

JEFFCO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES – OCTOBER, 2024

Attendees:

At Large Member - VACANT	Corky Guy	Erin Norton	Jessica Gregg	Laura Grims	Columbine AAR - VACANT
Amanda Bryan	Standley Lake AAR - VACANT	At Large Member - VACANT	Julia Morgan	Bear Creek AAR - VACANT	Therese Rednor
Amanda Gomez	Crystal Marine	Evie Hudak	Conifer AAR - VACANT	Leslie Dennis	Charter School AAR - VACANT
Annie Contractor	David Alex	Giselle Arroyo	Karena Hamm	Lucia Severtsen	
Aubrey Allmond	Dawn Fritz	Greg Aigner	Kate Otto	Matthew Noll	
Austin Long	JCEA HS Rep - VACANT	Hannah Hoeng	Katie Keivisto	Michele DeAndrea-Austin	
Brisneida Barrueta	Diego Rodriguez	Jaclyn Uttley	Option Schools AAR - VACANT	Michelle Kuenzler	
Caitlin Fitzpatrick	Elizabeth Armstong	Jeanine Baird	Kaylie Weese	Monica Keegan	
Carsten Engebretsen	Emily Lubkert	Jeff Baucum	Kim Bierbrauer	Rob Applegate	
Cheryl Secorski	Eric Koch	Ralston Valley AAR - VACANT	Kristina Stuber	Sara Kuntzler	

Minutes By Agenda Topic:

1. **Topic: Welcome and Approval of Agenda (5:30-5:35)**

Outputs/Outcomes no comments/changes - stand approved

2. **Topic: Charter Subcommittee**

- a. Process: review notes, vote on whether or not to submit to board
- b. School 1: Lincoln Academy Charter School- [Review Doc](#)
 - i. Questions about “100% participation rate”
 - ii. Question: this looks like a recommendation. Is it? No, not giving an up or down vote on the school.
 1. Subcommittee response: the rubric is black and white, but the renewals are not. Not meeting a standard shouldn't =
 - iii. Question: need to sell part of their property - why? Imminent domain, or
 - iv. Question: since you cannot make determinations in any category, is this appropriate work for DAC to be doing? - we should discuss this later
 - v. Question about this vote tonight - what are we voting on?
 - vi. Motion to Approve comments for Lincoln
 - vii. Vote to send comments to board: **passed vote**
 1. 32 yes votes
 2. 2 abstentions
 3. 0 no votes
- c. School 2: Montessori Peaks Academy - [Review Doc](#)
 - i. Questions: Capital purchase - buying a new building when up for renewal is that a red flag?
 1. Not for us
 - ii. Question: Art Charters on Jeffco Insights - they have to opt into it. Each of these renewals did include performance data from Jeffco Insights
 - iii. Confusion on academic data - performance data - is there data or not? There is academic data, but no data about performance against their own curriculum

- iv. Did the subcommittee use a specific statistic regarding disproportionate discipline - what data is being used to support that statement and what kind of data is being talked about here? (example, a note sent home, vs. a suspension)
 - v. Vote to send comments to board: **passed vote**
 - 1. 33 yes votes
 - 2. 1 abstention
 - 3. 0 no votes
- d. School 3: Mountain Phoenix Community School - **Review Doc**
- i. Questions: note of increase in low-income students, increasing representation of the community in which it's located
 - ii. Question: what are the socioeconomics of the community where it is located?
 - iii. Vote to send comments to board: **passed vote**
 - 1. 29 yes votes
 - 2. 2 abstentions
 - 3. 0 no votes
- e. School 4: Rocky Mountain Deaf School - **Review Doc**
- i. Question: "aggressive expectations" for growth - are those coming from the school or from some outside entity? - from the school
 - ii. Comment: this is such a great example of why the rubric is hard to use - they should get renewed, but by metrics
 - iii. Comment from District Liaison - only state school teaching only in ASL.
 - iv. Vote to send comments to board: **passed vote**
 - 1. 33 Yes votes
 - 2. 0 abstentions
 - 3. 0 no votes
- f. School 5: Doral Academy - **Review Doc** (does not include amendments voted on)
- i. Question: does it look like the external source of cost coverage look like it will cover their costs?
 - 1. We felt the FTE growth forecast to cover the costs was unrealistic
 - ii. Comment: why don't you just say the numbers, instead of using "unrealistic"
 - iii. Comment: this was a two-year renewal, not a 5-year renewal - they were already put on notice.
 - iv. Motion to approve the document, with the amendment to the document of specific data from the application around the balloon payment and FTE
 - v. Vote to send comments to board: **passed vote**
 - 1. 29 Yes votes
 - 2. 3 Abstentions
 - 3. 1
 - 4. No votes

3. Topic: Code of Conduct Review

- a. A motion was made to "**delay the final Committee of the Whole vote on the Code of Conduct until the January meeting**, and I further move that the DAC **create a temporary ad hoc subcommittee open to all members to comprehensively review and recommend changes to the DAC Code of Conduct and if necessary, the DAC By laws**. This Code of Conduct subcommittee is to provide a Draft Code of Conduct with all recommendations to the DAC Committee of the Whole prior to the January meeting. I think together we can make DAC, safer and more inclusive."
- b. Discussion:
 - i. Question: what will be in place until January? What protections for us until then? - **Current Code of Conduct will still be in place**
 - ii. Comment: apology that this happened.
 - iii. Question: are we allowed to make subcommittees? - **Yes, as per bylaws**.
 - iv. Question: who would be the chair? **Need to be elected, as is our precedent, but a committee chair can appoint a chair of an ad hoc committee. Not clear in Roberts rules or in bylaws**
 - v. Question: if they become a chair, would they sit on the executive committee, and if so, would that create a conflict of interest? **Would not sit on Exec Committee as an ad hoc subcommittee**.
 - vi. Substitute motion: take the Code of Conduct off the agenda and make this decision in November
 - vii. Amendment to the Motion: bring forward subcommittee recommendation in January for a vote in February (Seconded)
 - viii. Vote for February vote - **simple majority passed**.
 - ix. Vote for original motion to create ad hoc subcommittee - **simple majority passed**
 - x. Creation of the ad hoc subcommittee:
 - 1. Motion: any parties submit their names before next meeting, hold vote in November

2. Discussion: integrity of committee - shouldn't be chaired by persons involved.
 3. Suggestion: interested parties submit names to Greece, those people can start having conversations and get thoughts out, getting out notes
 4. Suggestion: temporary chair? Facilitator? If temporary chair, that should be the chair of the DAC, to truly just serve as a facilitator.
- xi. Note: we did ask members to come to today's meeting with thoughts, since it was on the agenda for today.
 - xii. Question: would the person who made this motion, based on personal experience, feel comfortable with the chair serving in this capacity, or should it be an outside party?
 1. Probably need an outside person
 - xiii. Question: would the person who made this motion feel comfortable facilitating?
 1. If the committee as a whole is comfortable with this, given her position, yes.
 - xiv. Motion: any interested parties in chairing the ad hoc subcommittee should submit their names for election procedure in November
 1. Offer from 3rd party facilitator, Trace, to be a neutral facilitator.
 - xv. Amendment to the motion: Trace should ask as an impartial facilitator to the ad hoc subcommittee

Question: can a non DAC member be a facilitator of an ad hoc subcommittee, as per bylaws?

Would be completely neutral party, no decision-making role

- Vote - "full majority" - passed

4. Topic: SAC Survey Discussion

- a. Updates to the SAC survey questions - [link to notes document](#)
 - i. Demographic match of SAC - **can we make checkboxes, not yes/no?**
- b. Suggestion for a separate survey for charters because these questions are not super applicable
- c. Suggestion to restructure the survey based on what we need from it, then do the question revision offline
 - i. Consider:
 1. Accountability - are SACs working well as a structure?
 2. What do you need?
- d. Concern: changing questions year to year means we cannot see trends over time
- e. What is needed in the survey:
 - i. What is their impression of the DAC structure change?
 - ii. Do they feel like their voice makes it to the School Board?
 - iii. Do they feel like the AARs represent them?
 - iv. ***May be hard to add it to deploy in November
- f. Logistics of the survey process:
 - i. Feedback in November in order to...
 - ii. For budget considerations to the school board, the district is scheduled to present in Feb.
 - iii. Need survey back in December in order to clean it up
 - iv. Also, budget will review data in December and present back to the DAC in Jan in time for the district
- g. Comment: not every SAC meets every month so you might not get a response
- h. Comment: A lot of this information we got at our last meeting
- i. Suggestion: break into two surveys: budget version along existing timeline. Other questions on a separate survey
- j. Suggestion: Budget survey is separate, according to this timeline, revamp remainder of questions to gather useful information along a timeline that makes sense
- k. Question: what does the school board need from us?
 - i. Erin Kenworthy, board liaison, speaking for herself only: are schools getting the UIP information that they need?
- l. Board liaison: the district has many impressive dashboards that lift up demographic data to the Board. DAC is not the only one.
 - i. What Erin wants to know: where are the issues that are occurring that are coalescing/occurring in multiple schools, multiple areas - collective issues impacting multiple schools in the same area
- m. **Outcome: budget survey to go out as planned. Perhaps do not need another survey, given FSCP restructure**

5. Topic: DAC Member Input

- a. Trace Faust - 3rd party consulting on committee operations
 - i. Special project opportunity - members completed survey of preferences
 - ii. Meeting feedback form