

## Meeting Notes

Jefferson County Board of Education  
Finance Advisory Committee  
VanHoose Education Center, Stewart Auditorium  
November 9, 2017 – 4:30 p.m.

---

### Members present:

Florence Chang, John Collopy, Tom Denton, Dena Dossett, Rob Fulk, Cordelia Hardin, Chris Harmer, Steph Horne, Kenneth Johnson, Stephen Lin, Angie Moorin, Eddie Muns, Bill Perkins, Marty Pollio, Louis Straub, Leslie Taylor, Bo Yan. Eddie Weaver joined via conference call.

---

## Summary of Committee Activities

Using evaluation research for effectiveness monitoring and funding decisions

- Leslie Taylor gave a presentation on evaluation research – what it is, what determinations the level of program evaluation, planning, implementation, impact, and variables influencing outcomes. Link to handouts below.

### Committee conversation:

- Every program does not require an evaluation. It depends on how much accuracy is needed.
- Higher cost programs do not always require higher levels of evaluations.
- Smaller scale programs may benefit from higher level evaluations to determine if they are effective. A program may not be scaled up if it isn't effective.
- Bellarmine Literacy program is a five-year program at \$3.7 million per year. Is it working and how does it compare to other reading programs from the past?
- For the amount of money spent on Bellarmine Literacy, 50 coaches could be purchased to train reading teachers in schools. Could \$3.7 million be used differently for more effective outcomes?
- A number of schools have not implemented Bellarmine Literacy to full capacity which could be the reason the level of reading hasn't been achieved in some schools. Did all schools buy in and are they implementing the program correctly?
- An action plan requiring all 155 schools to buy in and implement effectively is sometimes hard to achieve. Example is Goal Clarity Coaches in place for six years at \$11 million a year. This position is used widely for various needs. Is the purpose/outcome supporting the cost?
- Is two years a reasonable amount of time to see progress? This depends on what is being monitored. Hopefully positive trends would show by the end of year two.
- Level four evaluation is very progressive in its nature of up-front planning, collaboration effort on program expectations, what should be measured, training and implementation, observation, review of monthly data, surveys, information shared with stakeholders on data collected, discussion on where the program is and where support is needed for continuous improvement.

- For better understanding, we would like to see program evaluation at front and back end with focus, timing, and how cost is connected.
- Can we dig in more to see if a program is working – ask principals their opinions? Success of a program is not always measured in test scores.
- Program results can differ between schools depending on student groups and teaching experience, and whether the principal has bought into the program and staff are implementing it correctly. There are many variables that can affect the outcome of a program.
- Committee members especially liked the handout created by Jefferson County, Colorado. The continuous improvement matrix shows how gaps in planning, implementation, and impact result in outcome (coherence).

## Information

Link to [Meeting Materials](#)

- Using Evaluation Research for Effectiveness Monitoring and Funding Decisions
- 2017-18 Research Planning and Evaluations
- Evaluation Planning and Research Details
- Restorative Practices Evaluation Plan – Milestones Year 1

## Recommendations

- The December meeting has been canceled.
- The next meeting is January 11, 2017,  
VanHoose Education Center, Stewart Auditorium, 4:30 p.m.
- A shortened version of the evaluation presentation will be provided for the full Board during a work session on February 13, 2018.