now, don't -- can't
13 sift through all the stuff, because it's not clear.
14 I think if we can create this clarity for them, then
15 it's -- and I -- one of the reasons -- my
16 understanding, and you'll have to clarify this,
17 because I wasn't on at the time -- but one of the --
18 one of the prevailing reasons why the short-cycle
19 assessments came in was because schools didn't want
20 to just be held to that State Accountability System;
21 they wanted this other piece.

22 Maybe it didn't develop as it should have.
23 But I think it's -- you know, I think from past
24 history from the schools, that that's -- they wanted
25 that alternative.

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: That was our
2 intent. And I don't -- any of the ones I did,
3 nobody was told you have to do a short-cycle
4 assessment. What people were told was, if you don't
5 choose to, we count your letter grade and the PARCC
6 scores, or whatever the test scores were before the
7 PARCC.

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I'm going to -- we're
9 going to dive into the short-cycle; so I guess --

10 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But I'm saying
11 that was why it -- so we already were allowing for a
12 different approach. I assumed, from the beginning,
13 the reason we gave you people the contract was to
14 come up with a system that would let us have clarity
15 with the schools between these two entities.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Perfect. Okay. Let's
17 get through this.

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm not sure I
19 agree.

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: About that --

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I mean -- so I'm,
22 again -- it's like Carmie said, I'm the dissenting
23 voice. I think we're creating ambiguity.

24 When short-cycle -- my understanding as a
25 school administrator, when short-cycle assessments

1 came in, they were to inform instruction, so that we
2 would know, as we prepared for the PARCC, it would
3 give us indicators; because prior to that, we had
4 nothing. You just went all year, and then you ended
5 it.

6 Then short-cycles came in. I agree that
7 where -- that -- yes, the opportunity, and then
8 the -- well, anyway -- but we're in -- I agree that
9 particularly with the lowest 25 percent and with the
10 graduation grades, there's a disconnect. And I
11 can't figure out what it -- I can think of lots of
12 things, like what Trish was talking about.

13 But if we create a grade system, we're
14 going to create an ambiguity that draws these
15 charter schools away from the State. And I don't
16 know whether that ambiguity will be healthy;
17 because, again, it turns into accountability.

18 Granted, this is only one component. But
19 if that component -- if we have said, "This
20 component created by the State of New Mexico does
21 not hold value for us, as leaders of charter
22 schools; therefore, we're going in another
23 direction," I don't think that's good for students.
24 I don't think it's good for school districts. I
25 don't think it's good for State-chartered schools.

1 Those schools that are chartered by
2 districts, how much ambiguity do we want to create?
3 I see what you all are saying. I do. But I'm
4 concerned about creating a monster, if we devalue --
5 maybe if we disaggregate it, I would feel better
6 with it. But if we -- I just -- I'm not just not --
7 not sure; so...

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I want to take us back
9 here, just so that we're -- because these are all
10 very important points, that in terms of these four
11 components that they're considering, I think there's
12 the assumption that the State Accountability is
13 going to stay somehow in the framework. We're
14 talking about options.

15 THE CHAIR: It has to.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Exactly. And then,
17 also, in the statute, that there also has to be the
18 option given to schools to submit supplemental
19 assessments and to set mission-specific goals,
20 right?

21 So I think there's no question that any of
22 these are leaving, and we do need to talk about,
23 like, then, how --

24 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: How are we going
25 to give them value?

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Exactly. And, then, do
2 you want to add this achievement gap subgroup that
3 would address some of the concerns you have.

4 So really valid concerns, then. So,
5 again, I would -- let's stay focused on, right now,
6 what's included. The question then of how you
7 weight them and prioritize them, we will talk at the
8 end. But I think, first -- I know that these
9 options bring up a lot of this. But...

10 MR. TIM FIELD: One of the comments is
11 like, you're always going to -- you're going to have
12 a dual system, no matter what, to some extent;
13 right? But the question is the further you get away
14 from the A-through-F -- whatever it is -- the more
15 you're going to have the possibility you have where
16 you're great here and not so -- but maybe you're
17 okay with that, too. But that's just the -- but
18 there are always going to be two systems, to some
19 extent. You're always going to have two systems,
20 but how far away depending on how aligned you are to
21 the current A-through-F system.

22 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That may be where, as we
23 were talking a minute about those conditions, would
24 it be okay to have -- it may be that you are going
25 to want to make sure to put in some sort of triggers

1 or conditioning that if this condition exists, for
2 instance, an overall "F" school, you may want to
3 say, "We're going to have certain automatic..." --
4 but, anyway, so we'll come to that in a minute.

5 So Option 2 would be to use the
6 A-through-F components. You're using those grades
7 that they're assigned. But you're considering them
8 separately within your framework. Each one would be
9 a separate indicator.

10 So this would be just one sample. This
11 would be, say, pulling out the school growth
12 components. You're looking at the grade. You're
13 looking at each component separately.

14 What you then also have the possibility to
15 do is to prioritize them differently. So flashing
16 up on the screen, this is -- these are the current
17 weights. You would have, then, the opportunity --
18 you're considering each of the grades; but it may be
19 that you prioritize them differently than they are
20 within the A-through-F. You know, that is a
21 possibility that this option gives you.

22 You remain -- so, then, in terms of
23 thinking about -- you know, this particular, you
24 know, Option 2, strengths and concerns, you are
25 staying, you know, less aligned with the State

1 system than just using the overall grade. But you
2 are using those component grades. They are included
3 into the framework reports. There is alignment; but
4 it may -- you know, degree -- the degree to which
5 would depend upon how much you change weighting.
6 You also have, then, the ability to prioritize
7 certain of those indicators over others.

8 In terms of concerns with this method,
9 again, you have schools that don't quite understand
10 or trust part of the A-through-F. And there would
11 be additional capacity. There would be work, you
12 know, on Katie's staff's part, because they need to
13 kind of pull these separately and do whatever needs
14 to be done to re-weight them and roll them up.

15 I think another concern that is brought
16 up, you know, is just, further, you know, moving
17 away from the A-through-F, does that create even
18 more confusion for schools? So that is something
19 that I heard.

20 Anything else about this particular option
21 that you all would like to --

22 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: The law requires
23 us to consider the A-through-F in some way. It's
24 just that --

25 MS. POULOS: It requires you to

1 consider --

2 THE CHAIR: The State Accountability
3 System.

4 MS. POULOS: -- the State assessment data.
5 I mean, it's different; right? But it does require
6 you -- I can pull the language, because I think
7 that's important.

8 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. I'm just --
9 we're not totally decoupled from any of the stuff in
10 the grades is what I'm talking about.

11 MS. POULOS: Right. Yeah.

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Option 3, you would be.
13 You're using the assessments.

14 So let's talk about 3.

15 In 3, again, you would not be using the
16 grades at all; but you would be using the data that
17 the grades are based upon. You would be looking at
18 proficiency. And you would then have to decide,
19 Well, what are we going to say is Exceeds, you know,
20 and you would be looking at growth, and you would be
21 setting your own sort of scores.

22 We think that you remain in -- you know,
23 in line with the statute, because you are using the
24 State assessments for -- and the different
25 components. But you would be setting your own.

1 One, a little bit in the weeds, you know.
2 That would require you to say what are our
3 standards? What's "Meets"? What's "Exceeds"?
4 What's "Falls far below"? You would probably take
5 one of two approaches with that. You would either
6 use sort of a relative approach; so maybe top
7 quartile, 50 to 70 -- where -- or you could set
8 absolute limits, and actually says, "Exceeds is
9 above....," you know, "X percent -- percentage."

10 The benefit of using relative targets is
11 that they -- you can use them whether there's a
12 change in the State Assessment System, whether there
13 are changes -- because you're doing a comparative.

14 Thinking about -- and I just have a couple
15 of examples of, you know, from other authorizer
16 frameworks, where they have used these. But
17 clear- -- the strengths here are that you are
18 setting your own performance expectations. It also,
19 potentially, is a system that you can keep using if
20 there's a change in the State Accountability System
21 or a change in the State assessments; so very
22 obvious concerns here. You know, you really are
23 setting up a totally parallel system. It is a lot
24 of work. And, you know --

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And it's

1 continuous; it's sustainable work. It's not going
2 away. It's going to be --

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Exactly. So -- but we
4 felt we needed to bring this to you, because this is
5 an option. It is something that you could do, and
6 it is something to consider.

7 So any -- so we definitely want you to
8 take a moment and fill out your top -- you know,
9 that section on the Item 1, you know, sort of put
10 your thoughts, concerns, your negative-10 scores if
11 that's how it goes.

12 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I gave you a "10"
13 and a "1" and a "2."

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Are we ready to
15 move on to subgroups?

16 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Not if you want my
17 thoughts.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. All right. You
19 can add to it throughout the day, as well.

20 I would also say that if you would like to
21 have a follow-up conversation, please let me know,
22 because I am really happy to call and talk to you,
23 sort of more in-depth, either to understand concerns
24 or to talk through options with you; so -- okay.
25 Danielle, I will definitely follow up with you,

1 because I'm going to move on.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's fine.

3 That's fine. You move on.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. The next
5 component we will talk about is the subgroup
6 performance or the achievement gap. Clearly, this
7 sounds like a very high priority, especially since
8 it's not captured, really, in the A-through-F, with
9 the exception of this bottom 25 percent. And even
10 that is using sort of a super-group to try to get at
11 those lowest performing students.

12 So we really want to know schools that are
13 serving, you know, a large percentage, or all
14 students who are in one of these groups that we know
15 is going to have -- you know, not compare well to
16 statewide averages or kind of be masked, we want to
17 know how they are doing.

18 So -- and, again, when we think about
19 things being actionable, what we want you to have
20 the ability to do is to engage with a school that
21 comes to you and says, "We're serving the neediest
22 kids, and you're not being fair to us." We want you
23 to be able to actually dig in and say either, "You
24 know what? You're right. You're doing really well.
25 You're doing much better than -- that either their

1 peers would have expected," or, you know, "You're
2 not, really." That's why that "everybody F" doesn't
3 really help; because within those, there are
4 probably some that are doing better than average and
5 some that aren't.

6 So we have three options which are really
7 Option 1, 2, or do both, in terms of thinking about
8 this.

9 The first, we would look at proficiency of
10 those students in groups and do -- you know, we've
11 got a number of ways that we can look at comparisons
12 to try to get a sense of how are they doing compared
13 to their peers. Again, this is based on
14 proficiency; so it's a snapshot. But it can give a
15 valuable sort of, you know, snapshot within a
16 school.

17 Preferable for many ways to be able to
18 answer this question is the question of how is the
19 growth of those students in subgroups; because then
20 hopefully, what you're really able to answer is
21 how -- are the students learning at this school,
22 right? Not just where are they at this moment? So
23 they tell you sort of different things.

24 We'll throw in recommendations from here.
25 We'll build it how you like it. But I think looking

1 at both actually gives you the best view, the most
2 views, the most nuanced view, and the best ability
3 to really engage with the school to talk to them,
4 "Tell us about what's happening. Here's what we're
5 seeing; but tell us."

6 Before we dig into each of these, I do
7 want to say that we think, from the statute, that
8 you do need to look at this from the State
9 assessment, because it clearly says that you are to
10 look at disaggregated assessment data.

11 So that's why we considered these options,
12 as opposed to, you know, sort of looking at
13 disaggregated short-cycle, which would have other
14 practical issues that -- we're talking about
15 performance on the -- on the State Assessment here.

16 MS. POULOS: Can I just say? So, a couple
17 of years ago, I think somebody praised New Mexico
18 for having the smallest achievement gap between
19 subgroups and its non-subgroups. And they retracted
20 that, because it wasn't that it was a positive thing
21 that our subgroup gaps were so low; it was actually
22 that all of our proficiencies were so low. So there
23 wasn't a big gap.

24 So that's my concern, is like, there may
25 be some schools -- so are we looking at gaps within

1 a school? Or are we saying a gap between, like,
2 statewide performance of all students, and then your
3 subgroup? Or is it a gap between statewide
4 performance of this subgroup compared to, then, at
5 your school?

6 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That's a great, great
7 question, and pretty clear answer. Again, we will
8 do what you would like. But we really -- I do not
9 like gap measures.

10 MR. TIM FIELD: Within a school.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Within an accountability
12 system, okay? Because it's important to look at
13 gaps, and that's why you see them publicized. But
14 there are many problems with actually using that gap
15 measure, like measuring a gap as an accountability
16 measure; first being, that within a school, there
17 are many charter schools who are serving all kids in
18 poverty, all Hispanic kids, all Black -- you don't
19 actually have an in-school gap to look at.

20 And then, also, the other question is you
21 could have a school, and you could say, "You're
22 doing great. You have a really small gap." And it
23 could be because everybody's doing --

24 THE CHAIR: Everyone is, right.

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: What you would think of

1 might be your high performing group isn't actually
2 high performing, and from one year to the next, they
3 could actually decrease, which would make it seem as
4 though your gap was improving.

5 So we didn't want to do that like those.

6 So what we would recommend is either
7 actually drilling into each of the subgroups that
8 are present in a school and looking at their
9 performance, either compared to their peers
10 statewide -- so not comparing them to all students,
11 or even the highest performing, but their peers; so
12 how are the, you know, Hispanic students in this
13 school doing to Hispanic students in the district or
14 the state. That's still got some issues; but it
15 gives you a snapshot again.

16 There are some other issues that are about
17 essentially lining up about the same as saying how
18 are, for example, the Black students in the school
19 doing compared to all students at the state level?
20 Because you've got sort of this steady bar at the
21 state level that you're comparing each of the
22 subgroups and saying, "What's that gap?"

23 I will recommend to you that you really
24 just take a look at all of the subgroups separately,
25 so that you can answer that question, you know,

1 "Yes, I see that you're serving a lot of, you know,
2 kids in poverty. They actually are doing better
3 than, you know, statewide or within your district."

4 Now, we may want to look at can we
5 separate out and look at the reduced versus the free
6 lunch, because there can be some difference
7 obviously within poverty. And if we're looking at
8 special education, that can be really different,
9 depending on, you know, what their -- yeah, what
10 their level -- like that.

11 So in answer to the question, yes, we
12 are -- while we're calling this achievement gap,
13 because, essentially -- well, it doesn't actually
14 say that there; it says "subgroup performance" --
15 because that's how people actually think of it. We
16 want to know if there are achievement gaps.

17 In terms of actual metrics, we're
18 suggesting that you drill in and really get a sense
19 of what is both the proficiency of the students in
20 the subgroups and what is their growth.

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: So you're
22 talking about Option 3.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That's what I would
24 recommend.

25 THE CHAIR: But the question, still, is

1 who would we be comparing them to?

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. Yes.

3 THE CHAIR: You know -- and I -- you know,
4 part of me says well, it's really important to -- to
5 compare them to the district, because that gives the
6 parents more information in terms of what school I'm
7 going to send my child to, because there's a direct
8 comparison with this charter school that I'm
9 thinking about and this district school; so that's
10 value to the community, you know. That's -- that's
11 an important piece, more than because I -- there's
12 greater challenges with whatever local school your
13 child would be going to, you know, is important.
14 But -- I can speak for Cruces. We have a lot of
15 kids who don't go to the school that they're --
16 their local school. Parents take them.

17 So that's -- I think that -- but I think
18 the district, comparison to the district as a whole,
19 you know, I think that gives the parents a valuable
20 piece. I don't know whether it's necessary of what
21 we're particularly looking for; but I think it's an
22 important piece of information for the -- for the
23 public to know, you know, because we're -- you know,
24 there was just -- there was an editorial in the
25 local paper today that there are no choices for

1 schools -- for schools for parents.

2 Yeah. I'll send it to you. It's by a
3 very, very, very conservative -- actually one of the
4 people who [inaudible].

5 THE CHAIR: So I think that's -- so I
6 guess that's a tough question.

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, that could be an
8 option. With proficiency, if you decide yes, we
9 want to include a snapshot of proficiency, you could
10 do it several ways, right?

11 You could compare and set sort of targets
12 based on comparison to the district. You can do it
13 to comparison, you know, statewide. Those are
14 two -- I don't think that you want to get into
15 similar school. I mean, there are others: Look at
16 similar schools, assigned schools. That gets very
17 complicated and is generally hard to execute. But
18 those are the -- the two sort of things you would be
19 looking within this option.

20 Then when we look at -- when we talk about
21 subgroup growth, you know, this, again, is very
22 powerful, because we're saying, of those students
23 within the school -- you know, Hispanic, Black, kids
24 in poverty -- really focusing in on them and how is
25 their growth. Do they have high or low growth or

1 typical growth? And that's really important.

2 I think that's sort of what that lowest
3 25 percent is trying to get at. Are the most
4 challenged students growing? Are they learning?
5 And so this could be really valuable. So, again, I
6 think they both can be powerful and can -- you know,
7 they're generally probably going to be aligned; but
8 growth, I think, gets more closely to what you
9 really want to know.

10 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I think that it's
11 hard for some of our schools who take a kid in who's
12 three or four grade levels below, and then show the
13 proficiency. But they can show that they've made
14 even more than a one-year growth, but they will take
15 them several years to get there.

16 Just like I have some concerns with
17 English Language Learners; because I anecdotally
18 know that there are some schools who continue to
19 mark them English Language Learners, considerably
20 past when they have learned English, because it
21 helps their numbers.

22 So they just go off that home language
23 survey every year and still keep them there, unless
24 somebody happens to notice the child is extremely
25 proficient in English, and, you know, at the top of

1 the class.

2 And so I have some concerns on -- I don't
3 know that our schools -- again, it was APS public
4 school. But I had some anecdotal information from a
5 teacher who was concerned about that and said it
6 happened in other schools.

7 But I -- you know, I just -- I think, to
8 me -- and again, I'm not the educator, I'm the
9 parent and grandparent -- to making sure that that
10 child is growing at the absolute fastest rate --
11 pace that that child is capable of growing; because
12 some kids, it's going to be a much slower rate,
13 because our schools, just like anybody that they --
14 some of our schools just have a larger proportion of
15 kids with special needs because their school has
16 been particularly good at handling those kids, and
17 the word gets around, and those kids get in.

18 So I would want to see that the school
19 didn't suffer as long as that child was progressing.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well -- and the
21 problem I would see with measuring proficiency is we
22 would be back to No Child Left Behind or, "Retain
23 all third-graders who can't read on grade level,"
24 because if we could talk about widgets, that would
25 be great; but we're talking about children. And

1 "all children" do not -- anything. I mean, all
2 children do not walk at 12 months.

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I agree with you. And
4 the only thing that is better than No Child Left
5 Behind -- in terms of here. I'm just saying that in
6 those -- the targets for the subgroups were the same
7 for every group and all students. So what -- we
8 would not be suggesting that; we would be more
9 saying how are those students doing compared to
10 their peers statewide? There are still issues with
11 proficiency and that a child could come in --
12 there's a range within that.

13 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: That happens in
14 many of our schools.

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yeah. But the
16 third one includes both; right?

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right.

18 MS. POULOS: I actually think the statute
19 requires us to do both; because it says, "Gaps in
20 proficiency and..." -- so it says, "Achievement gaps
21 in both proficiency and growth between student
22 subgroups."

23 So that's -- I would say that I think it
24 requires both. And I don't know if there's -- I
25 mean, I guess in the way that we've done it in

1 current standings, where we do both look at grade
2 level proficiency and proficiency in comparison to
3 performance to peers, then, potentially, there's the
4 way to incorporate those two together. I don't
5 know.

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: It doesn't say we
7 have to weight them equally.

8 MS. POULOS: No, it doesn't. No.

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Very good point.

10 Okay. So if you could sort of put your
11 thoughts on -- and your preferences on the Option 2.
12 And then we're going to have a guest for our next
13 component.

14 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: An additional
15 thing re proficiency: Once you're proficient, you
16 don't see as much growth, if you're an eighth-grader
17 reading at an eleventh-grade level.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Actually, let me say
19 something on that. So, yes, in terms of just
20 points, perhaps. But the way the growth models,
21 including your value-added, are set up is that you
22 are being compared to your peers starting at the
23 same place. So at every level, with a good growth
24 model, you still get to see, is this student making
25 better-than-average or lower-than-average growth?

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But if you're
2 already "grewed up" --

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: You would be compared --
4 suppose you are advanced, right? You are going to
5 be compared to everyone else that's advanced. And
6 some of them are going to grow more than you or less
7 than you, and you're compared only to them.

8 MS. POULOS: The thing about that, though,
9 is even a drop in points can be growth. And it can
10 be above-average growth. It can be; because if your
11 peers, on average, drop ten points, and you only, on
12 average, dropped five points, then you have
13 above-average growth. You do. Under the model, you
14 do.

15 And so that is a myth. It is a myth. And
16 it's also -- yes, one or two kids, right on average,
17 might -- you know, if you say, well, this is the
18 bell curve. But what happens when you aggregate it
19 back to the school level is if -- if your kids are
20 truly on the bell curve -- right? -- then you end up
21 in the middle, okay? So you've got average growth.
22 You've got a "C."

23 But if all of your kids tend to be
24 bringing with them that lower-than-average growth,
25 that's why we believe it's saying something about

1 the school environment. We're not telling you what
2 it says about the school environment. It could be
3 there's classroom management problems; it could be
4 there's classroom problems. It could be there's
5 pedagogical problems, right? But it's because
6 you're not seeing the bell curve at your school. In
7 fact, you're seeing either lots and lots of kids
8 getting the above-average growth, which means you're
9 getting the "A" or the "B" -- right? -- or you're
10 getting a majority of your kids having that
11 below-average growth in comparison to their peers.
12 Right?

13 And so then it's saying there's something
14 about the environment.

15 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I think
16 that's why I like both; because you can either be
17 either proficient; that's great. Or, like, I know,
18 because MAS is one of them; like, they come in as
19 sixth-graders reading at a second-grade level. And
20 at the end of the year, they're reading at a
21 fourth-grade level; but they still are not
22 proficient.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. Right. And
24 that's a great success.

25 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Some kids will

1 never be proficient. That means on grade level.

2 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: There's my
3 third-grade grandson, who's actually doing
4 fourth-grade math and fourth-grade reading. What if
5 he gets lazy next year and just does fourth-grade
6 math and reading? How does his school --

7 MS. POULOS: I think that's the school,
8 right? Because you create an environment where he
9 keeps being excited.

10 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: You know -- but he
11 may have lost his best friend; because he has one
12 friend. And last year, that kid was home-schooled.
13 This year, he's back in school.

14 MS. POULOS: But if he's the one. But
15 we're not doing it one kid, one kid, one kid. But
16 if he's the one. But if that's happening with all
17 of your kids, and, as a result, all of your kids are
18 bringing back lower scores.

19 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I was just keeping
20 his as an example that he's --

21 MS. POULOS: But that's why I think it's
22 important to think about the fact that you do
23 aggregates.

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But last year,
25 they were giving him special help in reading,

1 because he just wasn't happy all year. Now, this
2 other friend is back. He read his way through the
3 summer; because I was buying him books at much
4 higher than third-grade reading. And they tested
5 him. This year, he's happy.

6 I'm just saying you get these things. I
7 think he's average for a lot of kids, you know. And
8 I have one who think's he's smarter than the
9 teacher; so he only half-learns everything because
10 he thinks he's already there.

11 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, hopefully --
12 that's why we'll do a trial run, because we want to
13 see what these metrics will tell you about the
14 schools. And also, some of these schools, you sort
15 of have a sense. And it's going to be interesting
16 to see, okay, is this lining up with what you think,
17 telling you something new.

18 We're going to -- I think the order --
19 we're going to do supplemental indicators next. And
20 then we'll do mission-specific. And Baylor Del
21 Rosario is doing that piece. He started at the
22 charter office five months ago?

23 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Yes.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And he got thrown right
25 into dealing with supplemental assessments. So we

1 wanted to make sure -- so the reason that I've had
2 several conversations with Baylor, just to
3 understand, like, okay, what are you getting? What
4 needs to be done? What's the process?

5 And so I thought it was important for you
6 all to hear that, as well; because when we consider,
7 you know, using them, we want to do it in a way that
8 makes sense, you know, what the schools can give us
9 and -- you know, so you have to be well-informed.

10 So we're going to start with what's so
11 about the supplemental indicators. And then in a
12 minute, Baylor is going to actually walk through
13 sort of the process.

14 Again, what we said in the beginning, we
15 want to make sure that you really think of these as
16 separate from those mission-specific indicators;
17 because our understanding is that when supplemental
18 indicators are being used, the focus is usually
19 reading and math, right? ELA and math.

20 So in a certain sense, this is a
21 duplication of -- or is testing -- at least the same
22 underlying -- not content, necessarily, but as the
23 PARCC, right? You're looking at ELA; you're looking
24 at math.

25 We have some schools that are doing

1 language assessments, other types of assessments
2 that we would put more in the mission-specific,
3 because, you know -- so that's sort of the
4 distinction that we're making here is that when we
5 talk about mission-specific, we really want to be
6 focused on things that are capturing a part of the
7 school's mission that is important, but not
8 reflected anywhere else --

9 THE CHAIR: Right.

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: -- in the framework.

11 THE CHAIR: Right.

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay.

13 THE CHAIR: I think the unfortunate thing
14 is it morphed because it was easy. It morphed into
15 the reading and math. And that was never -- and
16 once again, I wasn't around. But that was -- it
17 seems to me that was never the intention.

18 And it doesn't capture for us what is
19 important in terms of, you know, Their mission is
20 this; but they're doing a bang-up job in math and
21 English. That doesn't tell me what they're doing in
22 terms of their mission.

23 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: That was Vince
24 Bergman who put the emphasis on the math and
25 reading. And he was in control of the contract

1 negotiations for many years.

2 THE CHAIR: For a while. Yeah. And I got
3 that, yeah.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: As we talk about the
5 supplemental, if you start to think about, "Well,
6 what about" -- we are going to talk separately about
7 those mission-specific. So we want to just kind of
8 think about them each separately.

9 So statute does have language that
10 specifically speaks to the -- to giving the option
11 of rigorous valid indicators. So, you know, that
12 seems to apply to this category of supplemental
13 indicators.

14 Three-quarters of the charter schools
15 currently have what we would call a supplemental
16 assessment, as opposed to one of the
17 mission-specific in their charter agreements.

18 What -- our understanding -- and this is
19 also where Baylor was able to help us get a sense
20 of, okay, what do you have, or what's happening with
21 the reporting -- to this point half of -- about half
22 of the schools -- and they're still continuing to
23 submit them -- have submitted '16-'17, you know,
24 results -- submissions addressing these results.
25 But only half of those are the required

1 student-level results.

2 And Baylor will talk in a minute about the
3 process we go through that we need -- you need --
4 what is needed are those student-level results so
5 you can really have confidence, okay?

6 And then just the last thing that's pretty
7 important is that most of the indicator targets,
8 those targets that are put in the contract, are
9 focused on growth, because you can use these
10 assessments to evaluate proficiency or growth. But
11 most of them -- and I'm only telling you what you
12 probably already know -- but most of them are growth
13 or a combination of growth and proficiency. That's
14 sort of the [inaudible], yeah.

15 And then the second part of that is -- and
16 I think you've seen this before -- we sent it to
17 you -- most of the assessments used are NWEA. But
18 you can see here there is kind of a smattering of
19 the rest. The second most common one is Discovery.
20 And then Discovery will not be used -- right? --
21 after.

22 THE CHAIR: Right.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. Great.

24 Okay. So let's -- we're going to sort of
25 talk about the challenges, and then -- because I

1 think we know sort of the strengths.

2 So, Baylor, why don't you -- pass it over
3 to you.

4 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Good afternoon,
5 everybody. Thanks so much for allowing me to share
6 some of my experience and a little bit of insight
7 into my attempts to evaluate some of the short-cycle
8 assessments that the schools have provided to
9 support their -- not only their mission-specific
10 indicators, but their indicator targets. And I just
11 want to go over some of the challenges that I'd like
12 the Commissioners, you all, to be aware of.

13 Obviously, you all know that there's
14 multiple assessments out there. Some of the schools
15 are using, to measure some of their indicator
16 targets, multiple assessments, from NWEA for upper
17 grades; and, of course, some are using DIBELS,
18 slash, Istation for the lower grades for reading.
19 And so that's all mixed in there, as well.

20 The indicator targets, we were referring
21 to as mission-specific indicators around short-cycle
22 assessments. They may -- they may be the same;
23 like, NWEA is used a lot. But -- but the metrics
24 are different with them between -- or across
25 schools. So that's posing some challenges.

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So one school might have
2 a target based on the -- you know, the average
3 growth. Another might be using the same assessment,
4 but have a target based on a different metric. So
5 that can just be a little confus- -- it's not
6 consistent throughout.

7 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Yeah. So, like,
8 for example, lots of schools use NWEA. But one
9 school specifically wants to measure 10 percent
10 growth. By the way, it's very hard to figure out
11 10 percent growth from NWEA. From what I've
12 gathered from speaking to some of the administrators
13 or principals, they can't find 10 percent anywhere.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: What does that mean?

15 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: The assessment
16 vendors simply can't generate those kinds of reports
17 from their --

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: They'll charge you
19 more if you get something out of -- do you all use
20 NWEA?

21 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: So using NWEA --

22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Lit scores and --
23 yeah, I'm trying -- and it depends on the level.
24 One school may only go down to this level, and
25 another school goes down to this level. And you're

1 getting --

2 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Some have stated
3 in their -- in their indicator targets, 10 percent
4 growth by the end of the year. Others have it
5 stated using the same assessment, "Year's growth."
6 But that is not specified. That's not really the
7 term that's used by the assessment vendors, because
8 these are growth models individually generated for
9 each student. So, obviously, one year's growth is
10 going to be different for each student within the
11 same grade; so same assessments, but very different
12 expectations.

13 And oftentimes, the indicators -- or the
14 indicator targets -- don't match the metrics. For
15 example, an indicator target might reference a
16 percentile, while the metric actually references
17 a percent. A percentile really relates to a
18 percentile range. And the percentage is really just
19 a portion of the whole.

20 So -- and we've had sit-down discussions,
21 at least with one principal, who was pulling her
22 hair -- and so was I -- about trying to interpret
23 some of these -- yeah, what the target was and how
24 we are supposed to measure it. And that was
25 actually my first evaluation that I was conducting.

1 And it's going to get smoother from here.

2 MS. POULOS: So Baylor is thinking about
3 leaving my team? You better not be.

4 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: So that's
5 probably one of the bigger issues, that it doesn't
6 appear like it's an issue just on my end trying to
7 evaluate progress towards these indicator targets;
8 but it looks like it's an issue for some of the
9 principals that I've been talking with, as well;
10 indicators a bit nebulous, or they're written in a
11 way that does not relate to the assessment itself.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Uh-huh. Yeah.
13 It's very difficult as a principal.

14 THE CHAIR: But I think the -- maybe I'm
15 getting confused here. Because I think the
16 agreement is that the mission-specific shouldn't be
17 those targets. It shouldn't be the reading and the
18 math.

19 So I think we understand that there's
20 problems with them that doesn't assess the mission;
21 so that it's -- you know, it needs to be --

22 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, I think the thing
23 that's coming through is if you want to continue
24 having the option for these supplemental
25 assessments -- so not the mission-specific, but the

1 supplemental.

2 THE CHAIR: I thought we were just dealing
3 now with the mission- -- so that's why I'm confused.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: We got out of order.
5 We're talking about the supplemental assessments. I
6 apologize. We swapped them, and we're talking about
7 the supplemental.

8 Some of these issues will also apply to
9 evaluating the mission-specific. But we wanted to
10 keep these separate; because you need to make some
11 decisions about values you give to schools, how much
12 you would prioritize one over the other; because
13 this will come to how to weight them, how to process
14 them.

15 THE CHAIR: Right. I think we've got -- I
16 mean, obviously, it -- and it goes back years. So
17 there were -- it was, "This is what we have to do."

18 And they're just -- you know, we're always
19 playing catch-up with, "This is what we should have
20 done."

21 I think we've had conversations about the
22 short-cycle assessments and narrowing it down to,
23 you know, "Here is the -- the short list. It can't
24 be, 'I'm going to find this assessment that's
25 cheapest or fits my schools.'"

1 And that these are the assessments, so
2 that the language is gathered so that we're all
3 speaking the same language that we understand what
4 the target should be, and that many of the
5 assessments do allow, my understanding, is a -- a
6 signature so that the information can be sent
7 directly to CSD, as opposed to having it go to the
8 school, and then the school, then, sending back
9 whatever, that we have way clearer language as to
10 what is expected in terms of these -- these are the
11 reports. You know, if this is what you're choosing,
12 this is what the expectation is for the report.

13 And if you -- if this is in that level
14 that you're not going to be able to afford, then you
15 have to look at not choosing that; but that we -- we
16 do create clarifying language, so that we know what
17 the targets need to be, and we know what,
18 specifically, those reports are that -- and it's
19 upfront. So it's not, "Well, I couldn't get that,
20 because that's not in our plan to do that."

21 "Well, this is what we said upfront. This
22 is what we want from your school, if this is what
23 you're choosing to do."

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I think that that segues
25 nicely from the feedback from the schools. Because

1 what I'm hearing -- and I would definitely give as a
2 recommendation -- is one, you have clear guidance.
3 It would be wonderful if you had, like, "Here is the
4 list of approved. If you choose this assessment,
5 here are the targets we'll use for your growth."

6 Because growth targets, you can apply
7 consistently across schools. That will really help
8 with, you know, this issue of some targets being
9 based -- I mean, some of them, I remembered also
10 just said, like, "The students will show growth."
11 That -- that's very difficult to assess what's
12 meeting that, or even a year's worth.

13 So, anyway -- so having consistent
14 targets, having consistent sort of choices, yes.
15 Okay.

16 So then just so that you also understand
17 the capacity, or so that when you think about what
18 to include, the other thing that Baylor offered to
19 do -- or I asked him to do -- was to say, assuming
20 in the ideal situation that you receive this report
21 that you need, student-level report, right?

22 MR. TIM FIELD: And the targets have been
23 set appropriately.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. And the targets
25 have been set appropriately. And that report could

1 come directly from the school or could come from the
2 vendor.

3 So we're assuming here that Baylor has, in
4 his hands, the student-level reports he needs. I
5 want you to just -- I want to talk about some of the
6 concerns that you might have, even with that, you
7 know, ideal data.

8 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Sure. I think
9 the one that we're currently dealing with is
10 obtaining the student-level results. You know,
11 perhaps that's because indicators don't always match
12 the metric for the school, and the school perhaps
13 has a hard time trying to reconcile what's being
14 asked.

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So guidance there could
16 clarify. And so -- so assume you have them. And
17 that's pretty time-consuming, right?

18 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: It is. It is.
19 There have been a couple of Division e-mails that
20 have gone out and individual calls, and, as I stated
21 earlier, an actual site visit, just to make sure
22 that -- that, you know, the Division and the school
23 are on the same page in exactly what it is that
24 we're trying to measure or look at here.

25 And then verifying students on the -- on

1 the list itself. Some of the target indicators
2 have -- have -- the school will, for example, set
3 goals, target goals for students with IEPs. And
4 we've gone through about a little -- almost
5 25 percent of the data from the schools. And quite
6 a few of them have had that. And all of them have
7 not been able to produce that. I'm not quite
8 sure --

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And that's tough for
10 schools, as well; because they're having to take
11 their NWEA -- for example, for the NWEA, that's a
12 roster list of results. And they would have to sort
13 of merge, marry that up and go in. That's doable.
14 It's just Baylor can't do it; the school would have
15 to do it, or they'd have to -- so this -- we want
16 you to understand the capacity required for any of
17 these.

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I have a
19 clarification question.

20 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Sure.

21 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: When -- presently,
22 when schools submit their short-cycle assessment
23 data as a part -- to us, to the Charter Schools,
24 that's a requirement of the framework that we have
25 now? I mean, they're submitting this based on a

1 decision that was made by the Commission?

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: If it was in their
3 contract. So it would be in their specific
4 contract.

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So we're looking
6 at the old contracts, and we are complying with
7 something that was written in the contract about
8 using short-cycle assessment data.

9 THE CHAIR: Right.

10 MS. POULOS: Trying to, I would say.

11 THE CHAIR: Right. But there wasn't a lot
12 of clarity. There -- it was -- there wasn't a whole
13 lot of understand- -- it's like, "You guys, this has
14 to be done."

15 So now, it's -- you know, it's unfortunate
16 that you realize the issues you're going to face,
17 once the reporting -- it's, like -- so now, we -- I
18 think, hopefully, we've had the "ah-ha" moments.
19 And now we could hopefully fix it and try to create
20 the clarity; because we've stumbled multiple times
21 with this.

22 So now it's like, okay. Now we've got a
23 better handle on the language that needs to be
24 there, so that the school is real clear on what they
25 need to provide, it's providable. You know,

1 that's -- that has to be there.

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And what we have here is
3 sort of "in the best case" situation. So if you had
4 clarity -- what we're trying to show here is if you
5 had clarity, you could get the data easily
6 submitted. There is still, you know, a
7 significant -- which is probably going to require --
8 if you were able to get all the clarity out, still
9 four to eight hours per assessment report cycle per
10 school, okay?

11 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Is this
12 information valuable to us, as a Commission? Or how
13 is it valuable? Because all of my experience with
14 short-cycle assessments has been to inform
15 instruction internally to prepare the students with
16 whom I'm working for the standard -- the
17 State-required assessments.

18 And so that's that variation from school
19 to school; because every school has a little bit of
20 a different philosophy on something they're going to
21 use internally.

22 So in trying to standardize it to one --
23 one interpretation, is it valuable enough? Are we
24 bound to it? I mean, it was there; but --

25 THE CHAIR: We're not bound to it. It's a

1 means of the school being able to show us another
2 way of showing growth and proficiency.

3 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I think my --

4 THE CHAIR: And that's how we saw it. And
5 that's how schools have -- schools asked for it. So
6 the PEC responded to it, because the charters asked
7 for it.

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I think that the
9 school districts may have asked for it, originally,
10 too, and then realized what they had asked for. And
11 I don't know -- I will work with it however; but
12 it's -- is that data going to -- we don't know until
13 we get it. But the variations in that data --

14 MS. POULOS: Well, that's something that
15 I've been thinking about. I think all of you know I
16 have a problem with the short-cycle assessments, for
17 lots of reasons -- right? -- staff capacity and
18 many.

19 But one of the things that concerns me --
20 and Baylor and I had this conversation -- is one,
21 we're saying, "Either you have proficiency or you
22 grow," which means we don't -- for a lack of a less
23 callous way to say it -- I could work on it. But we
24 don't care whether our proficient kids are growing
25 or not; right?

1 But then my more important concern is --
2 and I've seen this; right? So a kid has a really
3 good day guessing. But Test 1 shows they're not
4 proficient, or making high growth. Test 2 shows
5 they're proficient or making high growth, one or the
6 other. Test 3 shows they're not proficient and not
7 making high growth. Test 4 shows not proficient,
8 not making high growth. And PARCC shows not
9 proficient, not making high growth.

10 But we have given this whole credit based
11 on that one day that maybe isn't a fluke. Maybe all
12 the other five days are flukes. But I don't know.
13 It challenges me, because the dual system, the --
14 we're not taking an aggregate, or an average, or --
15 I don't know. I don't know what the solution is to
16 that.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's not doing
18 what you wanted it to do.

19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I see; because --
20 the ACT, or the pre-SAT or the Compass -- is not a
21 short-cycle assessment. It's a finite assessment.
22 However, if I score a 25 on the ACT, and I'm a
23 sophomore, and I tank on the PARCC, then as a
24 principal, I'm going to say, "Something's wrong with
25 the PARCC. There's nothing wrong with that kid."

1 But that's not a short-cycle assessment.
2 When I get an NWEA score and I'm going into RIT
3 scores, and I'm using their little graph, and I'm
4 having to interpret for everybody, and I'm showing
5 this growth and this growth, and it doesn't really
6 quantify, I believe that -- and I don't know
7 elementary, as well; I don't know elementary at all.
8 But middle schools and high schools have assessments
9 that have been developed by the College Board, the
10 ACT, the PSAT, that give us information.

11 And if I have a school where kids are not
12 doing well on the PARCC -- your grandson in middle
13 school, that the ACT Aspire starts at those younger
14 grades, if he's showing, on the Aspire, if he's
15 moving along as he should, but on the PARCC, he's
16 tanking, then I have a legitimate -- I have a
17 legitimate bit of information that I should be able
18 to put, if all my kids are doing well on that. I
19 know I'm chasing rabbits. I don't mean to.

20 THE CHAIR: But schools have -- it wasn't,
21 "You must do this."

22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Oh, I know. I'm
23 looking at this list.

24 THE CHAIR: Schools have chosen. So they
25 chose not to use the ACT Aspire. That wasn't

1 because we said --

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm not saying
3 that we have said that. I'm just saying that --

4 THE CHAIR: So -- but it's an option.
5 They've always had that option that if that's what
6 they chose, they, for their own purposes, said,
7 "This is what we want to use."

8 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It's going to be
9 labor-intensive, then, if we still allow -- it's
10 going to be that, like you say, that four to 12
11 hours.

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I think it's an option.
13 I think what's important here, because it does seem
14 as though you have this requirement to allow it.
15 What I want to be -- or at least that's what you're
16 dealing with now.

17 Even in -- what I want to make sure is
18 really clear, I do think if you continue to have
19 these, there needs to be guidance. It would be very
20 good to have consistent targets, so that you don't
21 have different targets for every school; the targets
22 are the same.

23 But even if you have guidance, you have
24 perfect data submission, there are still going to be
25 some issues here. It is going to take four to eight

1 hours per school. And that's just a capacity issue.
2 It's --

3 MR. TIM FIELD: Not per school, per
4 assessment in the school.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Per schools. And some
6 of the schools have up to three assessments. So
7 that may limit other things that Katie's staff could
8 be doing computationally.

9 The other thing is the issue we kind of
10 skipped over, this verifying student lists. Baylor
11 does not really have the ability to go in, for
12 example, and determine which of the students on the
13 list are full academic, or, you know, didn't just
14 enroll in the school the day before. I would think
15 schools would want to be doing that. Or he could do
16 it, but it would probably add another four hours to
17 this.

18 MR. BAYLOR DEL ROSARIO: Just to add to
19 that, full academic year is -- if the student had
20 been tested in spring of 2016, then we would look
21 for that student in Spring 2017. Quite a few of the
22 schools had that as an indicator. And none of them
23 actually submitted or identified who the -- those
24 students were. And I don't know why.

25 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Because it takes

1 too much time. I'm looking at Trish, because she's
2 the test coordinator. But you all don't do NWEA or
3 anything like that; because the test coordinator has
4 to go back and assign every student to a teacher.
5 They have to look at the enrollment dates of every
6 one of those students. They have to coordinate it
7 with S.T.A.R.S. They have to know whether they've
8 been there enough time to get comparison grades.
9 And then they submit it to you. And a small school
10 is going to be going -- I mean, do you have to do
11 that?

12 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Yeah. Uh-huh.

13 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So you know the
14 agonies of that.

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: One other thing to just
16 bring up as a concern -- and this is in the, you
17 know, short-cycle assessments or interim assessments
18 are meant to guide instruction. And you'll
19 periodically see even NWEA coming out and saying,
20 "You should not be using NWEA for accountability."

21 But an unintended consequence is, if you
22 have a fall-winter-spring, there's the ability to
23 game the system. If it's starting to be used as
24 accountability, you can tank your fall so that you
25 show high growth. That -- I don't want to --

1 hopefully, nobody is doing that; but it is --

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: A lot of people
3 are doing that.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: It's so -- too, it's like,
5 "Oh, we're going to do soda time." It doesn't have
6 to be, like, bomb the test. It can just be that you
7 put more attention on the fall -- on the spring.

8 THE CHAIR: That can be in any case. So
9 you have to rely on the --

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But not PARCC; because
11 it's spring to spring to spring to spring.

12 THE CHAIR: But there's other ways the
13 system is gamed.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. But it's an
15 important one to just have -- so let's talk about
16 the options here.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: May I suggest, because we
18 haven't had a break, we need a break.

19 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Are we looking
20 that tired?

21 MR. TIM FIELD: I think we could have a
22 break before we go into options. I was going to do
23 it earlier; but Baylor was here waiting patiently.
24 But what do you think? Is that good?

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes. Absolutely. There

1 was agreement for a break.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: So 10 or 15? How many do
3 we need?

4 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Fifteen.

5 MR. TIM FIELD: Fifteen.

6 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Some of us are
7 slower.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: Come back right at 3:00,
9 all right? That clock is off. so now it's 2:45.
10 So come back at 3:00. Sound good?

11 (Recess held, 2:46 p.m. to 3:02 p.m.)

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. So we have a
13 little over half-an-hour, I think.

14 MR. TIM FIELD: We have until 3:45.

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: 3:45. Okay. So --
16 okay. So let's talk about options. And.

17 Before we talk about options for using
18 these alternate assessments, I want to reiterate
19 what was said. And it sounds like we have support
20 that if they are used, when they are used, it sounds
21 as though there is agreement that there be clear
22 guidance for schools on what assessments would be
23 sort of on your options list, and then also some
24 consistency in the growth targets that would be
25 used. Is that correct?

1 THE CHAIR: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, I am -- I
3 have a question. Because I actually don't know
4 this, anything about it. But I know that there's
5 this "Acupuncture" and --

6 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Accuplacer. It is
7 acupuncture. It is. It is acupuncture.

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Accuplacer.
9 Accuplacer. And I know there's that -- I know about
10 PSAT and ACT. I know some of those. But I don't
11 really know much about them in terms of what they
12 look like.

13 And so my feeling is that in high
14 school -- all high schools, but we're talking about
15 charters -- should be giving those; because,
16 otherwise, they don't know where their kids are in
17 terms of being prepared for college.

18 And one of the things that bothers me,
19 just on a personal level, is that we would be
20 sending students to college when they're going to be
21 taking remedial classes, and that we ought to
22 know -- and charter schools tend to be smaller; not
23 always, but they tend to be smaller -- and that they
24 should know that Carmie is fabulous in math;
25 reading, okay, not so great.

1 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Other way around.

2 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But, you know
3 what I'm saying? So I think that for me, and even
4 if we're ever talking about proficiency, it ought to
5 be in high school; because you've had 12 years,
6 wherever you went to school -- I'm not saying you
7 went to a charter school; because it doesn't
8 really -- shouldn't matter -- that's when you should
9 be looking for a degree of proficiency, if not at
10 12th-grade level, at least at, you know, 10.5 or
11 something like that. That's when it would be
12 important.

13 But I don't know -- I really don't know if
14 schools are giving something that they then use as
15 elementary schools might do for remediation.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Let's think about that.
17 Please write that on the -- on your feedback. But
18 let's also consider that for the options, because I
19 think that's a good way to look at that. Because
20 you all have certain things --

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And Accuplacer,
22 though, is really not that kind of a test. It will
23 tell you whether you will or not succeed in a
24 certain model class; but it --

25 MS. POULOS: You also do know which

1 schools are administering them -- which schools are
2 administering them for success for their students --
3 because it is in the CCRI. The College and Career
4 Readiness Indicator.

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And I know that in
6 Albuquerque, CNM is willing to go out to any school
7 and provide it. But most of them don't want it.
8 But I also know that Danielle's successor at
9 East Mountain, his folks did not want my niece, who
10 was there to take it when I said -- she was
11 supposedly an honor student. And I said, "I know
12 you're not there."

13 And I took her in and made her take it.
14 And she needed two remedial math classes, which also
15 they would not help her sign up for. And I got her
16 signed up and saw that she took them, so that when
17 she graduated and went right into CNM, she did not
18 have to take those remedial.

19 But there was no desire on the part of --
20 it certainly was not Danielle, by any means; but it
21 was at East Mountain after she was gone.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Seems like it's
23 a moral imperative. That's how I see it.

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: It's a good thing
25 for kids; but I'm not sure it's usable by us.

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So again, I want to --
2 so we've laid out three options, two subs in one, so
3 really four options. You may think of more; but
4 let's talk through. I'm sorry. We're a little out
5 of order. So on the feedback form, it's the bottom
6 one; it's the supplemental.

7 So Option 1 would be to essentially keep
8 this -- the use of these assessments as they are,
9 allow schools to include the assessment. It would
10 be optional.

11 I think the one sort of procedural change
12 would be getting clear guidance, making sure it's
13 clear that it's optional, you know, that schools
14 don't have to do it, and giving guidance around if
15 you choose to do it, here is how we'll evaluate it,
16 and here is how you will report results to us, just
17 to clean up that system.

18 Option 2 really uses it as -- in certain
19 conditions. So it would essentially be used in your
20 sort of assessing improvement. So you could set a
21 level -- so, you know, students -- or schools --
22 sorry -- that are -- we probably wouldn't want to be
23 using the A-through-F, but your framework, Tier 1,
24 2, 3, and 4, you're going to require them to submit
25 this.

1 And the two options within that is if you
2 decided to go this route, that you want to require
3 it of certain schools, it could either be included
4 and rolled up into their framework rating, or it
5 would be a submission that was considered during
6 renewal, but wasn't sort of rolled up into the
7 overall tier. So that's sort of the Option 2, where
8 it's being used in your interventions.

9 And then Option 3 is that it really would
10 be taken out of the academic portion and would
11 become an organizational framework. This may not be
12 palatable to most folks; but we wanted to present
13 it, at least. It could also be in companion -- this
14 is essentially saying, "What's important to us is
15 that you are using formative assessment to guide
16 instruction. We want to know that you are actually
17 doing that; but we're not looking at the results."

18 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That is all.

19 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay?

20 So those were the options that we saw. We
21 certainly would love to know if there are other ones
22 that you have, too.

23 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I just have a
24 question, or a comment, however. And I just, this
25 second, thought about it. So when you have a

1 special ed students, and they have IEPs -- and
2 talking about disability -- as opposed to GATE,
3 because here, we have IEPs for those -- every three
4 years, they have an individual test given to them;
5 usually, it's a Woodcock-Johnson or something,
6 whatever they're using these days.

7 And so that tells you something. I mean,
8 that tells you probably, in ideal situations, in a
9 one-to-one, quiet room, no distractions, blah, blah,
10 blah, blah, blah. "Please read this, Lyria, and now
11 tell me what the..." -- so it's -- to me, would
12 probably be a -- high on my level of accuracy for
13 that child because it doesn't have all these
14 distractions.

15 So it's possible that a special ed child,
16 given what I've just described, might do quite well
17 on that test, on a grade level, because it gives you
18 a grade and a percentile, I think. It's been a long
19 time. And then on the PARCC, the child is in the
20 lowest quartile, which wouldn't necessarily compute.

21 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Uh-huh.

22 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I don't know
23 what to do with what I'm saying. I'm just saying it
24 occurred to me; because it does make -- it does tell
25 you something about that child -- I don't know.

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But my immediate
2 response to that, within the framework -- because
3 you have -- ideally, we would love to have all the
4 information, and you have a process.

5 i would think that I -- I would, as an
6 authorizer, encourage schools that are serving large
7 percentages of special education students and are
8 concerned about how PARCC is coming out, to propose
9 that as a mission-specific goal, to be honest, to
10 say, "We'd like to use these assessments; we want
11 you to consider them," da-da-da.

12 But that's exactly what the
13 mission-specific option is meant to do, to address
14 concerns that schools have about performance that
15 are not reflected in the current framework.

16 MR. TIM FIELD: Maybe the school is, like,
17 you know, [inaudible]. But one of them is, "We want
18 to serve all kids. We want to serve all kids well."
19 They're committed to serving special education kids
20 pretty well. [Inaudible.]

21 (Reporter requests clarification.)

22 MR. TIM FIELD: I said nothing. I said
23 nothing.

24 But -- so I think -- you know, but the
25 challenge in using that kind of assessment, though,

1 is that, you know, once you put accountability on
2 it, then you can also create these incentives to
3 inflate it, whatever.

4 And the value that it has, pedagogical
5 value, of, like, "Now we really know how Lyria is
6 doing," can get muddled, because now, you've put
7 accountability. There's also that risk, whenever
8 you do that. But -- so...

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: All right. So fill
10 out -- so we'd love to hear a discussion. What do
11 you think of these options? What -- how do you
12 think supplemental assessments should be considered
13 or used?

14 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I like them under
15 organizational framework, where the school simply
16 says, "Yes, we do this. And this is the one that we
17 use." And not to use it as an evaluation.

18 We've talked and talked and talked about
19 assessing kids. But we've not talked about teaching
20 kids. And there is so much assessment going on
21 right now that the instructional time -- I mean, the
22 first thing we talked about this morning was
23 instructional hours.

24 Assessment hours can be counted --
25 right? -- as instructional hours.

1 MS. POULOS: Uh-huh. In fact, they are
2 required to be counted, which means students
3 cannot -- some students can't be off campus and
4 other students --

5 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's right. But
6 1,080 hours is not a lot of hours. And when you
7 take out of that 1,080 hours, how much are you
8 spending assessing?

9 MR. TIM FIELD: More than you want to.

10 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Probably out of a
11 nine-week grading period, you could estimate that if
12 you spread it out over the whole year, two weeks of
13 the nine-week, or three weeks of a nine-week grading
14 period are spent in assessment. And so you've cut
15 off that much instruction.

16 There is a definite disconnect in the
17 grades that schools receive in the areas of
18 graduation rate and in the area of that lowest
19 quartile. It is very discouraging to charters and
20 to school districts.

21 There is not an answer to it. We try --
22 everyone is trying to comply with it. But what
23 we're sitting at this table doing is really
24 unnerving me, because all we're talking about is
25 assessing, and we're not talking about teaching --

1 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: And kids.

2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: -- and kids.

3 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: And kids.

4 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And kids. And I
5 don't know -- that's why I'm saying with the
6 short-cycle assessments, just tell us you're doing
7 them. And I would say if you don't have to tell
8 us -- if we can change the contracts, take them out.
9 Don't --

10 THE CHAIR: We can't take them out of the
11 existing contracts.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So is it in
13 statute? Is it in Administrative Code that we have
14 to give an intermediate internal assessment?

15 THE CHAIR: No, it's not. But it exists
16 in the contract that they've already signed with us.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But if they wanted to
18 revise their contract --

19 THE CHAIR: We don't -- we don't do --

20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: That part of the
21 contract has not been.

22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, I mean, if
23 we did that -- I don't know. That's where we --

24 THE CHAIR: That would -- that would be a
25 profound amount of work.

1 I prefer not to have them in the
2 organizational. I prefer if a school wants to show
3 us their growth and proficiency, if they're choosing
4 to show their growth and proficiency in an
5 alternative manner, I think, because charters are
6 supposed to be flexible, that we give them that
7 greatest flexibility by saying, "Okay. That's
8 what --"

9 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: If they want to do
10 it.

11 THE CHAIR: If they want to do it, yes.

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So Option 1.

13 Any thoughts on Option 2?

14 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I'm sorry. I
15 jumped to Option 3.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That's good.

17 MR. TIM FIELD: And strengths -- or that's
18 your preference. Or what are the strengths and
19 weaknesses that you're contemplating wrestling with?

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Well, again, I
21 think this is going to be back to the schools who
22 are questionable, just kind of like the Tier 3 and
23 4, going back to that that we did before, and maybe
24 some in 2, because they could have the lowest -- you
25 know, they could have an "F" -- right? -- in the

1 lowest quartile. It kind of behooves them to figure
2 out why those kids are that way, you know, why
3 they're failing and where they're failing, and do
4 something.

5 And so in a sense, we're giving them the
6 flexibility to figure out what's going on; because
7 if you just keep teaching, and those kids don't
8 understand whatever it is, then that's sort of a
9 stupid thing to do.

10 And you know what? I guess you deserve to
11 be closed, if you're not doing anything to help
12 kids.

13 And also, I want to say, all kids don't
14 need to be tested. If your kids are already reading
15 above grade level -- and you know who that is. As a
16 teacher -- and I know you didn't teach. But as a
17 teacher, you know who in your class can do whatever
18 it is.

19 So you don't have to keep measuring
20 everyone. You just do a few kids. And they don't
21 need to be doing it all the time. You could take
22 the score from last year and -- you know.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Are you talking about
24 when this is used truly in the form of an
25 assessment?

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: When they want
2 to know where to teach as a data point. What is it
3 that I need to do to help Tim do better in school?

4 MR. TIM FIELD: Just mention one thing.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Only if you talk
6 slowly can you mention it.

7 MR. TIM FIELD: One question and/or
8 comment, Option 2, which is does it have to require
9 schools, make it an option to be "allowed" schools.
10 It's written there, "as required." I do feel like
11 it also -- it could be "allow," as well. Option 1
12 could be "allow."

13 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: That would change it a
14 lot. That would completely change that.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: So maybe it's an option.

16 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: That would be good.
17 That would be good.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: It would be the same
19 purpose. You'd say, for schools that are in our
20 Tier 3 or 4 that are struggling, failing, what have
21 you, we're going to, like -- let's say it's a Tier 4
22 school, a school we might consider non-renewing.
23 You're saying, "If you have some other data, other
24 evidence, other assessments that show greater growth
25 than what's being reflected in PARCC, we will

1 consider that. Either we will incorporate it into
2 the framework rating, or we will use it as
3 additional evidence." It doesn't have to be
4 requiring. It could be allowing.

5 THE CHAIR: I think that's true of 1,
6 also. You might have a school that's like a
7 B-minus; but they think that they can better show
8 us, I think it's -- I think it's incumbent on us to
9 allow them that flexibility to do that.

10 I have difficulty with saying the "D" and
11 "F" have to require them; because there may be some
12 other way that they feel they can better improve,
13 that that's just -- you're just taking more time,
14 and I can't do what I want to, that to require, say
15 you have to do it, I'd rather do allow with both of
16 them.

17 MS. POULOS: And I would just say, the
18 thing that's attractive for me and my staff, and
19 whoever comes after me, is if you maybe didn't allow
20 it for "B" schools, or even the "C" schools, but
21 only allowed it for the "D" and "F"s, then it
22 decreases the capacity needed.

23 And it is a heavy lift; right? Because
24 this is basically running a different letter grade
25 system, evaluating data. And we have a six- or

1 eight-member team that does that; right? And so if
2 we're doing it for 62 schools, one additional staff
3 member is not going to be enough, right?

4 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't think all
5 62 schools are going to jump onboard. And I
6 understand what you're saying, and I appreciate what
7 you're saying. But I think it's on us. Because
8 charters were created with this flexibility, I think
9 that's a piece that we need to hold true to them,
10 that if they want to do it, we have to offer them
11 that flexibility.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yeah.

13 MS. POULOS: Can I also just add -- and I
14 know you're going to disagree with me; but I want to
15 put it out there, right? But I don't know that they
16 were given the flexibility to have a different -- to
17 be measured differently than -- to not be public
18 schools, right?

19 Our public schools, we know our kids are
20 proficient, are measured based on our State
21 assessments. And so I just worry, the more we move
22 away from them being public schools -- and this is a
23 battle that they fight, and we fight every day,
24 right? Charter schools are public schools,
25 Commissioner Armbruster. Right? They're not taking

1 money away from public schools. They are public
2 schools, right?

3 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Yeah.

4 MS. POULOS: And so -- I just worry how
5 far away we are getting from public schools.

6 THE CHAIR: And I know -- we're going to
7 agree to disagree on this. Because I don't see it
8 as this huge divergent, that they're -- I think
9 because they do take the State assessment, I don't
10 think that differentiates them in the eyes of most
11 others, that, "Oh, look-it, they can also do this."

12 So I -- I -- that's never been in the
13 fabric of any conversation that I've had. But I --
14 I just think because -- I think flexibility is very
15 broad for them. And I think the concern is the
16 flexibility is becoming less and less with the
17 charters, that they feel like they're being penned
18 into.

19 I'm no different then the school four
20 doors down the road at a traditional public school,
21 because we're just being hammered into this -- into
22 this very, very confined area.

23 So I think this is one of those areas
24 where we have the opportunity to show them a little
25 bit more flexibility.

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. Let's move on to
2 the mission-specific, because I think that segues
3 nicely.

4 MR. TIM FIELD: Can I add one thing?
5 You're going to fill out your sheet here. I would
6 just say, for Option 2 -- go back to Option 2. I do
7 think -- we should -- we should have caught this,
8 this notion of "require" versus "allow." As you're
9 looking at Option 1, 2, 3, if you think you like the
10 idea of 2, but you want it to be allowed, mark it
11 up.

12 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Mark it up.

13 MR. TIM FIELD: Or if you like "require,"
14 circle "require." It's the same concept; but one
15 is, like, we're going to -- you know, you have to do
16 this if you're -- so that's just the twist.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But the difference there
18 also is that you're saying even if you haven't
19 written this into your contract, if you want to
20 submit supporting evidence at renewal, it will at
21 least be considered.

22 MR. TIM FIELD: All right. That's all.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. So that takes us
24 to the final component that we discussed, which are
25 the mission-specific goals. Because it's -- you --

1 you know, you need and want to provide schools the
2 opportunity to submit this, it's important to just
3 consider should this be optional or remain optional
4 or be required.

5 So that's the -- I think the more
6 important conversation here, or the area to make
7 sure that we're all in agreement, is that
8 [inaudible] guidance, so the developing the guidance
9 for both what does it mean to have a
10 mission-specific goal, what qualifies as one,
11 guidance on how to set targets. And it could also
12 be useful -- this would be part of your procedure
13 and your guidance -- not so much the actual
14 framework -- it could also be really useful to have
15 examples.

16 So, for example, your dropout recovery
17 school, here are some things to consider that are
18 sort of prepackaged for them; because what can be
19 very difficult about mission-specific is figuring
20 out, "What data will I use? Or how do I set
21 targets?"

22 THE CHAIR: Right.

23 MS. LYRIA BOAST: You sort of know that
24 you have certain -- you want to give schools the
25 freedom to come up with new things. But you also

1 know that there are certain categories: English
2 Language Learners, special education, dropout
3 recovery, college attendance. You know, you know
4 that there are some ways you can actually really
5 support them by sort of doing the thinking and
6 working with, Okay, what can we evaluate? What's
7 rigorous and attainable? And what really captures
8 this?

9 And that, again, would be more support
10 that you're providing or guidance that you're
11 developing as a change to your performance
12 framework.

13 THE CHAIR: I think we heard it through
14 the first listening tour, that schools
15 overwhelmingly said, "Here's your great opportunity
16 to look at this and help us to create those
17 mission-specific goals."

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right.

19 THE CHAIR: That, you know, maybe some of
20 them do -- are, you know, really different and
21 out-of-the-box, and, "Wow, this is -- this is really
22 great." But, yes, to guide some to -- and, you
23 know, I've done -- I've done a lot of looking into
24 these. And it's hard.

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: It's hard, yeah.

1 THE CHAIR: It is -- I mean, it is
2 frustrating, because it's a -- you know, this is a
3 really great state for charter policies and so on.
4 But then when you try to dig into the roots of --
5 you know, so many states, I don't think focus on
6 mission as much as, "Oh, you want to create a little
7 charter school, so we're going to let you create
8 this little charter school." And the "why" doesn't
9 factor into a lot. It's -- we want to, because.

10 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Because we think
11 we can do better.

12 THE CHAIR: So we're creating this school.
13 Which New Mexico is unique in that fact, because the
14 school is supposed to have something unique.

15 So I think we have an obligation to make
16 sure that they're holding true to that uniqueness,
17 and they're not, you know, drifting off of that
18 mission. And we know that it's easy to do; it
19 happens, especially as you go from founder to now
20 second and third generation, that it just gets
21 diluted.

22 So I think we need to support them in --
23 and I think we talked about it through the listening
24 tour -- is that maybe we need to create a -- a small
25 subcommittee of schools to say, "Okay. Let's have

1 this conversation. Let's sit down and -- and if
2 you've got a great example, let's -- you know, let's
3 share it, so that we can create maybe a bank" --

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yes.

5 THE CHAIR: -- "of here's some things, you
6 know. And you can then tweak them to whatever is,
7 you know, works for you. And if you're struggling,
8 let's hash it out and see whether there is something
9 that, you know, we can help you with."

10 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That makes a lot of
11 sense and I think moves towards that support.

12 THE CHAIR: Right. Right.

13 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah.

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: We've had an awful
15 lot of mission creep over time. And some schools
16 start out like one that is no longer ours, but is
17 APS's, "Oh, we're International Baccalaureate."
18 Well, a couple of years later, we find they never
19 became International Baccalaureate. And we had two
20 of those.

21 THE CHAIR: Some of that is money.

22 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Right. No. They
23 haven't had the money for it or something. But,
24 also, they found it wasn't working, necessarily, for
25 the students who had chosen to enroll, in one of the

1 two that came to us. And, you know, they need to
2 know, if they decide they're going to do a certain
3 thing, they're going to be held to it. And if they
4 want to change it, they need to come through us.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Have a modification,
6 right.

7 THE CHAIR: And it's unlikely that we'll
8 change their mission.

9 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And we may not
10 allow it to be changed; because that was the idea.

11 THE CHAIR: Because Uplift, we -- that was
12 some of the underlying issue with Uplift was they
13 wanted to change the mission. We said, "No, because
14 this is what you were chartered for. If you want to
15 change it to this, then you need to start over."

16 With their revocation, it was, "Well, you
17 know what? You're not" -- and we knew that,
18 unfortunately, that they were going to come before
19 us. And part of it was, they're not meeting their
20 mission. We knew that, because we didn't allow them
21 to change it. But, you know, it was --

22 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So I think it is a valid
23 question here. Is this -- do you consider that this
24 should be optional or required? Because we
25 definitely have heard from you that this is what you

1 consider one of the highest priorities, that they
2 should be meeting their mission.

3 So I think it should just be clear. And
4 especially in those negotiations, they're
5 essentially being told, "You need to have" -- let's
6 just be clear. Is it optional? Or is it -- because
7 it sounds as though that is one of the high
8 priorities for you, as a Commission.

9 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well -- and if
10 they aren't meeting it, then anybody could come in,
11 give us a mission, and then become just a regular
12 school and say, "Oh, well, we didn't mean to do
13 that, because you didn't make us."

14 MR. TIM FIELD: Also -- I'll remind us
15 also that on the organizational framework, we do
16 have some measures that are more qualitative, about,
17 you know, "Are you meeting program requirements?"
18 So in addition to this goal, there is space for --
19 you want both. I'm not saying one or the other.

20 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But your mission
21 is your high-level. "This is what we're going to
22 do." And the other stuff is much farther down, and
23 you can change it without necessarily changing this.

24 MS. POULOS: I think maybe -- and I don't
25 know if this is what you're getting to, Tim -- and

1 I've said, "I don't think it should be required,
2 mission-specific goals. Because sometimes it's too
3 hard to develop a quantitatively measurable goal on
4 some of these missions," right?

5 And I'm not even saying like maybe moving
6 forward with new applicants, you require that; but
7 trying to get the 62 schools that you have that have
8 been in operation for a long time to develop a
9 quantitatively measurable goal on their mission
10 might land us in some troubling spots, versus having
11 the ability to qualitatively measure it through the
12 on-site observation or something like that.

13 And that's the only thing I would say is I
14 just don't know -- I'm trying to think, like,
15 Turquoise Trail's mission: "We're a good elementary
16 school," is kind of their mission. "We're just a
17 quality school."

18 I guess we could measure that. But, like,
19 I don't know. There are some schools that I'm just
20 not sure.

21 MR. TIM FIELD: There's a school I'm
22 working with in Philadelphia; it's kind of a
23 year-round, to some extent, Afrocentric STEM, been
24 around since 1970, one of the first schools
25 authorized. They're kind of a renewal. They were

1 having a "maybe not" stage a few years ago, probably
2 because they weren't a STEM school, and they never
3 were a STEM school.

4 And, like, they acted -- the school
5 actually has many great positive things about it.
6 But they're not a STEM school. But they were
7 recommitting that in the last few years. And, like,
8 they have a STEM program now. They've got a
9 coordinator. They're doing all these things.

10 I don't -- there's not really -- if
11 there's any way they could come up with a goal that
12 says, "We are going to hit this," or what have you.
13 But you can go to the school now and say, "Oh, wow.
14 You now have a core course that every grade takes.
15 You have a patio. You have a STEM course. You have
16 this robotics program. Like, yeah, you are --
17 you're trying to get there."

18 There's this focus on inquiry based
19 learning. So you would go there and say, "There is
20 evidence in my organizational framework this is a
21 STEM school."

22 You may still struggle to find a goal that
23 really capture -- a mission-specific goal that says,
24 yes, they're meeting their mission. It would still
25 be hard. But that's why -- my point was that if you

1 have this possibility of the organizational
2 framework to get at this, are they meeting their
3 mission, and partner with it. I'm not staying it's
4 either/or.

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Again, I've had
6 five years of this. And I'm a little suspicious of
7 a lot of these missions, to begin with. I had to
8 write so many mission statements through 30 years in
9 State government and 12 years on a -- you know,
10 community college board, I -- you know, I know how
11 hard it is to write one. I mean, you can fight over
12 one word for two days.

13 But if you can do that and get to a
14 mission, you ought to be able to find one measurable
15 goal. Literally, if you put that kind of effort --
16 it can be quantifiable on a level that doesn't have
17 to be per student. It can be -- you know.

18 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. So that makes me
19 think, one of the things that you definitely will
20 want to consider when we talk about the roll-up is
21 the weighting of mission-specific and whether you
22 want to be able to adjust to the weighting, given
23 the rigor and validity of the underlying
24 information.

25 So, for example, it would be very

1 different if you have a Chinese dual-language
2 school, and they're testing growth in Chinese
3 Mandarin proficiency. You would probably feel
4 fairly certain that you could measure that, versus a
5 school that --

6 MS. POULOS: I'll give you an example.
7 North Valley Academy, that has the -- how many laps
8 does each kid run around the track?

9 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, that's
10 quantifiable.

11 MS. POULOS: It's quantifiable; but it's
12 also not rigorous, right?

13 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I don't know. It
14 would be for me.

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Let's say a focus on
16 student characteristics: Grit, perseverance, right?
17 You could really value that, but the metrics to
18 measure it aren't there yet.

19 THE CHAIR: There are lots of schools that
20 have great --

21 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Right. But you wouldn't
22 be able to go in and see, "Yes, this is happening.
23 The tests or assessments that measure it are not
24 there yet.

25 THE CHAIR: But they've got rubrics for --

1 MS. LYRIA BOAST: They do, but it's not
2 there yet for --

3 THE CHAIR: See, my concern is if we value
4 and we weight mission very much, and it's a high
5 priority, and it only appears in the organizational
6 piece, there's a disconnect there.

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Okay. And then what
8 you -- then I definitely hear that. But what you're
9 going to have to grapple with is how much weight
10 there is in the academic framework, given that many
11 of the metrics are not going to be very rigorous,
12 and you may not really trust them very much. And so
13 that's the tension.

14 THE CHAIR: But I think that onus on rigor
15 and trusting is on us.

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But there are going to
17 be some missions you're just not going to be able to
18 measure very well quantitatively.

19 THE CHAIR: It could be. It could be.

20 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: "Our students
21 will go -- be prepared for college." And it's a K-5
22 school.

23 And I'm not -- again, I'm not saying it's
24 bad. I'm not saying it's bad. I'm just saying, and
25 how are we going to measure those students? They

1 may do really, really well. And that's great. But
2 that doesn't mean because you did well in third
3 grade, and you're on third-grade level, that you
4 will go to college.

5 MR. TIM FIELDS: What percentage of
6 parents, it's a low-income community, have opened
7 saving accounts for their students? Like maybe
8 there's a big push. And, again, that would be --
9 now, would you put a huge amount of weight on that?
10 I don't know.

11 But that would be something, like, "Sure.
12 Like, we were really focused on getting parents
13 engaged and kids, thinking about college."

14 It would be a great metric. But how much
15 weight would you put on that?

16 THE CHAIR: Well -- that goes to the
17 mission they created, you know, which that was the
18 mission they created.

19 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It was, and we
20 accepted it, which is fine. It's just that --

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, we haven't
22 accepted it.

23 THE CHAIR: We haven't voted for it.

24 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, I mean,
25 saying that for K through 5 is not the right kind of

1 mission. You can word it differently, so that
2 they're prepared to go on to mid-school and to high
3 school to be successful; but, you know, that's
4 not --

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I shouldn't have
6 looked, and I did not. I had all these different
7 points.

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I think that yes, you
9 can improve; but there are probably some missions
10 that you would approve that will still be difficult
11 to measure; right? There will be things you'll be
12 for it. You could even say, "Oh, yes. We know that
13 that's happening," and still not be able to put a
14 quantifiable academic target and measurement on it.
15 So, I mean, that's just going to be the rub for you.

16 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I mean,
17 Tierra Adentro has the flamenco dancing, and they
18 have to do so many performances. Isn't that what
19 they had to do, part of that? They were going to do
20 so much, or they had to be on the technical side, or
21 something?

22 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Their mission has
23 to do more with the cultural side; because they
24 teach not just the flamenco; they teach music; they
25 teach art; and they teach history all in the

1 culture.

2 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So, again, should the
3 evaluation of that mission be in the academic
4 framework or the organizational?

5 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well, I think I
6 could come up with a way to measure it.

7 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But then if you could
8 measure it, is that an academic measurement or an
9 organizational, that, yes, they're meeting their
10 mission.

11 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I'm an old
12 debater. I'm not giving; because I, honestly, think
13 if you can't come up with at least one way to
14 measure your mission, then you --

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I'm not questioning the
16 mission. I'm questioning where it belongs in the
17 framework.

18 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: No. But I'm
19 saying -- because, if your mission doesn't tie to
20 your academics, what does it tie to?

21 MS. LYRIA BOAST: But in that case, the
22 cultural thing, you would suspect, impacts, then,
23 the reading proficiency, the math, you know, the
24 learning, yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: But then they'd

1 need to be expected to meet the same grades. It's
2 not the methods used to get there; it's the fact you
3 got there in any of these schools.

4 Bottom line is all of these students need
5 to be prepared for life. And there's many, many
6 different paths to get them there. We're interested
7 that they have the skills to meet that life. And
8 along the way, we're going to look at these
9 different ways that people do it.

10 And I still think we can measure that they
11 are having -- keeping people on that path they
12 chose.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I kind of see it
14 as -- actually, not all that far from what you're
15 saying, Carmie; because I'm thinking that -- I'll
16 just use Tierra Adentro for this matter. Because I
17 want to go there because I love this culture, and I
18 love this dancing, and I love all these kinds of
19 things. So for me, I would have dropped out of
20 school. But if I could go to that school, and that
21 turns me on enough to do the math and the reading
22 and the language and all that stuff, then, in a
23 sense, that school would have met my qualifications
24 and goals. And that's great.

25 And some people -- and we've talked about

1 this before. I've forgotten. I think it's Media
2 Arts that has a lot with theater and -- right? --
3 and film-making and stuff like that.

4 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Film-making, yes.

5 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And what they
6 said one time -- and this is a very valid thing.
7 They said, "Lots of times students come here; not
8 because they care at all about this, but they feel
9 safe." Because with those kind of children who
10 would choose to go to that school, they don't care
11 if you're gay or you're trans or you're whatever you
12 are, they're accepting. And other students feel
13 safe there, where they may have been bullied at a
14 traditional public school.

15 So, you know, I don't know how to do that,
16 either. I don't know. But I do hear what you're
17 saying.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: I mentioned
19 organizational. I wasn't mentioning it as an
20 alternative. I wasn't saying, "Do that instead of."
21 Because right now -- make optional mandatory.

22 My point was more that it's really
23 important to this Commission that we are looking --
24 understanding is the mission being met, my point is
25 more like you have this, and you have the

1 organizational, and you can also push on that. You
2 can add more to that. You can put more energy into
3 how you're measuring on the organizational side,
4 also, was my point; not as an alternative, but more
5 just that's a way to really meet that goal you have
6 of making sure that these schools are truly living
7 the mission that they said they were going to do.

8 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So if you could fill --
9 we're actually running out of time. So we
10 definitely want -- please do address, you know,
11 whether you think this should be optional or
12 required in mission-specific, and any other thoughts
13 you have on mission-specific.

14 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: I've already told
15 you. Can I just put on here? I wouldn't weight it
16 necessarily heavy.

17 MS. LYRIA BOAST: That would be useful.
18 We're going to talk about it tomorrow, that you want
19 something.

20 (Commissioners speak concurrently.)

21 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What was the
22 goal guide, that we had -- we allowed people to put
23 in, but we weren't really measuring it? Patty, do
24 you remember that?

25 THE CHAIR: Aspirational goals.

1 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: What was that
2 related to?

3 THE CHAIR: Whatever they wanted.

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I couldn't
5 remember. Some school wanted it.

6 THE CHAIR: Some of them have an
7 aspirational goal that their kids are going to make
8 it two years into college.

9 It's so hard to measure that and to track
10 it that they put it in as an aspirational goal.
11 That's really great; but you don't want to be held
12 accountable for that, because you can't be. But
13 schools were, like, committed. "No, our kids are
14 going to be there two years afterwards."

15 It's, like, "Fabulous. How are you going
16 to track it," you know, besides -- because
17 there's -- "Oh, we're going to call them." It's
18 like, "Well, they change phone numbers."

19 You know, they move, and there's --

20 MS. LYRIA BOAST: So many are on Facebook
21 these days.

22 THE CHAIR: I know. But it becomes hard;
23 it really is. So it's, like, okay. So they keep
24 those as aspirational goals in their contract, just
25 because they want to report to us, at some point in

1 time, that -- whatever. But it's, like, we don't
2 want to -- we're not going to revoke you because it
3 didn't happen, because you can't do it.

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: I have one final request
5 of you, then. And this is the top half of that
6 second page, okay? And this is where we'd like to
7 know -- start to talk about -- and don't worry,
8 because we're going to have a lot more conversation
9 with this with the trial run results.

10 But we want to start to get a sense of how
11 you prioritize these four different components.
12 This doesn't correspond -- sorry -- to what's on the
13 screen.

14 So what we have here is the graph at the
15 top that has the four components. And then it's
16 asking you, in this middle column, to sort of assign
17 a weight.

18 So I'm going to give you two options. If
19 you're tired and don't want to do math at the end of
20 the day, you could just do 1, 2, 3, 4; 1, most
21 important, to 4. But if you're up for a little math
22 challenge, then you would actually say what
23 percentage of 100 percent would you give each.

24 So if you thought, for example,
25 mission-specific should be weighted 50 percent of

1 it, you put 50 percent there, and you'd have to
2 split up the other 50 percent among the other three.

3 (Commissioners speak concurrently.)

4 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Well, this, you could
5 look to the other side and say, "Oh, what are my
6 concerns? Because this is saying, "How would you
7 value the State Accountability System" -- yeah,
8 these four -- "subgroup, mission-specific, and
9 supplemental assessment."

10 MR. TIM FIELD: No matter what you said on
11 your option for A-through F, Option 1, 2, or 3.

12 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So what it -- I'm
13 trying to get my full picture. It's been a long
14 time since lunch. Because we haven't even decided
15 what we're going to determine --

16 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Exactly.

17 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: -- if I give a
18 percentage, and I don't agree with what the group
19 determines, and I give a huge percentage.

20 MR. TIM FIELD: Think about what you have
21 selected on your options. Think about the options
22 you chose and your ideals.

23 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What if I get shot
24 out of the water, and I don't agree with it?

25 THE CHAIR: Then you get shot out of the

1 water.

2 I'm not doing a percentage; I'm doing a
3 priority. This is my number one, two. Because I
4 think it's too hard to start doing the math and
5 figuring it out at this point in time. I'm deciding
6 this is what is most important to me. This is
7 second.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: And most important being
9 weight; so -- yes.

10 THE CHAIR: Right. This is most important
11 to me because this is going to give me the greatest
12 information --

13 MR. TIM FIELD: To make decisions, yes.

14 THE CHAIR: -- to make decisions.

15 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And if you don't want to
16 do any numbers, say, "This one is most important."

17 MR. TIM FIELD: No. Put numbers. "1" is
18 the most important.

19 (Commissioners score their sheets.)

20 MR. TIM FIELD: So the first thing I want
21 to do is thank everyone. It's been a long day.
22 Everyone's has been staying engaged. I appreciate
23 people really staying focused all day long, till
24 now.

25 We're almost done. So I want to go back

1 to objectives today and just take a quick look and
2 remind us what we're trying to accomplish these next
3 two days.

4 And I'm just looking at this. I think the
5 first three, I think we hit. What do you all think?
6 Thumbs up, the first three?

7 THE CHAIR: Uh-huh.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: No. 4, the role of
9 categories, in fact, we actually made good progress
10 there, a consensus there.

11 5. Tomorrow is going to be important,
12 because, A, we haven't touched the financial yet;
13 and also we're going to look at results. I think we
14 made good progress.

15 THE CHAIR: Oh, absolutely.

16 MR. TIM FIELD: I'm not sure we're going
17 to hit 6. And, actually, to be honest, I'm not sure
18 we're going to hit 6 tomorrow; but 7, we definitely
19 will. So I personally think thumbs-up. Everyone
20 was so focused and engaged; it was successful that
21 way.

22 Meeting norms, I think, actually, started
23 on time pretty well.

24 MS. LYRIA BOAST: You kept us on track.

25 MR. TIM FIELD: I really appreciated that.

1 Breaks were -- we were making 15 minutes for breaks.
2 Looks like we'll commit to that tomorrow. Again,
3 heard everyone's voice.

4 Thank you.

5 For tomorrow, we do have that hour that's
6 kind of set aside that is kind of like a TBD on
7 topic. Tomorrow, as a reminder, the morning, we're
8 going to come in and look at results from both exit
9 tickets and kind of debrief that and also kind of
10 propose, "Okay, here's the trial run method we're
11 going to use." There are going to be debates and
12 things.

13 And then we're going to talk about the
14 financial framework.

15 Then we have like this hour after lunch.
16 After lunch, we're going to look at the financial
17 frameworks and exit tickets.

18 Then we're going to have -- sorry -- and
19 then we're going to do -- have an hour that's just
20 open time. Any thoughts about topics you want to --
21 we also could just give that time to you to cut out
22 early? But is there any topics --

23 THE CHAIR: We already have a vote.

24 MR. TIM FIELD: We'll also consider --

25 THE CHAIR: It's happy hour somewhere by

1 then.

2 MR. TIM FIELD: Think about it. We can be
3 flexible tomorrow; because we may think of some
4 things we want to touch on briefly.

5 MS. LYRIA BOAST: There may be some areas
6 that we feel that we really need to dig in more on
7 this.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: So we'll ask tomorrow.
9 Maybe you folks may have suggestions.

10 And then the other thing is we do have a
11 brief homework assignment. Ooh. It's not as long.
12 It's, I think, about seven pages. And it's the
13 financial framework.

14 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Seven pages sounds
15 terrible. It's not that it's big.

16 THE CHAIR: Financial framework. That's
17 like a foreign language.

18 MR. TIM FIELD: It may sound like a
19 foreign language. But do try to review it. The
20 first page is less foreign. The first page, like
21 the other, is kind of like saying, "Here is how we
22 looked at it and thought about this." So peek at
23 it. Obviously, tomorrow, we'll also walk through it
24 and talk about it.

25 And we'll do a similar thing tomorrow,

1 where we kind of have feedback we collect from you.

2 THE CHAIR: And I'm going to be honest
3 with this. Not that it's not my language. I mean,
4 I understand it. But the bottom line is whenever I
5 look at this, I'm speaking from a point that I
6 don't -- I could say, "Wow, this is really great."
7 I don't know that it's really great.

8 MR. TIM FIELD: Yeah.

9 THE CHAIR: That's my issue. That's my
10 biggest issue. I think, wow, I could support that.
11 But someone else could come back and say, "You don't
12 know what the heck you're talking about, because
13 this isn't" -- you know. So I always rely on, you
14 know, like, Paul, you know, to say, "This is exactly
15 what we need," as opposed to me saying, "This is
16 exactly what we need"; because I -- you know, I --

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: I agree.

18 THE CHAIR: I don't know.

19 MR. TIM FIELD: And the one thing I would
20 say, then, is the big part of the trial run, the
21 financial framework, is confirming that these were,
22 like, terms like, where you have had schools that
23 have really struggled, what they have flagged using
24 these metrics.

25 So I would say that's probably going to be

1 a reality for a lot of folks. But the trial run is
2 going to be about really kicking the tires on these
3 things and understanding, is it collectible, and did
4 it actually give us the data we would need. So
5 maybe it's a less robust conversation; but I think
6 we at least want to get some input on this.

7 THE CHAIR: Right. Absolutely.

8 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Has someone like
9 David or Paul or someone who does those number
10 things, seen this?

11 MS. POULOS: Yes. They will not be here
12 tomorrow.

13 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: But they have
14 seen it.

15 MS. POULOS: They have seen it, and we
16 have had robust discussions.

17 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: The result of
18 those discussions were kind of this? Or were they
19 going to think that we would redo all of this? I
20 just feel like I'm going to be --

21 MS. POULOS: I think the value tomorrow
22 can be us talking about why they can be valuable
23 measures. I will say that there has been a way of
24 looking at and thinking about school finance that is
25 not willing to change.

1 And very -- we had a very interesting
2 conversation with the folks from Public Impact,
3 David and me in the room, and Paul, and thought we
4 had great consensus on, like, yes, these can be
5 valuable pieces of information, especially on a
6 rolling basis, kind of as a dashboard. And I think
7 we'll talk about that idea tomorrow.

8 And then we -- and then, just being blunt,
9 we got to the end of the conversation, and the
10 statement was made, "None of these have any value
11 whatsoever," despite the fact that we had just had a
12 conversation saying, "Yes, they do have value."

13 And I think there's a challenge with
14 changing the way we think about it.

15 So David's primary interests are, "Do they
16 have a Business Manager? Are they licensed?"

17 And all of that is reflective; right?

18 What we're trying to do is -- and even
19 help him and his team understand -- like, there may
20 be pieces of data that, along the way, on a
21 quarterly basis, could actually raise some red flags
22 that they haven't thought about before. And I think
23 that is the work that we, as the Public Impact
24 folks, and with David's input, and then vacillation
25 back --

1 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You're going to
2 tell them there's something they haven't thought of.
3 Uh-huh. Therein lies the rub.

4 THE CHAIR: I don't want to repeat history
5 with all this input from the previous time, all this
6 input, and everyone thought this was great. And
7 then it was, like, "This is just horrible," and they
8 had to go back and reinvent the wheel again. So we
9 just don't want to do that. And then we kind of
10 ended up with something that wasn't very useful.

11 MS. POULOS: Right. And I think that's
12 what we've been talking about and why I think it is
13 actually mostly about the implementation. Because
14 the thing about New Mexico public finances is
15 long-term stability isn't a problem with our public
16 schools; because when things work the way they do,
17 which we, I think, all agree is not necessarily the
18 right way -- right? -- we don't want the public
19 State system to, like, bail out and save our charter
20 schools. But that's the way they think. "My job is
21 to bail out and save everybody," right?

22 COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: That's just what
23 they do with school districts.

24 MS. POULOS: Right. But if we implement
25 on a quarterly basis to say, "Whoa, red flag" --

1 right? -- then we start thinking about this actually
2 being a useful system. And I think that -- I truly
3 believe that was the problem with what happened
4 before, is it was an end-of-year measure, and it
5 didn't make sense. In that context, as an
6 end-of-year measure, it makes no sense. Zero. As
7 an ongoing kind of flagging system, it makes a lot
8 of sense.

9 MR. TIM FIELD: And I think the trial run
10 will be a chance to, like -- that's kind of our
11 hypothesis, honestly. But the trial run will be,
12 like --

13 THE CHAIR: We might have to create a
14 different question. And that's fine, yeah.

15 MR. TIM FIELD: So -- great.

16 THE CHAIR: Okay.

17 MS. POULOS: Are you done?

18 MR. TIM FIELDS: Yeah, I'm done.

19 MS. POULOS: Because I just wanted to
20 propose -- I can send out a menu for Mucho's, which
21 is just a sandwich shop, tell everybody it's at your
22 cost. But I can have my team arrange orders
23 tomorrow. Okay. That's going to be in your e-mail
24 boxes, and maybe just write it down, and in the
25 morning, I'll have my team take care of gathering

1 orders.

2 THE CHAIR: Thanks.

3 MR. TIM FIELD: Great. Any last thoughts?

4 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: Thank you, all.

5 THE CHAIR: Well, just thanks for,
6 certainly, all the time that you put in prior to
7 this, you know; because I certainly appreciate
8 the -- the good conversations that we've had on the
9 phone with this. And I appreciate the fact that
10 you -- you listen.

11 And that's -- you know, to me, that's --
12 that's the most important thing, that it's not just
13 giving lip service to, "I've got to call them, so
14 I'm going to call them"; but it's, you know, the --
15 the thought went into it. And I appreciate that.
16 And, certainly, today, I appreciate everyone's time
17 and effort into this.

18 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: And I think Tim
19 will be here tomorrow. He told me. He's teaching
20 today.

21 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: Well -- and
22 Gilbert will be here.

23 THE CHAIR: Gilbert will be here
24 tomorrow -- Carlos?

25 COMMISSIONER TOULOUSE: And that's the

1 problem though, of bringing people up to date who
2 weren't there. If I skip one, I'm going to skip
3 both days. I'm not going to come in to --

4 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: It's about
5 financial.

6 MR. TIM FIELD: How do we -- I want us to
7 leave and break. Thoughts about how we engage --
8 assuming it's him, and --

9 THE CHAIR: I think -- you know,
10 personally, I think they get the handouts. And if
11 there's any questions, they can ask questions. Not
12 Friday.

13 COMMISSIONER RUIZ: "The parking lot."

14 THE CHAIR: This is -- yeah -- that they
15 need to ask questions on their own time after
16 they've had an opportunity that -- and this is where
17 we do struggle, that we spend a lot of time here at
18 the work sessions; and then for those folks that
19 just show up on Friday, it becomes profoundly
20 difficult. It's like we just can't keep getting
21 people up to speed.

22 And I understand that people have lives
23 and things like that; but this is -- this is what
24 this is, you know. So if --

25 MS. LYRIA BOAST: And will they all be

1 here, like, the entire day? Or just the afternoon?

2 THE CHAIR: You mean tomorrow?

3 MS. LYRIA BOAST: Yeah. Tomorrow.

4 THE CHAIR: Gilbert, I'm assuming, will be
5 here all day.

6 COMMISSIONER ARMBRUSTER: Tim, I thought
7 that he was coming here all day. And I don't -- Jim
8 will not be here at all.

9 THE CHAIR: Jim will not be here at all.
10 He won't be here until Friday. Who knows about
11 Carlos?

12 (A discussion was held off the record.)

13 (Proceedings in recess at 4:01 p.m.)

14

15

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 September 15, 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. : 7855L (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