



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
December 9, 2015, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on December 9, 2015,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The Student Center
2 Accountability Project, Dr. Asp do you want to start
3 this?

4 MR. ASP: Sure will. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
5 We are excited to have with us today some representatives
6 from a group of districts that's been involved in
7 something called the schools -- excuse me, the Student
8 Center Accountability Project. These folks were before
9 you last spring where they asked for your support to move
10 forward on this project. They are back to talk some
11 about the progress, but also to request some resources
12 and support from the department and we're excited to hear
13 what they need from us and then we hope to have an
14 opportunity to think about what that means and how we
15 might be able to -- to do that.

16 I just want to point out that this is a very
17 kind of interesting turn of events to have them here
18 today since ESEA was reauthorized this morning and inside
19 that bill was a, some might call it a restriction. We
20 look at it as an opportunity or a way to provide some
21 space for these kind of projects to continue that says
22 state accountability systems are going to have to include
23 not only student performance, but other factors outside
24 that, and that's exactly what these folks have been
25 working on and it puts us in a position to learn from



1 this -- these kind of projects in our state as we're
2 moving toward implementing the new bill.

3 So we are excited to have them with us today
4 and applaud their work, and I'm going to introduce Lisa
5 Yates from Buena Vista, let her introduce her fellow
6 panelists and take us forward.

7 MS. YATES: Great.

8 MR. ASP: Assistant Superintendent.

9 MS. YATES: Yes. Thank you for having us.
10 At the table with me are: Bob Webb from Monte Vista,
11 then Rob Sanders from Merino, and other districts that
12 are part of the staff are with us, and I'll just jump
13 there. The other participating districts are: Sue
14 Holmes is here from Buena Vista, the Superintendent
15 there; from Kit Carson, Rob Framel; La Veta, Bree Lessar;
16 and then from South Routt, Darcy Moore; I also want to
17 recognize Brett Miles who is the executive director in
18 the northeast bow season, he's been helping to facilitate
19 the project this fall and has really helped to get
20 traction to the work.

21 So when we were here last time, I think much
22 of our work had the name The Rural Innovation Alliance
23 associated with it and we have officially taken on the
24 name of our project, The Student Center Accountability
25 Project or the SCAP. And we quite by accident used the



1 picture of the hands in our last presentation but we feel
2 like it really does represent our project. We are
3 wanting our students to be more seen than they have been
4 in the previous accountability systems. So this is a
5 project that is not intended to hide, but instead to be
6 very transparent -- be very transparent. So we are
7 raising our hands to be seen and we are also seeing those
8 hands as -- as looking at a fuller picture, and those
9 hands might also be representing those things that are
10 holding up the system that are often not reported in our
11 improvement plans. They -- the whole picture is not put
12 there. So the hands are really coming to represent this
13 project.

14 So today why we are here before the board.
15 One, we wanted to provide an update and were asked to do
16 that, but also, we are seeking assurances from the State
17 Board for the member districts of the SCAP to replace the
18 DPF, the District Performance Frameworks, which will soon
19 be 2.0, as well as the unified improvement plan for our
20 participating districts. And then the second reason why
21 we are here is really to legitimize the work of the
22 project. We would like for CDE to seriously consider
23 this project as a scalable accreditation model for other
24 districts. In doing so, it feels like the project will
25 come underneath the department more than it has been, so



1 that we are seen with as much importance as some of the
2 other initiatives that are happening in assessment and
3 accountability.

4 So our core values, what the SCAP is about.
5 We believe that accountability systems are designed to
6 emphasize every student, which is not new to
7 accountability. That is the premise of No Child Left
8 Behind and much of the guidance around accountability
9 involves highlighting every student, but what we're
10 adding to that is the whole student. And again that's
11 what we just saw with ESEA being updated, that more --
12 broader measures should be used and so that's a large
13 part of our accountability system. So we're adding,
14 we're not hiding, but we're expanding what we -- what
15 accountability should be.

16 Our second core value is that we believe
17 accountability has the purpose of continuous improvement.
18 Because of this, SCAP integrates the evaluation of
19 systems so we want our stakeholders to look at those
20 things that are part of our system that influence how our
21 students perform. What we call meaningful learning. So
22 we want the accountability system to uncover our
23 deficiencies, to highlight our strengths so that we can
24 build strategic improvements plans that become the life
25 of our schools. Right now that process is separated. We



1 don't feel that the UIP's are fully supporting our DPF's.

2 And then our last core value, we know that
3 what get measured and reported is what gets done and so
4 we are asking to expand and enrich what gets measured and
5 reported and we believe that will have an impact on our
6 students. That their experiences then will be expanded
7 and enriched. So we're not looking to get out of
8 accountability, in fact we're looking to enrich it.

9 So I'm going to hand this over to Bob and he
10 is going to describe some of the features of SCAP and
11 where the process is right now.

12 MR. WEBB: I appreciate being here and I
13 apologize for my scratchy voice, fighting a cold, drove
14 up from Monte Vista so I'm doing really well, and I
15 appreciate the water Val. Will you click them for me?
16 Thank you.

17 As Lisa said, one of the things we want to
18 make sure we do in this project is remain compliant, both
19 with whatever the new reauthorization act is going to
20 bring to us, and whatever the state decides is the
21 necessary new DPF. We want to absorb that into our
22 project as one of those measures we want to continue to
23 use. It has value, but as she also said, we believe it's
24 also incomplete and so Pat Riley, he used to coach the
25 Los Angeles Lakers. One time I remember him saying that



1 success is a progressive realization of a worthwhile
2 dream and so we are wanting to make this a progressive
3 realization just like we do with our other assessments.
4 We have formative, interim and summative. This process
5 that we want to engage in will have formative for the
6 districts at the local level.

7 Our league of colleagues will help us
8 understand ourselves by coming and helping us do some
9 things and then we will have the summative measure that
10 would include the CDE coming in and I'll get into some
11 more of those details in just a few seconds. But
12 everyone of our districts in the SCAP project is
13 committed to state assessments. We know they have value
14 and we're still going to continue to use them. We are
15 not trying to run from those. We just believe we need to
16 add other measures so that we can again do some more
17 formative -- as we grow, we need to know what we're
18 doing.

19 And so that's part of what we want to
20 include and make sure it's there. And then each of our
21 local districts will engage in the school quality review
22 process where we'll not only deal with just the
23 assessment data and analyze that but get into some of the
24 other measures. So as you can see on the slide there,
25 there are some systems supports that uphold, if you can



1 visualize the hands holding up the meaningful learning,
2 there are other things that we asked to do that we know
3 are valuable, but we don't have the time to really assess
4 in the way that we perhaps should, but we do look at
5 those as necessary.

6 And so we want to also show our constituents
7 what we are doing in those areas because that's where the
8 local community members feel they understand, I think,
9 and we can show them through the use of a data dashboard.
10 We also know that our primary purpose is to ensure
11 meaningful learning, and on the graphic, you can see the
12 two main areas are academics and learning dispositions.
13 And then underneath each of those are some proof points,
14 some areas of things that we need to do. We find metrics
15 and we've identified some in each of those categories
16 including the DPF to help demonstrate to our constituents
17 where we're are in those meaningful points so -- or those
18 proof points.

19 What we believe about those other systems of
20 support is that they're inputs. They are important and
21 they're valuable and sometimes we don't feel that we have
22 enough of the resources that we need to adequately do it,
23 but we also need to demonstrate to our constituents and
24 our staff how we're utilizing those resources that we do
25 have. So those are the inputs, both the professional



1 culture, those things related to professional
2 development, the teachers preparation et cetera, and then
3 some of the other resources that are at the board level
4 or the community level and whether or not we're using
5 those effectively to meet the goals that we have. The
6 UIP sometimes asks for those in a round about way but we
7 don't get it to show how much time and effort it takes to
8 really utilize those effectively. So we want to use --
9 be able to use that as another proof point for the
10 community.

11 As I mentioned a little bit ago, local
12 districts on an annual basis, just like we do with our
13 current Unified Improvement Plan, we will again analyze
14 ourselves, but not just based on the single state measure
15 that goes into the UIP and District Performance
16 Frameworks, but also in a progressive nature again
17 utilizing local tests and/or some interim tests like NWA
18 or Galileo so that we can have more frequent turnaround
19 on the data so that we can use it in a way that's going to
20 make a difference in the year that we have those kids.
21 So that's part of those.

22 We're also a little concerned about the lack
23 of -- the amount of time it takes for us to get the
24 useful test data back, so we are going to include -- each
25 district will have -- we've already decided will choose



1 two proof points in each of those categories that were in
2 those red boxes that you saw earlier, so those will be
3 part of the process. We're not trying to create anything
4 completely new, but we have utilized resources from other
5 states that help in unify district, New York City
6 Department of Education, and so there's other resources
7 that we've been looking at for other places that have
8 meaningful ways of demonstrating and showing the type of
9 accountability that we want to put out there for our -
10 that would make it easier to show how the full child is
11 affected.

12 We will still continue to publish an annual
13 report. We'll identify at the local level which of those
14 priorities may be in the resource area that our district
15 feels it may need to focus on. It may be different than
16 Buena Vista as it is to Monte Vista as it to the others
17 in the group, but we'll still report those out and we'll
18 still show them to the public and we also will utilize
19 our colleagues in this league of schools to help come in
20 every other year perhaps or however we feel it might be
21 most useful to do a peer review.

22 Something we don't get in the process now --
23 until we're at the point of being a priority improvement
24 we don't have many site visits because CDE's time is
25 limited. We want to take advantage of the expertise in



1 our -- in the neighbors and those that are in the project
2 to help us see how we're doing before we get to the end
3 game and so we can see better how we're progressing. Are
4 we really doing what we say we're doing from the outside?
5 And then on the fourth year have the Department of
6 Education come in and perform an audit.

7 Are we really doing what we said we're
8 doing? So that we can have that, and you can have that
9 assurance from a compliance mode and what we're saying
10 we're doing, we're actually doing. So I know this feels
11 like it's really rapid like we have an hour and a half,
12 talk some more about this. But that four -- that three
13 step plan I think, as I mention earlier, the formative,
14 the interim and the summative is a part of what we don't
15 get and want to have.

16 MS. YATES: Before we go to the assurances
17 that we're asking, Rob's going to take us back to the
18 slide with the graphic on there because I think this will
19 help in clarifying the assurances that we're asking for.
20 So in meaningful learning that is the expansion of the
21 DPF. We're looking for -- we would include the DPF but
22 then we're asking that performance tasks, some
23 demonstrations of learning would also be included in what
24 is reported to the public and then that whole other
25 category of learning dispositions, which we're calling



1 engagement and mindsets would be included in a dashboard
2 and Rob is going to speak a little bit more to that.

3 The system supports that you see underneath
4 there in black, that's what we would -- we would really
5 get a lot of data by using school quality reviews or the
6 peer reviews so that we know where is the route cause of
7 why our students might not be performing as we would like
8 them too in the meaningful learning. So the school
9 quality reviews would be a priority of -- priority
10 importance in this plan.

11 MR. SANDERS: And what's interesting about
12 that I believe with the passage of the new ESEA Federal
13 Law it goes right along with what is in that bill. So
14 you know when we first presented this to the board a lot
15 of excitement was generated. We were really excited to
16 get started on the project and one of the things that was
17 asked of us is what can we do? What can we do as a
18 board? How can we help you? Well here we are today to
19 ask you for your help and what we are looking for are
20 some assistance. Some assistance in the form of some
21 assurances.

22 So the first assurance that we'd like to
23 request or ask is that we'd like some flexibility and
24 especially in the area of learning dispositions. Some of
25 the data in learning dispositions is going to be very



1 difficult to quantify but we doesn't mean we shouldn't
2 try to quantify that. Each district is committed to at
3 least two data points in each one of those area under --
4 with the exception of the DPF because that comes to us
5 already made. We're looking for two area under
6 performance tasks, two -- minimum of two under
7 demonstrations of learning, minimum of two under
8 engagement and a minimum of two under mindsets. We'd
9 want feedback from those areas from our stakeholders, or
10 school board members, our teachers, our staff, data
11 experts, anybody. We've also had this reviewed by
12 individuals at the both Stanford and CU Bolder with very
13 positive feedback.

14 The thing that we would ask for in terms of
15 flexibility is it we're not going to get it right on the
16 first time around. We'd like some flexibility to not get
17 it right the first time and be able to go back and say
18 that didn't work, lets try this a different way and fix
19 it. So at the same time we would still then publish the
20 results of whatever we had out there.

21 The second assurance we'd be looking at or
22 requesting is that we would be able to replace the
23 current unified improvement plan to one that meets more
24 the needs of the SCAP group. We would also not want to
25 run a dual system and if a district was or a school was



1 placed priority improvement or turnaround, let the SCAP
2 process work rather than reverting back to the priority
3 improvement and turnaround.

4 The other thing that we would ask for from
5 the department is that we would like your support around
6 whatever we develop in this UIP that we get some
7 technical assistance on all statutory regulations that
8 are required inside of that UIP.

9 The third assurance that we'd be looking at.
10 We're not afraid of accountability in the group. We're
11 actually like Lisa said, I think we're looking for more
12 accountability, just appropriate accountability for our
13 communities. We want our communities to be able to see
14 progress toward our goals, but we would need some help.
15 We would need some help with creating those dashboards.
16 We've looked at a few, I won't go over each one
17 individually, but we've looked at a few of them but we
18 need to go back to our local district accountability
19 committees, our boards, our communities and find out
20 exactly what it is they want to see in a dashboard model.

21 The one we've kind of messed with is on the
22 overhead now. This is our first attempt and we're
23 looking at -- we divided into five areas under meaningful
24 learning, that's academic state performance, state
25 performance test, demonstration of learning, learning



1 dispositions, mindsets and engagement. We believe it's
2 comparable to the DPF.

3 How we would do this is we talked about
4 having three years of data posted on there, we would have
5 some set percentage, whether we talked about 85 percent
6 of student meeting those goals, and then compare them
7 from year to the next is how well students did in each
8 one of those areas. We would be measuring that against
9 that 85 percent benchmark. We also talked about doing
10 some other types of brochures, we're currently working on
11 that in Merino right now where we are working on a
12 brochure where anybody could walk into our district at
13 any point at any -- any entry point and pick up one these
14 brochures like the one on the top from Tacoma,
15 Washington.

16 It's a very interactive tool, you put your
17 goals right on it, you put down exactly what it is your
18 wanting to get accomplished, parents can walk through,
19 anybody, if there is peer review, if there's CDE
20 personnel that come through and want to do a review, at
21 any point can pick up this brochure. This is what we are
22 saying we're doing, and this is what we are expecting to
23 get feedback on. You can click on any one of those and
24 it actually opens up to a -- a different site on a
25 webpage that will show more detailed information on each



1 one of those things. All of this stuff would be based on
2 our feedback from our school quality review that we are
3 in the process of creating.

4 We're also asking that on school view that
5 these dashboards be displayed along side the rest of the
6 state with the regular school performance frameworks and
7 those kinds of things that are already put on, as well as
8 the UIP, that are put on the CDE website.

9 The last assurance that we're asking for is
10 that -- there's several projects or pilots out there. We
11 would like to have just as much legitimacy. We'd like to
12 have just as much access to resources and time and money
13 and personnel that all the other efforts are receiving.
14 We also feel strongly that if 178 school districts came
15 in and want to do a pilot, we feel that there's room for
16 that in this process and we would strongly support
17 multiple project across the state. One of our goals
18 however is to -- for the small rural schools or for the
19 rural schools is to create somewhat of a blueprint for
20 other districts to follow if they so choose behind us.

21 MS. YATES: So with that assurance number
22 five, several of us in this SCAP have also been
23 participating in the accountability 2.0 work group and we
24 find that that work has been helpful in moving forward
25 accountability. Clearly it hasn't gone as far or as



1 comprehensive as what the SCAP is looking at and I know
2 the department is looking at different reiterations of
3 accountability as well. So all of those efforts that are
4 happening out of the department we support and just want
5 to continue in partnership with the department in this
6 being as -- as a viable option as those things that are
7 under the department.

8 One of those, I know there is a report
9 coming up following this regarding assessments and the
10 possibility of performance tasks replacing some of the
11 grade levels where the park would be given, and we see
12 that as being valuable. Again it just isn't as far -- or
13 go- - it's not as comprehensive as what the SCAP is. But
14 we definitely support that work in looking at how
15 performance tasks -- you see that as one of our
16 indicators is using a performance task can be very
17 valuable in completing a picture of meaningful learning.

18 MR. SANDERS: Before you go on to that,
19 there is one thing I want to make sure that we point out
20 in here. The state assessment -- every group here does
21 value the state assessment however we want to make sure
22 that we're clear that state assessment is offered, we are
23 from districts that vary in the amount of parental opt-
24 out that occurred. We have some that have a large parent
25 opt-out to some that don't have any opt-out at all. We



1 feel like we should have that flexibility inside of there
2 because our parents choose to opt-out of the assessment,
3 we should still include that information in our report,
4 but we want to make sure you know we are offering those
5 tests.

6 MS. YATES: And in fact, if we did have
7 large opt-outs, we now have data that would help the
8 stakeholders know how our students are doing.

9 So last Friday we met with all of our nine
10 district boards together so the -- all of the
11 Superintendents and all of our boards came together, and
12 we wanted to make sure that all of our boards were in the
13 same position of information and walking away from that
14 had strong support from all of our boards. And with that
15 we also asked for them to give us recommendations in our
16 coming to you and one of the recommendations we had was;
17 how will we know this project is successful. And so we
18 would like to share with you how we would know that this
19 project is successful.

20 First our local board agenda's, so if you
21 came into a SCAP district and looked at our agendas you
22 would see regularly on those agendas improvement planning
23 updates and action plans. Those would include the
24 deficiencies or the areas of focus that have been
25 identified through these school quality review and the



1 boards would be involved in hearing how those
2 deficiencies have been addressed. We have ideas about
3 how that could happen if we think of those system
4 supports, that bottom layer, those could be regularly be
5 on an agenda. So one month we might be looking at
6 curriculum and instruction and the next month looking at
7 professional learning and the boards would be keeping
8 then the district accountable to those improvement
9 efforts.

10 A second way we would know the project is
11 successful is that our stakeholders would easily be able
12 to tell anyone the vision in our priority -- our annual
13 priority areas of focus so that those brochures of the
14 annual reports that Rob referenced would just be a
15 natural part of the way the system operates. And they
16 would be visible -- easily articulated.

17 The third way we'd know it's successful is
18 that CDE would be a partner with us. And they would be
19 partnering with us through the support of implementation.
20 I think sometimes and we've talked about it in 2.0 how
21 can we move from CDE only being compliance or having that
22 sense of being the compliance office but working with us
23 to make these actions the reality of what we have. So
24 that would be evidence that this project is successful.

25 Fourth, and probably four and five are the



1 easiest evidences and what we would be most proud of, is
2 that the SCAP dashboards -- those samples that we showed
3 in our first attempt at it, along with our annual report
4 would be published by CDE. So when our stakeholders and
5 the public want to know how our individuals districts are
6 performing and what we are doing about that performance
7 it would be the first thing that they see.

8 And then with that, that our improvement
9 plan, so we are just calling it a SCAP improvement plan
10 that would be informed by those school quality reviews
11 where we as peers would be going into each other's
12 districts to do - to give feedback, they would be valued,
13 and they would be used in place of the current Unified
14 Improvement Plans. So with that, we know that we would
15 need guidance from CDE to see if there's rules that need
16 to be changed, but that would be evidence to us that our
17 project had been successful.

18 MR. WEBB: Okay so what's next. For us the
19 need is great. We have a lot of things to do besides
20 teach still. But we do have another meeting planned and
21 the 20th of January. We've been gathering together in
22 Buena Vista, the districts and outlining the scaffold
23 that we put together we shared with you so far. For us
24 next, we'll be continuing to work on the - identifying
25 what measures we're going to use in each of those red



1 boxes which of the two or more that we might use as proof
2 points in those areas of accountability.

3 We also need to put more structure to the
4 school quality reviews. We've used samples of and we
5 kind of done some rubric work, identified - kind of
6 started on some definitional things, that what does this
7 mean in each of those areas. But we have a ways to go,
8 an so that's coming and further into the Spring and
9 partially depending upon how much support we can feel
10 from going down this path some of us will continue to
11 work on implementing the SRQ's, some will do a self-
12 evaluation, others may invite another district in to say
13 okay why don't you help us identify or work in this area.
14 Just depending on where each of the boards -- individual
15 boards are at with the process of using the scaffold that
16 we have.

17 We really would like to get more feedback
18 from our local boards about the design elements. I think
19 Rob mentioned the dashboard, what is going to be
20 appealing but also what is going to allow the public to
21 see where we are strong but also where we know we need to
22 improve and that's key to us. So that they know why we
23 are making some of the decisions about how we're using
24 the resources and why are we doing the personalized
25 learning or whatever each district has identified, so we



1 need that support from not only our school boards but the
2 district accountability teams that are crucial in
3 conversations and have some other boots on the ground for
4 us.

5 We'll also be trying to frame how would an
6 annual report look like, what would it include, what
7 necessarily -- what does it necessarily have to have to
8 be compliant and so again why we use we DPF and a big one
9 for us because it's -- it is a costly endeavor for us, we
10 have no source of funding right now, we've - we've - one
11 district in particular has contributed a significant - or
12 committed a significant amount of money. All the rest of
13 us are taking time away for and traveling to Buena Vista,
14 some have to spend the night et cetera, but we would like
15 to have some funding to do that as well as some of the
16 other technical stuff. Designing of the dashboard,
17 making it interactive, all those things that we just --
18 we don't have the funds to do on our own nor the
19 expertise to do on our own.

20 So trying to identify those, the intention
21 would be to jump in in the fall with the first year of
22 implementation to put in place what we currently have
23 been. How are we doing over the course of that year?
24 We'll continually review it together as a group, tweak it
25 as Rob had said. Our initial ask was that this should be



1 a three year process that we -- first year was design,
2 trying to get things to the point where we could include
3 what we need to have, then implement it and measure how
4 we are doing and then come back and review it, gather
5 that baseline data the second year and then the third
6 year so we are ready to roll so that on that fourth year
7 then CDE could come and say we think you can do this, or
8 great job on all of it, we don't need you to do anything
9 different, so right. But so that's what's next for us.
10 I appreciate your time.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much Ms.
12 Yates and Gentlemen for the presentation. I have just a
13 couple of questions and observations. One, you all are
14 investing a lot of time and effort and that equals money
15 and to this effort and it's obvious you can't proceed and
16 continue to do that unless you believe there is a payoff
17 down the road. So I would like to really ask department
18 staff without putting anybody on the spot, and obviously
19 without asking for a final definitive answer but of the
20 asks that were made of the department, are there any
21 legal or obvious legal reasons why we couldn't -- why we
22 couldn't honor those particular requests and if there are
23 particular legal reasons, could those be remedied by the
24 general assembly and/or maybe have they been remedied by
25 the new Federal Act?



1 MS. PEARSON: I think that -- there's
2 nothing that I see in there that's flashing lights
3 statutory change. I think there's some things that we
4 might need to do in State Board rule but I think what we
5 really need to do is sit down with you guys and talk
6 through some of the details, because you know it's always
7 in the details, to figure out exactly what -- where those
8 assurances are asking and what we need to adjust, but I
9 do think there are some things we would need to work
10 through, probably through State Board rule, maybe it's
11 just CDE policy.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So at least -- by
13 definition at least no impediment to us if we could work
14 out an arrangement with the - with these districts to try
15 and see how much of that we could implement and then
16 secondly, are there -- is there any possibility of any
17 grants being available that we either control or could
18 direct to this project that might help -- I know these
19 districts are not the wealthiest in the state, that we
20 might be able to assist them some way financially.

21 MR. ASP: Mr. Chair.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Asp?

23 MR. ASP: I want to support what Allyson was
24 talking about. We need to dig into this and talk about
25 how we can do these. I think the most expensive one, but



1 that doesn't have anything to do with it, is creation of
2 dashboards and how they work on. They are a great idea,
3 cost a little money, take a little while to figure out
4 but that's -- I'll set that one aside and certainly bring
5 up some good issues here.

6 Certainly we can help these folks look for
7 funding. If we do this in a coordinated way, as Ms.
8 Yates was talking about with some sort of assessment
9 pilot, we have some funds, home owner funds that are in -
10 - were in 13.23 to help efforts like this, they were
11 under an assessment pilot idea, but I think we can work
12 together on that. There's some funders that we've -- at
13 least are aware of that would be interested in this
14 piece. Examples -- some other states we've been working
15 with have gotten some support from some foundations to
16 think about accountability and different way, Ms. Morgan
17 can talk more about that than I can at this point.

18 But we're excited about this opportunity
19 because it gives us a chance to pilot some things and I
20 think Bob pointed -- or Mr. Webb pointed out very well
21 that we want to try some things out and see how they work
22 and see how scalable they are and build on the work
23 they're doing and as long as we're - we're still creating
24 DPF's, District Performance Report's, that are part of
25 their system, so that part of the accountability system



1 remains in place no matter - unless somebody, the
2 legislature takes some other action here. And so we can
3 add stuff to this piece without asking permission per se
4 and we'd have to work out some of the other details,
5 Allyson what do.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

7 MR. ASP: So I think there's ways to move
8 forward providing support. We just need to get a little
9 bit more specific about how we work with these folks to
10 make sure we're helping.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you for coming, thank
13 you for the very hard work. I'm very pleased about it.
14 Philosophically I think accountability system ought to be
15 shining a light as opposed to being some kind of hammer
16 or a negative, so I think the approach you're using is
17 exactly that, so go forth, however I know how challenging
18 this is, so I know it won't be easy. I do -- I would
19 like to hear when you guys come back as you've been
20 working on these things what are some of the responses
21 from parents. What are some responses say from a few
22 people in your business community, because I do think
23 they pay a lot of attention, the status of your schools
24 in your communities is significant to them? They may or
25 may not have some input to you on some of the things they



1 want to see, especially since the communities are supper
2 large, it should be, I hope, pretty easy for you to get
3 some kind of feedback that's broader than your own board.
4 Not that I don't think it's critical, that's where you
5 are going to get the support to keep doing this work, but
6 as you're doing it to get a little bit more of the
7 broader communities that you live in to see what is this
8 going to do for them.

9 What assurances does this give them? And
10 probably most important, is this enough for them? I
11 would think it would be, but you want to verify that this
12 dashboard, this kind of information is really going to
13 give them confidence and give them -- paint the picture
14 of who you are and what you're doing for kids. Thank you
15 very much.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you again for coming.
18 It's great to hear your thinking through the process.
19 Here's a question. Is doing what you are trying to do
20 under the umbrella of the state oversight going to
21 actually make your life more complicated, because you're
22 looking at things like learning dispositions, which are
23 subjective, hard to assess, performance demonstrations,
24 things like that. Are you better off doing this locally
25 and not under the egis of what the board or what the



1 state would approve or not? I mean in other words the
2 two things you mentioned are the District Performance
3 Framework and the UIP, right? And so you're saying
4 you'll -- you'll use the DPF, but you want to not do the
5 UIP, is that right? In other words, what are you gaining
6 by this and why do it under the egis of the state, why
7 not do it locally?

8 MR. WEBB: Well we know we are required to
9 have an improvement plan and so the SCAP is our
10 improvement plan instead of doing the existing UIP in the
11 same way because it really is based primarily on a single
12 measure. We want to expand it to utilize our local
13 assessment information that give us that more timely
14 information plus the other measures that we might have.
15 For example, the -- an ICAP for the students, the
16 culminating project. We are expected to do it, we think
17 it's great work to do but we don't really get the
18 recognition for the time that we are putting in, so this
19 give our community a bigger, better picture of how it
20 relates over time, not just in that single year.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Um-huh.

22 MR. WEBB: Your first question, I appreciate
23 you asking personally, and I can't speak for everybody
24 else, but I guess it depends on how much big brother
25 there is looking over shoulder, because we spend a lot of



1 time, very invigorating work for all of us. It's
2 exciting and it's rejuvenating, and it will bring some of
3 the art back to teaching for our staff when we engage
4 them in these kinds of conversations and that's the power
5 behind it. Instead of just meeting the letter of the law
6 it allows us to dream and then take the kids to the next
7 level instead of the just got to do it because it's a
8 checkbox. At least that's my opinion, I'm not sure how
9 the other feel so.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just thinking about the
11 data privacy issues with something as subjective as
12 learning dispositions and then - in other words it seems
13 to me that those things are great, do them at the local
14 level. Once you bring them into the state oversight now
15 you have to have data fields to assess those things, data
16 privacy issues, I just wonder if there's a way to do your
17 work without bringing it to the state and I don't really
18 know the answer to that question legally but I guess I
19 would like to see us explore how to free you up from -- I
20 mean what's the -- what does the state need? How can
21 that be met and then and then if that can be reduced
22 somehow or adjusted then go do this work locally without
23 having to create state fields of data around something as
24 subjective as learning dispositions and mindsets, that
25 sound difficult and having a lot of implications.



1 MR. WEBB: Just to expand a little bit on
2 that, I don't know as we are necessarily looking for
3 oversight if you will. What we are looking for is a
4 partnership and what we are looking for is some -- some
5 technical assistance. We don't have statisticians. We
6 just don't have them, and it would cost us a lot of money
7 to go find them. So we're asking that we work side by
8 side with CDE and then every fourth year - we're just
9 asking for them to come to take a look and see if our
10 last three years of review from our peers, from our other
11 group, whether they're consistent, whether we're just
12 kind of, I guess just saying blowing smoke up each
13 other's skirts I suppose. We don't -- we don't want
14 that, we want to be able to say that, you know, this is
15 an honest approach, we want -- and I agree, it should be
16 something that's a shining example of what's going on.
17 But we also know that we all have areas that we need to
18 improve, and our parents and our people should know what
19 those areas are, and they should know why we a spending
20 the resources we're spending then.

21 And the question around the Unified
22 Improvement Plan, even if the Unified Improvement Plan
23 was not required, we would still do it in Merino, just
24 because I believe whole heartedly in improvement planning
25 for your school district, regardless of whether it's



1 mandated or not. All we're asking for is that we can
2 change what's currently there to reflect more that one
3 state assessment that I had one high school kid take.
4 And I don't know who that's going to work and so I would
5 like to be able to change that around a little bit to
6 reflect better some of the other areas that we're looking
7 at inside of that -- inside of our goals and our targets.

8 MS. YATES: I would just emphasis to you
9 that we are looking at this data being housed locally and
10 that it's our local boards that are verifying that data
11 because I might -- in most of the body of -- or menu of
12 measurements we looked at were measures that we're
13 already using. So the workload was lets -- we already do
14 have this body of evidence about how our students are
15 meaningfully learning -- learning meaningfully but we
16 don't get to share that. And so it would be housed
17 locally, and we would be generating the reports, we would
18 just have assistance in how those are generated. So not
19 interested in sending that data, I think that would be a
20 bow out if all that is going to the state to be
21 regenerated.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, any other comments?

24 Yes, Dr. Asp?

25 MR. ASP: Just one comment and I appreciate



1 Dr. Scheffel's question. The state could be helpful in
2 using the state test to verify some of the -- not the
3 dispositions and those, just the academic pieces and
4 you'll hear more about and idea of how we might do that
5 in a little bit. But that's more where we saw our piece
6 in terms of giving data to you folks that helps
7 triangulate what you're seeing locally with the summit
8 assessment, it may not be given all of the time. It may
9 just be given occasionally to verify those things.

10 So that -- even verification is more of
11 having you see things you've collected locally along side
12 with an outside measure and if not, have some discussion
13 about what your local piece is and the outside measure
14 you're having and if it is in line, more power to you.
15 And those other measures we wouldn't have any intention
16 of collecting data around some visual pieces that these
17 folks are looking at at the state level, that'll be
18 pieces that they would certify.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, we
20 appreciate the presentation.

21 MS. YATES: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll proceed then with
23 Item 18, discussion of proposed assessment pilot.

24 (Pause)

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, lets try and



1 come back to order. Okay the next item is the proposed
2 pilot assessment. Commissioner Asp if you'd like to take
3 over please?

4 MR. ASP: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I
5 have to tell you, this afternoon presentations are very
6 exciting for us at CDE. It's great to see the SCAP
7 project and also, we're excited to talk a bit more about
8 the idea of assessment pilots. Again the reauthorization
9 of ESEA was very fortunate today in a sense that opened
10 up a window for assessment pilots without having to go
11 through what it looked like was a complete waiver
12 process, although we've been working on that idea as you
13 know a little bit.

14 So what we're looking at here is to take you
15 back through and talk through a process that could
16 provide more -- useful timely information to school
17 districts that's helpful to them and to teachers and to
18 parents and students and also -- but maintain some sort
19 of comparability as well so that parents can be able to
20 look at the performance of individual schools and
21 districts and make some choices about that and you heard
22 some of that already overlapping in the accountability
23 pilot proposal.

24 We see these as going hand in hand and allow
25 us to -- pilot and actually learn from these ideas that



1 are being -- local districts are interested in so that as
2 we move forward in our accountability system comes back
3 on line or whatever the legislature starts to do with
4 that, we have an opportunity to actually learn something
5 without intruding something to the whole state and then
6 wondering why we didn't think through some of these
7 unintended consequences we -- I'll think I'll use Rob's
8 point here earlier.

9 Rob's point, we can kind of screw up, so to
10 speak, I hate to use that technical language and then fix
11 that in a local -- in a local setting before we go to the
12 whole state and do some things, we wish we hadn't done.
13 So Gretchen Morgan has been talking to you about the
14 effort for a while, we also have some guests today from
15 local school districts that are interested in this idea
16 and we brought them along so you can have a chance to
17 hear from those folks as well. And so I'll turn it over
18 to Gretchen and we'll go from there.

19 MS. MORGAN: I was just looking around to
20 see, Lisa's name is up here also because she had said she
21 might want to speak during this item too. And then when
22 we talked in the hall earlier, she said, "Well, I think I
23 maybe said everything I wanted to say the last time."
24 And so she's not sitting up here, but I'm not going to
25 say that she can't at some point can make comment if she



1 -- if she chooses to do so, but I think she's in the
2 hallway right now.

3 So today as Dr. Asp described we're just
4 going to try and mostly give you time to hear from theses
5 folks from districts about their interest in this. I
6 think last time we had a discussion there was - there was
7 some questions about what about this is appealing to
8 districts, so the board had asked us to identify a few
9 folks who might be willing to come in and talk about that
10 and we have some people who are willing to travel
11 significant distances actually, it's very kind of you to
12 come in and share with the board. I'm sorry my mic isn't
13 really getting it.

14 Okay, so just three things on our agenda.
15 Review key components of this potential assessment pilot
16 and as Dr. Asp described, the situation is different. I
17 have not yet updated my slides to reflect the Senate
18 passing of ESEA so they'll be some last minute edits when
19 we get to the last slide of this deck about how I might
20 go forward about this. But just review some sort of key
21 components of this, give you the chance to hear from
22 districts, and then have you as a board have a chance to
23 sort of discuss and explore this yourselves. So you can
24 have some discussion with one another and of course ask
25 questions of any of us who are here. So that's the plan.



1 So you'll probably remember this slide, it -
2 - we've talked with you all before about why the
3 department has started facilitating conversations about
4 these topics and the quick summary is that we had been
5 receiving a lot of informal feedback which caused us to
6 start asking more formally about feedback from folks and
7 that was some very consistent themes in that feedback.
8 And these are the four green bullets that are on this
9 slide. And I think you heard from the SCAP group earlier
10 a lot of interest in addressing the third bullet here,
11 which is the concern that the current accountability
12 system relies to heavily on the state assessment and they
13 have a lot of ideas about things they would like to try
14 to remedy that.

15 But this conversations really going to be
16 about the last bullet on here, the one with the green box
17 around it that says current assessment data isn't
18 sufficiently timely or instructionally relevant. For the
19 time students in school spend participating in the state
20 assessments and again this is one of those very
21 consistent themes of feedback. It's sort of a return on
22 investment concept, right? That for the amount of time
23 people spend they would like it to be more useful to
24 those people in classrooms, so that's kids and parents
25 and teachers. And I think this conversation that's been



1 happening with these districts now for many months in the
2 state has been about seeking ideas for ways that we could
3 do assessment and accountability that are more useful to
4 parents, students and teachers and you know, do create a
5 system that people want to participate in because they
6 believe it's going to provide useful information for the
7 systemic priorities like the first bullet here, which is
8 that we have some way to do comparability. To inform
9 parent choice and things like that. But that it also
10 provides useful information to individuals and especially
11 to those individuals closest to the classroom.

12 So that's what we're going to talk a little
13 bit more about. I did want to also flag here that you
14 all asked some questions before about 13.23 and it
15 describing an ability to just pilot like a different
16 assessment. I'm sure some of you have had conversations
17 with Keith King about this. I know I have had
18 conversations with Keith King about this. And he really
19 is interested in using the room that was given in 13.23
20 to try some other assessment at the same time as the
21 state assessment and to be able to compare results from
22 those two measures over time to see if they are
23 sufficiently comparable to try and make an argument for a
24 selection of a different assessment which is what 13.23
25 invites. In 13.23 it did ask us to as the Federal



1 Department of Education whether they would allow someone
2 to not double test in that scenario that Keith is
3 interested in. Their answer was no.

4 But this scenario that we are going to talk
5 to you about today is different, and now that's really
6 been formalized by the creation of this pilot project
7 inside the ESSA which really says the feds are interested
8 in some small number, seven, the magic number, of states
9 trying something that is different. It still doesn't
10 describe exactly what Keith is up too, at least to my
11 read of it right now, but it does describe what we have
12 talked to you about before and what these districts are
13 going to talk to you about today.

14 So this is just a quick reminder. We're
15 talking here about piloting, right? And the idea is, as
16 you described before, that it would be nice if we could
17 try some things and figure out what about them really
18 works and what about them needs to be refined before it
19 becomes a new state wide approach onto these things. Not
20 that we don't want to get to a state wide approach that
21 everybody feels better about in the way that we're
22 describing here but that it'd be nice to learn in a
23 somewhat contained way so that the risk of what we're
24 learning is contained. These folks are really brave
25 actually in indicating interest in trying something in a



1 brave new world kind of way, but that's what we're
2 talking about.

3 So quick, just review, this is the only
4 slide I included from last time just to give some
5 reminders about the basics of what this pilot would look
6 like. It's that these districts that would be
7 participating would have the ability to use a commonly
8 developed or identified set of performance tasks across
9 grade levels in language arts and math and only in some
10 grade levels to give the state assessment in addition to
11 that. And really what this does is it changes the role
12 of the state assessment, right?

13 Instead of the state assessment being the
14 way we measure, whether all kids are getting to the
15 standards and are on track to graduation, it becomes the
16 way we validate the local measures of whether all kids
17 are on track towards standards and graduation. And so
18 you know, definitely with the conversations we've had
19 with districts about this they see this as a sort of
20 increase in local control and that they have the ability
21 to do these assessment on their own, to have teachers
22 score them, to make those determinations about student
23 progress and report those to us versus us measuring it
24 directly for every student I think is probably the most
25 significant difference here in a technical since of what



1 happens.

2 In terms of why this might be sort of more
3 useful to the users, we talked about before, teachers,
4 parents and students, obviously is these are scored
5 locally the data is available immediately, right? That's
6 the big difference in terms of practical things, that it
7 is just far more timely. We would have to ensure that
8 they're quality tasks. That they align to standards and
9 that we have good validation measures around folks so
10 that that timely data is also high quality data aligned
11 to standards. And so the pilot would require us to
12 develop those things in concert with one another.

13 The last think I'll just point out is that
14 we've also considered, and I think that this would be
15 allowed in the pilot programs that they described, the
16 idea of a direct sort of audit of locally scored
17 performance tasks and you know, the idea that if I were
18 you know, a fourth grade teacher at my school -- where I
19 used to be a fourth grade teacher, and I did these -- I
20 evaluated performance tasks for my students that maybe
21 one of them would be chosen by the state to be evaluated
22 by a team of like super scorers. I don't know what that
23 means super scorer, but you know what I'm saying.

24 People who are identified by the state and
25 trained to be high validated scoring teams and that when



1 they are done doing that, they would send it back to me
2 and to my school. And I do think there are some
3 potential for unique value there of if again -- I think
4 back to when I was a fourth grade teacher in a classroom,
5 I wouldn't just get a score back from the states and
6 wonder what was it my kids did that produced that score,
7 I could see just what my kid did, just what I thought it
8 meant and then what somebody else thought it meant. And
9 so in terms of instructional value, and again this
10 conversation began with how can it be more
11 instructionally value -- valuable to those folks, there's
12 the immediate value of the timeliness but there might be
13 more lagging value also of teachers just getting better
14 instructional feedback.

15 So those are the reasons that we have
16 brought this to you before and this is sort of an
17 overview of what it looks like. I'm going to transition
18 now to our district folks and the only prompt I gave them
19 was why are you interested in this and so we'll hear from
20 them about what they have to say. I would suggest we
21 just go down the table this way.

22 MS. LISA: And I am not very well prepared.
23 Gretchen -- I have been speaking with Gretchen about the
24 assessment pilot for the purposes that I gave in the SCAP
25 that I just really want to see these projects working



1 under the same umbrella as opposed to being parallel and
2 so definitely see value in performance tasks and those
3 tasks that students -- or that teachers are administering
4 locally being part of accountability. And for the
5 reasons that Gretchen just mentioned that's teachers
6 looking at that -- looking at a test that is -- that they
7 themselves have scored and then getting it verified
8 outside for all of those reasons that she mentioned that
9 we have it in a timely manner, that we can use it
10 instructionally is exactly why Buena Vista and I can
11 speak for all of the SCAP districts because it's a
12 component of ours of having performance tasks would very
13 much support this kind of work. Thanks.

14 MR. ADAMS: Thank you, my name is Ken Adams,
15 and I'm the Superintendent at Garfield 16. Hello, Ms.
16 Rankin how are you today? Couple of quick things, first
17 of all, I sit on the Best Board and I will tell you this
18 room is never this warm for our meeting, so I don't know
19 what they are doing to you, but it seems purposeful. So
20 it is rather warm, your average of perfect, Excellent.
21 So I did give you a handout, but I just wanted to touch
22 on a couple of things that are fairly important coming
23 from a fairly small district. We have about 1,000 kids
24 in our district. If you don't know where Parachute is,
25 go towards Utah and stop just about 70 miles short, your



1 there. That's kind of how to get there. Current
2 practice is probably not any different than it is in most
3 other districts in the state.

4 We have a lot of local assessments and state
5 assessments and we have a lot of local assessments
6 because we need data, we need information to be able to
7 help kids. We use NWA, we use IREADY for the read act,
8 we use that hated word TS Gold, at least when I hear some
9 of your meetings, I listen for that word sometimes. So
10 we have a lot of local data and then we throw on a huge
11 state assessment on top of that. And I will tell you it
12 has created some interesting conundrums for us. And one
13 of the reasons it is causing some impact has to do with
14 our transiency rate. We over the last five years have
15 had a transient rate of almost 50 percent.

16 So we have 1,000 kids, we have about 500 new
17 kids every year. So we have actually set a goal to try
18 to keep people in our system and we're down to 33
19 percent. But what that means is we have to be able to
20 get data on kids, be able to affectively instruct those
21 kids as fast as possible. A state assessment that takes
22 9 months for us to get data back, does no good for us.
23 It really is negligible. In fact, we would like to say
24 we use the data, but we don't use it for much. But that
25 being said, this opportunity that we have here to be able



1 to create performance based assessments and we've already
2 started that in-house but to be able to work with Mesa
3 County, Bayfield, Pagosa, some other districts that have
4 expressed interest in this would lend itself to create
5 some interrater reliability across our state which is
6 huge for us.

7 We do believe in have extrometrics, we use
8 NWA to validate where we are, if you are familiar with
9 that assessment. We have started working this year to
10 create a portfolio system, PreK through 12, we have a
11 Pre-School through 12 grades so our kids can track their
12 own data and we're also working on a capstone systems at
13 grade levels one, five, eight and 12. So not only do our
14 kids know exactly where they are but our parents in our
15 community know where our kids are. Because they will be
16 presenting out-turn to our community so the previous
17 groups presentation was fairly nice for me because we're
18 talking about increasing local accountability and we're
19 doing it through, in my mind an assessment practice which
20 part of that assessment are our portfolios in our
21 capstones but what we would like to be able to do is pull
22 a little bit back off the state assessments.

23 Because right now when we throw that on top
24 of everything, the focus shifts to that for months on
25 end. We have the highest rate for the size of our school



1 district for AP course work in the entire state. We have
2 17 courses at our high school level for 300 kids. So
3 every kid in our high school takes AP course work. Which
4 means we have been increasing rapidly with our
5 achievement, but it also falls right in the middle of
6 state testing. So I can tell you even with 98 percent of
7 our kids taking the state assessment that is not their
8 focus. It really is not. They have other things in mind
9 and that's getting college credit.

10 And so our kids tend to focus on those
11 things that matter, ACT, AP for the high school and down
12 the line our younger kids look at NWA as a marker for
13 them to be able to improve themselves. They track their
14 own data, they look forward to the assessment, and rue
15 the day when they have to set down for the state
16 assessment in the middle of that. All that being said,
17 one of the things that we found out this last year, was
18 when we had to go through and do the state assessment, we
19 did NWA at the very tail end of that. What it caused was
20 a burnout for our kiddos and to really say we have any
21 valid data right now would be a farce, because we don't.
22 We came back this summer, we looked at our data, almost
23 every kids declined NWA and we know that is impossible
24 with the work we're doing.

25 However when you've been testing since the



1 middle of March and you take that test in May, we are
2 doing seeing really any effective data coming out of that
3 so we would really like to be part of a pilot program
4 where we could back up some of the state data, where we
5 could increase our capacity at the local level where we
6 keep our data in-house at the local level and where we
7 can work with our parents and community to improve our
8 system. So thank you for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. Mr.
10 Parrish?

11 MR. PARRISH: Good afternoon, I'm a school
12 board member from district 51 in Grand Junction,
13 Colorado. My perspective as a board member is probably
14 from the 30,000 foot level and that is, I interact with
15 community members and staff. The thing that I hear is
16 there is a growing assessment fatigue based with what a
17 tasked with accomplishing now with state assessments.
18 And I really feel that assessment fatigue is contributing
19 to what I'm going to call a sense of civil disobedience
20 to where more and more parents are opting their children
21 out of the state assessments.

22 And so you have -- and then you look at the
23 impact that it has on the system, whether it's dollars
24 for technology, time where we lose the availability of
25 technology for intended course work where we shut down



1 labs across high schools and middle schools to do
2 assessments, we don't have the technology at the
3 elementary level. We -- it's clear that we have to do
4 something.

5 I think we definitely want accountability.
6 I hear over and over in our community that accountability
7 is important. They want to know how their children are
8 doing relation to other students in the state of Colorado
9 and they want to also know how their students might do in
10 relation to other students across the country. So our
11 proposal in no way would eliminate the need for
12 accountability. I just think that we want a stronger
13 accountability in that how do we make students
14 accountable for their own learning and how do we have
15 assessments in place that will truly identify where
16 students need to be met according to their needs and
17 teachers can use that immediate data to inform and guide
18 instruction.

19 We don't feel that that takes place with the
20 current state model. I would hope that you would
21 consider this opportunity as a state to look forward to
22 how we can really turn the tide, keep accountability, we
23 -- get assessment that's meaningful for the growth of
24 students at the classroom in a timely manner.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Schultz?



1 MR. SCHULTZ: I appreciate the opportunity
2 to also be here today. District 51 is the largest school
3 district on the western slope. We have 21,000 students
4 in 44 schools. The thing I want to share with you in
5 addition to what Mr. Parrish has just shared is we're
6 committed to transformation of our district that we've
7 been working on for actually three years. And it's
8 coming to fruition in some very exciting ways because
9 we're transforming our district to a competency based
10 system or performance based system of learning which a
11 key component is students move at their own pace and they
12 demonstrate mastery and application of what they've
13 learned in that process.

14 And we're just at the very beginning stages.
15 But having the flexibility that this opportunity would
16 provide to develop assessments that really involve
17 students in their learning as Mr. Parrish alluded to in
18 such a way that they're setting goals and really moving
19 ahead at a rate that's not only making sure they've
20 mastered what they've learned but that they are getting
21 to apply what they've learned and even go deeper, do a
22 deeper dive into meaningful learning that can be carried
23 on. And formative assessments that we could develop and
24 monitor at the local level are critical to that
25 opportunity.



1 And so we're excited about this, our
2 business community is fully engaged with us. Lots of
3 enthusiasm is developing around this effort in our school
4 district and community and we're just looking forward to
5 the opportunities that it presents.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

7 MS. MORGAN: Thank you. So I just have one
8 more quick slide.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

10 MS. MORGAN: Which was again supposed to be
11 the description of the two pathways that were possible
12 but now we really sort of have one. Now that ESSA is on
13 it's way to be reauthorized it seems like the easiest
14 path for the state to pursue if we're interested in this
15 is through the pilot program that was created in ESSA.
16 Previously we had talked to you about seeking flexibility
17 just through negotiations essentially with the secretary,
18 but now that program exists, and I think we just wanted
19 to make sure you are all aware of what that process would
20 be and we're going to have a lot to learn in the next few
21 months about how they're going to launch that pilot.

22 I think if the board is interested in us
23 pursuing this it behooves the department to stay pretty
24 close to the Department of Ed and watch and figure out
25 how they get this program off the ground. I think their



1 intention was to create something with very similar
2 parameters to what New Hampshire did negotiate and so
3 what's in there right now looks very familiar to us based
4 on what New Hampshire had in their specific flexibility
5 agreement. But I think, you know if the board were
6 interested it would behoove us to stay pretty close and
7 watch that process and be ready as soon as they're ready.
8 So that having been said, we know that you all would like
9 to have some opportunity for discussion among board
10 members but also, I've asked these folks to stay and be
11 available for questions if you have some of those as
12 well.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Gretchen is there any
14 specific action you want the board to take today or is
15 this just informational and we'll be moving forward at
16 some point or where are we.

17 MR. ASP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What we'd
18 like from you is just support, kind of like you said to
19 the earlier folks, go forth and see how this works,
20 continue to work with these districts who are already
21 kind of leading us and then as we hear about what these
22 parameters are, we'll come back to you and say this is
23 what it looks like in terms of actually being part of
24 this. But we'd like to be poised to reduce the amount of
25 state assessment. There's several ways you could use



1 state assessment here and - and just peak your interest,
2 one is to test - not test every kid, every year in every
3 subject.

4 So you might say we're going to give this
5 state assessment in reading the 4th graders, but we don't
6 do math, or we don't do science and we try to reduce the
7 burden that way or we could do some sampling processes if
8 that were to say we just want to get enough feedback so
9 these guys can see how we doing on this test so it's not
10 so burdensome. Now here's really the pie in the sky, if
11 you change the view of say testing that way -- that you
12 make think about reducing even the size of the test. But
13 that's another step down the road, but just the idea of
14 thinking how we could use local assessment -- is what
15 we're -- and so we're asking you on -- I'm sorry. We
16 just want to hear if you want us to move forward in this
17 piece.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Schroeder?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So I have heard from some
20 parents they're very happy with the reports that they get
21 on their kids scores, where they're strong, where they're
22 weak, so while I don't object to changes and to districts
23 doing their own thing, I don't want to lose that for the
24 reporting. And so I don't know whether the burden ends
25 up being greater if you have to recreate such a detailed



1 report as has been prepared by the testing premises.
2 That's a caveat that I hope you'll -- you'll consider
3 because they are value.

4 There's some comparison to other kids in the
5 state, there's comparisons to other states, there's
6 detail on which areas your kid's strong in and which
7 areas they are not strong in. Parents use that over a
8 couple of years they can actually see, geesh, maybe my
9 kid need a math tutor, or maybe we've got some issues
10 where I as a parent can be helpful. So I recognize
11 that's an added burden, but I would hate to have our
12 parents lose that kind of information on their individual
13 kiddos.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Flores?

15 MS. FLORES: Aside from PARCC and I'm asking
16 this of you as well Gretchen, and you Elliott, would you
17 consider using NAPE which is -- they do -- it's a shorter
18 version and it could also be a pilot. Would you consider
19 also maybe using the California Achievement test which I
20 would think is probably more into the academics, more
21 subject, you'd get more information that way or the ITBS
22 or even the ACT aspire, which I was told was going to be
23 ready maybe by -- by this year, that would also go along
24 with the ACT which they would -- which I think we may be
25 considering giving at the 11th grade or so. And this



1 would give you -- and I don't know how many times you'd
2 like to do this but it's up to you to think about that.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Who would like to field
4 that. Ken.

5 MR. ADAMS: Yeah, thanks. Thank you for the
6 question. Actually we do NAPE currently. Yeah, we've
7 been doing NAPE in fourth and eighth grades both over the
8 last few years. Different districts are selected
9 throughout the state and they use a sampling process for
10 that. The trouble is they don't give us back school
11 level data so that information again is a great
12 assessment, it compares against -- across the entire
13 country, across -- and PEZA would be the same thing,
14 across the nations. Unfortunately unless they are going
15 to give us that data back it's going to be the same
16 result as the current test.

17 MS. FLORES: But if the US Department of
18 Education is supporting this, I can't imagine that they
19 wouldn't support the use of NAPE in this - in this way.

20 MR. ASP: If I could jump in.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Asp?

22 MR. ASP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And turn it
23 back to you. There's two issues with this. One is the
24 idea of looking at local assessment as a way of making
25 determinations about whether your kids are meeting



1 standards versus what the actual state test is right now.
2 There's some requirements on state testing both in our
3 state law as well as our federal law that require them to
4 be reflections of our state standards too. And so if you
5 were going to use these assessments you'd have to think
6 about that piece.

7 That's going to take some changes in law to
8 broaden what those assessments may be and some of that
9 may occur over the next year or so as we move along. What
10 we're hoping to do is support these folks in these in
11 developing these local assessments that give them good
12 data and then be able to show we don't to give the state
13 tests on a regular basis. Even - we have to think
14 something about Dr. Schroeder's remarks about what we
15 give parents on an ongoing basis. But your question is
16 not out of line, it's just a ways down the road before we
17 can have that conversation.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, yes, Dr. Scheffel?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have a question for
20 Dr. Asp. Do the feds allow a correlation with the state
21 test and another test as reflected of standards as a way
22 to say that the test is aligned with standards or does it
23 have to be directly as opposed to indirectly?

24 MR. ASP: Thank you, Dr. Scheffel. The --
25 what they require -- their definition of comparability is



1 usually goes across two pieces and there's some technical
2 aspects that we could talk more about. But one is that
3 does it measure basically the same content and the second
4 is, are the scores reasonably comparable or correlated,
5 so there's two pieces. Because you may be able to have a
6 test that correlates a lot but really doesn't measure the
7 content.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: The content.

9 MR. ASP: So there's two pieces to that.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry, I don't know who
12 was first. All right Ms. Mazanec go ahead.

13 MS. MAZANEC: So I think this is kind of
14 very exciting. Are you ready to do this, to be a
15 possible one of the magnificent seven?

16 MR. ADAMS: Absolutely we are.

17 MS. MAZANEC: You're up for this?

18 MR. ADAMS: That's why we came over here
19 today. We are absolutely ready and willing.

20 MS. MAZANEC: All right, great.

21 MR. ADAMS: We realize there are still some
22 unknowns. But we heard in a speech last week about, you
23 know, when we're talking about innovation and change
24 you've got to be shaping and reshaping ideas. A lot of
25 these questions are going to have to be dealt with along



1 the way and we don't necessarily know all the answers.
2 But as Mr. Parrish alluded to as far as District 51,
3 we're interested in comparability and we're also
4 interested in making sure our parents have accurate
5 information about the progress of their students and how
6 they compare to other districts. So it's not throwing
7 out the baby with the bath water, it's taking the best of
8 that and still allowing us -- to allow students to move
9 and be able to own their learning.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Great, thank you.

11 MR. ADAMS: Um-huh.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM. Yes, Joyce?

13 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Parrish, Mr. Heppenstall
14 and Mr. Schultz, thanks for coming, I know from whence
15 you came and the drove over.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was sitting by your
17 house today.

18 MS. RANKIN: Oh, how's it going? And I
19 guess this would be to Gretchen, but anybody can pile on.
20 This idea of this magnificent seven, I mean there is
21 going to be 85,000 people compete for this. But I can
22 sure see because of the makeup of state groups of rurals
23 that can create a repeatable process and anything like
24 that that can give us, not only a leg up, but I know on
25 the western half of the state there's a tight group of



1 Superintendents that if these three people and maybe two
2 more work together, I mean they could lead that, that
3 charge. And I -- I really see, I'm optimistic about
4 seeing the creation of something new like this that --
5 that can be repeated.

6 MS. MORGAN: Um-huh. And I will just add to
7 that. One of the criteria that is in -- that we know so
8 far about the pilot is that it be representative of your
9 states.

10 MS. RANKIN: Well anything you do.

11 MS. MORGAN: Right, we obviously have that
12 interest here already, but that is really emphasized too
13 in terms of how they would evaluate us to determine if we
14 are one of the seven states is the degree to which we
15 could do that. So obviously the leadership we have from
16 different parts of the state already in here would be
17 important, I think, to our success.

18 MS. RANKIN: But I think we have to be
19 creative about how we differentiate ourselves from the
20 others that are applying, and I'm sure they're doing the
21 same thing.

22 MS. MORGAN: Right.

23 MS. RANKIN: But I think we're better.

24 MS. MORGAN: I agree.

25 MS. RANKIN: I think you're right.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

2 MS. FLORES: I just want to apologize. I
3 wasn't trying to demean your assessment data anyway. I
4 was just trying to see if you had thought about maybe not
5 being as burdened with the testing that the state, you
6 know, has there.

7 MR. ADAMS: Dr. Flores, that's also why
8 we're here. We're seeking less burden. Teachers need to
9 be able to teach.

10 MS. FLORES: Exactly.

11 MR. ADAMS: And students need to be able to
12 learn.

13 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff?

15 MS. GOFF: Well thank you and
16 congratulations. This is already a pretty big
17 accomplishment just to come to the point where you are
18 seeing it, it's not done yet. Happily we have districts
19 that are stepping up and willing to give some major
20 things a try and that's great. I'm also -- I'm curious
21 and I'm hoping that our medium and large size districts
22 are invited to take part in the conversations. I do
23 think we have, overall, in general, across the board and
24 incredibly talented school world in Colorado. And
25 anything that opens up the opportunity sharing, whether



1 is Best Practices in commonalities you know.

2 And as far as your -- your pilot decision
3 making and the contents of what that will look like, you
4 know -- I guess I'd -- my -- I think it's a co-concern
5 and a co-interest is no matter what assessment package or
6 program we might choose, other accountability parts that
7 might go along with that, parent communication, continued
8 professional learning that how it works out for everyone
9 who does this and the general concerns we have as a
10 country which came through -- reflected in the new part
11 of the law -- the new form of the law and that's not new,
12 but equity. We aren't concerned about are there
13 measures, are there tools within your plan and the
14 results that you get, do they tell you something about
15 how you're lining up those needs and those interests and
16 ideas for school finance, you know, what are some of the
17 creative ways that communities can come together of all
18 types and sizes. And look at possible ways to solve
19 individual situation needs around that. Good idea.

20 So I just want to put my plug in for the
21 medium and large size districts too. But also that -- to
22 promote the idea that everybody's got to contribution.
23 And in the development of your pilots and others that I
24 see sitting in the room, hopefully it will involve a lot
25 of voices that have a lot to offer. Good luck.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions or
2 comments. Gentlemen, thank you very much for making the
3 trip over and I just would observe that from my memory of
4 the magnificent seven that was a noble cause, but most of
5 them died in the fire fight. Good luck. Thank you.
6 Okay, lets proceed next to public comment. We'll go a
7 little bit out of order. Elizabeth, if you could find
8 our sign-up sheet please.

9 (Pause)

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, here we go. Let's
11 start - a reminder that Ms. Burdsall will have the timing
12 sheet and we'll start with Lisa Steven, please.

13 MS. STEVEN: Good evening, thank you so much
14 for allowing me to come and speak this evening about an
15 agenda item on your agenda for tomorrow and that is the
16 decision around which versions of the high school
17 equivalency test offered to those students who are taking
18 that test. My name is Lisa Steven, I'm the Executive
19 Director and founder of Hope House of Colorado. We are a
20 non-profit organization that works with parenting teenage
21 moms. We will serve 150 teenage mothers this year. An
22 important statistic to note is that there are over 4300
23 babies born to teenage mothers in the state of Colorado
24 each year. Less than one-third of those teenage moms
25 will earn their high school diploma and fewer than 1



1 percent will earn their college degree.

2 The teen mothers who participate in the GED
3 program at Hope House often come from very chaotic and
4 dysfunctional homes, often dealing with domestic violence
5 or addiction behaviors in their homes. Our average teen
6 mom at Hope House has dropped out of high school in the
7 ninth grade. These are harsh statistics but the most
8 important fact to notice, is that all of our teen moms
9 are extremely motivated to build a better life for their
10 little one. And extremely motivated to break the cycle
11 of poverty that they grew up with.

12 Between 2009 and 2013 Hope House has helped
13 140 teenage moms earn their GED. 48 percent of our
14 teenage moms go on to further education. Following the
15 introduction of the revised GED in 2014, Hope House has
16 seen a 70 percent drop in the number of teen moms who've
17 earned their GED through our program. This year alone,
18 we've seen 15 teenage moms drop off simply due to
19 discouragement with how difficult they perceive this test
20 to be. Hope House has worked hard to rectify this
21 situation for our girls forming a partnership with an
22 online high school called Goal Academy. I'm getting all
23 shaky, you guys are so important, I'm kind of nervous.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You're not only shaky but
25 confused.



1 MS. STEVEN: Sorry, and it is kind of hot in
2 here. Most importantly we've added, in addition to our
3 new partnerships, we've added more tutors, volunteer
4 tutors to our classroom who tutor our teenage moms one on
5 one in the current form - version of the GED. We've also
6 learned there is a different version of the GED test
7 called -- or of the high school equivalency diploma
8 called the Highset which is offered in Wyoming and when
9 we learned that, we started looking into whether or not
10 it wasn't possible to take our teen moms to Wyoming to
11 actually take the test there.

12 Upon learning that that is possible, we
13 began driving our teen moms to Wyoming to take the test
14 and they are passing and it's wonderful. And so I could
15 tell you a lot of things about numbers, but I think the
16 most important thing is to tell you about a name. And
17 the name I'd like to tell you about is Ms. Jackie.
18 Jackie joined our GED program in early 2014. She'd
19 become pregnant at the age of 16. She comes from a very
20 difficult family background, and like most of our teenage
21 moms, she would tell you that actually becoming a mom
22 saved her life. It allowed her to totally change the
23 types of friends that she was hanging out with, potential
24 gang activity, and -- am I almost done, is that what that
25 means, sorry, and basically make the decision that she



1 wanted to move forward. She has been in our program -
2 was in our GED program for almost 24 months. That is the
3 longest time that any teen mom has worked on their GED in
4 Hope House ever.

5 Generally they're able to earn their GED in
6 in about four months or less. She almost came to the
7 point of quitting when we learned about the Highset. The
8 most important thing I can tell you is that I overheard
9 her running into our program managers office the day that
10 she first took a pre-test of the Highset version of the
11 high school equivalency and I overheard her say "I get
12 it, I get it, I understand it, I do have the knowledge."
13 She was so excited that she could actually understand
14 this version of the test differently then she understood
15 the other version.

16 She drove to Wyoming followed by Rocky
17 Mountain PBS who did a story on the GED test and followed
18 Jackie there to take it. They also followed her to her
19 high school graduation at Hope House about a month later
20 and got to watch her walk down the isle in cap and gown
21 and graduate with her high school equivalency diploma.
22 Jackie is now enrolled at Front Range Community College
23 and will start her program there in January. We are
24 asking you to please to consider the option of all three
25 version of the high school equivalency diploma in



1 Colorado. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Ms. Steven and
3 thank you for what you do at Camp B's. I need this
4 tabled.

5 (Pause)

6 MS. STAPLETON: Good afternoon, and thank
7 you members of this board, Interim Commissioner and Mr.
8 Chair for your service. I am Anita Stapleton from
9 Pueblo. I am a concern parent and disgusted tax payer.
10 Today Senator Lamar Alexander said Christmas came early
11 for American students. He called the passage of ESSA as
12 a big Christmas present and once signed should have a big
13 red bow on top of it. I have a different take on it. I
14 see it as the white elephant gift wrapped in pretty paper
15 but once opened it's filled with rotten eggs.

16 It was portrayed as a way of states to get
17 out of common core. The following is a statement by the
18 US Department of Education Chief of Staff just yesterday;
19 according to Emma Vedehra, Chief of Staff, Us Department
20 of Education, this bill will embed college and career
21 ready standards or as we know, common core. They do not
22 expect any states to get away from the standards. It
23 also solidifies the departments plans for a full Pre-K
24 expansion. It was also stated that the Pre-K grants were
25 significant in moving the ball and that the states were



1 on the hook financially as well. The Department of
2 Education is giddy with excitement at the impending
3 passage of ESSA.

4 That should be a red flag. Referencing
5 Senator Lamar Alexander's terms of endearment, baby core
6 for Pre-K, kinder core and on to K through 12 challenging
7 academic content standards. Federal mandate dictating
8 only standards, assessments, curriculum, but now
9 universal teacher development. I urge this board to get
10 ahold of the 1061 pages of this omnibus bill and see it
11 for what it is, the destruction of public schools. Thank
12 God reportability portion failed. This was a gift for
13 private, parochial and home schoolers to be free from the
14 federal mandates. It is all about redefining language.

15 Let's take a look at Title I, which is not
16 defined as students that don't meet expected outcomes.
17 Again I have to ask who's expected outcomes. How does
18 one measure proficiency when non-cognitive data is the
19 focus. I want to read a section of the US Department of
20 Education report; expanding evidence approaches for
21 learning in a digital world, I implore the board to
22 please read this document that you've been provided with
23 before you vote on joining pilot assessments and
24 especially as you discuss and vote on the MOU with
25 teaching strategies tomorrow. This report is all telling



1 from the digital badging that Governor Hickenlooper has
2 mandated through executive order to the very tools such
3 as expressing cameras and pressure mice to measure
4 physiological and non-cognitive data.

5 The availability of technology to create and
6 support more sophisticated digital learning systems
7 offers the opportunity to measure these qualities on the
8 basis of student behavior in a learning system rather
9 than self-report. I'm going to skip to the end because
10 this part is the most important. Understanding how to
11 support the development of these non-cognitive skills and
12 how to assess them. Our priorities for the US Department
13 of Education; the department has prepared a brief on grit
14 tenacity perseverance slated for release back in 2013.
15 The brief summarizes current research on these skills and
16 offers recommendations for research and development
17 priorities in this area.

18 The authors propose the grit tenacity
19 perseverance are teachable and made up of three
20 components; academic mindsets, cognitive framing that
21 support perseverance, effort for self-control and
22 strategies and tactics such as adaptations. And going to
23 the bottom, it calls for designed based implementation
24 research to connect theory and practices and highlights
25 that need for longitude in studies. They need to measure



1 the non-cognitive data, and how are they doing this is
2 through embedded assessments. It's all in the report.
3 You can read it in less than a day and I just implore
4 you, you have it, share it. I know some of you have read
5 it. but this isn't rocket science.

6 We need assessments that measure academic
7 growth. I thought that was what No Child Left Behind was
8 supposed to push us towards. And now all this talk
9 today, to me is just like beating a head against the
10 wall. They're talking about implementing assessments
11 that are going to measure non-cognitive data,
12 physiological, psychosocial profiling. And this document
13 tells you why and how they are going to do that and now
14 all these districts that are going to pilot are going to
15 follow suit, because they have to follow these mandates.
16 This totally strips all of us from having any say or
17 control in our children's education and this will push
18 teachers out the door and will push parents to home
19 school. And I encourage them to do that if we can't get
20 a handle on this. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Stapleton.
22 Charlette Brantley?

23 MS. BRANTLEY: Good afternoon and thank you
24 very much for the opportunity to address you this
25 afternoon about one of the items that is on your agenda



1 for tomorrow around the Kindergarten Readiness
2 Assessment. I'm Charlotte Brantley, I am the President
3 and CEO of Clayton Early Learning, I am also a member of
4 the Statutory Early Childhood Leadership Commission and I
5 come before you today to both represent the Early
6 Childhood Leadership Commission and also to talk to you a
7 little bit about my day job with Clayton Early Learning.

8 The Early Childhood Learning Commission
9 strongly supports the value of understanding of how ready
10 a young child is upon entering into kindergarten. This
11 transition is one of the most important in a students
12 life. As what happens in kindergarten can set in motion
13 successful learning and academic performance for the
14 remainder of a students K-12 career. We know that not
15 all children enter this critical year with the same level
16 of readiness. To support the progress of each young
17 student throughout this first year of formal schooling,
18 teachers and parents need a solid formative understanding
19 of where the child is at the outset along the continuum
20 of essential knowledge and skills. In my role as a
21 provider of high quality evidence based early childhood
22 education, my day job, for a diverse population of low
23 income children, I witness everyday the power of teachers
24 and parents who are guided by their passion for
25 supporting young children successful growth in learning.



1 Their ability to act on this shared passion
2 is greatly enhanced by the routine use of appropriate
3 assessments and planning tools. Appropriate assessments
4 and tools that are aligned with those assessments. We at
5 Clayton Early Learning serve nearly 700 children in our
6 own schools, our home based learning programs and through
7 contracts with other providers in Denver, Summit County,
8 Eagle County and the San Luis Valley. In each classroom
9 we use evidence based assessments, primarily TS Gold to
10 inform our practice. We also believe strongly that state
11 wide as well as district level aggregate data on the
12 readiness of Colorado children is essential to making
13 informed decisions about both public and private
14 investments in pre-school learning.

15 As I'm sure you are aware, public sentiment
16 about the importance of the early years continues to move
17 in a very positive direction in this country. As we seek
18 to offer a quality early education experience to more of
19 our children, particularly those at risk, good data about
20 the impact of these efforts becomes increasingly
21 important. The Early Childhood Leadership Commission
22 understands the challenges faced by some districts and
23 teachers implementing the state required assessment,
24 particularly for those teachers with two groups of half
25 day students. The Leadership Commission believes that



1 the compromises recommended by the department are
2 reasonable and create the appropriate balance between the
3 amount of work required and the necessity of
4 understanding where each child is upon entry.

5 We also believe that the process the
6 department has led for the past several years to both
7 select assessment tools recommended for approval and to
8 support implementation have met legislative intent. Any
9 further changes at this time to require less of districts
10 in implementation we believe would no longer meet that
11 intent. Thank you, perfect timing.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

13 MS. MAZANEC: You get a gold star for that.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Cindy Schulz?

15 MS. SCHULZ: Good afternoon and it is hot in
16 here and thank you so much for all your hard work that
17 you do do. My name is Cindy Schulz, I'm a
18 kindergarten/first grade teacher for the last 30 years.
19 I represent also, I sit on the Early Childhood Leadership
20 Commission and today address you as a very passionate
21 kindergarten teacher and would like to encourage you as
22 you vote tomorrow to approve the memorandum of
23 understanding with the Kindergarten School Readiness and
24 the adjustments made with the teaching strategy school
25 assessment tool. As adults with responsibility for young



1 children all professionals in the early care and
2 education workforce have a similarly complex and
3 challenging scope of work and make a high valuable
4 contribution to healthy childhood development and early
5 learning.

6 As a classroom teacher, to understand the
7 student's instructional needs and build a student
8 instructional plan, teachers need researched based
9 assessment tools such as teaching strategies goal. Every
10 teacher and adult working with children understands the
11 importance of consistent, stable, nurturing and
12 protective relationships and learning across all domains
13 and enable children to fully engage in learning
14 opportunities and continuous developmental achievements.
15 Thus the teacher and adults working with the care and
16 education of young children bear a great responsibility
17 not only for learning but to be able to protect
18 individual data.

19 Working to ensure the maximum protection for
20 individual student data while producing the statutorily
21 minimum information for the school kindergarten -
22 Colorado Kindergarten School Readiness Reporting System
23 is a goal that needs to be approved, but still allowing
24 the teachers and families to gain valuable information to
25 begin the amazing developmental and early learning



1 journey with each of their children entering
2 kindergarten. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much.
4 Shelly Penn? Shirley, I'm sorry.

5 MS. PENN: Yes. I have to tell you, my name
6 is Shirley Penn and I have to tell you, I'm in awe of all
7 the things that need to know about and understand. I
8 know the issue of -- and I'd like to speak to you about
9 the matter of choice again. I know there are many
10 questions and concerns that you have, and this is a
11 difficult issue to understand. So I'd like to just walk
12 you through a few of my experiences to help you see why I
13 am so passionate about the matter of choice. When the
14 idea of a new -- a change in the GED test came along, I
15 wasn't concerned, I'd been through test changes before.
16 As teachers and administrators we were put through
17 trainings as early as 2012, we thought we were ready, we
18 thought we were going to be just fine.

19 I think that first wake up call came from me
20 was in 2013 when I asked my GED teacher to take the test
21 so she could see what it was like. Now let me tell you
22 about my GED teacher. She's taught at that time, I think
23 for four or five years, she's a graduate of Purdue
24 University, she had a Degree in Chemical Engineering and
25 she graduated with honors. When she took the GED test it



1 came back and said she wasn't prepared for college. That
2 kind of raised some kind of concerns and I started
3 looking out and asking questions and talking to other
4 folks and I found that -- that there were instances, many
5 instances where the -- the test itself did not measure
6 the skills that the student had accurately.

7 And that's not to be detrimental about GED,
8 it's a - it's a valid test that we're not trying to get
9 rid of, but we think that each test has a unique way of
10 testing and each test can capture the knowledge that a
11 student has in a different way. So just like this
12 teacher was not able to demonstrate her skills on this
13 test, many of our students are also not able to
14 demonstrate their skills on one specific test. One of
15 the critical points is the fact that it's a computer
16 based test and although my teacher was very skilled, had
17 a lot of knowledge and had some basic computer skills,
18 she didn't have the proficiency to demonstrate what she
19 knew.

20 So we really implore you to having a paper
21 and pencil test. You've heard a lot about different
22 students here, you've heard about the inward mothers --
23 or the single moms, you've heard about - you've gotten
24 some letters and documentation from the Department of
25 Corrections. So I'd like to talk about that for just a



1 second. The adult world of -- the adult education world
2 is so diverse. I'd like to tell you another story of a
3 student that was actually in my daughters class, and she
4 also teaches in adult ed.

5 This woman was highly educated, I'll hurry
6 fast, was turned down for promotion time after time but
7 each time someone else was hired for her position she was
8 the one that trained them. She knew the job, she could
9 do the job but she couldn't get the piece of paper so she
10 couldn't get the job. So that's so important. What are
11 our goals in getting the GED? The last thing I'd like to
12 say is these are real people, we've gone from over 10,000
13 high school equivalency diplomas issued to a year down to
14 less than 3,000. If that happened in a high school what
15 would you do and what would you think. There's a
16 problem. We have to address this problem. We've tried
17 to address it for two years and what we're asking you now
18 is to help us by giving us some choice in assessments.
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you and looks like
21 Claire Roberts?

22 MS. ROBERT: Hi, I'm Char Robert and I'm the
23 Family Economic Security Program Manager for the Colorado
24 Center on Law and Policy. CCLP creates pathways out of
25 poverty for Coloradoans. I also am the staff coordinator



1 of a coalition called Skills to Compete which is a multi-
2 sector coalition that advocates for assess to skills
3 training with a particular concentration on in-demand
4 middle skill jobs and I'm here to ask that you adopt
5 options for high school equivalency testing.

6 If someone has no high school equivalency
7 diploma, that means that the person is closed out of most
8 jobs. If they have no high school equivalency diploma,
9 they might be blocked from advancement in their current
10 low wage job. If they have no high school equivalency
11 diploma it means that they're likely blocked from
12 training opportunities to increase their skills and
13 increase their income. If they have no high school
14 equivalency diploma, it means that they're blocked from
15 receiving PELL grants for post-secondary training with a
16 few exceptions. Why not choose more paths, more options
17 for letting people achieve upward mobility? Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, I
19 appreciate it. That's all the people that signed up for
20 public testimony, so that's concluded, we're now down to
21 a few house keeping items, state board member reports.

22 MS. MORGAN: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

24 MS. MORGAN: I believe there is one more
25 person that would like to address you in public comment.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, please come up and
2 introduce yourself.

3 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you for allowing me this
4 time. My name is Diane Johnson and I run the Aurora
5 Public Schools Testing Center and I wanted to speak
6 against adapting a second option or two as a way for
7 students to earn their high school equivalency diploma.
8 And I speak both as an educator, I taught for 21 years
9 and I currently run the testing center where we offer
10 students the opportunity to take the high school
11 equivalency exam, the GED test.

12 And yes, it has been a big transition from
13 paper based testing to computer based testing, but as an
14 educator I know what is expected of our students in high
15 school and I know that the current GED test is what we
16 expect of our students and we know that they are capable
17 of learning and I fully believe that every student
18 whether they're 17 or 70 is capable of learning, learning
19 these skills and content that will help them move forward
20 with their lives. I feel like if we go back to a paper
21 based test it is a step backwards.

22 Computer based testing is not going away. I
23 feel like if we take a paper based test and even
24 implement it for a couple of years they're sooner or
25 later going to be like oh we got to switch to a computer



1 based test and we'll find ourselves in the same
2 predicament as we currently are. I know that it's
3 challenging, I know that educators are having a tough
4 time, but it's not just about getting numbers.

5 Are we giving the skills they need to move
6 forward with their life? And with this GED test,
7 although it is challenging, I fully believe that every
8 one of those students that walks through our door whether
9 they're 17 or 70 can learn the skills. I think as a
10 state we need to create a better pathway for students,
11 work with the educators to give them more strategies to
12 be able to help these students be successful. They are
13 asking to be - they need to be able to read and write and
14 do math, that is what we would expect of anyone that is
15 graduating from our high schools.

16 That is what we would expect if they're
17 going into a post-secondary opportunity and that is what
18 the employers expect. GED Testing Service took their
19 time and developed this test with input from the state
20 standards and national standards and from all the states
21 that are working with GED Testing Service. It is a
22 quality exam, it is a well done exam and students that
23 finish it and complete should be incredibly proud of
24 themselves. They've taken a challenging exam and can
25 move forward with their lives and I think that I would



1 ask the board to just contemplate GED Testing Service has
2 been a huge impact, it's not just about numbers.
3 Colorado has gone with GED Testing Service because they
4 are the force to be reckoned with in high school
5 equivalency examinations and we need to honor that as a
6 state and not talk a half of a step backwards for our
7 very deserving clientele. And my time is up and thank
8 you for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And thank you. Okay,
10 we'll return to board members reports, anyone want to
11 volunteer to report, Ms. Rankin on the event we attended
12 -- most of us, we all attended actually, last week?

13 MS. RANKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Last
14 weekend the board attended the CASB Conference, for those
15 of you at home, it's the Colorado Association of School
16 Boards and I have to say there were a lot of school board
17 members there and I met a lot of new people. One of the
18 highlights -- well actually the main highlight was the
19 State Board of Education. But I have to say the second
20 highlight was the joint budget committee. And I say that
21 because you had to have a ticket to get in and many
22 people did not get in and wanted too.

23 Senator Steadman, Representative Young,
24 Representative Hamner and Representative Rankin gave us a
25 statement on what the budget is going to be like this



1 year. They came into the room to the music of You Can't
2 Always Get What You Want, which was exceptional. Thanks
3 to Jane for hosting that. And one of the things that I
4 really disapprove of is when someone talks about
5 something that not everyone went to. And some people are
6 saying gee, that's really nice, I'm glad you had a nice
7 time, but I wasn't there, and I would recommend that you
8 go on the CASB website because they will have everything
9 that was at that conference online for people to review.
10 I don't know if it's there today, but I have heard it
11 will be up by the end of the week.

12 And some of the important smaller sessions,
13 break out sessions included technology, data privacy,
14 finance 101, blended learning, graduation guidelines, all
15 the things that we're talking about here at the board, at
16 the state and within our school districts. One of the
17 main things that was my takeaway in one of the sessions I
18 went to was the CDE dashboard. And we were talking today
19 about advanced dashboards and they are on websites that
20 inform parents, transparency about what there student is
21 going, what the school is doing, what the district is
22 doing, well it doesn't auger into these student's but it
23 gives parents a lot of information and we have a new
24 dashboard on our Department of Ed - Colorado Department
25 of Education website and I took a, kind of a class on it,



1 which was extremely helpful, it's a great tool and I
2 recommend that everyone go to that if you have any
3 questions and if you have further questions call CDE,
4 they'll help you with that I'm sure. It's called
5 schoolview and it's really a good place to go. And I
6 know I've talked too long but it was a great conference
7 and I'm sure you all have something to add on that.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Rankin, any
9 other comments about that or other events board members
10 did? Seeing none we'll move on the Commissioner Search
11 Update. We had 65 applicants with completed files, we
12 reduced that to 12, we've recently completed interviewing
13 5 candidates, we're still doing due diligence on those 5
14 candidates and perhaps sometime next week we will have a
15 meeting - probably likely by phone to see if we can
16 narrow that to finalists and make an announcement
17 hopefully next week. We'll see how the balance of due
18 diligence goes. Any other questions or comments before
19 we recess until tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m., no. Thank
20 you very much, we'll see you all tomorrow at 9:00 a.m.

21 (Meeting adjourned)

22

23

24

25

26



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 January, 2019.

/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