



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 19, 2015, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 19, 2015,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Marcia Neal(R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MADAM CHAIR: All right. We are reconvened
2 in order to engage in some questions, questions with the
3 panel. Deb, do you want to start it off?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I can.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I just thought we'd come
6 down the aisle.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. I'd like to first of
8 all --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Can you lower your mic. Yeah.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- thank you for the great
11 information. I had a question for Jennifer -- no, for
12 Holly.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Somebody up there.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: My question is, how do these
15 -- as we've been considering the difference between
16 guidelines and requirements, floors, ceilings, whatever,
17 how do these guidelines, which are really requirements once
18 they are fully implemented, help you in your school?

19 MS. SAMPLE: I think, in our case, they
20 would help us to focus efforts at the lower grade levels
21 and perhaps even help in terms of the overall preparation
22 for students farther downstream. As Dr. Cobb mentioned, we
23 already have students in the system and one of the most
24 difficult things we have to do is when we get a ninth-
25 grader who is reading at the sixth-grade level or their



1 math grade level is third- or fourth-grade level, and then
2 being able to close those gaps. And we just need to close
3 the gaps much earlier. And then, of course, my concern is
4 setting those cut scores in a way that would disenfranchise
5 those students who are already in the system and already --
6 I mean, at some point we have to look at growth, not just
7 your final score.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I guess my real question
9 is why would the state be dictating to a school like yours,
10 where you're already doing much of this great work? Why
11 would we be -- capstone, district approved in alignment
12 with CDE guidance and forthcoming implementation toolkit
13 documents -- why does that help you? I guess I'm getting
14 to the floor-ceiling discussion. I mean, why would we be
15 coming up with all this detail for you and your school?
16 How does that help you?

17 MS. SAMPLE: I think in my school our
18 biggest dilemma is we still have too high of a remediation
19 rate, based on college entry scores.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So why wouldn't you be
21 implementing these things on your own, based on your own
22 research?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Good question.

24 MS. SAMPLE: Well, we have -- and I have to
25 say I'm not sure -- one of the reasons we have what we have



1 is there's a commitment to the overall growth and
2 development of the student as a whole, without focusing
3 just on cut scores. So if we were to do that, there's a
4 concern about what is lost.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I'm just saying, with all
6 that these groups have generated, and all these documents
7 and guidance documents and all the work the CDE is putting
8 into it, I guess I'm asking, the State Board is asked to
9 decide on either a light touch or a heavy touch, right, to
10 look at high school graduation requirements. Why would we
11 have a heavy touch for schools like yours? How would that
12 help you?

13 MS. SAMPLE: I don't think that heavy touch
14 would help us at all. I think that -- and that's why I
15 speak about competency being demonstrated in a variety of
16 ways. It's not a standard space diploma if we're only
17 looking at some cut scores that require students to pass
18 those in order to graduate, because they could pass that
19 test without meeting the other standards. Flexibility to
20 meet a variety of pathways, as Mr. Stump mentioned, I
21 think, would be most beneficial to both my school and a
22 rural school in my area.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So while these documents can
24 be helpful, and it's great for the CDE to expose what ASVAB
25 score is a great threshold for students to be successful in



1 the military, great for parents to know, great for students
2 and schools to know, for us to set cut scores that go
3 beyond the very minimum that we need to do by statute
4 doesn't really help your score.

5 MS. SAMPLE: I don't think it helps my
6 school or students across the state.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: So your sense is that the
8 lighter touch that the State Board can take is actually
9 better because it gives schools and districts more
10 flexibility to meet our statutory requirement. But it
11 strikes me that setting up a mechanism within CDE, in an
12 implementation toolkit, with guidance for the district
13 capstones -- I'm not sure why we would do that. I'm not
14 sure what benefit it creates for the districts, if those
15 examples can be somewhere for people to look at
16 voluntarily.

17 MS. SAMPLE: Yes. That's what I think would
18 be most useful, the resources for schools that haven't done
19 those things before, would like to try to implement them,
20 or, in my case, we'd like to make sure we can always do
21 better.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Val, do you have a
24 question?

25 MS. FLORES: Actually, I just had a comment



1 about going through a program in graduate school, a
2 master's program that was competency based, where I don't
3 think the professors were prepared, and it took them two
4 years to come up with what the end result would be. And it
5 was very frustrating, you know, to go through that, for the
6 student.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

8 MS. FLORES: And I think that -- I'm just
9 wondering if there are students out there, or school
10 districts out there who have not, you know, come up with a
11 capstone, with what's required at the end.

12 Also, I believe that a score such as 18 or
13 19 is a score, 18 or 19. I mean, who's going to ask you,
14 "Are you an 18 or a 19," you know, afterwards? They're
15 going to think about, or know you as what you've done, what
16 you've accomplished. I mean, does it say anything about
17 your values -- personal development, social development?
18 Does it say anything about -- we know that now the brain,
19 and physically it does take more than 21 years for that
20 adult to develop, and maybe more. And kids develop at
21 different stages. So you may have somebody, even at 21,
22 who is going to do something at 23, or who -- you get the
23 gist.

24 And then reading that book about grit, and
25 how important grit is. And we know that school grades are



1 usually a better predictor than is a score. I mean, I can
2 just give you examples of my high school class of 375, and,
3 you know, who were at the top, who were at the bottom, what
4 those people have done. And it doesn't flesh out to do
5 those scores.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

7 MS. FLORES: So much more.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. We'll start at the
9 other end and come down, or we can do this way if you want.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have quite a few.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Go ahead.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is actually maybe
13 not a question for all of you. What's our most recent
14 remediation rate?

15 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

17 MS. HOLMES: Thirty-seven percent.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And did that go up from
19 the year before?

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. I mean, I'm not
21 answering.

22 MS. HOLMES: It went down slightly.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Slightly?

24 Is someone -- I've been told that taking
25 PARCC is a minimum requirement for graduation.



1 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it? It's not on our
3 list but some districts are saying that.

4 MS. HOLMES: On the menu that you all
5 approved unanimously in 2013, PARCC was listed --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's listed.

7 MS. HOLMES: -- as an option that districts
8 could use, as all of those items on the menu were an option
9 that districts can choose to use as part of a diploma or an
10 exit requirements, but that's optional.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Also, I wasn't
12 sure what you meant when you said something about cut
13 scores being an easy way out. I think that was you.

14 MS. SAMPLE: Back to me. Thank you. In
15 reading the media lately and the dialogue out there about,
16 you know, lowering graduation guidelines, I think if we
17 look at just cut scores on the ACT, you might be able to
18 pass that in ninth grade, and then what do you do? And
19 does that really indicate that you are ready to move
20 forward out of high school? Is there more to a high school
21 education than that?

22 And so that's where I think it's important.
23 And I know that the Department has described, in their
24 toolkit, what the local board responsibilities are that go
25 beyond those cut scores. That's just sort of maybe a



1 common impression out there right now.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And finally, I just
3 have a comment. We have some superintendents of small
4 districts here who are very much affected by what we are
5 doing here, and I'm disappointed that they weren't included
6 in this discussion. They need to be heard. And I also
7 just want to make a comment that I'm very frustrated at all
8 the time we spend talking about these kinds of changes, and
9 it's not healthy. It seems to me if we have a remediation
10 rate problem, we are not solving it by what we're doing
11 here.

12 And so I'd just like to see -- let's figure
13 out how to make sure that our children are ready for
14 college and stop coming up with new plans that are, you
15 know, essentially a remake of what we've been doing for
16 years and hasn't changed anything. So that's just my
17 comment. Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Scott, aren't you
19 a small superintendent?

20 MR. STUMP: No. School board member.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. School board member.
22 Jane, got any comments here?

23 MS. GOFF: I'll jump in. I think I probably
24 speak for the majority of us. We are all standing on two
25 sides of a chasm, and we're in the middle of a lot of



1 things, jumping from jumping. I know that the frustration
2 about nothing's working, we've got this high remediation
3 rate. I believe it's gone down from 40-something percent.
4 When this work started to kick in, down to the current 37,
5 is that good enough? No. No way. But we've been in the
6 process over the last few years of starting to look at the
7 possibilities for looking at things different, so a lot of
8 this, it is frustrating.

9 I guess a couple of questions. I know that
10 the higher ed, the discussion in reviewing the policy for
11 admission and also the changes to the remediation policy,
12 there was quite a bit of time spent on the PARCC and/or
13 perhaps SBAC, because when we're talking about, because
14 when we're talking about students coming in from other
15 states we have to keep the mind open for those things.

16 But that was -- if I recall correctly, and I
17 served on the Remediation Advisory Board, to the task
18 force, we ended up where PARCC and other tests like that,
19 including Compass conversations and ASVAB and such as that
20 were on the as-verified or as-considered, but they were not
21 ever -- the only true stipulation made at all was around
22 ACT as our -- and it is still our current work readiness
23 measure. So but those were listed as options for districts
24 at some point in time, or whatever our state determines to
25 be that part of it.



1 I would just say that I am an unabashedly
2 huge fan of performance opportunities, competency based. I
3 live -- my education life is based on performance and
4 competence, and I'm thinking that -- and for the smaller
5 districts and for -- I see Mr. Miles, Brett (ph) back
6 there, and, you know, appreciate and have a pretty good
7 idea of some opportunities within smaller districts. I
8 spent a lot of time in Adams County, which has an ongoing
9 and developing relationship with local businesses and
10 industries in bringing kids in. Those kinds of experiences
11 are there.

12 I just wonder if we are at a point -- when
13 do we get to a point where it's visible that those
14 organizations, those community groups, those schools, those
15 kids who are participating in that can talk about their
16 experience? When are we going to get to a point where they
17 can really display? It would be nice to see some of the
18 capstone projects on a nice video or something.

19 I just feel that our entire population needs
20 some visible, tangible examples of the possibilities.
21 Until we get to that point, justifiably enough time given
22 to those students and their programs, I think it's going to
23 be hard to latch on to how this could look and what we can
24 do to create substitute, as needed, as we agreed to. But
25 what is the best way to really make the focus of all of



1 this work on student success, and how are the students
2 playing out this part of their responsibility and the
3 things that they would like to do?

4 So I'm really not saying much here other
5 than keep looking down the road.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Keep going.

7 MS. GOFF: But I appreciate the work. Thank
8 you.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Jane. Steve?

10 MR. DURHAM: Just one observation, Madam
11 Chair, and one question.

12 You know, a high remediation rate can mean
13 one of two things. One is the schools, K-12 schools, are
14 not doing a good job. The other possibility is that the
15 higher education community should review its admission
16 standards, because it's not necessarily just A. A B could
17 be part of the problem.

18 But I do have a question, returning, and for
19 our attorney. Would it be possible for us to call these --
20 while the statute apparently refers to them as -- what does
21 it refer to them as? -- guidelines, they are, in fact, not
22 guidelines. They are, in fact, requirements. Is there
23 anything that would prohibit us from changing our documents
24 that we send out to everyone in properly labeling these
25 materials what, in fact, they are, which is requirements?



1 And nobody ever wants to take the heat for getting the job
2 done properly, but if they're requirements we need to treat
3 them as requirements and we need to advertise them as
4 requirements, and, if there is heat associated with having
5 those requirements then it can go to the General Assembly
6 where it belongs.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Tony.

8 MR. DILL: The short answer is I --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, I was just going to say do
10 you -- are you able to answer that question without it
11 coming back with a --

12 MR. DILL: Yes.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Go ahead.

14 MR. DILL: Yeah. The language is you are to
15 adopt a comprehensive set of guidelines for the
16 establishment of high school graduation requirements.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MR. DILL: In fact, although it discourages
19 guidelines they really do, if you read the statute,
20 function as really sort of minimum standards for high
21 school graduation. And I think that's broad enough to call
22 them graduation requirements or graduation standards.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

24 MR. DURHAM: Thank you very much.

25 MADAM CHAIR: I mean, that was a short one.



1 Angelika?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Tony.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, you've got another one.
4 Come back up here.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: While you're here, before I
6 go through the rest of my list, does guidelines mean you
7 have to meet all of them or is it what we think this is,
8 which is a menu for school boards to choose one or three or
9 -- in other words, I'm trying to figure out this long list,
10 and it'll be a growing list, I think, over time. Tell me
11 what guidelines means in terms of --

12 MADAM CHAIR: It's a living document.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: It's a living document, but
14 is it everything? No, by no means, right, because some
15 districts can't fulfill this.

16 MR. DILL: No, I don't believe so. Of
17 course, after saying you shall establish the guidelines we
18 go on for another, you know, two pages in terms of what
19 these guidelines have to include. And I think if you read
20 through that I think having differentiation is really what
21 was intended here between, you know, rural districts have
22 special concerns. And so there's really a whole host of
23 issues that need to be dealt with here.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: So can a board say I'm going
25 to pick one of -- just let me finish. Can a board say I'm



1 just going to pick one of these, from this list, and they
2 all have met the intent of this part of 212?

3 MR. DILL: Without sitting down and spending
4 10 or 15 minutes really closely reading everything in the
5 statute --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

7 MR. DILL: -- I really don't know. However,
8 you know, you do have discretion, you know, in terms of how
9 you -- you know, as long as all the statutory requirements
10 in there are being addressed, you do have discretion on
11 exactly how these are being done.

12 MADAM CHAIR: I think Scott wants to answer
13 your question.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Maybe I have more.

15 MR. DURHAM: If I may, Madam Chair.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

17 MR. DURHAM: To give a perspective on what
18 the council that proposed those, the original intent was,
19 in that, no, it was not that a student meet all of those.
20 Absolutely not.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Good.

22 MR. DURHAM: It was meant to say here is a
23 base level of performance, whatever we collectively agree
24 and say, you know, a student leaving a high school should
25 have this proficiency in English or math, to be ready for



1 entry into the workplace or into postsecondary, which is a
2 big wiggly piece. But the intent of the council was let's
3 let students demonstrate that in lots of different ways.
4 Let's not harbor them into one. So they don't have to do
5 all of those but those are meant to be comparable and
6 quantified as relatively equitable ways of measuring. So
7 the ASVAB scores is someone loosely -- well, research-based
8 tied to the SAT or the ACT, and then coming up with an
9 equitable performance point.

10 But the goal was lots of ways. And I know
11 we originally, in the council room, in the spring of 2013,
12 a big, big chart of options, and we're told that we needed
13 to whittle that back down to really the research-based in
14 the time that we had to say, no, these are the only ones we
15 can verify now. And then at this table, two years ago, I
16 said, "We need to expand that list," and I know that's
17 what's been working on and see the proposed list ahead of
18 you, and my hope is that it continues to expand, because
19 right now there are performance assessment tools in the
20 work that I'm doing that haven't even been seen in
21 education yet. And so we've got to get to what are the
22 ways that are emerging that we can identify if the student
23 is ready.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. So I'd like to



1 just comment on a couple of the changes that were
2 recommended this time around, based on what we passed a
3 couple of years ago, or last year -- last year.

4 The advanced placement, the drop of one
5 score piece, I just want to say that it reminds me of the
6 efforts in a lot of high schools to give weighted grades,
7 and I think it's analogous. In order to encourage students
8 to take actually IB or AP courses, weighted grades were
9 give, so that if you got a B you got a higher score in your
10 GPA than for PE.

11 So I think to me it makes sense where the
12 assessment committee, or whoever suggested this, I think
13 this actually makes sense, because it does encourage
14 students to go ahead and take some of those harder courses,
15 demonstrate that they can essentially get through them.

16 The interesting thing about the IB
17 successful completion, there are kids that don't take the
18 IB test in a course that they take. So that also makes --
19 that's also a refinement, I think, of the work that you all
20 have done, and I appreciate that.

21 I'll admit I'm a little worried about where
22 we go with PARCC or CMAS, simply because we haven't done --
23 we haven't had our conversations yet about what that means.
24 Fundamentally, you posed the question what does a Colorado
25 diploma, a high school diploma mean? We have to have the



1 conversation here, does that mean that our students have
2 met our Colorado standards? Then how do we work in
3 partnership with school districts to develop their own
4 graduation requirements to somehow suggest, yep, if you're
5 a Colorado graduate you've demonstrated, in some way, that
6 you've met the Colorado standards. I mean, that's the way
7 I see it. I think that's a discussion that we need to
8 have, whether that's really what we believe in.

9 So thank you very much for the work. I also
10 appreciate the additions of options for districts to
11 consider. Having served on a board, I think school boards
12 work very hard and try to be very thoughtful in developing
13 their graduation requirements, because they need to come
14 back to their own community. And I'll tell you what.
15 Sometimes parents think things sound too hard, and when
16 their kid is 25 years old and they're living in their
17 basement, they're saying, "Gee, you should have asked for
18 more." So I'll close with that.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Val, you had another comment?

20 MS. FLORES: Yes, I did. I have a question
21 about, if kids can go to school until they're 21, and if
22 the colleges -- I know that colleges are expensive -- why
23 not have kids stay in school until they meet those
24 requirements instead of going to pay all that money in
25 college? I mean, kids, parents should have the right to do



1 that.

2 I know I taught at a school that was maybe
3 about \$40,000 a year, and there were kids who knew, who
4 needed remediation. They were not just poor kids. They
5 were very rich kids. And I had to teach a remediation
6 course in English language arts. So I thought, why are
7 they paying this amount of money, not only in math -- I
8 mean, in English language arts and English, but also in
9 math. It was just phenomenal amounts of money to get those
10 remediation, you know, credits.

11 So why not be honest, you know, with
12 parents, with the community, and say if you are going to
13 take remediation classes, take them in the school district.
14 Don't take them in the college, where that's going to be so
15 expensive.

16 Thank you for hearing me out.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Deb?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I just have one more
19 question. It's for Rebecca. Can you just surface, what is
20 the minimum the State Board needs to do? And it's in the
21 context of, you know, we can have a regulatory approach to
22 improving quality, and we can look at data for a long time
23 that suggest that's not particularly the best approach,
24 regulation. People will address often time the letter of
25 the law, but the spirit of it somehow gets lost.



1 So I think setting these competencies can do
2 some great things in the sense of shining a flashlight for
3 kids and parents, what does it take to be successful in
4 college, in a career path, in the military, whatever? And
5 the Department is in a great position to expose that
6 information so people are aware of it. But to set specific
7 cut points that high schools have to meet, specific kids
8 have to meet, is a different thing, because testing is a
9 genre that some kids are good at, others are not, which is
10 why you have capstones and other options in there.

11 So to me, being heavy on the regulatory side
12 does not really serve the kids or the parents or the high
13 schools or the districts very well, but shining a light on
14 information helps. So the question is, what is the minimum
15 the State Board needs to do to fulfill our statutory
16 obligation, and then how can we infuse not so much a
17 regulatory approach but choice. You know, help people see
18 the panoply of options that they can embrace in order to,
19 in a district or in a school, to show that they are
20 prepared for the next step.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Question or just a statement?

22 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, Rebecca. Go ahead.

24 MS. HOLMES: I'm interpreting your question as what are the
25 minimum requirements inside the qualifications.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Those are statutory.

2 MS. HOLMES: So, Madam Chair, we have
3 interpreted that, with some legal guidance as well, that
4 there is a requirement that the State Board set minimum
5 qualifications. Those minimum qualifications be aligned
6 with the postsecondary remediation cut scores in our state.
7 Postsecondary remediation cut scores currently exist in
8 only English and math, and so that is one reason you all
9 could certainly meet your statutory requirement in our
10 interpretation and scale the menu back from four subjects
11 to two. And that where there are cut scores set by the
12 Department of Higher Ed and the Commission of Higher Ed, as
13 there are currently in ACT and SAT, and as we understand
14 through future process there will be on other assessments
15 as well, then the cut scores must align.

16 So I think that's the regulatory minimum.
17 To Scott's comments, there has always been an intention,
18 then, in doing so, to offer districts more choice than they
19 would have if we only had the assessments that higher ed
20 has recognized in order to have a more robust recognition
21 of college and career readiness and that students choose
22 many pathways other than just traditional higher ed
23 institutions.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: So if we have this menu of



1 options, the language that precedes that menu is going to
2 be really important. Students or districts must embrace
3 two of ten. One or two, and three or six, or how many,
4 right. That language that precedes that menu, whatever is
5 on it, whatever initial thresholds are there, that's going
6 to be really crucial. Is that right?

7 MADAM CHAIR: Good point. All right.

8 One nice thing about getting to be the last
9 person to make comments is I get to hear what everybody
10 else says. So I'm sitting over here writing notes.

11 I think both Deb and Val made some really
12 good points there, and that's talking about the variety of
13 ways. Again, I am a very strong local control person. But
14 if we have local control and we are graduating kids, as we
15 are, that are not prepared for workforce or college, then I
16 think we need to step in.

17 Schools such as Cherry Creek and Aspen, they
18 don't have much of that problem. Some, I'm sure, but, you
19 know, schools such as Dove Creek may have a few of those
20 problems. So I think we really need to be -- I totally
21 agree that we really need to be working for them all to
22 meet that.

23 And to Val's -- just a suggestion, one of
24 the things I would really like to see, and I've seen it in
25 Mesa County and that's why I mention it, is that CMU works



1 with the Mesa County School District and offers -- they
2 offer a remedial class while the kids are still in high
3 school, that they send their teachers down and they take
4 this remedial class. Because we all know, we let way too
5 many kids move by with, as I said, just a GPA, and it
6 doesn't mean a whole lot. So that's just a suggestion that
7 some people could meet.

8 We all have different ideas about local
9 control, and I believe in it very strongly, and yet, having
10 been in the classroom, I know how many kids we're leaving
11 every year that were not prepared for either workforce.
12 And I like what Scott, too, what Scott said. You know, if
13 it's a workforce score, if they've scored high in some
14 workforce test, then you know they can get out of school
15 and get a job, that's just as important as what they got on
16 their ACT.

17 So I think you're doing great work. It's
18 hard work, and you've been working at it for a long time.
19 But I think, from what I hear, you really are talking about
20 all those options and all the different ways, and yet
21 trying very hard not to put the heavy hand of this is what
22 you must do, because we really need for schools to maintain
23 as much local control as possible.

24 So I congratulate you and I think you're
25 doing a good job. And with that we'll move on to the next



1 agenda item.

2 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, could I ask
3 counsel a question, just briefly.

4 MADAM CHAIR: We're trying to get out of
5 here by 11:30, so keep it brief.

6 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. Could I have a copy of
7 the statute that's relevant to this discussion, and could
8 you provide us with your opinion as to what the minimum
9 amount the Board would have to do to comply with that
10 statute?

11 MR. DILL: Okay.

12 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Thank you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. It was a great
16 discussion.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and Notary, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such were reported by me or under my supervision, later reduced to typewritten form under my supervision and control and that the foregoing pages are a full, true and correct transcription of the original notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600