In Attendance: Michael Johnson (DPS), Anne-Marie Lemieux (DCSD), Janice McDonald (CCSD), Kelly Perez (LPS), Rosann Ward (PEBC), and Barbara Yamrick (APS)

Staff: Chad Burns, Marci Elder, Julie Stelzer, and Cris Veteto

Guests: DAC Members: Margaret Bierman, Mitzi Leaver, Steve Steadman, and Susan Street
DPS Representatives: Molly Ferrer (Legal Counsel), Laurie Premer (School Choice Office), and Anne Rowe (DPS School Board President)
Parents: Paul Dantzer, Katie Douglas, Jenn Eure, Emily Kotnis, Jenny LaPerriere, Amy Larchick, Jay Leaver, Alex Meland, Sarah Mullaney, Heather Perkins, and Todd Perkins,

Kelly welcomed everyone to the meeting and called the board meeting to order.

Approval of Agenda
Kelly asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Rosann made a motion to approve the agenda, and Janice seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Approval of Minutes
Kelly asked if there were any corrections for the minutes; there were none. Rosann made a motion to approve the minutes and Barbara seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Executive Director Report
Chad read his Executive Director Report, which is contained below in its entirety for the minutes. Before reading his report, he congratulated RMSEL’s 8th grade girls’ basketball team for winning the championship in their tournament over this past weekend for the second year in a row, and thanked John Stene, Athletic Director, for his leadership in organizing the Independence League in which our students compete. Chad also recognized David Sheldon, the leader of Ski Club, for receiving 150 donated ski lift tickets from Winter Park.

While we have reached the time for deep discussion that will ensue today over the past five months of negotiations with our five district partners and the Public Education and Business Coalition, it would be a missed opportunity to not celebrate the everyday accomplishments of our teachers and students.

As we returned to school on January 9, 2017, our staff and students jumped into the exploration of new learning expeditions and/or case studies in their classrooms. Students in the middle school are conducting Action Based Research (ABR) projects in which they are conducting research in our community on a topic on which they would like to construct a more argumentative essay with local data to support their respective claims. Kindergarten students continue to venture into the community to meet with local organizations. Most recently the students traveled to the South Metro Fire Department to interact with firefighters and emergency responders in the community. My 12th grade students in our Senior Learning Experience/Graduation Portfolio course have completed their SLE essay prior to winter break and are now creating a final product to demonstrate the three traits of High Quality Work, defined by EL as complexity, authenticity, and craftsmanship. The students are researching the topic of Autonomous Travel in the Next 50 Years. The students are divided into collaborative teams and assigned to conducting a research study of each aspect of the topic. For example, one group is researching the economic impact and another is looking at social policy. The final product will require an editorial and publication team of students to write a book and publish their work through the software program, BookWright. The motivation and engagement of the students in their final semester is at an all time high for the year as they take on this assignment. Finally, our 4th/5th grade students are studying the topic of persuasive writing in Writer’s Workshop. The students have worked to create a case study, “Why RMSEL?” They have
collaboratively worked with their teachers and our administrative team to construct marketing material for our school, write persuasive letters, and speak publicly at our Open House, which may exceed 150 prospective parents. Our deep commitment to authentic and public learning are core values of our school that continue to drive our team to create a sense of belonging and character through challenging work.

The work of our students in 4th/5th grade has assisted our team each month as we host our monthly Open House. On Friday, January 13, 2017, we conducted the Re-Enrollment Acceptance/ Relinquishment of current RMSEL families to determine the number of openings for the 2017-2018 school year. The final day to complete an application for the lottery for the 2017-2018 school year is Friday, January 27, 2017 at midnight. The lottery will be run on Monday, January 30, 2017, and I begin the exciting process of calling all new RMSEL families. I personally call each new child/family and welcome them to our school and invite them to shadow. The resounding joy of sharing with new families their acceptance to RMSEL is truly heartwarming. We provide families the opportunity to shadow at RMSEL before making the final commitment to attend. We invite all accepted applicants and up to ten wait list applicants to shadow. Teachers also provided a question/answer Open House to new families to answer any questions that they may have after shadowing. New families then have one week to respond with their commitment. The process of shadowing takes approximately one month to complete.

As of Friday, January 20, 2017, we have 430 applications. We anticipate that this number will increase up to 500 applicants by the close of the window on the 27th. Of those applications, 121 are in Kindergarten for 25 open spots and 109 are in 6th grade for 28 open spots. While the interest and support of our program is astounding within the surrounding community, it is always challenging to know that of the 121 students that apply for Kindergarten, 96 students will not have the opportunity to attend. Parents make a conscious decision to apply and attend the Rocky Mountain School of Expeditionary Learning as an alternative to the school offerings within our respective districts.

We conduct no outside marketing of our school district beyond the school website and public Open Houses. We do not dedicate financial resources to media advertisements, mailers, events, school travel for parent nights at local schools, fairs, etc. Currently, we have 63 openings for the 2017-2018 school year with 430 applicants. It is important that financial resources are driven into the classroom rather than away from teaching and learning.

**Professional Development Summary – January 2017**

We are currently deeply involved in the classroom lab inquiry process in professional development. This year, classroom labs are structured a bit differently than they have been in the past. Teachers have been grouped with colleagues of similar levels of teaching experience instead of by school level or discipline. The groups are therefore mixed, representing a blend of Lower, Middle, High, and Specialist teachers.

The collective focus of this inquiry process is: How can we foster student engagement and ownership through the design of our lessons, our routines, and our structures? The lab inquiry process centers around the learning targets of: (1) I can analyze student engagement and learning in order to refine instruction for my students’ achievement, and (2) I can actively contribute to a collaborative inquiry process about student learning and engagement.

During the six-week lab inquiry process, all professional development is tied to the classroom lab focus. Part of the process involves two formal classroom lab days, where one teacher from the group serves as the host. A large portion of each lab day is dedicated to a cycle of a prebrief with the host teacher, observation of the host teacher’s instruction in his or her classroom, and debrief with the use of a tight protocol. Additional time during the day is set aside for learning together through reading journal articles, excerpts from books and other resources, looking at student work, and/or a feedback cycle for group member lessons. Each day ends with a synthesis of learning and articulation of next steps.

Wednesday morning professional development is also tied to the lab inquiry process during this six-week cycle, including sessions within the schedule where teachers bring samples of student work and videos of portions of their lessons. With this structure, each participant of the lab group has direct responsibility and involvement.
(Acknowledgement of District Service Links) Chad recognized Clay Abla, Service Link representing the Littleton Public School District.

(IGA will be a Discussion Item per Agenda)

**Open Forum**
Kelly informed those present that there will be two opportunities for guests to address the board during the meeting today. The first opportunity will take place after the board business items on the agenda, and the second opportunity will follow the discussion. She read the following to the guests:

This time period will provide an opportunity for members of the community to speak to the Board on items of interest or concern. It is the Board of Education’s policy not to hear public session personal complaints against any district personnel. In addition, it is a violation of the Federal Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) to discuss in public or elsewhere individual student issues. It has been the practice of the Board not to respond during the current meeting to statements or questions presented during this segment of the agenda. Every person addressing the Board will have three (3) minutes to present his or her views. To speak to the Board during this segment, please sign up prior to the meeting.

Parents who signed up to speak to the Board included Margaret Bierman, Paul Dantzer, Mitzi Leaver, Steve Steadman, and Susan Street.

**Consent Agenda**
No items for the consent agenda.

**Action Items**
- 2015-2016 Budget Carryover Resolution – Barbara made a motion to accept the 2016-2017 Revised Budget and the Budget Carryover Resolution, and Janice seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN SCHOOL OF EXPEDITIONARY LEARNING
RESOLUTION
BY
BOARD OF COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

WHEREAS, the sponsoring districts are authorized to enter into this Agreement pursuant to the Boards of Cooperative Services Act of 1965, as amended, C.R.S. 22-5-101, *et seq.*, and C.R.S. 29-1-203;

WHEREAS, the sponsoring districts previously have formed a board of cooperative educational services to establish and operate an expeditionary learning school for the benefit of students residing within the sponsoring districts;

WHEREAS, the sponsoring districts wish to continue the operation of said expeditionary learning school using a school-based governance structure;

WHEREAS, the parties wish to operate the expeditionary learning school within the boundaries of School District No. 1 in the City and County of Denver and to obtain certain facilities and services from said school district while working collaboratively with and providing educational opportunities for students of the other sponsoring districts;

WHEREAS, the BOCES acknowledges that a portion of the prior year ending fund balance is categorized as Assigned per the definition of GASB 54 for budget carryover for use in the subsequent budget year;

RESOLVED, the BOCES authorizes the use of a portion of the 2015-2016 beginning fund balance for the following:

| Implementation of Strategic Plan | $50,000 |
| Construction & Renovation        | $150,000 |
FURTHER RESOLVED, the use of this portion of the beginning fund balance for the purpose set forth above will not lead to an ongoing deficit.

This resolution may be executed in one or more counterparts, all of which taken together shall constitute the same resolution, and when signed by the President of the BOCES may be certified by any proper director of the RMSEL organization.

By their signatures, the undersigned member(s) evidence their approval of the above proceedings as of January 24, 2017.

_____________________________
Kelly Perez, President

_____________________________
Barbara Yamrick, Vice President

_____________________________
Rosann Ward, Secretary/Treasurer

- Intergovernmental Agreement Renewal 2017-2022 – Janice made a motion to move the Intergovernmental Agreement Renewal to Discussion Items, and Anne-Marie seconded. The motion was unanimously passed.

Discussion Items

- Intergovernmental Agreement Renewal – Chad said that the board asked him to bring a presentation and synopsis of where the renewal of the IGA process stands today. His PowerPoint presentation is included below for the minutes (slides read left to right, top to bottom).
Regarding the Outstanding Items in the IGA Contract Negotiations, Chad noted that the original IGA language is shown in black font, and the replacement language requested by DPS is shown in red font. Chad said that DPS submitted additional verbiage last night requesting that the final sentence shown in slide #7 be added. Chad said the conversation over the last 6 months has revolved around the impact of these items to the operation of RMSEL. The concerns are noted in the IGA Discussion Outstanding Questions stated in the PowerPoint slides #9 and 10. DPS has asserted that they want equity and access to all students; but that needs to include equity for current RMSEL students.
For instance, if a RMSEL 5th grader does not pass their portfolio, they do not advance to 6th grade. Chad said that RMSEL wants to ensure that the longstanding practice of the portfolio as the documentation of learning which advances students at RMSEL remains intact with fidelity through these negotiations. Chad asked, regarding the second bullet of slide #10, in the event the BOCES comes to agreement regarding this IGA language, will RMSEL still be able to maintain that a student’s advancement is tied to the completion of the portfolio? Chad said it is understood that the BOCES board sets policy for RMSEL, as long as it is not in contradiction with the terms of the IGA contract. Chad opened it up for discussion at this time. Kelly said that at this time, the floor was opened for the previously mentioned Open Forum discussion. Mike Johnson, DPS, said he wanted to speak to this, to attempt to provide explanation. Barbara made a point of order that the floor was open for comments from the public audience, after which the board would discuss the matter without dialoguing back and forth with the public audience.

Steve Steadman’s, DAC member, grandson has attended RMSEL since Kindergarten, and is now in 5th grade. Steve believes RMSEL is a fantastic place for children. The leadership of Chad, Marci, and Kelsey has been visibly shown to their family. Josh has grown and felt loved. Their family completely supports the RMSEL administrative team, and the portfolio process, which is integral to the success of the children; they work very hard on their portfolios.

Mitzi Leaver, parent, volunteer, and substitute teacher, said her family has been at RMSEL for 11 years. They have 3 children who have attended RMSEL, beginning with their youngest child in kindergarten. She said the portfolio process is the most authentic learning experience she has ever seen. Her children attended other schools prior to RMSEL, so she believes she has experience with the education at other schools. Her daughter who graduated from RMSEL, is now attending college, called after her first round of finals and declared her belief that portfolios were much harder than her college finals.

Susan Street, DAC member, mother of three K thru 12 alumni; all went to or are in college. They are now successful adults, and she credits RMSEL for that. The portfolio process is unbelievable; she is a passage panelist and intends to participate as long as she is physically able. The autonomy of RMSEL is what makes RMSEL what it is, and that autonomy must be protected. RMSEL is a one-school district, unique, and to have any other district impose restrictions on the program at RMSEL creates a barrier to the implementation of its program. RMSEL is a school of choice, and parents need to come into it knowing that RMSEL is not the same as any other school in any other district. Susan has been a parent at RMSEL for 20 years, has historical perspective from serving on DAC and as a parent.

Margaret Bierman, parent, volunteer, DAC Chairman, said she sees RMSEL as being an integrated fabric of adventure program, portfolio, academics, admission, or discipline, and these are not independent variables that can be tweaked without impact upon another element of the RMSEL program. DAC wants to provide context to the board of those areas where tweaking will impact other areas.

At this point, the Open Forum discussion closed and the floor was returned to Mike Johnson.

Mike said that DPS shares the parents’ enthusiasm for RMSEL and believes that RMSEL provides a very valuable service to students. The negotiations have been long and confusing. The IGA is a contract among all five school districts. The DPS board members do not usually get directly involved in contract negotiations, it is usually dealt with by their staff. Molly Ferrer (legal counsel) has been negotiating the contract for DPS and is available for questions. Laurie Premer (School Choice Office) and Anne Rowe (DPS Board President and former RMSEL BOCES board member) are also available to give input and respond to questions if needed. Mike stated that he believes there may have been some confusion that has arisen during the emails and conversations that have taken place. He denies that DPS has any opposition to the portfolio process and said if there is proposed language in their recommendations implying such, it will be removed. Mike said that when he and Molly read the old contract, they assumed RMSEL admits students by lottery. He said that there was language proposed that he and Molly believe implied that RMSEL wanted to pick and choose its students after the lottery was run. DPS is in opposition to that. Mike said that the current status of the negotiations is that RMSEL would be able to make an independent decision about the grade a child is entered into in the lottery. DPS is proposing that students be entered into the lottery based on the current grade in their current school. Although they did not say this in the original language, DPS agrees that if a student is
going to be held back at their current school, they should apply to the lottery for the same grade. He said the narrowness of their position is that RMSEL should not be able to make a decision independent of the child’s current school as to the grade placement in the lottery. Mike said they have been very deliberate at DPS to be sure that lotteries are blind and fairly done, but he acknowledges that it hasn’t always been clearly done that way in all schools. He said he would be happy to discuss that with anyone in detail as to the reasons for those practices. DPS has four EL schools where enrollment is done by straight lottery; DPS believes that is the right way to do it. Barbara said that she will speak against the IGA not go forward with the APS board with the terminology regarding age based enrollment. She said RMSEL stands as a district, not as a subset of another district. Aurora does not permit moving a student forward to the next grade based solely on age; they are striving hard to assert that it must be on academic achievement. Therefore, a student must meet RMSEL’s qualifications, including portfolio. RMSEL is not a school of another district, but its own district. Mike said that if a child is held back in the current school, they would not be advanced to the next grade in the lottery. Barbara stated an example of a student moving here from Hawaii: according to the standards of the school in Hawaii, they may say the child is ready to move on to the next grade; however, if the student comes to RMSEL but does not meet RMSEL’s portfolio requirement, RMSEL must have the ability to deny that student’s enrollment in the grade they applied for in the lottery. She reiterated that RMSEL is a district, and as such, the requirements and expectations for advancement must be upheld. Mike said this language is not in reference to portfolios. Chad asked to clarify and referenced slide #8. Item 3(f)iii displays current School of Choice Statute. RMSEL has never enacted this statutory protection of the IGA because it is not clearly defined as originally written in the IGA. If admission was denied because of not having a required level of performance, without clear language regarding what RMSEL’s eligibility criteria policy was, it would not be maintaining an objective decision process. In the past, there have not been clearly defined eligibility criteria for admission. In a school of this size, RMSEL has one course of study. For example, if a 5th grade student from Asbury applies to RMSEL as a 6th grader, but review of their academics demonstrates they are not prepared to go to 6th grade, what happens? Two options were proposed: run the lottery, give the child the 6th grade spot, and then as allowed by statute, RMSEL would then deny admission. The other option is to move the student to the 5th grade prior to the running of the lottery. Rosann thanked Chad for making sure the conversation is framed around students. She said she is struggling with the reality that there will be repercussion on not just a single student, but it impacts the entire classroom; what happens to that teacher and the rest of the students in the classroom? If the DPS recommended language is adopted, how will that be addressed? Anne-Marie asked Mike if he is willing to change the language to accommodate a student being held back, he said yes, if the student is being held back in their current school. Anne-Marie then asked if he is in agreement with the portfolio process of not advancing a student if they do not pass the portfolio. Mike said yes; DPS’ concern has always been about fair process in the lottery, not with what RMSEL does after the child is a student at RMSEL. Anne-Marie said the language could be tweaked then. She agrees that the supporting districts do not get to demand what RMSEL does as a district. Mike said it is possible that there could be a hypothetical child who would enter 6th grade at RMSEL and not be at the same level as the other 6th graders; it happens in all schools, and the teachers need to modify instruction. He said the possibility that RMSEL could deny admission based on an independent evaluation is a slippery slope. Rosann said she is not suggesting denying admission, and that reviewing a student’s achievement and placing them appropriately is differentiating and customizing instruction to the child. Rosann is still concerned that the language requested by DPS will have a detrimental effect on RMSEL. Barbara said the issue is this: a child is entered in the 5th grade lottery, and is determined, after the lottery but prior to admission, to not be ready for 5th grade; then there is no availability in 4th grade. Then what? Mike said DPS’ concern is only with the running of the lottery itself; it is up to RMSEL to figure out what to do after the child is at RMSEL. Janice said she believes there should be a provision of instruction for all students. Barbara said that if a child has been admitted by the lottery does not mean they have been entered into the school; admission to the classroom is based on space and ability. Anne-Marie asked again if DPS will agree that there is a problem with the language currently requested by DPS; rather than by age, RMSEL should still have the ability to determine a child’s placement based on academic appropriateness. RMSEL as a district needs to set policy, not another district. She said the current policy proposal is that age is driving placement of children. Mike said DPS is proposing the lottery be based on a child’s current grade level in their current school. Chad asked a clarifying question: Is DPS seeking to make sure that every student, based on age/ability, would be able to apply in the lottery? Mike said it is based on the current grade in the current school. Chad then asked if it is then correct that once student is enrolled at RMSEL, the eligibility criteria of RMSEL would apply, as long as it is not denying admission.
Mike responded that once the student is enrolled at RMSEL, it is up to RMSEL to determine how to best deliver the education to the child. Chad asked if, once enrolled it was determined that the student needed instruction at an alternative grade level, the BOCES would set advancement and retention policy. Mike said if the way RMSEL decides to provide education to the child is in a lower grade level, that is fine. Chad asked, in the event that it is determined after the lottery that a child is ready for a lower grade, would RMSEL be able to use its eligibility criteria to move that child to the lower grade, but not deny them access? Mike said after the child has already started attending RMSEL, it is RMSEL’s decision to determine how they will educate the child. Barbara again said, when there is no room for that student in the grade other than the one they applied for in the lottery, it is then denying enrollment because of no spaces. Speaking about Aurora; if you are going to be admitted to 5th grade, the standard is coming from 4th will allow enrollment in 5th grade. If it is then determined the child is actually only ready for 4th grade, Aurora would have the ability to place a child in 4th grade. That ability does not exist at RMSEL because of the size of classrooms. RMSEL is not Aurora. Kelly said it sounds like there are two issues on the table: DPS is saying every child must have access to the lottery; once they are in RMSEL, RMSEL’s policies would determine what is best for the student. There is a need to clarify and separate the issues; if a child does not have skills to be successful in 6th grade, RMSEL has authority by state statute to determine the appropriate grade. Kelly asked for Chad’s response. He said that RMSEL needs the BOCES board to go through the process of defining that policy. He said the language exists in the statute, but has not been clearly defined in RMSEL policy. This board has the ability to set policy that is not in contradiction to the contract. Mike said he assumes that RMSEL has students currently who may not be ready to move on. Rosann said that the eligibility in the lottery should be at the appropriate grade level, not solely based on current grade. AnneMarie asked how to tweak the DPS language so that the student is in the lottery at the appropriate grade level. RMSEL cannot do what big districts do; RMSEL has a finite amount of space in which to place students. RMSEL needs the ability to offer the lottery to the appropriate grade level. Chad said the concern is making sure that students are meeting the metrics of prepared competency as defined by Colorado Academic Standards required for advancement until graduation. At RMSEL, the portfolio is also supported with input from the teacher. It is challenging to correctly place students and not lose the student along the way. Chad has 12th grade students in his SLE class that he knows will need to take remedial classes at college. How do we prevent that moving forward? Students may have met the requirement of advancement, but not the level of competency. A compromise of this board with DPS may be to understand that students will enroll in an open lottery system, but the child needs to move grades once enrolled (as determined by a collective decision, not by just Chad), then RMSEL has the ability, if a spot is available, to move a student into the appropriate grade. Mike said what is supposed to be happening in a child’s current school is that the educators are making judgments regarding a child’s placement in the next grade. DPS is requesting that RMSEL respect those decisions in the lottery. Once a child is enrolled at RMSEL, an education plan needs to be developed for that child. Barbara said suppose there are 10 spaces in the lottery; 10 students “win” the lottery, but one of those 10 students is not prepared for the grade for which they won the lottery, and RMSEL does not have the space to enroll that student in the lower grade. In the other public school districts, there are a lot of schools, with a lot of resources and interventions available. RMSEL does not have those same resources; there are a set number of spaces in a classroom. She said students need to be accelerated at their level of academic achievement. AnneMarie said it seems like all five districts are on the same page; a fair lottery is appropriate, and wanting what is best for kids. The concerning language as requested by DPS is the forced lottery into the next grade up from the current school grade. She asked Mike how to change the language so that a child isn’t automatically placed into a grade through the lottery for which they are not prepared. Mike said he is in agreement with terminology that would define that if a child is held back in the current grade after the lottery, the child would not receive the spot in the grade for which they applied, and would go back into the lottery for the lower grade. Julie said if a child gets accepted into 6th grade, but then is held back in 5th grade, RMSEL would not have a spot for them in 5th grade. Mike said that if the current school decides after the RMSEL lottery to hold the child back in the same grade, the child would have to be placed on the wait list for the same grade. Rosann asked if this terminology should be included in an admissions packet that would state that if the child is retained at the current school, the spot would then be forfeited. This would then retain the purity of the IGA that all students are eligible for application to the lottery, but then admissions policy would define that there are qualifications for admission. Chad said he supports that, and Janice agreed. Mike said that is fine with him; his assumption is that the student would complete the requirements of the current grade. Barbara said she is still having difficulty accepting the language added by DPS in regard to admission based on age. She stated that at RMSEL, wait lists already exist.
If a child is denied the grade level for which they originally applied, they would go to the end of the wait list for the lower grade, even though they “won” the lottery. Rosann agrees that this is an issue, and she wonders if there is a way to adjust the language in the presentation of the lottery on the front end, which still allows any child to apply through the lottery, but also parents understand up front that there are admission requirements beyond the lottery. Mike said he wants to respect the decisions being made in the child’s current school; once a child is enrolled in RMSEL, he trusts RMSEL in educating that child. He doesn’t want RMSEL denying a child admission based on written evidence that comes after that school’s decision. Using a hypothetical 5th to 6th grade applicant who gets a spot in lottery, Chad said then RMSEL may contact their school regarding retention; if child is being retained in their current school, enrollment would be denied at RMSEL based on no space. Mike said to place the child on the wait list for the appropriate grade at the end of that grade’s wait list, not ahead of the other applicants. Barbara said she understands better the position of DPS in not wanting RMSEL to be able to deny a child enrollment without documented support of why that child is being denied. Mike does not believe RMSEL should be able to override the input from the prior educator, whether based on letter grades or whatever written evidence is provided. Make it clear in the admissions paperwork that the enrollment spot being awarded through the lottery is contingent upon the successful completion of the current grade. Anne-Marie said she wanted to clarify what is being discussed is keeping the IGA language as is, and defining the admissions process. She asked Chad if there is any concern that this will affect current students. Chad said that clarification will be added to the terminology that will not affect current students; RMSEL will continue its portfolio practice as usual. In regard to an application for a student who ended up being retained at the current school, that child would effectively end up being “denied” a spot because of there not being an openings in the retained grade. Kelly said she feels that with all of the dialogue she feels that it has come to a good consensus, and asked if all board members are on same page now in regard to the IGA language. Anne-Marie asked Mike if any clarifying language needs to be added to ensure that this IGA is not misinterpreted if it should later appear that admission policy is different than implied by the IGA. Mike asked Molly to address the drafted language in question. Molly said that RMSEL would have the ability to define “his/her current grade level” as the appropriate grade level based on the prior school’s recommendation. Chad asked if language can be added regarding RMSEL’s admission criteria. Molly said that it needs to be clear in the IGA that any retention decision is determined by the school that is currently serving the student. Janice said she agrees with stating in the IGA that there is an admission policy for RMSEL. Mike proposed that “provided that the child’s current school advances the child…” be added to the terminology. Rosann disagreed and said that is too specific, and it should simply say that enrollment adheres to RMSEL’s admission policy. Anne-Marie proposed that “as defined by RMSEL admission policy” be added to the IGA terminology, which policy this board will set once the IGA has been finalized and agreed upon. Barbara asked for a point of order: Is Anne-Marie just discussing or making a motion? Anne-Marie said she will make a motion when the IGA is back as an action item, not just discussion. Chad said the clarifying point is that the current school would make the decision regarding grade level placement, and that if a child is retained, they would not end up being placed in the grade for which they applied in the lottery; this still allows a fair lottery application process for every student. Rosann made a motion that the BOCES board votes on the renewal of the IGA at the next RMSEL meeting in February, once the supporting districts have reviewed the revised terminology. Barbara seconded the motion, and then said that she needs the revised terminology immediately for the Aurora board meeting next week. Chad said he will add the revision of the clarifying language and send it out to all the board members immediately. The motion was unanimously approved.

Kelly said that at this time, the meeting would return to Open Forum, with an opportunity for parents to speak to the board. Margaret asked a clarifying question regarding the timing issue of the lottery being held at the beginning of February; parents may not know that early that their child will be retained. Does a child who is being placed in a different grade because of retention post-lottery go to the top or bottom of the appropriate grade wait list? Steve thanked the board for the thoughtful discussion, and suggested that the revised terminology be stated as simply as possible and refer back to RMSEL’s admission policy. Paul said he has been in the classroom, and has seen students who enter a grade and are not ready for that grade (due to social promotion). The process needs to be based on the metrics of where the child is academically, not based on what was filled out on a piece of paper; the child needs to get the help they need, and no one wants a child to graduate high school and be set up for failure. He is from Detroit, where Detroit Public Schools are being sued because students are graduating but are illiterate. Susan said parents and students have not been mentioned much in this conversation. Parents have a choice to enroll students where they
want them to go, based on admission policies at whatever school; RMSEL should not be stifled in accepting a student only on a previous school’s evaluation. In the admission policy, if RMSEL feels they can accommodate a student based on teachers, class size, and the community, they should not be stifled in the decision regarding that student. Janice asked Chad for confirmation that the information from the discussion today will be sent to all five district board members, Chad said yes. Mike said that they had received an email from Cherry Creek counsel with minor changes and that this is not necessarily the final. Barbara wanted to acknowledge the presence of the other school district officials, including Anne Rowe, DPS Board President; Molly Ferrer, DPS Legal Counsel; and Laurie Premer, DPS Choice Office.

- Discipline Policy and Procedures Revision – Caplan and Earnest Recommendations IGA/J Policy
- Student Policy “J” Timeline of Revision

**Report Items**

- 2016-2017 Budget Revision – Julie noted that the board received the revised budget via email in their packets, and said that there weren’t any big changes. Kelly asked if there were any questions; there were none.
- Budget Update (Julie Stelzer) – The Management Summary is included in its entirety below for the minutes.

**Revenue**

As previously noted, DPS changed the funding payment schedule for 2016-2017. Beginning this school year, PPR funding is paid from DPS on a quarterly basis according to the following schedule: 25% is funded on July 15th, October 15th, January 15th and April 15th. The final quarterly payment will incorporate any changes in the State’s supplemental budget, if applicable, to reflect any adjustments or rescissions from CDE. The first 25% of PPR funding was received in July, and the second 25% of PPR funding was received in October as per the payment schedule. PPR was budgeted at $7,626.05/FTE X 379.5 FTE, and $7,731.66/FTE X 386.5 FTE (10/1/15 count) is the per pupil amount that was received ($2,988,286.59 X 50% = $1,494,143.30). The PPR and FTE difference funded at 50% explain the budget variance. This line item was adjusted with the revised budget. According to DPS, the January 2017 payment will be adjusted to the official October 2016 count numbers and will include any known CDE revisions to PPR.

Kindergarten financial aid (#42500) has $3,500 remaining, and there remains $9,795 in fieldwork financial aid (#67800). Under the RMSEL’s fieldwork fee structure, families with three (3) or more children at RMSEL have the option to take a 10% discount on their fieldwork fees. To date, eight (8) families have opted to take advantage of this discount.

Per the Budget Appropriation resolution approved by the board in June 2016, $100,000 of beginning fund balance is reflected on the budget for Prior Year Budget Carryover (#43503). This is in alignment with the provisions of GASB 54 and the categorization of fund balance assigned for budget carryover. This line was adjusted to $200,000 in the revised budget.

Per HB 12-1345, $214,616.50 was received in August to assist the BOCES with meeting state educational priorities determined by CDE. These funds are used to employ key personnel to implement a Response to Intervention (RtI) process for monitoring student achievement with 20% of our school population in grades K-12. This line item was adjusted to actual in the revised budget.

In August, we received $10,164.79 per the READ Act to support reading intervention for students in grades K-3 as identified from state assessment scores. This line item was adjusted to actual in the revised budget.

The amounts reflected in the Fieldwork Carryover-Landmark Trips (#43600) line items include fieldwork fees carried over from 2015-2016 as well as 10% landmark trip allocation from the 2016-2017 fieldwork fees. These amounts are allocated toward funding the landmark 5th grade Sailing trip, 6th grade Yellowstone trip, 8th grade Civil Rights trip, and the 11th grade trip to Costa Rica.

Actual enrollment from October 2016 count is 393 FTE. This is the reason for the variance showing in the fieldwork fee grouping (#44200), and this line item was adjusted as well in the revised budget.
The revenue derived from kindergarten tuition (state only funds .58 FTE for kindergarten) remains on target, with 6 months (January 2017-June 2017) remaining to be invoiced.

Classroom revenue (#46400, #46500, #46550 and #46600) represents the student contribution toward the 5th grade Sailing ($4,800), 6th grade Yellowstone ($5,000), 8th grade Civil Rights ($7,350) and 11th grade Costa Rica ($20,365.35) landmark trips.

School-Based fundraising (#47000) is over-budget due to a parent donation of $5,000. The accounts in this sub-category were adjusted in the revised budget.

Miscellaneous income (#49000) is greater than anticipated due to the write-off of fieldwork fee deposits for students that decided not to attend RMSEL. These funds will be used to offset other budget shortfalls.

**Expenses**

Line items with notable variances or exceptions are explained below.

Lease #60020 – this variance is due to a timing difference related to the lease payments of $75,000 to DPS which are due 11/1 and 5/1.

Classroom Renovation #60031 – this account does not have a budget associated with the expense but was adjusted in the revised budget. The expenses in this account are for work performed over the summer in the common areas, carpet and painting of the High School Science, Humanities classrooms and mobile classrooms as well as toilet partitions.

Construction General #60032 – this account does not have a budget associated with the expense but was adjusted in the revised budget. The expenses in this account are for the installation of the plumbing and sink in the Community Room for the DPS school lunch program ($15,483) and the refinishing of the gym floor ($1,733).

Furniture #60035 – this account is over-budget due to the purchase of replacement desks for new staff. The line item was adjusted in the revised budget.

Equipment #63250 – this account is over-budget due to the purchase of a carpet cleaner but was adjusted in the revised budget.

AVID/Movement #66211 – this account does not have a budget associated with the expense but was adjusted in the revised budget.

Elementary Fieldwork #67402 & #67403 – these expense accounts are offset against funds in the Fieldwork Carryover-Landmark Trips #43610 and Classroom Revenue #46400 for the 2016-2017 Sailing trip.

Fieldwork Fee Discounts Taken #67850 – this account is over-budget due to the many families that opted to take advantage of the discount. This line item was adjusted in the revised budget.

**Items for Future Agenda**

Chad reiterated that the IGA will be presented at the next BOCES meeting for a final vote. He said the J Policies will be presented to the board in groups of 10-15, the first reading will be conducted, then second reading and approval; the intent is to have those all reviewed and revised by June 30th. There are 60 policies to be reviewed, which have been in place since 2009. The only two amended policies since 2009 are harassment and drug/alcohol policies. Coulter Bump will review and make recommendations to the board regarding the revision of the policies. Mike asked that the changes from CASB policies be noted when they are distributed to the board.

Kelly commented to the audience that the budget will be posted to the website after the approval in this meeting. She also noted that the board members receive all of the budget information electronically several days prior to the board
meeting, and have opportunity to review it and come to the meeting well prepared to move ahead. Barbara said that when the board has questions, they freely discuss them in this meeting.

**Adjournment**
Kelly asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Barbara made a motion to adjourn, and Rosann seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.

____________________
Kelly Perez, President

____________________
Rosann Ward, Secretary/Treasurer