



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
October 12, 2016, AM

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 12, 2016,  
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 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hello.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There you have it. Good  
3 morning. The State Board of Education, please come to  
4 order. I think that's an unlikely event. Ms. Burdsall,  
5 would you like to call the roll, please?

6 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores.

7 MS. FLORES: Here.

8 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

9 MS. GOFF: Here.

10 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

12 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.

13 MS. RANKIN: Here.

14 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

16 MS. BURDSALL: Board Members Schroeder.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

18 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Here.

20 The quorum is present. Let's see now if  
21 everybody, the members in the audience would rise for the  
22 Pledge of Allegiance. Dr. Scheffel, would you mind leading  
23 us, please?

24 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the  
25 United States of America and to the republic for which it



1 stands, one nation under God, individual, liberty, and  
2 justice for all.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Okay. All  
4 right. Item 4 is the approval of the agenda. Is there a  
5 motion for the approval of the agenda? Dr. Schroeder has  
6 moved this -- the approval agendas are second to -- yes,  
7 Dr. Scheffel, second step motion. Is there objection to  
8 that motion? Say none that motion score adopted by a vote  
9 of seven to nothing. Item 5. The -- oh, yes?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So now can we pull of?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. So Dr. -- Dr.  
12 Schroeder will read the consent agenda. And then, once  
13 that's done, if you want an item pulled off just indicate  
14 which it is and we'll do that.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. And --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Schroeder's looking for  
18 her glasses.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- Dr. Schroeder's waiting  
20 for her glasses.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, I have to wait.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want to borrow  
23 mine?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Are they cheaters?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, but they should  
2 know.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: No, that's okay. When I say  
4 something wrong, please correct me.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to put the following  
7 matters on the consent agenda. 15.02 regarding  
8 disciplinary proceedings concerning a license charge number  
9 2015 EC 868 Direct Department staff and the State Attorney  
10 General's office to prepare the documents necessary to  
11 require a formal hearing for the revocation of the holder's  
12 license pursuant to Section 22-60.5-108 CRS. 15.07 approve  
13 for initial emergency authorization request as set forth in  
14 the published agenda.

15 15.08 approved one renewal emergency  
16 authorization request as set forth in the published agenda.

17 16.01 approved Denver Public Schools  
18 innovation application on behalf of Goldrick Elementary  
19 School as set forth in the published agenda.

20 16.02 approved Denver Public Schools  
21 innovation application on behalf of International Academy  
22 of Denver and Harrington as set forth in the published  
23 agenda.



1 16.03 approved Denver Public Schools  
2 innovation application on behalf of Schmidt Elementary  
3 School, as set forth in the published agenda.

4 16.04 approved Denver Public Schools  
5 innovation application on behalf of Val Verde Elementary  
6 School, as set forth in the published agenda.

7 16.05 approved Boulder Valley School  
8 District Re 2 request for early college designation for  
9 Monarch High School as set forth in the published agenda.  
10 This is the end of the consent agenda.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Ms. Mazanec,  
12 do you have a request for removal of an item or so?

13 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, I would like to pull item  
14 15.04.

15 MS. BURDSALL: Actually, there were a few  
16 items that had been -- that had been pulled, may have an  
17 older version of the --

18 MS. MAZANEC: Has 15.04 already been pulled?

19 MS. BURDSALL: Yes.

20 MS. MAZANEC: No problem, then.

21 MS. BURDSALL: 15.04, 15.05 --

22 MS. MAZANEC: These are the older versions.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: We only -- we only put 15.02  
24 on the consent.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. 15.04,  
2 15.05 and --

3 MS. BURDSALL: And 15.06.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 MS. BURDSALL: My apologies for not getting  
6 your revised agenda.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Not a problem. Yes --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, I have a  
9 couple of questions and so I think I need to pull them from  
10 the consented --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- consent agenda,  
13 16.01 through 16.04?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 16.01 through 16.04 will  
15 be removed from the consent agenda. All right, is there --  
16 for the remaining -- for the remaining part of the consent  
17 agenda does require unanimous consent for the motion to  
18 adapt the -- the consent agenda. Is there an objection to  
19 the adaptation of the consent agenda, absent item 16.01  
20 through 16.04? Seeing no objection to the approval consent  
21 agenda, the consent agenda is approved as amended. Item 7,  
22 Commissioner Anthes, you are -- we are ready for your  
23 report.

24 MS. ANTHERS: Do you want to go to the  
25 director report?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We could do that.

2 MS. ANTHES: 16.01?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I usually stay in order.  
4 Is there an objection to -- okay. Yes, Ms. Burdsall,  
5 please proceed.

6 MS. BURDSALL: Good morning, Chairman  
7 Durham, members of the Board, and Interim Commissioner  
8 Anthes. Just my friendly reminder to speak into your  
9 microphones and if you turn them off when you are not  
10 speaking, just remember to turn them back on. For those  
11 needing to connect to our wireless, the -- you'll want to  
12 connect to CDE hotspot. And the password is still Silver,  
13 capital S.

14 In your Board packets, you have the  
15 following materials; your events calendar and quick plans  
16 expense report, and your Board packets and slash on the  
17 bench before you slash on Board docs are the following  
18 materials: 10.1, a PowerPoint for the assessment  
19 procurement and park discussion.

20 11.01, a memo regarding the 2016 growth  
21 participation and performance frameworks update and  
22 accompanying PowerPoint.

23 For item 15.07, you have a memo regarding  
24 the four initial emergency authorization requests.

25 For item 15.08,



1                   You have a memo regarding the one emergency  
2 renewal request.

3                   For item 16.01, you have a memo regarding  
4 Denver Public Schools innovation application request on  
5 behalf of Goldrick Elementary School and their supporting  
6 materials pertaining to the request.

7                   For item 16.02, you have a memo regarding  
8 Denver Public Schools innovation application request on  
9 behalf of International Academy of Denver at Harrington and  
10 their supporting materials pertaining to the request.

11                  For item 16.03, you have a memo regarding  
12 Denver Public Schools innovation application request on  
13 behalf of Schmidt Elementary School and their supporting  
14 materials pertaining to the request.

15                  For item 16.04, you have a memo regarding  
16 Denver Public Schools innovation application request on  
17 behalf of Alberta Elementary School and their supporting  
18 materials pertaining to the request.

19                  For item 16.05, you have a memo regarding  
20 Boulder Valley School District early college designation  
21 request on behalf of Monarch High School Early College and  
22 their supporting materials pertaining to the request.

23                  For item 17.01, you have a memo regarding  
24 the eligibility requirements for participation in the multi





1 districts online school Title I allocation pilot and  
2 accompanying PowerPoint.

3                   For item 18.01, you have a memo regarding  
4 the administrative procedures for State Board  
5 accountability actions, their accompanying PowerPoint and  
6 the draft 2016 procedures for State Board accountability  
7 actions.

8                   For Thursday, item 3.01, you have a memo  
9 regarding Denver Public Schools annual report regarding  
10 alternative preparation pathways and the MOU granted to  
11 Denver Public Schools.

12                   For Item 3.02, you have a memo regarding  
13 Colorado culturally and linguistically diverse needs and  
14 strategies.

15                   For item 4.01, you have a memo regarding the  
16 accountability for alternative campuses rulemaking hearing,  
17 a redlining clean copy of their rules. The rules are  
18 crosswalk -- the rules the statute crosswalk, comments  
19 we've received in response to written comments document.

20                   For item 5.01, you have a memo regarding the  
21 notice of rulemaking for the turnaround leaders development  
22 program rules accompanying PowerPoint, a redlining clean  
23 copy of the rules and rules to statute crosswalk.



1                   For item 6.01, you have a memo regarding the  
2 waiver of statute and rule -- rulemaking hearing, redlining  
3 clean copy of the rules, and rules to statute crosswalk.

4                   For item 8.01, you have a memo regarding  
5 that Every Student Succeeds Act update, the accompanying  
6 PowerPoint, the ESSA Spoke and Hub Committee report and  
7 updates for effective instruction and leadership. The  
8 Title programs fact sheet and Title programs table.

9                   For items 9.01 and 9.02, you have a memo  
10 regarding the annual inspection and preventative  
11 maintenance of school transportation vehicles, and  
12 operation and maintenance inspection of school  
13 transportation vehicles, rulemaking hearings, for those two  
14 rules to be combined into one, a redline copy, and clean  
15 copy of the rules. The rules to statute crosswalk, comments  
16 we've received, and response to written comments document.  
17 And that concludes my report.

18                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Questions to  
19 Ms. Burdsall? Seeing none. Thank you, Ms. Burdsall.

20                   MS. BURDSALL: Thank you.

21                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We will now proceed to  
22 Commissioner Anthes for your report.

23                   MS. ANTHERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Members  
24 of the Board, good morning. Just wanted to say a few  
25 things and I'll so just let you know that we know you



1 received several materials very recently. And just wanted  
2 to let you know that again, we try not to do that, but so  
3 many things are changing so quickly. We want you to have  
4 the most up to date PowerPoints and information on that.  
5 So again we -- we try not to do that, but apologies for  
6 some of the late materials. And hopefully, as we get  
7 through some of these initial transition times, we can make  
8 sure that that gets back on schedule. Just wanted to give  
9 you a couple updates. These will probably go more in depth  
10 throughout the day, today and tomorrow. But we'll give you  
11 the highlights of what our team has been working very hard  
12 on, just some of the things.

13                   As you know, the preliminary accountability  
14 frameworks went out to districts. And that has been even  
15 more challenging this year just with all of the different  
16 various participation issues that are going forth. And so  
17 we expect more movement this year than ever, from  
18 preliminary to final frameworks. And the staff are working  
19 hard to develop processes and differentiated processes for  
20 districts based on, you know, based on their specific data.  
21 So we are in the process of finalizing and ensuring that  
22 the request to reconsider process is done, and that there's  
23 ways that districts can address their preliminary nature of  
24 the frameworks and get to a final framework that has been a  
25 heavy lift for the team.



1                   As you know, we had our ESSA Hub meeting on  
2 Monday. You will hear more about that. But I think that  
3 was successful. We heard from the Ed Effectiveness Spoke  
4 Committee, as well as the Assessment Spoke Committee and  
5 that Hub -- Hub Committee meeting and many of you were  
6 there. So you know about that and we will get into more  
7 details on that a little bit later. I had the pleasure of  
8 being the emcee and kicking off the Family and School  
9 Partnership in education month. This is -- October is that  
10 month and Dr. Scheffel came to that event, as well as some  
11 of our previous Board members. But this is the fifth  
12 consecutive year that the Governor has proclaimed this  
13 Family and School Partnership month, so the CDE team is  
14 doing a whole bunch of awareness activities around how  
15 important family engagement is in student's lives and how  
16 that increases academic achievement and civic engagement  
17 and all sorts of things.

18                   So we're using the whole month of October to  
19 promote that activity. So that was a fun event here last  
20 week. And then lastly, another good news piece is that we  
21 announced the Colorado Teacher of the Year, the 2017  
22 Teacher of the Year, it was in Chairman Durham's district,  
23 District 11. Sean Wybrant is a career and technical ed  
24 teacher at William J. Palmer High School in Colorado  
25 Springs. And we had a wonderful ceremony, was that



1 yesterday? I think it was yesterday, to support him and we  
2 think he's going to be an amazing representative from  
3 Colorado.

4 He does really creative, energizing things.  
5 And he -- he said he wanted to get into teaching to change  
6 the world. And so I think he's going to be a wonderful  
7 representative for Colorado. And he was very humble and  
8 moved by the announcement. So we were thrilled to do that  
9 piece of good news. The district is very proud of him and  
10 the Principal's very proud of him and all of the students  
11 were cheering and screaming and -- and yelling for him in -  
12 - in a big a -- assembly for the whole school. So -- so  
13 that was wonderful. So with that, I think that's my  
14 report, Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, Dr.  
16 Anthes. Any questions for the Commissioner? Seeing none.  
17 Thank you very much. Let's proceed then to Ms. Jennifer  
18 Mello and the Legislative Update. Ms. Mello, spare us too  
19 many details about the political situation, would you?  
20 (Inaudible).

21 MS. MELLO: I'm I on? I feel like I'm not  
22 on. I'm on. I got a sign that I'm on.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is it -- are you on?  
24 Okay. I think you're just speaking and you get a little  
25 amplification as well as the recording.



1 MS. MELLO: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There you go.

3 MS. MELLO: Oh, there we go. Now, I'm on.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

5 MS. MELLO: Yes. We are in quite a time in  
6 our political process. And as you all are elected  
7 officials, you know even better than I do, you're out there  
8 talking to voters everyday. So I guess, let me just say  
9 thank you for that service because I -- I work with elected  
10 officials all the time and I know it really is a service.  
11 I know that you guys do a lot of hard work and you don't  
12 get paid really, frankly, anything financially to do it and  
13 it does matter for our democracy, particularly where we are  
14 at this point in time. So that's a little bit of my  
15 personal opinion. Thank you for your service. This will  
16 be pretty quick because we're not really at a point in this  
17 cycle where I have a lot of details to talk about  
18 legislation.

19 I do want to make sure that you're aware  
20 that our JBC hearings and briefings have been set. That is  
21 not a schedule that -- we don't get asked about that, we  
22 just get told when those are, and I believe that  
23 information was sent to you. But the briefing which is  
24 when the JBC staff brings information to the Joint Budget  
25 Committee and talks about whatever they want to talk about



1 is scheduled for the 7th of December. The hearing is  
2 scheduled for the 16th of December. The hearing is when  
3 the Board and the Department kind of have a chance to  
4 either respond to the materials brought forward by the  
5 staff or to put whatever on the table that you all want to  
6 put on the table.

7                   We also will have SMART Act hearings  
8 sometime in the November-December time frame. Those have  
9 not been set yet and I don't anticipate we'll have dates on  
10 those until after the election. As you all know, this  
11 Interim Committee on ESSA has been meeting. It held two  
12 meetings in August, they are also not planning to meet  
13 until after the election. They have not publicized when  
14 their additional meeting times will be. So we will have  
15 quite a packed calendar in that mid November to mid  
16 December time frame and we'll obviously, as soon as we have  
17 details about those dates, about -- about the meetings we  
18 don't have yet, we'll get those to you. I do wanna point  
19 out that we have -- I've been working with -- with staff  
20 and it's -- we've had a very proactive outreach to  
21 legislators around the schools whose preliminary ratings  
22 showed them to have been on the clock for five years. Did  
23 I say that right, Elisa?

24                   Elisa and I do a lot of back and forth,  
25 because she says it to me in a very technical way and then



1 I try to say it in a way that I can understand. So she has  
2 to correct me sometimes. But, you know, particularly for  
3 legislators who have schools and districts on that list in  
4 their legislative district, we really wanted to make sure  
5 that we're just communicating clearly and well with them  
6 and giving them information. It's nothing you all haven't  
7 gotten. You all get the information at a much higher level  
8 of detail. It's more things like, "Hey, heads up, these  
9 schools are on the list. Here's the process." We did  
10 those webinars. I believe the materials were sent to you  
11 all.

12 We redistributed those materials when we  
13 sent an e-mail out last week letting legislators know if --  
14 if a school or district in their legislative district was  
15 on the list. So we're just really trying to make sure  
16 legislators understand that there is a statutorily required  
17 process, what that looks like. You know, a lot of them  
18 were not there when that was adopted. A lot of them don't  
19 necessarily serve on the Education Committee, don't spend a  
20 lot of time in the details on these. So it feels  
21 appropriate and like the good role for the department to  
22 just be saying, "Hey, here's the facts, here's what's going  
23 on." So that they can, one, be prepared. They can think  
24 about it. They can talk with their local districts and  
25 they can answer questions from their constituents.





1                                   And then the final thing I thought I would  
2 do is just, we talked last time a little bit about some of  
3 the issues I think may be coming out of this session. And  
4 we talked about early childhood discipline. We talked  
5 about concurrent enrollment, areas I think that there will  
6 be some activity in. What I would add to that list at this  
7 point, is a continuation of kind of a bigger picture  
8 conversation around school finance and equity and school  
9 financing issues. That issue is certainly not going away  
10 and I think we're likely to see continued legislative  
11 attention on those topics. The other thing I would add  
12 that I didn't talk to you all about last time is marijuana  
13 and the issue of, should I? Well, there's candy here but  
14 I'm sure that is not part -- it's look how nicely it's  
15 labeled? Yeah, exactly. So there has been a -- a group of  
16 very active parents who would like to see more education on  
17 marijuana in the schools. They think that the School  
18 Health Professionals Grant Program, which is a program  
19 already administered by the Department, might be a good  
20 vehicle for that.

21                                   So I think they are looking to potentially  
22 bring some sort of legislation or something around that.  
23 They would expand the School Health Professionals Grant  
24 Program, both in terms of the amount of financial resources  
25 going into it and the scope of it. So I think that will be



1 another conversation that -- that will come at us and we'll  
2 -- we'll want to engage with. And then the final thing I  
3 would note is that now is probably a good time, when your  
4 spare time, when you're not out on the election trail to be  
5 thinking about your legislative priorities for the 2017  
6 session. We'll have that discussion in more detail at the  
7 next Board meeting, is my understanding of the plan. And  
8 what I will do is bring to you a document that is kind of  
9 updated just like, again, like a factual basis, right? So  
10 if there's things on there that we took care of last year,  
11 we can take those off. But you all obviously, as the  
12 policymakers, have much more say in the substance of -- of  
13 -- of the direction of that policy. So if you can't sleep  
14 maybe spend a little time looking at the legislative  
15 priorities and we'll have a -- a more discussion about that  
16 coming soon.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Some other  
18 questions for Ms. Mello? Yes, Ms. Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: Do you have a list of those  
20 legislators that have schools or districts in the  
21 turnaround? Do you have that match to those legislators  
22 and could I get a copy for the third CD?

23 MS. MELLO: Chairman Durham, Board Member  
24 Rankin. Yes, absolutely. The staff here -- you guys have



1 really good staff and they were able to -- to do that for  
2 us, to match that up so we can certainly get back to you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have some stuff  
4 by CD. I'm sorry. We have some -- one of the last things  
5 they handed out was by congressional districts, so that one  
6 of the columns -- but the -- the list is not up to date  
7 anymore, right? The list is -- what are -- changing?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean, the documents  
9 we were providing?

10 MS. RANKIN: I have 360 schools and I know  
11 which ones are in that category but I don't know who the  
12 legislator is.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The statewide  
14 legislator. Yeah. Okay. That makes sense.

15 MS. RANKIN: That -- that -- I understand  
16 what you're saying but that wasn't my question, I think.

17 MS. MELLO: That -- that's very easy. I  
18 mean, we already have that together so happy to forward it  
19 to you.

20 MS. RANKIN: One more follow up question,  
21 Ms. Mello. Do you know how many education bills were  
22 actually brought up in the legislature last year? I -- I  
23 know a couple of yours goes like 119 and then how many  
24 passed? I -- I'm just curious and if you don't have at



1 this time, I'm sure it's something that they'd have over  
2 somewhere. Yeah. Go ahead.

3 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member Rankin.  
4 I -- I don't know off the top of my head. I think that  
5 you're right, it's usually around 100. You know, that's a  
6 pretty consistent. Certainly, we can bring -- I can do a  
7 more thorough analysis and bring that to you next time.

8 MS. RANKIN: If that's okay?

9 MS. MELLO: Of course.

10 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Any further  
12 questions for Ms. Mello? Ms. Mello, in terms of time  
13 frame, if the Board does elect to have proactive  
14 legislation, how much time would you need to find sponsors,  
15 and presuming we wanted the bills to move early in the  
16 session, so what -- when would you suggest that we have  
17 specific recommendations for legislation, approved or not  
18 approved by this Board?

19 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, thank you for the  
20 question. Yesterday, would be great. I -- I mean in all  
21 seriousness, I would say that as soon as possible, really.  
22 I mean, we will work with you all and -- and do our --  
23 certainly do our darnedest, whenever you can do that. But  
24 the sooner the better, especially if we want to have it be  
25 early in the legislator's kind of queue of bills that gets



1 introduced. And obviously, we want to make sure we have  
2 the best possible sponsors who understand the issues and  
3 are in -- in a good position to advocate for the bills. So  
4 the sooner you can get me that information, the better.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Any further  
6 questions? Thank you, Ms. Mello. Appreciate it.

7 MS. MELLO: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll now proceed out of  
9 order for the -- for item 10 which would be the park  
10 discussion and I think --

11 MS. RANKIN: We're trying to get Joyce down  
12 here. We texted and --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So why don't we take a --  
14 a couple of minute break 'till Ms. Zurkowski gets -- gets  
15 here. We can do until 10:00, so we -- we have a half hour,  
16 just do not waste it. And so -- so as soon as Joyce might  
17 be available and --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we taking a break?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, we will take a stand  
20 recess for five minutes.

21 (Pause)

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. I order the  
23 Board to come back to order. Ms. Zurkowski, thank you for  
24 accommodating our schedule, and we'll start with --



1 Commissioner, if you'd like to introduce this program, we'd  
2 appreciate it.

3 MS. ANTHES: Sure, Mr. Chair. This is a  
4 sort of PARCC assessment update, per your request from the  
5 last Board meeting, and I'm going to turn it over to Joyce  
6 Zurkowski.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you. Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: All right. So I have a  
10 couple of pieces that are -- more than a couple, pieces of  
11 information that I wanna share with you. Really what I  
12 want to do is give you some background in terms of what our  
13 requirements are from a procurement point of view, and a  
14 timeline for some of our procurement options. I'll talk  
15 briefly about legislative requirements, the assessment  
16 implementation timeline, procurement requirements, ninth  
17 grade procurement considerations, and then I do wanna  
18 briefly mention some of the cross-state PARCC procurements  
19 that are going to be occurring. So in legislation, we have  
20 had a fair amount of conversation about what the  
21 requirements are for our consortium participation. At the  
22 last Board meeting, the Attorney General indicated that we  
23 no longer were required to be part of the governing Board  
24 of a multi-state consortium, but there is a second part of  
25 that legislation that talks about the State Board relying



1 upon assessments developed by the consortium of states, and  
2 that is going to require some additional investigation to  
3 fully understand what does that exactly mean to rely upon  
4 those assessments.

5           In terms of timeline, in 2014-2015, that was  
6 our second administration of our CMAS Science and Social  
7 Studies assessment. It was our first administration of our  
8 CMAS, PARCC, ELA, and Math assessments. Going across that,  
9 at the top row, you can see that we are intending to move  
10 forward with our -- sorry, we move forward with our third  
11 administration in 2015-2016 for Science and Social Studies,  
12 second administration for ELA and Math, and this year will  
13 be our fourth administration of Science and Social Studies,  
14 and our third administration of ELA and Math. You may  
15 recall that when we started to have conversations about  
16 trend, what I indicated was we really needed to have at  
17 least three data points before we could start talking about  
18 trend, and that's the information that we will have at the  
19 end of this administration. So next summer and next fall  
20 for you all. For --

21           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Zurkowski, just for  
22 the audience's benefit, when you see -- say CMAS, you  
23 really are referring to PARCC?

24           MS. ZURKOWSKI: So remember for the Colorado  
25 Measures of Academic Success.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I understand it, yes.  
2 Okay, right.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Two components, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: For that ELA and Math right  
6 now, we are utilizing those PARCC assessments. For 2017-  
7 2018, we are required to have to go through procurement and  
8 have a new contract in place for Science and Social  
9 Studies. That is a requirement, we don't have flexibility  
10 with that. The intent at this point is not to change the  
11 assessment itself, but merely to change the administration  
12 contractor for Science and Social Studies. You'll notice  
13 that for CMAS, ELA, and Math, otherwise known as PARCC, I  
14 have question marks for what will occur in '17-18, and '18-  
15 '9, and '19-20. At the bottom, I did include reference to  
16 the PSAT 10 and the SAT. As you may recall, this past year  
17 was the first administration of the PSAT 10, and this year  
18 will be our first administration of SAT, and you will see  
19 the timeline for that contract will run through '19-'20  
20 with a new contract in place in 2021.

21 What is important for us to keep in mind  
22 with our assessments, in addition to what our procurement  
23 requirements are and our timeline requirements for  
24 procurement, is what is actually occurring with our  
25 standards. And so you will notice that I have indicated





1 that you all will be adopting revised standards in July or  
2 by July of 2018. Those standards will be in full  
3 implementation in school year 2020-2021. Obviously,  
4 depending on how significantly those standards are revised,  
5 we are going to make adjustments to our assessments  
6 accordingly. Assessments always follow the standards. So  
7 you will see that I have indicated for 2021, that we will  
8 need to have revised Science and Social Studies  
9 assessments, revised ELA and Math assessments. Again, the  
10 extent to that revision will be dependent upon how much the  
11 standard themselves have changed.

12                   So again, in terms of our required  
13 procurements, we are required to go out this year for  
14 Science and Social Studies, and there is an expectation  
15 that we will have a new contract in place for school year  
16 '17-'18. Question is, how do we address ELA and Math? We  
17 have a couple of different options. Option A is that we  
18 could move forward with procurement for ELA and Math at the  
19 same time that we move forward with procurement for Science  
20 and Social Studies. Even with that, we could choose to  
21 move forward with actual implementation on two different  
22 schedules. We could choose to transfer the contractor in  
23 '17-'18 or we could choose to maintain our current  
24 contractor in '17-'18 and move to a new administration  
25 contractor in '18-'19. Option B is that we would actually



1 procure the ELA and Math assessments next year separate  
2 from the Science and Social Studies assessments, and then  
3 we would have implementation in '18-'19. Another decision  
4 to be made is whether or not we would want to move forward  
5 with that procurement with the other PARCC states or  
6 whether we would want to move forward with a Colorado-only  
7 procurement.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores?

9 MS. FLORES: So who are the states that are  
10 on the consortium right now with us?

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So currently we have DC,  
12 which is not a state. We have Maryland, we have New  
13 Jersey, we have Rhode Island, we have Illinois, we have us,  
14 and we have New Mexico.

15 MS. FLORES: And the Department of Defense?

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And in terms of other  
17 entities that are utilizing the assessments, we do have the  
18 Department of Defense, and then Massachusetts and Louisiana  
19 are leveraging assessment content from the consortium.

20 MS. FLORES: So how -- how many total?

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there are six states plus  
22 DC, plus Massachusetts, Louisiana, and the Department of  
23 Defense.

24 MS. FLORES: Possibly?

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: No. They -- they are.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: They're using PARCC? They  
2 -- Massachusetts, Louisiana use the part of the test?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Is that what you meant? You  
5 said something about they -- they -- they are leveraging --

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: They are leveraging the  
7 assessment content from the PARCC consortium. So  
8 Massachusetts is moving forward with a -- I believe they're  
9 calling it MCAS 2.0, and a portion of that assessment  
10 includes PARCC items, a portion of that assessment is  
11 unique to Massachusetts. Louisiana also has approximately  
12 50 percent of their test that is utilizing PARCC content,  
13 and approximately 50 percent of their test is Louisiana-  
14 specific.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Zurkowski, when -- the  
16 whole idea of consortiums came up initially when -- when  
17 the idea was you'd have a number of states that have broad  
18 opportunities to compare among states and regions perhaps  
19 given the dwindling participation in PARCC. Is it safe to  
20 say that that particular objective is not as well met as  
21 was intended?

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, so I think there  
23 were several different objectives, and yes, one of them was  
24 in order to be able to have cross-state comparisons with a  
25 little bit more information for schools and districts than



1 what we got under (inaudible). With some of the shifts  
2 that have occurred, the reduction in the number of states  
3 who are participating, our ability to do those cross-state  
4 comparisons have been reduced. In terms of being able to  
5 leverage the resources of a multitude of states, that still  
6 does exist, right? We do get some benefit from being able  
7 to not have to develop all of those assessments completely  
8 on our own and utilize resources from Maryland and New  
9 Jersey and Illinois. But in terms of the comparison, it is  
10 more challenging.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin?

14 MS. RANKIN: If we mirrored what Louisiana  
15 and Massachusetts do, do they take the same part of the  
16 PARCC, or is it different, or do we create some Colorado  
17 assessments and then we have to see if the Feds approve  
18 that? How does that work?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So again, as PARCC has been  
22 evolving the conception of how the content would be  
23 utilized is also evolving. So although originally the  
24 intent was that all states would utilize the exact same  
25 forms of the assessment, that no longer is occurring. So



1 as we look at what Massachusetts has done, again, they have  
2 taken -- sorry, they have taken PARCC content and  
3 incorporated into a test that also has Massachusetts-  
4 specific content. Could Colorado move in that direction?  
5 Theoretically, we absolutely could. We would need to  
6 investigate what fiscally that would require, as well as  
7 what additional resources. You are providing a great  
8 little segue for me to talk about what's on this next  
9 slide.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: This doesn't have anything  
12 to do with the Feds?

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So in terms of -- and I  
14 apologize, so in terms of --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: But Joyce, you said  
16 something about the Feds, and I couldn't figure out what  
17 you meant.

18 MS. RANKIN: I think they have to approve  
19 ours.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So typically, the way states  
21 maintain control of their assessment system, they implement  
22 that assessment system, and they -- then they submit that  
23 assessment system to the Department of Education to go  
24 through peer review for approval. There may be some back  
25 and forth in terms of that and the state may need to make



1 some revisions to their assessment, but there is nothing  
2 precluding Colorado from a federal point of view to say we  
3 want to move in a different direction. That is a Colorado  
4 decision. Thank you for making sure that I hit that.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is Colorado decision  
6 subject to disapproval by the United States Department of  
7 Education?

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It is subject to the peer  
9 review by the Federal Department of Education. At which  
10 point, yes, we could get fully approved, we could get  
11 partially approved with, "Please, you might want to  
12 consider this," we could get the, "You need to make some  
13 changes and these are the changes you need to make." Yes,  
14 there are definitely some -- I did not mean to indicate  
15 that there were not federal requirements. I am saying that  
16 there is not a federal requirement that says that we must  
17 remain a Member of the PARCC consortium. Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then the other hurdle is  
20 this issue of rely upon assessments developed by the  
21 consortium of states. Do we need a legislation to negate  
22 that language?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Do you want to take that?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll be interested to  
2 hear about that.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So I -- I -- I believe what  
4 the Attorney General's Office indicated that last time we  
5 met, was that we needed to do some more investigation in  
6 terms of what that language means. It is unclear at this  
7 point what that means to rely upon, right? It -- it does  
8 not say must administer complete test of, it says rely  
9 upon. So I think there is some room for conversation to  
10 explore what flexibility we have within the legislation to  
11 completely remove any tie at all. The cleanest way would  
12 do it would be perhaps to execute legislation.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

14 MS. FLORES: I mean, excuse me. Let me just  
15 -- rely upon these assessments. Rely upon these  
16 assessments, assessments. That could be -- I barely wake  
17 up, lots of assessments. That assessment has not been?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, so that portion  
19 of the legislation is referring to the assessments that  
20 were developed by the multi-state consortium. So if you  
21 look at the full legislation, you can see the connection  
22 between those two.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

24 MS. FLORES: Did you say that?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I'm just trying to figure  
2 out --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I would just  
5 dictate if -- if we're looking at it and if we could do  
6 that now, what we would do is look at the legislative  
7 history. Because I'll tell you, by looking at that  
8 language, it strikes me that the intention there and I'd,  
9 you know, I'd -- I'd be comfortable with in any of it.  
10 Colorado is not gonna go along in a very specific  
11 commitment and going to participate in any consortium and  
12 to say we're not gonna develop our own assessment. And if  
13 we -- and after that time, we still need to draw a Colorado  
14 assessment -- I mean, that's how I read it now. But  
15 certainly, the cleanest path, as Joyce mentions, is always  
16 to get some legislative blossom to a different path.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: But it seems that we have to  
19 make a decision before that could happen. So then the  
20 question is if we were to move forward and not be a part of  
21 the consortium and use PARCC, what -- what are the  
22 consequences of that?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I read the statutes  
24 forbidding exactly that. But asking us to do all, the  
25 PARCC assessment that's been created by the consortium and





1 anything will be moving forward. But the edges of what  
2 that looks like are sort of everybody's guess.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Zurkowski.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: If I may, I would like to go  
6 through few of the options. By no means, do I want to  
7 indicate that this is necessarily contains all of our  
8 options, but I think it has -- hits on a couple of  
9 different pathways that we potentially could go forward  
10 with. The first is moving forward as potentially a Member  
11 of the consortium or not a Member of the consortium but  
12 utilizing the assessment as it is, right? It would be the  
13 same form of the assessment that other PARCC states are  
14 utilizing, and that's what you see in that first row. And  
15 you would see that in '17-'18, we would have the fourth  
16 administration.

17 In '18-'19, we would have the fifth  
18 administration with a new contract. In '19-'20, the sixth  
19 administration, and then notice in 2020-2021, I am still  
20 indicating that we probably are going to need to have a  
21 revised assessment. And again, the extent to that  
22 revision, we won't know until we have the standards that  
23 are adopted by this Board. Working backwards in order to  
24 have a revised assessment in 2021, we would need to be  
25 field testing items no later than '19-'20, and we would



1 need to be developing those items no later than '18-'19.  
2 So that is our first row, which is basically moving forward  
3 with the ELA and Math assessments that we are currently  
4 giving, intending to have a revised assessment in 2021.

5 The second option --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Let me just say what I think  
9 I heard you say.

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: In 2018, the Board adopts  
12 any revisions to the standards. Immediately to the extent  
13 there are changes, you'll be developing some new questions.  
14 And the field testing in the next year means that you pop  
15 those into the assessment but don't grade them, and you  
16 look at how they were answered in any kind of feedback, one  
17 way or the other, in order to verify that they're good.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I guess with -- I just wanna  
21 clarify that. When we would look at '19-'20, we would have  
22 a couple of different options in terms of how we wanted to  
23 do that field testing. One way is to incorporate those  
24 items right into our operational assessment. And as you  
25 indicated, they would not be scored for purposes of



1 inclusion in that year's score for the students. That  
2 really is essentially an opportunity for us to review the  
3 items and make sure that they are functioning the way we  
4 expect them to function, and to ensure that there is not  
5 any bias or sensitivity issues that we may have missed  
6 during the developmental process.

7                   Then those items, after having been field  
8 tested, we would review them again from a second metric  
9 perspective. And if there are any indications again of  
10 that bias sensitivity issue, we would look more closely at  
11 those items. They are then ready for use in 2021. That  
12 field testing, as I indicated, could be embedded within the  
13 actual operational assessment or we can move forward with a  
14 model that we did with Science and Social Studies, which  
15 was we had a standalone field test. There are advantages  
16 and disadvantages to both of those approaches. But in '19-  
17 '20, the items would be tried out and not counted for  
18 scores that are utilized for the student or for  
19 accountability.

20                   MS. SCHROEDER: So the bell that's going off  
21 in my head is when you're talking about a separate field  
22 test, that you've got some kids that you're gonna be  
23 testing twice that year. So talk to me about what are the  
24 advantages and disadvantages.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So again, a part of it is a  
2 logistical issue, part of it is also a frankly we don't  
3 necessarily need to have all students in the state  
4 participate in the field test. So you may remember that  
5 when we went through the Science and Social Studies field  
6 testing, basically what we did is we put out an all call  
7 and said, "Are you interested in field testing?" And at  
8 that point in time, there are enough Colorado schools and  
9 districts who are willing to participate that we could get  
10 representative information --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- and we didn't have to do  
13 any forced recruiting.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So we didn't have to force  
15 anybody to participate? I think that's we're --

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Not in those standalone  
17 field tests when we move forward. Again, that was a  
18 different time, right? Because that was the first time we  
19 are moving forward with online assessments. So there was a  
20 lot of interest and a lot of intrigue in terms of how is  
21 this going to work, what will this look like, how will our  
22 students react, how will our adults react. Moving forward,  
23 we're not gonna have that kind of a shift or as drastic of  
24 a shift. I do believe that there would still be some  
25 schools and districts that would be interested in what does



1 that potentially a new system look like, how our students  
2 reacting potentially, but we're in a different spot than we  
3 were back in 2013.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, and you may getting to  
8 this. I apologize. But I guess as we look at this and  
9 figure out the path forward, can we reflect on what people,  
10 teachers, parents, students, other professionals are saying  
11 about PARCC, you know? I mean, some things I hear, "We  
12 don't get timely data. It's a very language-dense test."  
13 Students who are fully English proficient largely close the  
14 achievement gap at least to a great extent. And so I mean,  
15 I guess I don't want to get lost in all the noise before we  
16 say, "Why don't people like this test?" And some people  
17 might like it. But I -- I talked to a lot of  
18 superintendents, and teachers, and parents, and students  
19 who have issues with it. So as we reflect on what's the  
20 path forward, can we use that lens and maybe hear from  
21 others about what are people in your -- your constituents  
22 saying about this test?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So absolutely, I think  
2 before we would want to move forward with a procurement, we  
3 want to review, first of all, the information that we  
4 already have. And I think most of us could look at each  
5 other and say, "Who has heard that perhaps the PARCC  
6 assessments are too long?" I -- I'm not sure we need to do  
7 a lot of delving into that issue, right? There is a  
8 general perception that the assessments are long. Is there  
9 a way for us to shorten those assessments while still  
10 ensuring, right? The second metric integrity of the  
11 assessment is still able to provide the necessary data to  
12 the schools and districts. So I -- I think we already know  
13 that length is a target for us. Timeliness of results, as  
14 we have talked about before, there are a couple of  
15 different issues with the timeliness of results. Colorado,  
16 long term, has had a commitment to those constructed  
17 response items, right? Where students write their answers.  
18 That has been a Colorado value, historically, going all the  
19 way back to the inception of CSAP, it is embedded within  
20 our law as well, that will always take longer to score than  
21 a straight multiple choice test.

22 I think within a procurement, however, there  
23 are ways for us to talk about, long term, how can we  
24 shorten that reporting time? Are there ways for us to get  
25 information out to schools and districts more quickly?



1 This past year, we started and piloted utilizing rolling  
2 files so that as tests were scored, they were made  
3 available to schools and districts before necessarily all  
4 of the data was available, right? So for -- as an example,  
5 we knew that for our integrated assessments, because we  
6 have relatively few students who participate in the  
7 integrated pathway at high school, both in Colorado and the  
8 consortium, that that was gonna be a set of assessments  
9 that were scored later in the process, and they went  
10 through all that second metric work later in the process.

11 But we said we won't hold up the three  
12 through eight Math assessments. For that, we'll get those  
13 out earlier to schools and districts. We heard from some  
14 schools and districts that they really liked that, we heard  
15 from other schools and districts that it was confusing. So  
16 again, as we try to figure out how to be more flexible and  
17 get information to the hands of folks earlier, we need to  
18 also make sure that we're being very clear about what it is  
19 that they have in their hands, and we're not adding  
20 increased confusion to the field. The other piece for this  
21 year as well was that we knew that the online assessments  
22 would be ready before the paper-based assessments would.

23 Again, the paper-based assessments were  
24 going to take longer to score, there was more processing  
25 time, there are some things that the consortium is doing



1 this year to reduce that. We do expect that we will be  
2 able to beat this year's reporting timeline next year, and  
3 that's always a strong goal for us, is to shorten that  
4 timeline. In terms of your third point, which referred to  
5 language load, keep in mind that there are a number of  
6 Colorado educators who participate in item review. Moving  
7 to our own assessment, it is true that all items would be  
8 reviewed by Colorado educators, and so you may believe that  
9 it is a better reflection of Colorado values, as well as  
10 making sure that we are looking closely at language load  
11 and we are not introducing unnecessary confusion to the  
12 students. I do believe -- sorry, when you were reviewing  
13 some of our other assessments, you had a better reaction.

14 MS. FLORES: But that wasn't the question,  
15 though.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Will we -- will we --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Dr. Scheffel,  
18 please proceed.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Will we get like a list of --  
20 of other tests that would meet a threshold of acceptability  
21 where we could really put them side by side and compare and  
22 contrast?

23 MS. FLORES: Right now?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Maybe that's -- I don't see  
25 it in the PowerPoint, but maybe that's coming.





1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there are relatively few  
4 off-the-shelf tests that are available that would meet the  
5 requirements of the state and federal law. I would expect  
6 that we would want to move forward with a procurement that  
7 would perhaps allow that as an option, and we're gonna get  
8 to that on row number 3 here. Or we may say that, "You  
9 know what? Colorado is really interested in having a  
10 unique to Colorado test that is thoroughly reflective of  
11 Colorado expectations and is developed completely by  
12 Colorado educators." That would be a procurement process,  
13 though. I do not believe that there is a way for this  
14 Board to dictate outside of a procurement process that we  
15 must select a particular test. Can I --

16 MS. RANKIN: Can you tell us those tests?  
17 Can you tell us any of those assessments that would meet?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So I will tell you that  
19 assessments that would --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Maybe next week you can tell  
21 us, right? You can tell us next week.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Zurkowski.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there are a couple of  
25 assessments that do exist, that I believe vendors would



1 want to put before us, and you have probably heard of some  
2 of those, right? ACT Aspire. I will share with you as I  
3 have shared with ACT that I am concerned about alignment,  
4 and we would want to look very carefully at alignment with  
5 ACT Aspire. There is also -- and I don't know whether you  
6 would consider Smarter Balanced than off-the-shelf test or  
7 not, but there is the Smarter Balanced test that exists.  
8 There is also an assessment that Maine is utilizing that is  
9 going to, I believe, be considered an off-the-shelf  
10 assessment, which could be an option for us. Other  
11 assessments that have been mentioned --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's it called?

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- I -- I'm not sure. I can  
14 look for you to see what it is that Maine calls that  
15 assessment. For some other assessments I have heard, this  
16 group mentioned or I've heard in other spots, and we talked  
17 about this last month, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. At  
18 this point, there's not a strong indicator that that is a  
19 well-aligned assessment. At this point, again, those are  
20 some of the assessments that perhaps could be off-the-shelf  
21 that we can talk about a little bit when we go to CMAS  
22 option three. Are you okay with me talking about the  
23 option two because I think we're getting --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you want to --

25 MS. GOFF: We have some questions.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you wanna go ahead and  
2 follow-up?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I said we will --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, we will.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Sorry. Go ahead, Jane.

6 MS. GOFF: I'm gonna go back to that  
7 timeline a bit.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mm-hmm.

9 MS. GOFF: If we, let's say, we change  
10 tests, and we want to do a field test, and we want to do  
11 all of the validation and the stuff those people at the  
12 other end of the table are expert about -- talking about,  
13 and we have -- we will have new -- in the sense, even if  
14 they don't change one letter, we have a new cycle of  
15 standards. So what is the first year that -- that the real  
16 -- the operational test, the real test, the real first year  
17 of standards implementation and the real first year that  
18 graduation requirements are needing to be met? How does  
19 all of that line up?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Zurkowski?

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So -- Mr. Chair. So when we  
22 look at that first row, I'm going to point to you to the  
23 year 2020-2021, and that would be the first year that we  
24 would have an assessment that would be aligned to the  
25 revised standards that you all are expected to adopt in



1 July of 2018. Again, how significantly different that  
2 needs to be is to be determined. So that is that 2020-2021  
3 --

4 MS. GOFF: So that sets --

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- school year.

6 MS. GOFF: -- full school year plus a month  
7 or two after the standards have been adopted?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: It is two years after the  
9 standards have been adopted.

10 MS. GOFF: So there's a two-year period of  
11 time in there when -- when the new standards, whatever they  
12 may be, are being implemented, planned for, professionally  
13 developed, implemented. So then, we have students that  
14 will be under a new set of graduation, our guidelines  
15 district requirements, ending in '21. So the -- the  
16 graduation determination for each individual student has to  
17 be made by '21. So they will have been having to fulfill  
18 those -- I'm sorry to be really repetitive and redundant,  
19 but I'm -- I'm concerned about trying to do all of this at  
20 the same time, amidst some other rather large projects we  
21 have going on, and trying to solicit for this. We have a  
22 lot of things going on here. I'm just -- I'm just want to  
23 encourage everybody to be very cognizant of the fact that  
24 if this doesn't line up, and doesn't make sense, and  
25 becomes another confusing mess to people out in school



1 districts, we've got -- we've got to keep this in mind.  
2 And that's -- that's where I'm going to go with this today.  
3 I'm not prepared to discuss other propositions for other  
4 contractors or other exams. I'm just concerned that we  
5 don't take this conversation in some logical steps. And I  
6 think I, it's my opinion, our first concern should be where  
7 do we have time -- when do we need to do each part of this.  
8 That's all I have say.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So and I know you're trying  
11 to present some positives for the interruptions, but it  
12 would be great to have a list of what other states are  
13 entertaining since there's only seven states left in PARCC,  
14 and two that are I guess leveraging the content. It'd be  
15 great to see a list of what other states are doing. Some  
16 obviously are doing Smarter Balanced, others are doing  
17 other tests. So that would help us think through options,  
18 and then I think we have to define alignment, you know? I  
19 think you referred to that, Jane, how do we identify and  
20 determine alignment. There's several ways of doing it.  
21 And then my final -- my final comment would be, I'd love to  
22 see how this paper and pencil option relates to students  
23 taking it all online and which tests allow the paper-pencil  
24 option, which tests don't, and all of that, and maybe  
25 looking at the data. I mean, as far as how students in



1 Colorado did based on how they took the test because that  
2 would help us, going forward, determine what's working,  
3 what's not working.

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Just in terms of the paper  
7 option versus online option, keep in mind that Colorado  
8 legislation requires us to have a paper option for any  
9 tests that we do have online. So that is obviously a  
10 requirement that we would have to include in any  
11 procurement that we did. Legislatively, we're required to  
12 do that, anyway.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have -- I've never  
14 seen the data as far as how does that work for students.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

16 MS. FLORES: One of the issues I think that  
17 people --

18 MS. BURDSALL: Microphone.

19 MS. FLORES: -- parents in my area are  
20 concerned about are knowledge, you know? They -- they just  
21 don't think that this test is filled with knowledge, and in  
22 fact I've thought about it. And it -- and looking at the  
23 test, having looked at the tests, I think in Bloom's  
24 taxonomy, it would go up to analysis and judgment, and --  
25 and that's really important for kids to do analysis and



1 judgment, of course. But, you know, we need some of the --  
2 the lower skills for kids to -- to know, and I think --  
3 especially at the elementary, middle -- middle area, middle  
4 school, and such, I think we need more knowledge type  
5 questions and such because that's something that's really  
6 missing. And certainly, I think that, again, I -- I'm not  
7 putting down analysis and judgment, certainly we need  
8 those. But I think for our lower, elementary, middle  
9 school, they need to think about something. They need to  
10 make judgments about something and analyze things. So I --  
11 I think this test is really missing in those areas and --  
12 and we could do better.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead, Ms. Zurkowski,  
14 you wanna recede back to the -- your outline, please.  
15 Thank you.

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So as  
17 we look at option number 2, and again, I had the historical  
18 information, what I have for you is looking at '17-'18, the  
19 question is, do we move forward with a new contract, do we  
20 not? But more importantly, what you see there is I put  
21 abbreviated. Actually, I have an abbreviation for  
22 abbreviate, ABV. I -- is there a way for us to move  
23 forward with a shorter test, potentially as soon as the  
24 '17-'18 school year? Is that a strong priority for us? If  
25 it is, we perhaps want to think about that this point, then



1 we could move forward with that abbreviated or shorter test  
2 in '18-'19 and '19-'20. And then again, what I have in  
3 that '20-'21 school year is we're going to have to have a  
4 revised test based on those revised standards.

5           And again, how significantly that test is  
6 revised, will depend upon the standards, and frankly, this  
7 timeline, I assume is that the standards are not suddenly  
8 something completely new, completely different. Because if  
9 they are completely new, completely different, different  
10 than anybody has seen before, folks are gonna need more  
11 time to actually implement those, and I'm kind of crossing  
12 a line here. I hope Melissa doesn't mind. So keep that in  
13 mind. But with that second option, similar to what we had  
14 with the first option is, I think our goal would be is to  
15 even though we are shortening that test, we want to make  
16 sure that we can still talk about it in a comparable way to  
17 our current test. That may be relevant -- well, I would  
18 suggest it is relevant as I look to the person to my right,  
19 from an accountability point of view, right? To be able to  
20 say that we have a certain level of comparison is important  
21 for our accountability system, it may become very relevant  
22 to your conversations that you have about some of our  
23 schools and districts and some of their ratings.

24           Similar to what we did with TCAP, that's  
25 what I would be looking at, right? We made some





1 adjustments to CSAP with those new standards. We came up  
2 with TCAP, but we were able to still say that we had enough  
3 comparability to move forward with accountability. That's  
4 what that second row says. That fourth administration,  
5 although that it is a shorter test, our goal would to -- be  
6 to make sure that it is similar enough that we can still  
7 compare it to the other three years. So when you look at  
8 that second row, we would essentially have six years of  
9 comparable data to rely upon for our schools and our  
10 districts. Notice I still have within that option that we  
11 would start development -- new development no later than  
12 '18-'19, with field testing in '19-'20, with that revised  
13 test in 2020-2021.

14                   The last option, and we've had some  
15 conversation about off-the-shelf kinds of options, has us  
16 moving to an off-the-shelf product in '17-'18. Under a new  
17 contract, we would utilize that assessment in '18-'19 and  
18 '19-'20. We would still probably want to start doing our  
19 own development in '18 -- no later than '18-'19 with field  
20 testing in '19-'20, targeting that 2020-2021 with a  
21 potentially revised assessment. Again, all depending upon  
22 how much those standards look different than what we  
23 currently have. Challenge with that last option is that we  
24 essentially would have three years of data under our  
25 current CMAS, PARCC, ELA, and Math. We would have a stop,



1 we would be starting with a new set of data in 2017-2018,  
2 have three years of data, have a stop, and then potentially  
3 have a new set of data starting in 2020-2021. While I am  
4 very sensitive to some of the concerns about the length of  
5 test and are there things that we can do to revise the  
6 test, that many stops and starts --

7 MS. FLORES: And content knowledge.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- could be problematic for  
9 our schools and districts and could cause you some  
10 challenges, as well. So I just need to put that out there  
11 in terms of that third option. I did want to talk a little  
12 bit about ninth grade and procurement considerations. We -  
13 - at our August Board meeting I believe it was, I shared  
14 with you some participation data comparing 2015 to 2016 and  
15 even prior years. And we know that starting in 2015, we  
16 saw a significant increase in the rate of our parent  
17 excusals, a significant decrease in our participation with  
18 our high school students. Last year, in tenth grade,  
19 rather than giving the CMAS, PARCC, ELA, Math assessments,  
20 we made that transition to PSAT 10 and we saw participation  
21 go from about 62 percent to about 88 percent. So we got  
22 closer to 90 percent, about 25 percentage points increase.

23 We are wondering whether or not there is  
24 something that we can learn from that tenth grade  
25 experience because we know that we still have a significant



1 participation issue with our ninth graders. We're still  
2 sitting at about 73 percent participation. What we are  
3 hearing from the field is that they would like for us to  
4 consider the possibility of, yes, they strongly believe  
5 that our assessment must be aligned to our Colorado  
6 academic standards, but they would like an assessment that  
7 is more clearly connected to the college entrance exam in  
8 terms of the content, the formatting, and the scores. They  
9 would like to be able to have a single administration of  
10 the assessment, and they would like for us to consider  
11 deeply testing time. And is there a way for us to reduce  
12 our testing time in high school, given some of the other  
13 experiences that our students are engaged in? I want to  
14 talk a little bit about that single administration.

15           When we first started to have conversations  
16 about the possibilities of moving to PARCC versus moving to  
17 smarter balance, one of the advantages that folks saw was  
18 that the PARCC system has six different end of course  
19 Mathematics tests to utilize in high school. And the  
20 thought was wouldn't this be a great way to have a better  
21 stronger connection between instruction and the assessment.  
22 As we have moved forward with actual implementation, having  
23 six different high school assessments, as possible  
24 assessments in sixth grade, has been a challenge for folks  
25 to actually implement. And so what we are hearing now is,



1 is there a way we could have a single administration and  
2 all of my ninth graders could take the same Math test? So  
3 again, under CSAP days, it was a single test, folks weren't  
4 liking that. They wanted options, they wanted choice, they  
5 wanted a clear connection to instruction. They are getting  
6 that with the CMAS PARCC assessments. It's a challenge for  
7 them. They are now requesting some folks that we go back  
8 to a single administration, single task for students.

9                   And also with the single administration,  
10 they are wondering whether we can go to a single day  
11 administration with those assessments. So as we are  
12 considering how to move forward with all of our  
13 procurements, I think one of the things that we wanna  
14 consider is, do we move forward with ninth grade under a  
15 different route? Then we move forward with three through  
16 eight while still making sure that we have connection  
17 between our high school assessments, but we are also able  
18 to draw a clear connection between our three through eight  
19 system and our ninth through 11th grade system. And I  
20 think we can make that a requirement of any procurement  
21 that we put out there. That would allow for accountability  
22 to do some analysis in terms of whether or not we could go  
23 forward with a growth metric.

24                   Again, if we can move forward and ensure  
25 that everything is connected to the Colorado academic



1 standards, I think that we would probably be pretty  
2 successful with English Language Arts, especially. With  
3 Mathematics, we already have a challenge with growth for a  
4 number of our kids because we have the six different high  
5 school math tests that are available for our ninth graders.  
6 So should there be an issue with math? I would suggest we  
7 have some challenge already. I actually think it might be  
8 easier for us to develop a growth model. Again, I'm making  
9 a list, I'm very nervous here, and so I want to put it out  
10 there that of course accountability would need to  
11 thoroughly analyze this and research this, but I do think  
12 that there is a way for us to draw a connection between our  
13 three through eight system and a 9 through 11 system that  
14 would adjust our ninth grade assessment.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Final questions,  
16 concluding questions for Ms. Zurkowski? Just start down  
17 the line and just go in order. Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So in terms of when this  
19 decision has to be made and we're looking at what -- when?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: When is our current contract  
22 with PARCC end?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So we do have  
24 the option of extending our current contract for the ELA  
25 and Math assessments for an additional year, if that's what



1 we wanted to do. So for additional years, so it would take  
2 us -- we could extend our current contract --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Be through '18?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- through '18.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: But our current contract  
6 ends when? If we don't extend it?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: After this -- after the  
8 test this spring in '17.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So I mean, this decision has  
10 to be made in May '17; is that right?

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So if we are  
12 looking to have a different assessment in place in May of  
13 '18, we need to make that decision very, very soon.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Like in the next month? Two  
15 months?

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: We would want to be moving  
17 forward with our procurement within the next month or two.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So let's say December '16,  
19 is that what you're thinking?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: No later than that. And  
21 that gives me a little bit of an ulcer to wait that long.  
22 Again, if there's -- we can also try to write our RFP in  
23 such a way that it gives us some flexibility in terms of  
24 whether or not we choose to --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So can I just follow up  
2 then?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah. I just want to --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So it sounds like that we  
5 really need to -- if we're going to make any changes, we're  
6 really in a box. We just have to keep doing what we're  
7 doing, right? Unless we really get on it in the next  
8 month, is that what you're thinking?

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, I believe that  
10 Colorado needs to have some direction for their procurement  
11 within the next month.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: So it would be great then to  
13 make that decision if we had comparative data. This is a  
14 helpful slide, but what would be great would be to look at  
15 what other states are doing, what assessments meet the  
16 threshold of acceptability, how long they are, I mean, you  
17 know, the things that we've been hearing about PARCC,  
18 length, timeliness, screen time, privacy issues, you know?  
19 There's about six issues that I hear repeatedly on PARCC.  
20 So I guess what I'd like to see is what are other states  
21 doing to address those issues because many of the states  
22 have this -- have the same issues that we do.

23 And so I think we need that information  
24 right away including the cost. And then if we were to also  
25 add end of course assessments, again cost. So then, the



1 final issue is the alignment piece. I'm not convinced that  
2 PARCC is well-aligned with our standards as I look at the  
3 validity data and the content validity of the tests aligned  
4 with the content of the standards. So I have three issues.  
5 And I think for us to make a decision in the next month, we  
6 need quickly information that is comparative across states,  
7 tests that meet the threshold of acceptability, and address  
8 the six or so issues that we repeatedly hear about PARCC.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

10 MS. FLORES: You know, I think we're kind of  
11 thinking too much about accountability -- about  
12 accountability, and of course that's important, but we  
13 should really think of different things. And I know some  
14 of my colleagues, Angelika, doesn't like me going outside  
15 the -- thinking this is weird, but we should really be  
16 thinking about this whole thing of growth versus great --  
17 where the kids are at great level. If we thought -- if we  
18 had to have kids at grade level, I think we would do much  
19 better. And again, this has to do with accountability and  
20 all these 20 years of reform. Let's think grade level. I  
21 think we could get more kids at grade level as opposed to  
22 thinking about all this growth and whether we should shut  
23 down schools.

24 If we just really just started thinking, not  
25 reform ideas because this is just on reform ideas. But





1 thinking about grade level -- let's get kids to grade  
2 level. And again, that means we need to think about  
3 content. Again, I'll say it again, knowledge, content.  
4 It's very important. People need to think about -- they  
5 need to think about things. These content skills and such  
6 that they need before they can go into being able to make -  
7 - analyze and make judgments and think. We need to think  
8 about school changing possibly to year round, especially  
9 for many of our minority kids. And there's a lot of  
10 research that has shown that for minority kids, who are  
11 poor, kids that are poor minority, would do better if they  
12 had a year round type of system. If we change high school  
13 in -- we need to start thinking about different ways of,  
14 you know, giving that content-based and doing all those  
15 skills that kids need to -- need to know.

16 We need to start thinking about it  
17 differently. And I think this business about whether they  
18 have growth -- look at Denver. Denver's going at 0.001.  
19 Their growth, yeah, but they'll never get there in a  
20 thousand years. Maybe they'll get to grade level, where  
21 everybody has. And I don't think that 67 percent -- 67.7  
22 percent graduation rate is right for Denver. And they only  
23 have 4.7 percent that are -- that, you know, where did the  
24 other 30 percent of the kids go? If they have a dropout  
25 rate of 4.7 and only graduate 67 percent, you know? I



1 mean, it doesn't make sense. We need to start thinking  
2 about important things. Getting kids at grade level,  
3 that's what we need to do as opposed to thinking all these  
4 other reform ideas that have really taken us off course for  
5 most kids. And most kids in my district are minority kids  
6 -- minority kids, poor kids. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Flores.  
8 Final question, Ms. Mazanec? Anything? Ms. Rankin?

9 MS. RANKIN: No.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff?

11 MS. GOFF: No.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Joyce?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, I'm sorry.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry. Did you --  
15 pardon me if I --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: This last page of this is  
18 interesting. Did you need a couple minutes to try to talk  
19 about this? Because if one or the other of these, the  
20 timeline comes in here and whatever we're talking about  
21 doing something in the next month doesn't seem to jive with  
22 this. So I would like to hear a little bit about it.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So last slide. On the last  
2 side, I do reference two different RFPs that will be coming  
3 out of the PARCC states as a collective. The first RFP is  
4 expected to be released, yet this calendar year, and it  
5 really addresses a revised structure for the consortium.  
6 The second RFP deals with the administration contractor for  
7 implementation in school year '18-'19, and that will  
8 probably be coming out at some point during this fiscal  
9 year. So again, as we're thinking about timelines, you  
10 know, we got to be kind of ahead of the game here with our  
11 procurements. I indirectly referenced that a second RFP  
12 and option B as one possibility that says that we would  
13 procure our ELA and Math separately from Science and Social  
14 Studies and we would do that for implementation in '18-'19.

15 We could do that with PARCC state so we  
16 could essentially say that RFP number 2, "We're signing up  
17 for that RFP number 2," or under option B we could say,  
18 "We're not signing up for that RFP number 2 that would move  
19 us forward with a shared contractor with other PARCC  
20 states. We would instead move forward with an RFP and a  
21 contractor that could be unique to Colorado." Timeline is  
22 challenging. There are a lot of balls in the air.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just let me interrupt.  
24 Just one question. I presume that we will not agree with  
25 PARCC to anything that removes any of our legal options or



1 conflicts with our own procurement requirements and there  
2 is someone watching the store on that to make sure that  
3 that doesn't happen and if our only option is withdraw from  
4 PARCC to avoid that eventuality, that'll be brought for the  
5 Board for them to act on. Is that -- Dr. Anthes, is that -  
6 - since you are our representative there, that should --  
7 that should -- should PARCC put something out that would in  
8 any way tie our hands or tie the legislature's hands in  
9 dealing with these issues, our only option if they make  
10 that part of their procurement, might be for us to  
11 withdraw. Is that a safe conclusion that we should not  
12 allow that to happen, if possible?

13 MS. ANTHES: I think so. And Ms. Zurkowski  
14 will have to correct me if I'm wrong here, but because we  
15 have multiple legal frameworks in this issue, the  
16 procurement legal framework that are, you know, statutory  
17 requirements, I think what we've been talking about is  
18 being able to write our RFP in a way that allows some  
19 choice and flexibility in the types of responses we get to  
20 that RFP. And I think by that time, even though the timing  
21 is challenging, I think by that time, when we start getting  
22 responses to the RFP, we will know more about the PARCC  
23 Inc. Choices and could make some decisions then. If I  
24 understand your question correctly, and Ms. Zurkowski,  
25 correct me if I'm -- if you have additions.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's not a question I had  
2 the opportunity to think about was I didn't realize that  
3 there was any possibility of us becoming bound by this  
4 third party action in a manner that might limit the legal  
5 options that the Board or the legislature may wish to  
6 pursue that. And I think PARCC should be on notice if they  
7 put us in that spot, the only option might be withdrawal  
8 and we certainly should not to spend any -- any action for  
9 PARCC that would leave us only that option.

10                   MS. ANTHES: Yes.

11                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. Let's  
12 see. Jane, did you have your last comment?

13                   MS. GOFF: No. Thank you. I appreciate  
14 that. I'll leave it at the rest.

15                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Dr. Schroeder?

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: So I think this conversation  
17 has been kind of all over the map and I don't know if  
18 there's anyone on staff who can take some of these  
19 different comments. I analyzed -- analyzed the effect of  
20 that. What I think I'm hearing is that if we make  
21 significant changes soon, we will literally blow up the  
22 system yet again. That worries me. I would like to have  
23 some understanding of what are the consequences. We've got  
24 schools that are working really hard to move forward. If  
25 we change everything again, it puts an awful lot of folks



1 wondering what are the expectations to be deemed  
2 successful? What are parents got to know?

3                   Some people might object to accountability,  
4 but the way I see it, it's letting parents know, as their  
5 kids are going through the system, if they're on track to  
6 graduate. If they're on track to be prepared for something  
7 else afterwards and I see that is extremely important. I  
8 also wonder if it's possible to get a sense of the fiscal  
9 constraints that we have. If we want to go do something  
10 new and go on our own, who's gonna give us the dollars  
11 support? Can we leverage other things, et cetera. So I  
12 don't know. I have a hunch it's kind of a big task given  
13 that the way this conversation has gone, but I think we  
14 need to bring this into knowing. If you do this, these are  
15 what we believe are the consequences. We don't even know  
16 what the consequences are, right? That's just the reality  
17 of the things that we decide to do, but this is a little  
18 scary today. Very scary actually.

19                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

20                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Well I'm not sure why it's  
21 scary. I think what we're doing is looking at whether or  
22 not this assessment meets the promises that were implicit  
23 in adopting it. And so many states have left PARCC, and  
24 our question is, does it meet our needs? And so the  
25 question is, is the test valid? I have yet to see good



1 validity data for the PARCC. What is the cost? We can  
2 figure that out. How long is it? People have big issues  
3 with that. Is the content a good content? And what I see,  
4 is it's a language loaded test. It isn't a good content  
5 test in general. Certainly, on the ELA, from my  
6 experience.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So I agree with you that  
8 there's some merit in looking at other states --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: We need to look at it, yeah.  
10 I mean so this isn't scary, right? This is what we're  
11 supposed to do, isn't it?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: This is the test that is  
13 most closely aligned of any assessment that's been studied  
14 with Knape. And Knape is supposed to be the gold standards  
15 of assessment. So if you've got a new one to bring, that's  
16 really great. Some acknowledgment has to be made that  
17 there is no perfect assessment. So is this the best of the  
18 assessments that are available?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's why I'm saying, if we  
20 have to make this decision in the next month, we need some  
21 great information yesterday.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: But we don't have to make it  
23 for one year at a time, Deb. This is not for the next 50  
24 years.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, but we have so much  
2 feedback from people in our districts --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Actually, not.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- and parents and teachers,  
5 and still not so much test.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Not so much test. That  
7 that's not true. The others I'm getting are the opposite.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, go ahead.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: My only point is -- my only  
10 point is that this is exactly the time to be looking  
11 carefully at the test and determining if it meets the needs  
12 of Colorado. And all those issues that you referenced  
13 which should be content, validity, length, cost. And so I  
14 hope we can just get some information if we have to do that  
15 quickly, to look at, if there are better options.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Let me just close  
17 with a couple of things. And I think because Goff's  
18 concern that we do have a lot on our plate is very real  
19 one. We do have one clear advantage and that is, if we  
20 don't act in the next month, it doesn't preclude us from  
21 acting in a timely fashion for 2019. So it doesn't  
22 foreclose the options and I think what's missing so far  
23 from the analysis that should be included probably in the  
24 longer timeframe is, I think as a practical matter that  
25 took off 30 days is pretty tight. It's almost what I would





1 characterize, usually you're talking about cost benefit  
2 analysis. I don't think that applies here. It's really a  
3 benefit disruption analysis and I think that can be done by  
4 listening to and at least soliciting the opinions of others  
5 who are involved in the administration of the tests,  
6 students, parents, school districts, teachers, so that we  
7 should spend some time at that.

8                   And I apologize that I asked this issue to  
9 come to be brought before us. Only several months ago,  
10 something we should've done many months before that and  
11 that failure is solely my own. But I think, as I've  
12 learned a little bit more about this, it does confirm my  
13 personal view that the greatest force in the universe is  
14 inertia and that PARCC is now the inertia which, for better  
15 or worse, will take significant effort to overcome. And  
16 we're gonna have to work at that, I think pretty diligently  
17 and I think all the things that Dr. Scheffel mentioned, do  
18 deserve careful analysis. So thank you very much, Dr.  
19 Scheffel, that was very helpful and I just wish we'd done  
20 it six months ago. Thank you.

21                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. Your welcome.

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Why don't we take  
23 about a five minute recess before we start public  
24 participation?

25                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We'll come  
2 back to order. We're now for -- here for public  
3 participation. We'll start with Chris. And we remind  
4 everybody of three minutes. Ms. Burdsall will be the  
5 timekeeper so be mindful of her and so we'll start with  
6 Chris Carter -- Chris Carter. And Dr. Schroeder would you  
7 please assume the Chair for the moment.

8                   MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, .

9                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

10                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know.

11                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know.

12                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Get us an order,  
13 Angelika.

14                  MS. SCHROEDER: Now, so we're ready?

15                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Coffee.

16                  MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Please go ahead,  
17 sir.

18                  MR. CARTER: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair,  
19 Mr. Chair, Board Members, Commissioner. My name is Chris  
20 Carter. I'm currently the Director of Curriculum at Strive  
21 Prep Charter Schools here in Denver and I'm a proud parent  
22 of a first -- in Denver Public Schools. Previously, I've  
23 served in roles as a teacher assistant principal,  
24 principal, manager of teaching learning, and Board ember.  
25 This is my 11th year serving in public education and I'm in



1 -- and I'm representing myself today. I'm here today to  
2 give a parent and educator perspective on two critical  
3 questions in education. First, do we keep PARCC? Second,  
4 to what extent do we revise Colorado academic standards?

5           As a way to answering these two questions, I  
6 want to share the word poster I saw in a classroom this  
7 past week. The poster reads, "When a flower doesn't bloom,  
8 you fix the environment in which it grows, not the flower."  
9 Now, if you will please consider two scenarios. Scenario  
10 one, our students are such flowers. When they don't grow  
11 or bloom, we don't throw them out and start over. We  
12 create a more supportive and inclusive learning  
13 environment. Scenario two, now in (inaudible) our state's  
14 assessments and standards are such flowers. Should we  
15 throw them out and start over or should we create a more  
16 supportive and inclusive environment for them to grow and  
17 flourish?

18           As a parent and as an educator, I want to  
19 see them grow and flourish much like I want to see my  
20 daughter grow and flourish as a first grade student. My  
21 suggestion is not to fight the battles of the past but to  
22 fight the battles of the future. Let's keep PARCC and  
23 Common Core. Let's create a better environment for them to  
24 grow and bloom. Schools that are good for teachers are  
25 good for our students. If teachers have what they need,



1 students will have what they need. Today, I bring you two  
2 solutions and suggestions from the perspective of a parent  
3 and educator with these two questions. Solution one,  
4 Common Core PARCC to redesign SAT are the best  
5 instructional resources in K-12 education that has been  
6 gifted to us in the last 20 years. Let's keep them. The  
7 only issue we really have is timeliness at the school level  
8 of data and that can be fixed in a variety of ways through  
9 contracts, negotiations, and better products and services.

10                   Solution two, teachers and parents need  
11 curriculum models and materials from the lesson level to  
12 the unit level. We can look at Engage New York as a model.  
13 Yes, we are a local control state and our schools need more  
14 resources and quality support. We don't tell teachers,  
15 "Here you go and let us know when you need help." Rather  
16 we provide teachers with resources and support so going.  
17 We need to create the same relationship between the state  
18 and districts. We can look at the Arkansas Public School  
19 Resource Center as a model that supports schools with  
20 critical curriculum resources and still gives autonomy with  
21 local control. As a parent and educator, I only get one  
22 shot at my students education. This work is personal and  
23 urgent to me. Thank you very much for your time, your  
24 consideration, and your hard work for our students and  
25 families.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you Mr. Carter.

2 MR. CARTER: Thank you.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Sasha Rauch Kelly.

4 MS. KELLY: Good morning, Mr. Chair and  
5 members of the Colorado State Board of Education. Sorry.  
6 My name is Sasha Rauch Kelly and I'm here representing  
7 myself today. As a fifth year teacher at Harrison High  
8 School in Colorado Springs, I'm pleased at the opportunity  
9 to be before the Board today to -- in order to advocate for  
10 stability in our assessments and standards. I believe that  
11 extending our partnership with PARCC and holding the  
12 Colorado academic standards unchanged is in the best  
13 interest of teachers and students. The districts I work  
14 for in Colorado Springs services a community that has 73  
15 percent free and reduced lunch. In recent years, we have  
16 made significant progress in closing the achievement gap  
17 with an at risk population.

18 In my time as a teacher, I have experienced  
19 the shift from TCAP -- from CSAP to TCAP and most recently  
20 the transitional PARCC. I distinctly remember testing  
21 season as a first year teacher at Harrison. My  
22 administrator's schedule path meeting to share grade level  
23 data with our students. Instinctively I believed my  
24 students would be disinterested in learning their results  
25 from the year before, I was wrong. I was shocked to see



1 students sitting on the edges -- edge of their seats  
2 eagerly waiting to see how they had performed and how they  
3 grown as individuals and as a group. The student  
4 investment in demonstrating their academic growth as  
5 measured by our state assessments was astounding. This  
6 experience stands in stark contrast to student response the  
7 past three years.

8                   The rapid transition from CSAP to key -- to  
9 TCAP to PARCC left many students, teachers, school  
10 districts, and families with a sense that they are being  
11 asked to hit a moving target. I have watched as students  
12 and my peers have grown frustrated and disillusioned with a  
13 constantly moving bar that fails to provide tangible  
14 feedback on their academic progress or instructional  
15 effectiveness. I wholeheartedly believe in teacher  
16 accountability measures as stipulated by Senate Bill 191.  
17 However, changing the standards or assessments too  
18 frequently can be discouraging for educators and students  
19 alike. It takes time to adjust to and build investment in  
20 a new form of assessment and standards. Changing either  
21 one now would simply reset the clock requiring students and  
22 teachers and districts to once again start from scratch.

23                   Though the move to PARCC was initially met  
24 with trepidation by both students and educators, I believe  
25 we're on the cusp of overcoming that resistance. Changing



1 the assessment now, once we change the standards  
2 evaluation, communicating to students and families, that  
3 educators are unsure of what it is our students need to be  
4 able to do. This move will only further undermine the  
5 credibility of assessments as a valuable tool for  
6 instruction. Teachers and administrators at my school have  
7 invested time and resources in researching PARCC  
8 assessments, developing their understanding of its  
9 connection to the Colorado state assessments, sorry,  
10 standards, and building relevance for students.

11 Valuable progress has been made and more  
12 time is needed before we truly consider starting anew. I  
13 want to reiterate the importance of keeping PARCC in our  
14 current academic standards. Consistency in the  
15 expectations we set for Colorado students contributes to  
16 teacher expertise. This in turn improves teacher retention  
17 allowing schools to focus on continually improving the  
18 quality of instruction to better serve students rather than  
19 needing to fill a revolving door of vacant classrooms.  
20 Thank you, Mr. Chair for your time, and Board members.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

22 MS. KELLY: Good day.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Are you back?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah go ahead.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Brian Gaynor. I hope that's  
2 correct.

3 MR. GAYNOR: To you all, I sure -- I'm sure  
4 I seem just like another student appealing to keep PARCC  
5 for less work. I'm sure I seem lazy, so that I will have  
6 to learn a new test and learn new information and I assure  
7 you that I am more than that. I speak for myself but I  
8 also speak for the teachers, students, administration,  
9 future generations, and I'm the voice of generations past.  
10 My name is Brian Gaynor and I'm a junior at Harrison High  
11 School located in Colorado Springs. Let's start by saying,  
12 yes, PARCC is a good benchmark and data point for students  
13 and teachers to see growth. However, when you pair with  
14 practice ACTs, PSATs, and district tests like CBMs and  
15 assessment sets all on top of finals you have a mess. A  
16 mess of a student body, a mess of teachers, and a mess of  
17 administration. Your continual expression over the needs  
18 of these tests really does nothing good in a classroom and  
19 your common core goes out the window.

20 Now it's all about teaching how to take a  
21 test and not what's on the test. This is where we falter.  
22 The errors in the one to two month time between tests.  
23 This time the time spent by teachers constantly revising  
24 and editing their curriculum to put the needs of the next  
25 test for next exam. Soon, lessons go from this is how





1 history was to this is how the test wants it. Two, this is  
2 the formula to this how the exam once you solved. If -- I  
3 don't -- I don't need take crazy tests to get a job, to get  
4 a promotion, to have a kid, to vote, to travel, or even to  
5 run a company. There's no series of standardized tests in  
6 the real world to help me be successful in life. It's time  
7 to stop -- it's time to stop hurting our students for  
8 standardized tests and more for life in the world, the real  
9 world. This is why the United States is ranked third in  
10 human development. We're not preparing our students for  
11 life.

12 Here are a few more fun facts. The United  
13 States is ranked 15th in tertiary graduation rate at 36.5  
14 percent, seventh in the knowledge of avoiding pregnancy,  
15 26th in employment growth, 14th in college graduation  
16 rates, and sixth in 20 to 24 year olds in college at 34  
17 percent as a co-ordinary education rate. You all speak of  
18 the validity and how you need the validity and data points  
19 yesterday. How about we let those data point set in before  
20 you make a decision to change PARCC? You need validity and  
21 need data points, that takes time. Please give us that  
22 time. However, yes in theory and on paper this method  
23 works, teaching students, test the students, help the  
24 stragglers. However, how are we supposed to say that we're  
25 helping growth when the United States is ranked 34th in



1 Math with a nine -- with a nine percent decrease in  
2 international testing scores in the math department.

3                   How are we supposed to say we're educating  
4 when we're ranked 18th in Reading, 15th in literacy, 35th  
5 in Math, and 29th in Science? That shows that adding more  
6 tests and replacing them with new ones does nothing for the  
7 students, it only adds more stress and ruins their mental  
8 and physical health. How was the student supposed to take  
9 a test if they can't say, "Hey, stay healthy." For  
10 instance, there's an increase in 600,000 suicide related  
11 debts between the ages of 15 and 24 between the 1950's and  
12 2011. So I stand before you today to appeal for the  
13 continuation of PARCC testing as opposed to creating  
14 another state level standardized test and in fact starting  
15 over again. Please stop stressing students and stop  
16 stressing teachers. The second that we stop focusing on  
17 tests and what's on them and start focusing more on the  
18 education and intellect of our students, is the second that  
19 we, as Americans, as citizens, and as a country we'll be  
20 able to compete globally and truly become great again.  
21 That's my message and thank you for your time.

22                   MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

23                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Keeling Richardson.

24                   MS. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon -- Good

25 morning members of the Colorado State Board of Education,



1 my name is Keeling Richardson and I am representing myself  
2 in the issue of PARCC. As a junior at Harrison High School  
3 who is heavily involved in my school and wants to benefit  
4 not only this generation but also for future generations to  
5 come, I'm pleased to speak in favor of PARCC assessment.  
6 As a student and as a teen, we sometimes feel that  
7 teachers, parents, and just adults in general, don't really  
8 understand where we're coming from because they forget what  
9 it was like to be our age. So try for just one moment to  
10 put your feet back in the shoes (inaudible) wants for, as a  
11 student. For me, and likely for you as well, our  
12 generation has been the guinea pig generation. While I  
13 know many of the experiments are well intended, it seems  
14 likely that we are always part of a new test or a new  
15 strategy.

16 It would be nice for once to stick with a  
17 test for a suitable time to where we can get substantial  
18 data to show how we have grown over the years and gain  
19 knowledge. It would be so valuable for us to know that we  
20 did not just fail the test because we didn't know how to  
21 work through the mechanics of a new test but because we  
22 hadn't -- we hadn't mastered the information we needed to  
23 be successful on the test or in the real world, or to know  
24 that we are learning and that we have been prepared for  
25 what the world has for us. The PARCC test is also



1 connected to the Common Core standards and curriculum. And  
2 I remember as you would walk through the halls and worry  
3 about the homework you didn't do, the job you have to go to  
4 after school, and a practice that you have to run suicide's  
5 for.

6                               But when you get to the class and the bell  
7 rings you are able to connect with your peers because you  
8 are on the same level of learning. Forty-five states in  
9 the United States currently have these Common Core  
10 standards while five states in DC have PARCC, and PARCC is  
11 starting to grow while five states do not have this system.  
12 Luckily, I have personal accounts that reflect how Common  
13 Core shaped our daily lives. In my Math 3 class last year,  
14 there was a student that came from Hawaii and moved among  
15 the states a lot because he was a military child. Due to  
16 this fact, he came here and had a different knowledge but  
17 was similar and could help with learning as well. Not only  
18 have this been applicable in my Math class but also in  
19 English classes.

20                               This year there was a student that came from  
21 a state that clearly did not have the Common Core  
22 curriculum. This entire year so far there has been -- he  
23 has been behind in how to write an essay, gain points in  
24 all the areas needed to pass the exam. Sure you would --  
25 could say that he's just not intelligent or as skilled as



1 others, but it is because in his previous state he was not  
2 taught the same ways that we have in this state. That's  
3 why I believe we should keep PARCC and keep the Common Core  
4 standard because if we change one then we will be far more  
5 likely to change the other. We don't want to be another  
6 state that is not equal with the rest of our nation but one  
7 that is able to set an example of what is working and build  
8 from our already strong foundation.

9                   As a student, I feel that this is working  
10 and I am the one that these tests have gained data on and I  
11 am the one who has been here from the start for these  
12 tests. As a student, sorry, you have been appointed in  
13 this position as a Member of the state the Board of  
14 Education to assist in helping the future generations of  
15 doctors, lawyers, and policy makers, so please listen to  
16 what our teachers believe will work, what our students  
17 believe will work, and what our parents believe will work.  
18 Not just the people that come here because they are getting  
19 paid by their corporations but who truly care and are truly  
20 concerned about this. Our system is not broken so please  
21 don't break it by trying to change it. Let us build on  
22 what we have to continue to demonstrate our growth and  
23 ourselves and our community. Thank you.

24                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Nathan Montgomery.



1 MR. MONTGOMERY: Thank you, Board for this  
2 opportunity to speak with you this morning. My name is  
3 Nathan Montgomery and I'm the Secondary Math Specialist  
4 with the Adams 12 School District, although today I come to  
5 you as an individual. I would like to speak in support of  
6 the PARCC assessment and what it is brought to our -- our  
7 district specifically known as 12 and to all of the PARCC  
8 states. The beautiful opportunity is to have this  
9 assessment that really pushes the assessment of student  
10 knowledge to a much higher level than the basic skills and  
11 what we used to get on tests like the Iowa, Test of Basic  
12 Skills. It's very much pushing our students to a much more  
13 deeper level of understanding of mathematics and actually  
14 applying it into the real world.

15 The lovely thing with that is when we have  
16 an assessment that pushes our kids to that level, we have  
17 the work with our teachers, with our schools, with our  
18 parents, with our students, and really push the -- the  
19 baseline understanding of mathematics throughout our  
20 district. I'm very happy to announce that Adams 12 became  
21 a performance level district this year and a lot of it had  
22 to do with the extra thinking and depth of knowledge that  
23 went into our mathematics and our English Language Arts  
24 instruction that came really from the Common Core and with  
25 PARCC's pushing us towards that direction. I would like to



1 continue to be able to use that assessments in my district,  
2 for my students, and I urge you all to continue Colorado's  
3 association with the PARCC Consortium. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. We'll now  
5 proceed to item 11, the growth and participation update.  
6 Commissioner.

7 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
8 This is an update from Alyssa Pearson on sort of how the  
9 last couple of weeks have been going in terms of the  
10 preliminary frameworks and just some information about  
11 that. So I'm going to turn it over to Alyssa Pearson.

12 MS. PEARSON: Good morning, everybody. So  
13 this morning we just want to give you a bit of an update on  
14 where we're at with school district accountability, the  
15 timelines, the ratings, and specifically focus on some of  
16 the data components for the ratings. We haven't talked to  
17 you all as a whole about the growth results you received  
18 all that information before the growth embargo but we  
19 haven't had a chance to talk about it. All together so we  
20 wanted to share some of that growth because it's been two  
21 years since we've had that information and then also talk a  
22 little bit about participation rates for schools and  
23 districts. We've talked about it as a state but we want to  
24 talk a little bit specific to the schools and districts



1 today. So I want to start with the school and district  
2 performance framework.

3                   And a sense of where we're at with the  
4 timeline. So the preliminary release of the draft  
5 preliminary reports went to districts on Tuesday, October  
6 4th. With the new context, this is the first year we've  
7 had accountability using the new CMAS PARCC assessments.  
8 There are new things that we're discovering about how the  
9 data systems work, about how the data was reported to us,  
10 how we're reporting it back. So we really -- these are  
11 really, really preliminary. We have the request to  
12 reconsider process for a reason, and that's to work through  
13 the things that we haven't seen with the data. Prior to  
14 releasing, we validate with districts, we look internally.  
15 We do a whole lot of analysis. But there is something you  
16 just don't see until you see your data with it.

17                   We shared data with districts last spring as  
18 informational so that helps some of it, as well. But there  
19 are still things that are getting flagged now that weren't  
20 flagged in the past. So that's why we've got these  
21 requests to reconsider process. We've been -- our team's  
22 been on the phone with superintendents and district staff  
23 constantly. That's our job. We have draft requests that  
24 are due on October 17th and that's an optional process. We  
25 let districts, if they would like to submit a draft to us,





1 so we can give them feedback and help them strengthen their  
2 requests and ask them any questions back that we wonder  
3 about what they're putting forward. We have that timeline  
4 for them to do that.

5           The final request will be due to CDE on  
6 November 7th. So it gives us time to review, get feedback  
7 to the districts, have them revise and then turn back into  
8 us. What we are hoping for a tentative timeline is that  
9 we'll have the district accreditation status and ratings to  
10 share with you all in December. The commissioner  
11 determines those. And then the school plan types for you  
12 in January. We've talked about the expectation that we may  
13 be getting more requests reconsiders this year a lot  
14 because we have the new assessments. Because we are at the  
15 end of the accountability clock for some schools and  
16 districts, we've expected a higher level of those. So  
17 depending on the volume that we actually get, we may need  
18 to change that timeline. If we can't do a thorough enough  
19 job and a careful enough job with the review for December  
20 and January.

21           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

22           MS. SCHROEDER: I think you're making me  
23 nervous about the timeline. Don't we have a deadline then  
24 for the making decisions for those districts that were on  
25 the clock?



1 MS. PEARSON: On the accountability clock?  
2 You do, but that's June 30th of 2017. So -- so ideally, if  
3 we can get through in January and what we may talk about if  
4 we get too many and I'm anticipating that we're going to be  
5 able to do the December and January, we just want to leave  
6 it out there in case we are just overwhelmed in a way we  
7 were not even expecting. We can put the ones that are at  
8 year five that you all need to make decisions on earlier in  
9 the schedule and review those sooner and bring those  
10 forward for you to vote on those separately and then do the  
11 other ones later.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay --

13 MS. PEARSON: If it comes down to that --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that might be --

15 MS. PEARSON: -- so we'll talk all --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that might be a way to --

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- mediate, otherwise we're  
19 going to spend one month every day getting to know all  
20 those hearings.

21 MS. PEARSON: And we can talk more -- or  
22 this afternoon when we're talking about the administrative  
23 procedures. We'll talk a little bit more about the  
24 schedule and the timing and the numbers that we have.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. But you're keeping  
2 track of our deadlines.

3 MS. PEARSON: We are absolutely keeping  
4 track of the deadlines and how to map it all out and how to  
5 fit it all in.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: 'Cause I was actually  
7 planning on going on vacation after that was all over. And  
8 --

9 MS. PEARSON: There's no vacation allowed  
10 here.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No vacation for anyone.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Do not mess with July again  
13 this year.

14 MS. FLORES: Mr. Chair?

15 MS. PEARSON: Well, the decisions all need  
16 to be done before July.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: I know.

18 MS. PEARSON: So --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. We're not having a  
20 meeting in July.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we did have one.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I know. Sorry.

23 MS. PEARSON: So you --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.



1 MS. PEARSON: -- Thank you, Mr. Chair. You  
2 all received the preliminary data on Friday. If you have  
3 questions about that, please let me know we're happy to  
4 talk with you all about it. I think you also know that  
5 there was a court request for it. We provided it Friday.  
6 There was an article posted last night about the schools  
7 and districts that could possibly go into year six  
8 depending on what happens to the request to reconsider  
9 process. So I just want to kind of let you that's --  
10 that's where we are in the process with everything. So as  
11 a reminder, these are the components of what's going into  
12 the school and the district performance frameworks and the  
13 ratings. We have three main indicators that we're talking  
14 about. We have academic achievement, where we look at the  
15 mean scale score. Kind of the achievement level of  
16 students on the English Language Arts, Math and Science  
17 CMAS assessments. That's really, you know, the old  
18 proficiency kind of idea when we talked of students were  
19 proficient or not. And we're looking at that overall first  
20 school and district and for the major disaggregated groups  
21 as well.

22 And the waiting of that we talked a lot  
23 about this last spring and into this summer. But where you  
24 are landed the waiting for that is 40 percent of the  
25 elementary and middle schools framework is based on



1 achievement and 30 percent of high schools and district  
2 readings are based there. And then we have academic growth  
3 which we'll talk more in-depth on and a little bit, but  
4 looking at the median student growth percentile, we looked  
5 at that for English Language Arts and Math and CMAS. Again  
6 overall, and for those major disaggregated groups. And  
7 then, we also look at ACCESS -- Growth and ACCESS which is  
8 our English Language Proficiency Assessment for those  
9 schools and districts that have at least 20 students that  
10 are taking that access assessment. Growth is weighed 60  
11 percent for elementary and middle schools and 40 percent  
12 for high schools and districts.

13                   And then finally we have the post --  
14 Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness indicators. Those  
15 include graduation rate, overall and disaggregated groups,  
16 the dropout rate, the average Colorado ECT composite score,  
17 for this last year and the future that will move to the new  
18 11th grade and college entrance assessment of SAT, and the  
19 matriculation rate which was new this year, was added by  
20 state legislation and that's weighed 30 percent for high  
21 schools and for districts. So all those different  
22 components come together to create the rating for the  
23 schools and the districts. And I wanted to just talk a  
24 little bit about the ratings and explanatory notes that  
25 you'll see. There's some of these things that are a little



1 bit different this year. Our goal with the frameworks this  
2 year is really to be able to be as transparent and clear  
3 about what's going on with the data going into the ratings.  
4 Because we're in a little bit of a different context. Our  
5 Accountability Law was written in 2009. We had a very  
6 different context than in terms of opt out numbers. Joyce  
7 showed you some of those numbers in August and talk to you  
8 about it today, about how those things have changed to the  
9 context we're in now.

10 So we have a few different things that  
11 you'll see in terms of the ratings and the descriptors  
12 we've added. This year, we have insufficient state data  
13 low participation for both schools and district ratings.  
14 And that's something we haven't had before. In the past,  
15 we've had insufficient state data small tested population  
16 for some of our really small districts. Like (inaudible)  
17 has six tested kids right now and so we can't look with  
18 (inaudible) with data privacy, we can't give a rating based  
19 on that data. So we've had that situation in the past, but  
20 now we have a situation where schools and districts have  
21 enough students enrolled. But because of decisions around  
22 who's participating and who not -- who isn't, we can't  
23 report the data that's left, if there's any data left.

24 So we're assigning insufficient state data  
25 low participation ratings there. And then with our



1 ratings, even with the performance and improvement and  
2 prior to improvement, we've added some descriptors to them.  
3 You probably saw that in the data file. Some of them are  
4 getting performance plan, low participation. And that's  
5 just to try and be really clear and transparent when a  
6 school or district is below the 95 percent participation  
7 rate in two or more content areas, it's just putting it on  
8 there to say look, this school has a low participation or  
9 this district has lower participation, we just want you to  
10 be aware of it when you go read through the data and look  
11 at what this rating is based on. We also, in some cases,  
12 have them decreased due to participation noted on there.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is the participation rate  
15 noted? Does it in any way negatively impact a district, as  
16 far as their rating, if they have low participation rates  
17 or high opt out rates?

18 MS. PEARSON: So that part on low  
19 participation is just -- it's a notation. And right on the  
20 first page of their school performance framework and  
21 district performance frameworks, they have the actual  
22 participation rates. Right there. And so they've got the  
23 participation rates, and then they have what we call, and  
24 I'll talk about this, and that decreased the accountability  
25 participation rate. And that's where we removed the



1 students that were coded as parent excusals. Per the  
2 Board's direction of not holding schools and district of  
3 (inaudible), we pulled those ones out so that we know what  
4 the rate is with them removed. So I'll talk through that  
5 in a sec 'cause I know it's not.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So there's not a case -- is  
7 there a case where a district could be rated lower than  
8 otherwise because of a high opt out rate?

9 MS. PEARSON: No -- so -- so we have --  
10 we're decreasing due to participation which is a policy  
11 we've always had in place. And we had talked through with  
12 you all. Only when it's due to reasons other than parent  
13 excusal. So when we pull the parent excusals out of what  
14 we have coded, and I'm going to get into this in a minute  
15 and this is where it gets a little bit trickier, of what  
16 was reported to CDE and we have coded when we pulled those  
17 out, if they are under 95 percent then, then they're  
18 getting lowered ratings. The policy that we've always had  
19 if there's other reasons why students are nonparticipants  
20 besides parent opt out. The confusing part of what's going  
21 on now and what's so important in the preliminary piece is  
22 that the coding does not always accurately represent the  
23 actual parent excusals. From what districts submitted to  
24 CDE and then the documentation they may have on hand about  
25 who actually was an opt out. Those things are not





1 perfectly aligned right now. So that's why we're working  
2 through the requests to reconsider process to make sure we  
3 get all of that cleaned up. So I'll show you numbers in a  
4 little bit. If we can put this on hold a little bit and  
5 then we'll get back to it, is that okay?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So again, what we're  
8 just trying to do is be really clear about where ratings  
9 are coming from, where the data is coming from, and  
10 interpretation and things we want to be careful with when  
11 looking at the data this year. Here's just a link of  
12 resources, in case you all want to dig deeper. You are  
13 getting questions, of course, if you get questions feel  
14 free to send them to us and we're happy to answer those for  
15 districts or for parents or community members that you're  
16 getting them from. We have one pager around the ratings  
17 and what -- what was on the previous slide, what those  
18 mean. We have a document on the changes that happened from  
19 the 2014 frameworks to the 2016 frameworks.

20 We have annotated report so you can see what  
21 the actual school and district performance frameworks look  
22 like. And there's annotations on there to walk through the  
23 different components on them. And then we've got a request  
24 to consider guidance posted along with templates for local  
25 schools and districts to be able to submit their data and



1 the expectations for those. And we have a streamlined  
2 process for some of the ones around participation where  
3 it's a coding issue. We've kind of streamlined the process  
4 for them to go through that. And then our staff has been -  
5 - along with being on the phone, whenever the phone rings,  
6 we also have set aside office hours, so people can sign up  
7 for a specific time to talk with staff and really work  
8 through their request to reconsider questions and they're  
9 just general questions about the frameworks.

10                   Okay. So I want to spend a little time  
11 getting into growth. Like kind of, that was the big  
12 picture. The frameworks getting into the component around  
13 growth. We want to talk a little about what is growth. I  
14 know, some of you this is new, you weren't on the Board the  
15 last time we really released the growth data and for others  
16 of you, it's been a few years since we've had this  
17 conversation. We want to talk about what it is, why it's  
18 important, why Colorado's had such a strong value around  
19 growth over the years. The information that's publicly  
20 available and what parents will receive and the suppression  
21 rules with it. Just to be real clear on those. So the  
22 growth data really shows how much students progress. How  
23 much progress students have made from the last year to the  
24 current year as measured by the CMAS PARCC assessments.



1                   That's what we're going to talk to -- about  
2 today in English Language Arts and Math. And that's really  
3 in comparison to other students like them. So we look at  
4 students that have a similar academic history that scored  
5 the same on the tests in the previous year. And then we  
6 look how much they grew or didn't grow. Like their change  
7 in score compared to other kids just like them. It allows  
8 for comparison for a group of -- an individual student, a  
9 group of students, schools, and districts. We can look at  
10 it -- well like that. While we value growth data in  
11 Colorado, it provides another component and kind of a  
12 dimension of looking at performance of schools and  
13 districts compared to achievement.

14                   So achievement tells us that really  
15 important idea of like our students at grade level, are  
16 they on track? Are they right there in terms of  
17 proficiency? But growth adds to that understanding of  
18 performance of a school and a district by saying, how much  
19 growth of students mean? How much -- if a student started  
20 below or a group of students are starting below, are they  
21 catching up? Are they making more growth compared to other  
22 students across the state? So it's really trying to get at  
23 the impact that schools and districts have on helping  
24 students progress. The growth data is really important for  
25 the accountability (inaudible) determinations we just



1 talked about the weightings there. Elementary and middle  
2 school, again that's 60 percent of the frameworks. And  
3 high schools and districts, it's 40 percent in the  
4 frameworks. And we also really encourage growth to be  
5 looked at during improvement planning within schools and  
6 districts. And we look at it here, as well in terms of  
7 trend and support.

8                   So we can see districts that, you guys  
9 remember the old four quadrant pictures, districts that  
10 have high achievement and high growth. They are running,  
11 right? Districts that -- but then we've got a  
12 differentiation between those that have low achievement and  
13 low growth and maybe those with low achievement and high  
14 growth. So the ones -- when we're looking at the ones that  
15 are struggling with achievement, the ones that have higher  
16 growth, we know they're on this trajectory. We have a  
17 little bit more confidence going on there and the ones that  
18 have low achievement and low growth. So it really gives  
19 this other -- this richer picture of performance of schools  
20 and districts. And as a parent, as well like it's  
21 something, you know, just personally I care a lot about --  
22 about my children. I want to know that not only are they  
23 at that proficiency level but that they're growing over  
24 time.



1                   So this is a big summary of the state level  
2 growth data. The way growth works, you know, it's  
3 normative. So at the state level, our median growth  
4 percentile is going to be at 50. We're on a scale, it's  
5 just like those (inaudible) growth charts your kids are  
6 between one and 99. The state is always going to be at 50.  
7 So you see a lot of these numbers at 50 but when you look  
8 at the disaggregated groups, there are some patterns here  
9 that we see that are often 50 that we think are important  
10 to talk about. The first half of this chart shows English  
11 Language Arts growth for the state and the second half is  
12 Math. And then the little print at the bottom is showing  
13 the different disaggregated groups. So you'll see that at  
14 number two, the bars that are sticking up pretty far above  
15 50 are gifted students. So they're making the highest  
16 growth in the state.

17                   Our English language learners, this is  
18 always been something that people think English language  
19 learners are going to make less growth -- growth in  
20 general. English language learners have been right about  
21 50, sometimes even above 50. This year though, we're at 50  
22 for English Language Arts and for Math we're at 47th. We  
23 went down a little bit and that's something for us to spend  
24 some time and look at -- look at. We're seeing -- we've  
25 always seen some gaps between males and females in terms of



1 growth but now we're seeing some larger ones and these are  
2 just initial and we need to investigate, we need more years  
3 of data to really be able to see if this is a trend but I  
4 think it's something we wanted to flag. The gap for males  
5 and females in English Language Arts is 10 points.

6                   So females are at 55 with their meeting  
7 growth percentile and males are at 45 and Math it's a bit  
8 smaller. It's 41 to -- or 51 to 48 but there's still a gap  
9 there. With females having more growth and we see growth  
10 is kind of the precursor to what might happen with  
11 achievement or may continue to happen with achievement --  
12 with achievement gaps growing larger there. And then  
13 finally the group that we're struggling with growth the  
14 most within this state are students with disabilities. And  
15 remember, we're comparing students to other students with  
16 similar academic history so if a student is struggling  
17 academically they're compared to other students like them  
18 in terms of measuring growth. But we have some data there  
19 that we want to dig into more and look at what's going on.  
20 Our students with disabilities on IEPs have always had  
21 lower growth but now it's a bit lower than it's been in the  
22 past as well.

23                   So at a very high level, that's kind of the  
24 state summary. We want to make sure you all knew where --  
25 what information is available. So we've got some just flat



1 Excel files that have all the school districts state data  
2 for researchers. People that really want to dig into all  
3 of that. That's posted on the website and the link is on  
4 this page. Then, we have individual school and district  
5 summary report. So if you're going to visit a school or  
6 district and you just want to see their -- their summary,  
7 we can pull that up for you. We have static files of those  
8 but then we also, at this link on here and I'll show you a  
9 picture in a sec, have an interactive tool where you can go  
10 on -- you can get a little bit more data through that with  
11 the participation rates and other information there.

12                   And then, individual student growth reports  
13 will be sent to district soon. We don't have them yet. We  
14 kind of did the aggregates growth data and districts have  
15 their individual students growth results. They just don't  
16 have the pretty one pagers to be able to hand out to  
17 parents. So we needed to stop, get the frameworks out and  
18 then -- the frameworks out, we're going to go get those  
19 growth reports to districts so they can share those with  
20 parents but they're on their way. So this is a picture,  
21 this is an annotated growth report. We won't spend a lot  
22 of time on this right now, but it's just an example of what  
23 the growth reports look like this year. These used to be  
24 affectionately called the Green and White because we had  
25 green and white color on them. We now are affectionately



1 calling them the Bronco reports because we've changed them  
2 to blue and orange.

3                   They're a little bit more color coded kind  
4 of a heat map, so you can see easier where the performance  
5 is above and below 50. We've gotten a real -- a lot of  
6 real positive feedback from districts so far. If you all  
7 are getting suggestions or hear things that people would  
8 like on these reports that's not on there, please share  
9 them with us because we can iterate and we'll improve them  
10 for next year. But they show again the school compared to  
11 the -- the district, compared to the state for English  
12 Language Arts and Math overall by grade level and by all  
13 the disaggregated groups that are shown right there. I'll  
14 talk about it a little bit more later, but let me just show  
15 -- tell you now since you'll see some blank white cells.  
16 If a group is less than 20, we don't report the data. The  
17 really nice thing about growth when we use the median  
18 growth percentile, all the data suppression stuff we've  
19 talked about, you can't do it with medians.

20                   You can't subtract and figure out a kid and  
21 look at one group compared to the other because it's the  
22 medians and the way the math works out. So we don't have  
23 to deal with all those complicated suppression. We'll see  
24 where it's just if you're less than 20, we don't report the  
25 data. So that's what I -- this is one of the static





1 district reports what they look like or school reports.  
2 This is the district report. It's the same thing. It just  
3 doesn't have the school level columns in it. When we have  
4 more years of data, we'll add in multiple years on these.  
5 But right now, we didn't want to have the old growth on  
6 here with the new (inaudible). We want to try and make a  
7 little bit of a clean break with the information.

8                   And then this is what the interactive tool  
9 looks like, and you've got the link to it if you all want  
10 to play around with it later. But right there, there's a  
11 drop down so you can select the district you want to look  
12 at, and they'll come up with all the schools within the  
13 district. And then if you want to look not just by the all  
14 students group by -- but by a specific disaggregated group  
15 for school, you could select that right here. And then  
16 when you hover over the bullets at the little cells, it  
17 will come up with the participation rate and give you a  
18 little more information there, too. So what's not  
19 available? This year, we do not have adequate growth,  
20 which was the measure of, is the growth enough to reach our  
21 proficiency or our benchmark expectations? To really do  
22 those -- those calculations well, we need more than just  
23 two years of data.

24                   So we were held on that for this year. The  
25 four quadrant model, you know, the cool visualization tool,



1 we're working on redesign for that with the new assessments  
2 where the data is in the warehouse, we're working to figure  
3 out how to get that all updated and if we do it in a little  
4 bit of a different format. So we're working on it, it'll  
5 come in the future, it's just not there right now. And  
6 then we talked about data suppression already, about a size  
7 of 20. I know a question that's come up a lot is why is  
8 this different than assessment? We use 16 for assessment,  
9 we use 20 for growth. When we first were running growth  
10 data way back in the day, we did a lot of analysis on  
11 looking at the data. We know when we have smaller and  
12 count of a smaller number of students, the data is more  
13 variable. And looking at it, when you hit 20, it kind of  
14 stabilized in a way that it didn't before 20. So that's  
15 why they set 20 as that minimum in there.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Don't I understand  
18 correctly, though, that we're gonna have to make up our  
19 minds between 16 and 20 for ESSA?

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. The -- it looks like  
21 what's in -- I think it's in the proposed regulation. It  
22 says that we'll have a single N size for our all measures  
23 and use one number. So we have --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: We have some head shaking  
25 over there. So I'm --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hold on. No, that's --  
2 that's correct.

3 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Yeah.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So is that --

5 MS. PEARSON: So we're working -- one of our  
6 Spoke groups is working on that recommendation, looking at  
7 data of what that minimum N should be.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And then that'll come  
9 to the Hub --

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. It'll come to the Hub.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and to the Board?

12 MS. PEARSON: It'll come to the Board.  
13 It'll come to the -- yeah.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I'll be interested, for  
15 whomever, what are the states have been doing with that as  
16 well, please? Thanks.

17 MS. PEARSON: So that's all I had on growth.  
18 Do you guys have any questions on growth before we move on  
19 to talk about participation a little bit?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions from the members  
21 over the growth issue? Okay. Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could you just look at slide  
23 16, just go back?

24 MS. PEARSON: Sure.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So could you just unpack  
2 these numbers real quickly?

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: This 58.5, what is that?

5 MS. PEARSON: Sure. So the -- what the  
6 numbers are in the columns are the median growth  
7 percentile. So every student gets a growth percentile 1  
8 through 99. And then for the school, what we do is take  
9 the median of all those student's growth percentiles.  
10 Actually, only look at the students that have been  
11 continuously enrolled. We take the median of those  
12 students, and that's what's reported there. So that's the  
13 -- you have better eyes than I do, 56.5 on there is where  
14 it comes from. And then that's why you see is the state  
15 we're always at 50. The state, the median, the way that  
16 model works, the states always going to be at 50.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: So will there always be some  
18 schools that are, in this case, orange?

19 MS. PEARSON: So that's a really good  
20 question. That's a really good question. So the growth  
21 percentile, it's normative at a student level. So there's  
22 always going to be students from 1 to 99 in terms of  
23 student distribution. Schools, though, if we had all  
24 schools having the same kind of impact on students as  
25 measured by the growth measure, all schools can be at 50



1 because you could have it equally distributed around 50  
2 other student -- the student distribution. So -- so we  
3 don't necessarily need to have half the schools below 50  
4 and half above, we can have all schools right at 50. We  
5 don't have that because we do see an impact that the  
6 schools are having on that growth metric.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: So if you made a bar chart of  
8 these numbers, what would the distribution look like? It's  
9 a very skewed distribution, right?

10 MS. PEARSON: In terms of the school  
11 distribution?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

13 MS. PEARSON: We can do that. I think Mary  
14 probably actually has it in one of the ones that she did,  
15 so we can get that for you all so you can see the  
16 distribution of schools by their median growth percentiles.  
17 So it's not a perfect bell curve because it's not set up  
18 that way.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just thinking what --  
20 what I -- how would I think about this if I'm, you know,  
21 Discovery Canyon Campus? I'm saying, "Okay. I've got a 40  
22 in ELA, 48 in Math." What would I say to myself if I were  
23 that school?

24 MS. PEARSON: I think I would want to go  
25 look in and see why looking at the individual students and



1 looking at the system as a whole and see why our students  
2 may not have been making as much progress as students in  
3 other schools that had similar students to them. And I  
4 would probably go dig in and look at the disaggregated  
5 groups and look at which types of students we're growing  
6 and which ones weren't, if it wasn't in particular  
7 classrooms or in particular programs.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. I'd love to talk to  
9 you briefly about this.

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, absolutely.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think this kind of data,  
12 I'm not sure who would help. I think when the schools look  
13 at it, I -- I don't know if they need -- would need more  
14 information to be able to interpret it. So that is  
15 actionable or maybe it is actionable, I don't know. But  
16 median growth percentile is what you said, right?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, exactly.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because there's a lot of  
19 questions nested in that approach to depicting the data.

20 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. And I did a very  
21 high level for you all today. We've been doing webinars  
22 and trainings with schools and districts because we know  
23 it's been a few years since people have looked at growth,  
24 about what it is and how to look at it. One thing we  
25 usually talk about -- about the performance framework data



1 is it's -- it's a high-level map, and it kind of tells you  
2 where you -- to go and dig. It doesn't tell you the  
3 answers in and of itself, but it gives you some flags about  
4 where you may want to look, and where you might wanna dig  
5 in further, and see what's going on. So it's really kind  
6 of this -- this high-level map of what you might want to  
7 clue in to where you're seeing great successes and what  
8 that tells you because there's a lot to learn from that,  
9 and where you might see struggles, and where -- what's  
10 going on there for you to be able to go dig in, look at  
11 what's actually going in your classroom, look at your local  
12 assessments, look at that other richer data really pull it  
13 apart and see what's going on there.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: But it's confusing because  
15 median is a middle score, so it seems like that would  
16 constantly be moving. So I don't think I -- if I'm a  
17 school, I can look at that number and say, "Well, if only I  
18 could get it up 10 points, I'd hit 50, and then I wouldn't  
19 have an orange color. I'd be blue."

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't think that's right.

22 MS. PEARSON: I think the growth --

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's the beginning and it  
24 keeps changing.



1 MS. PEARSON: I think you're hitting on a  
2 really important point. Growth is a hard thing to set up a  
3 distinct target around in terms of instruction, right?  
4 It's more about an indication about the performance that's  
5 occurred and a way to think about going forward. What we  
6 really, I think want our teachers focused on, is how do we  
7 help students learn the standards. And if they're making  
8 progress learning standards, as shown in the assessments  
9 that we're giving, then their growth is going to reflect  
10 that. But to -- to make a plan around and make a target  
11 around what you want your growth to be, it's hard to  
12 translate that into instruction. That's absolutely true.  
13 But it's a really important piece of understanding the  
14 performance of a school in terms of what stakeholders have  
15 told us that they really value, especially educators about  
16 wanting to have that, not just where the kids have come in  
17 at in terms of proficiency, but understanding the progress  
18 they've made.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean, this is a high stakes  
20 metric that's inside our algorithm to determine where  
21 school or district falls. And yet the middle score will  
22 always be changing. So that's what's -- I don't -- I'm not  
23 sure if we've always done this or whatever, but it strikes  
24 to me that it's not easily transferable into an action and  
25 it strikes me that it would constantly be a moving target





1 because the middle score is just that. Depending on who  
2 the scores are, it's going to move. So you can't look at  
3 it and say, "Well, if only I could get up 10 points, then I  
4 -- I hit a great target and I wouldn't be in the bucket  
5 that we don't want to be." It doesn't -- it doesn't  
6 translate to that.

7 MS. PEARSON: So --

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Shouldn't we have metrics  
9 that do translate into that?

10 MS. PEARSON: So the median is what we've  
11 always used for measuring growth. It's been the measure  
12 since the beginning. They looked at using means versus  
13 medians and why medians were -- we don't need to get into  
14 this for the rest of you, but it's -- it's the metric that  
15 we've always used. I think all of our measures can move  
16 over time based on the kids, same with proficiency, same  
17 with mean skills, where all of that has that, and we want  
18 them to reflect what the -- the change in the population  
19 is. But we can -- I think we should probably talk more  
20 because I think I'm not totally getting in all your  
21 concerns.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: That is a discussion we had  
25 some years ago because I had kind of the same concern.



1 Couldn't we actually identify what is a year's growth and  
2 use that as the metric?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: It feels like a zero sum game  
4 sometime. I mean, like --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: And ultimate -- it is a zero  
6 sum game. That's what norming essentially is. However,  
7 the argument that was used at that time was that if you  
8 look at what it takes to be 50 percent, the hope is that  
9 that keeps going up over time, but that in the meantime,  
10 there is a real resistance to having an absolute. The  
11 other thing that I think it does, I think it does do is  
12 that way back under CSAPs, there were -- there was often a  
13 comment that some years the assessment was harder than  
14 other years. That it wasn't constant in difficulty based  
15 on the different examination questions, and this actually  
16 helps to diminish that because all the kids are taking that  
17 same assessment. And if it's harder this year, it will  
18 still be norm. So there are sort of pros and cons on both,  
19 and I've had concerns about norming it as opposed to  
20 actually being able to say to parents this amount of --  
21 this amount of knowledge or skill is a year's growth. But  
22 I think in the -- I'm -- I'm becoming more and more  
23 convinced that for right now, while we're working with new  
24 assessments that we really shouldn't even have that  
25 discussion, we should keep it normed until we're much more



1 confident in whether we can measure what is a year's growth  
2 in -- in achievement grade by grade. I think it -- it's a  
3 pretty difficult one to get to because I don't know there'd  
4 be agreement.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson?

6 MS. PEARSON: I think the -- the year's  
7 growth is something other than technical advisory panel  
8 struggled with for years about how do we do that. I think  
9 the component that we don't have this year on adequate  
10 growth is really what you both are looking for is that some  
11 measure of, is this growth enough to get a student to a  
12 certain performance level or to keep them above a  
13 performance level? And so when we have that data again,  
14 and I think we'll be talking with you all in the future  
15 about what those measures and metrics are and they're  
16 defined in statute right now but under the old proficiency  
17 language, so I think we need to think about those a little  
18 bit, that'll get more of that what percentage of your kids  
19 are making enough growth to get to a certain level.

20 The other thing we can do, if we have  
21 stability with our assessments, is baseline our growth  
22 measure. And so we looked at doing that at the end of  
23 TCAP. We can set a baseline for what 50 is and keep that  
24 steady year to year, so that then everybody could be above  
25 50 if we were making enough growth to get -- get students



1 there. We just need stability with our assessments to be  
2 able to do that, but we did go back and look -- look  
3 historically under CSAP and TCAP with that if we had  
4 baseline, and we hadn't made progress on a slate like 50,  
5 one year with little above, and then a little bit low, and  
6 little above, and little below, but there wasn't any kind  
7 of -- we weren't get -- we weren't making more growth at 50  
8 every year in the prior assessment. But I think it's -- I  
9 think it's a really important thing, especially for that  
10 sense of fairness with the -- with the measure to be able  
11 to baseline it.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

14 MS. PEARSON: So last topic for you all.

15 Let's talk a little bit about participation. As we talked  
16 about the beginning about the new ratings and the  
17 descriptors on the frameworks, I wanted to show you some of  
18 the very preliminary data. And this is going to change,  
19 but I wanted to show you just kind of give you a sense of  
20 where we're at. So the first column is about the schools  
21 and districts that received a low participation note on  
22 their frameworks. Just to say, their overall participation  
23 rate was below 95 percent in two or more content areas. We  
24 had 74 districts and 48 -- 486 schools that had that note.  
25 So that's 40 percent of our districts, 27 percent of our



1 schools, okay? And then in terms of the decrease due to  
2 participation, and again this is very preliminary and we  
3 know this is going to change because this is where we have  
4 this coding challenges with people thought they coded as  
5 parent excusals didn't code as parent refusals and just the  
6 confusion there, but we had 20 districts that were in the  
7 preliminary lowered just about 11 percent of districts and  
8 111 schools or about 6 percent of those schools that have  
9 lowered ratings. We know a lot of this will change. When  
10 they change, they won't get lowered anymore, but they will  
11 still very likely have that low participation note. So in  
12 total, we're gonna have like 40 percent plus 11 percent, so  
13 about 51 percent of our districts that are below 95 percent  
14 participation in two or more content areas.

15 MS. MAZANEC: How many?

16 MS. PEARSON: About 51 percent of our  
17 districts.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Fifty-one.

19 MS. PEARSON: Fifty-one. And 95 percent is  
20 a pretty high bar, but -- and I'll show you in a second  
21 kind of the gradations in that, but that's where we're at.  
22 And then we'll have about 33 percent of our schools that  
23 have the low participation flag, too. And then we talked  
24 to the beginning about the insufficient state data due to  
25 low participation, we have eight districts in that



1 situation and 32 schools. And I anticipate that'll  
2 probably increase because we have some that even though  
3 they met that number of 20 kids that tested, so we gave  
4 them a rating, it may not be representative of their  
5 student population. So they'll be able, through the  
6 request, to reconsider process to come to us -- to us and  
7 ask for an insufficient data or state data rating just  
8 because we don't have the information to be able to really  
9 suddenly give it.

10 We wanted to give them the information we  
11 had, and then go through the request to reconsider process  
12 with them around that. It's kind of the status of where  
13 we're at right now. This is a map of Colorado with our  
14 overall participation rate. The red shows the districts  
15 that are below 95 percent into a more content areas. The  
16 yellow, the ones that are above. The gray one is Agate,  
17 they have very few kids. And then this next picture is  
18 probably a little bit more helpful. We have this  
19 interactively as a tool for you all, and we'll send the --  
20 the link or -- Bizy sent me the link for it. And this just  
21 tries to show a little bit in terms of not above and below  
22 95 percent, but the -- that grayish blue color is 95  
23 percent or greater. The green is between 80 and 95  
24 percent. That beige color is 50 to 70 -- to 80 percent.



1 The yellowish orange is above 0 to 50, and the bright  
2 orange is zero.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you've excerpted the  
6 parent refusal reason for opting out, right? What are the  
7 other reasons? In other words, how do you -- is it like,  
8 well, if the student has a letter on file, then we -- then  
9 we excise that data point from this calculation? And in  
10 which case, what are the other reasons that students don't  
11 participate?

12 MS. PEARSON: So this, just to be clear,  
13 this actually is the -- the pure participation rate. This  
14 is not what we're using for district lowering ratings, this  
15 is just what the participation rates came out as so that we  
16 can see what percentage of students are participating to --  
17 to have to use for our data and for our school and district  
18 performance frameworks. So this is any reason a student  
19 didn't participate is -- is included here. So it may be a  
20 parent excusal, and maybe a student didn't complete the  
21 test. We had a lot of blanks reported, just the kids  
22 didn't take the test, we didn't get a reason. We have  
23 medical exemptions but those are pulled out of this because  
24 if a student is on -- having a medical emergency clearly,  
25 we're not expecting them to take a test right then. What I



1 am forgetting? Absent during the testing window. Those  
2 are the big one. Misadministrations, which is not a huge  
3 percent.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what percent are because  
5 of parent excusals? When you look at the universal reasons  
6 why somebody doesn't take the test, is that 80 percent of  
7 them?

8 MS. PEARSON: You could see the majority in  
9 terms of low participation versus decreased to the  
10 participation, based on the data that we currently have and  
11 what the districts reported to us. The majority are around  
12 low participation, 'cause 74 percent of other -- parent  
13 excusals, 20 is without parents excusals. I bet that 20 is  
14 going to change, because I think it just was confusion by  
15 the district on what to report.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So 74 percent of the reason  
17 students don't take the test is because of a parent  
18 excusals?

19 MS. PEARSON: Sorry, that's not the right  
20 number. I will get you the actual percent. That's not --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just talking about  
22 whether or not districts get penalized. That's all. And  
23 you're saying, they --

24 MS. PEARSON: -- they do not. The one thing  
25 that is hard right now is if -- if -- if they have a parent





1 excusal, that they report it to us in the way that we  
2 expected them and gave them guidance on how to report.  
3 There is confute the system. There's a lot of different  
4 steps in the system, and so some of them thought they  
5 reported that to us and did it. So that's what we're  
6 working on the request to reconsider process. So that's  
7 why I know that middle column around on the decrease will  
8 change.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

10 MS. PEARSON: Oh, yeah. And then we can  
11 pull up -- when Joyce presented in August, she called it  
12 the watermelon chart. I don't know, if you remember. But  
13 it had the watermelon colors and the red color with the  
14 black font with the number of pairing off that, and then  
15 like the yellows where the other ones. So we can pull that  
16 up and resend that to you as you can see it. But again, we  
17 know there's some coding issues so we know that our data  
18 that we have here isn't perfect on that.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Can you tell us the these  
22 districts that have zero participation?

23 MS. PEARSON: Yes. I should have had that  
24 written down for you, guys. Hold on. I don't want to do



1 it without memory and tell you the wrong thing. And you  
2 all have the link, too, so you can look at it.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Through the districts?

4 MS. PEARSON: The one and then far -- let's  
5 go. The one up North, right on the border, that's Plateau  
6 85. The one right South of it is Lonestar, and this one  
7 right here is Kit Carson. And this is for English Language  
8 Arts results. So that's what I had for you all today.  
9 Some other questions? The first one was Plateau 5.

10 MS. MAZANEC: It's not the same, is it? Or  
11 is it Plateau --

12 MS. PEARSON: I think Plateau 85 is --  
13 Plateau 50 is not. Plateau 50 is out West, I think. Hold  
14 on. I will get out. Just a second. Talk to them  
15 yesterday. Yes, Plateau 5 is East.

16 MS. MAZANEC: It is.

17 MS. PEARSON: You got it.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

19 MS. MAZANEC: It would be nice if they  
20 always -- sort of like the word out of this.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

22 MS. PEARSON: I know.

23 MS. MAZANEC: I look for (inaudible) or  
24 somewhere and I can't find it.



1 MS. PEARSON: Just get them memorize the  
2 district code. That's why I'm trying to memorize the  
3 school district codes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec, did you  
5 present earlier conversation have question about on page 4  
6 going back to the timeline for asking for reconsideration?  
7 This be a good time for you to raise that issue.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. Are we done?

9 MS. PEARSON: Yep, I'm done.

10 MS. BURDSALL: Will you speak into your  
11 microphone?

12 MS. MAZANEC: No. So I think you've got the  
13 same e-mail I did from a superintendent concerned about  
14 timeline, and not having any information soon enough. And  
15 I mean, I know we've been talking about how the timeline is  
16 type, but can you address that?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yes. We're working with  
18 people on timeline and help. So right now, the draft, it's  
19 only drafted into the 17th. We can be -- if there's things  
20 going on we knew there was fall break. There was other  
21 issues going on, so we'll work with people individually.

22 MS. MAZANEC: So draft on 17th and the final  
23 on the 7th?

24 MS. PEARSON: At the 17th (inaudible) on  
25 November 7th.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I'll communicate with that.

4 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

5 MS. MAZANEC: Superintendent have --

6 MS. PEARSON: Let's take a break and see if  
7 it's the same one, because I wrote them back last night,  
8 but then the e-mail got up here. So we'll talk. I didn't  
9 -- I didn't know that you were on there.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, he wrote to both of us.

11 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Then let's talk and  
12 make sure I got the right one. Okay.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Just -- what I mean,  
16 already knows the answer. I've -- that the difference  
17 between this map, I'm looking at Jefferson County, I'll  
18 just get specific. On this one it says that there isn't  
19 that meets 95 percent participation. However, on the  
20 Language Arts --

21 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

22 MS. GOFF: -- it's not quite there.

23 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

24 MS. GOFF: So can -- do I talk to people  
25 with the explanation that this is true or false or right or



1 wrong. There -- and when you add in the Math, the Math  
2 participation rate as well, along with the Language Arts.  
3 That the reason there might be a difference here meeting or  
4 not meeting, you met the standard or you didn't meet --  
5 it's because only one of those content areas is represented  
6 here. They're going to be wondering why are we --

7 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

8 MS. GOFF: -- we want to know why that just  
9 disappear.

10 MS. PEARSON: You've got it right there it's  
11 about the multiple content areas, 'cause we look at Math,  
12 English Language Arts, Science, and ACT as well.

13 MS. GOFF: Correct. Well -- now, wait a  
14 minute.

15 MS. PEARSON: What?

16 MS. GOFF: Say that again. Which --

17 MS. PEARSON: We look at Math, English  
18 Language Arts, Science, and ACT. So they need to  
19 (inaudible) two or more content areas to not be needing the  
20 95. So we'll go --

21 MS. GOFF: This is not just -- is this does  
22 include all of CMAS?

23 MS. PEARSON: This -- that map you're  
24 looking at, right there, is just English Language Arts,  
25 right there. But we have another way to look at Math



1 separately and -- and the link on the tool, you can select  
2 the assessment that you want to -- if you want to look at  
3 Math, you want to look at Science, if you want to look at -  
4 - I think it's on there, too. Let me double check.

5 MS. GOFF: Well, we -- I -- that may not fit  
6 in what's your plan of presentation today. I'm just --  
7 thank you. I probably would have gotten here an hour or  
8 after we leave each other today.

9 MS. PEARSON: You already got it. You're  
10 good.

11 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

12 MS. PEARSON: You knew it.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Hey, excuse me.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Did you say -- did you say it  
16 has to meet 95 percent in two or more?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, because sometimes  
18 there's just like a weird thing with one content area, so  
19 we look for a pattern before. We have a flag there.

20 MS. MAZANEC: I'm also interested in other  
21 reasons for OP.

22 MS. PEARSON: I can give you a list of all  
23 the codes right to, we'll get that.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Because I know in -- in -- you  
25 know, some online schools that have a population of



1 students with medical issues and disabilities, it's a  
2 struggle.

3 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. And those medical  
4 exemptions have always --

5 MS. MAZANEC: It may or may not to get  
6 (inaudible) opt-out for.

7 MS. PEARSON: And that's okay. The --  
8 there's two codes, you guys are getting more than we ever  
9 wanted.

10 MS. MAZANEC: I know.

11 MS. PEARSON: If a student withdraws before  
12 completion, like if they move districts, they're not  
13 counted in the participation rate at all. So if they're  
14 coded that way, you just take them out. And if their  
15 medical exemption is that the language is right now, same  
16 thing, their taken out, because again, for a student is in  
17 a medical emergency situation or has -- we don't want there  
18 is conversations way back in the day about kids being in  
19 the hospital, and people trying to take a test to them.  
20 No, that's -- that's not the point of testing there.

21 MS. MAZANEC: So I just -- I just want to  
22 make sure that -- that it's clear that no -- no schools are  
23 being punished for their non-participation rate if they  
24 have the opt-out from parents.



1 MS. PEARSON: Yes. Right now is what they -  
2 - yep --

3 MS. MAZANEC: Simply a non-participation  
4 rate without explanation or that's --

5 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

6 MS. MAZANEC: -- that's the difference. And  
7 also good to note. Okay.

8 MS. PEARSON: So what -- what is currently  
9 coded at CDE. And again, we know that some of that is not  
10 what the districts intended or what they have on file. So  
11 that's what we're working out. But with what they got in  
12 their preliminary, based on what we have here, their rating  
13 is not lowered unless they're under the 95 percent in two  
14 or more content areas when we remove the parent excusals  
15 from the calculation, and the medical exemptions, and  
16 (inaudible) before completion.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

18 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Just recalled another  
19 question, I was asked recently. Does the -- does this  
20 reported -- this information on opt-out participation --  
21 part of that. Does that include CoAlt testing as well? So  
22 our -- our special education teachers, students, scores,  
23 does it -- does it --

24 MS. PEARSON: Yes.





1 MS. GOFF: Uniform process for handling with  
2 that.

3 MS. PEARSON: Both assessments. Both  
4 assessments with the same rules around the coding are  
5 included in the participation calculations.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay, thanks.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. You should just come  
8 next to me.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further question for Ms.  
10 Pearson. Anything? Going once and twice. Thank you very  
11 much.

12 MS. PEARSON: Thank you all.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And we're now waiting --  
14 we have Lieutenant Governor next. I think we'll stand in  
15 recess. I don't think we can move any forward to take up a  
16 little time here. I don't believe, so. Maybe we could --  
17 I guess we could do the item 19, individual Board members  
18 reports on upcoming activities while we're waiting? Want  
19 to take that out of order, 19? Start with Ms. Mazanec,  
20 anything on item 19?

21 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry, we were -- we were  
22 going --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was being-

24 MS. MAZANEC: We were going back to the last  
25 one.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Trying to finish that up.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then we just go out of  
4 order. We -- we do need to wait for the Lieutenant  
5 Governor. It's the report individual Board Member reports  
6 on upcoming or previous activities. Can we get that out of  
7 the way?

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, I have been invited to  
9 visit St. Vrain Valley School District, and I believe it's  
10 the 21st of October, and to Burlington on the 26th. And  
11 I'm really hoping to make both. That's about all I have to  
12 report.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

14 MS. RANKIN: Could I go back and just  
15 mention something --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

17 MS. RANKIN: -- from this last report. We  
18 received this letter from Alicia Bono the Principal at  
19 Cache La Poudre Middle School. And I think we should bring  
20 this to everyone's attention at this point, because this is  
21 not a stand alone letter. I don't believe, at least not  
22 from what I've heard. And she makes the point that,  
23 "Opting out has become a domino effect and will continue to  
24 increase. There is no longer any benefit to testing, given  
25 the fact that the results are invalid for their intended



1 purposes. It is a complete misuse of taxpayer dollars.  
2 Additionally, it is no longer possible to write school  
3 improvement plan based on PARCC data." She goes on to say  
4 that, "For the sake of the students and dedicated educators  
5 in the State of Colorado that we either require all  
6 students to test or cease testing." I just think, this is  
7 a concern of a lot of people and the amount of money that  
8 we spend on education, and I -- I just wanted to bring that  
9 forward.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin, I -- I also  
11 received that same letter and I did respond. Actually, I  
12 see if I -- since the letter came in hard copy, I responded  
13 in hard copy and I had to see if my assistant can get my  
14 copy, my response, but response was essentially that the  
15 legislature has made a determination about not penalizing  
16 students for non-participation or should -- for parents --  
17 students, not it's parents that's the participation it's  
18 parents sanctioned, and that this Board is then I think  
19 followed up appropriately, and said we don't -- we're not  
20 penalizing districts for that which they cannot control. I  
21 think I would -- I don't think I stated in my response, I  
22 think I would disagree that I -- I don't think meeting 95  
23 percent, and I'm sure Ms. Pearson may disagree, necessarily  
24 invalidates results. I don't believe it does.



1 I mean, when there are all kinds of  
2 statistical ways to compensate for a -- a black  
3 participation, even if it's concentrated in a -- in one  
4 group, you can, as long as you have kind of minimal  
5 participation, you can usually make legitimate  
6 extrapolations to -- to get it to an answer. That's  
7 complicated, but it's done in -- it's done in polling all  
8 the time where you under sample left-handed with  
9 (inaudible) you can impute what had you properly sampled  
10 them, what -- how that would affect the overall result. So  
11 I'm not at all convinced that not meeting 95 percent of  
12 participation validates results. I think, the federal  
13 standard is wrong simply provided you have enough of a  
14 sample to -- to be able to do that extrapolation and it  
15 occurs. I think it can be done.

16 I don't think we do it, but I think we could  
17 do it. And so I essentially just reminded the principal  
18 that I don't -- that we're following the law and that's  
19 what the law is. And personally, I agree with the law, I  
20 don't think -- I don't think any administrator wants to be  
21 in the business of seeing how much pressure they have to  
22 apply to a student or parent to make them take a test. I  
23 don't think that works either. So you have to make -- I  
24 just don't believe there's a chance that will work. So I  
25 did respond.



1 I do know that Lieutenant Governor's here,  
2 so we'll suspend the reports. And so Lieutenant Governor  
3 Lynne if you'd like to join us at the table here.  
4 Appreciate it. And welcome to your first adventure with  
5 State Board of Education.

6 MS. LYNNE: Well, thank you. It's nice --  
7 first of all, I appreciate the opportunity to be here.  
8 More importantly, the work with you in other forums and  
9 certainly with Katy on some of the intersection between --  
10 what the Governor's trying to do in a broader education  
11 space. So thank you for the opportunity to be here. And I  
12 think today has given -- I've been in my seat for five  
13 months, and have been spending a lot of time, as you can  
14 imagine, from correction, agriculture, there's so many  
15 other issues. I do -- I think I have my feet a little bit  
16 wet but not a lot wet. So I actually, ironically, just by  
17 way of introduction, I have been a Lieutenant Governor for  
18 five months. The Governor asked me to wear all the  
19 different role and I know Joe Garcia who (inaudible) now  
20 and who had a great career in education. Wore a different  
21 hat than all of you. Of course, he was the Executive  
22 Director for the Department of Higher Education. I  
23 actually am the acting Executive Director for the  
24 Department of Higher Education 'cause we're still working  
25 to find somebody to take that -- that seat. But



1 importantly, what the Governor asked me to do as the Chief  
2 Operating Officer, and that is a position that didn't exist  
3 that from his point of view was designed to -- oh, thank  
4 you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No problem.

6 MS. LYNNE: Okay. Thanks. I didn't know I  
7 had to eat it.

8 (Overlapping)

9 MS. LYNNE: Yeah. So what he really wants  
10 to establish is greater accountability and transparency in  
11 what all of our state agencies do. And particularly  
12 communication with elected officials, with the general  
13 public, so that we're describing to you and to everybody  
14 else around the state, what are we trying to do with the  
15 money that's allocated to us, and how are we holding  
16 organizations and meeting our own departments and the  
17 people that work in them accountable for delivering  
18 results? And hopefully always in a positive direction. So  
19 that is my task that's at hand. From a personal  
20 perspective, I just want to share with you my trajectory to  
21 this point. Although, somebody introduced me today and  
22 they started with where I was born which was not relevant.

23 I've been in Colorado for 12 years. And for  
24 the 12 years that I was here prior to taking on the  
25 Lieutenant Governor's job, I was the Executive Vice



1 President for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan and Hospitals.  
2 I had 16,000 employees working for me, and obviously spent  
3 a lot of time in the healthcare space. I will tell you  
4 that, when I wasn't doing healthcare, honestly, I was doing  
5 education. I don't claim to be an expert but I have  
6 certainly spent a lot of time thinking about education  
7 issues. Even back to my very first job, when I was 23  
8 years old, I was the budget analyst for the city of New  
9 York on education issues, and that quickly morphed given  
10 the time frame which was New York's fiscal crisis into  
11 somehow being the lead negotiator for teacher's contracts  
12 for the city of New York.

13                   So I spent a lot of time with the UFT and  
14 the AFT and probably could go through some names that you  
15 would all recognize. But since I've been in Colorado over  
16 the last 12 years, I've been the Chair of the Denver Public  
17 Schools Foundation, the Chair of Teach for America, the Co-  
18 Chair with Mayor Hancock and Tom Boasberg of the Denver  
19 Education Compact, a trustee on the Board of the University  
20 of Denver. And currently, as you know, as I said in  
21 addition to Lieutenant Governor Higher Ed, I wear the hat  
22 of the Early Childhood Leadership Council Chair with Barb  
23 Grogan. So what that means is education is very important  
24 to me personally, and wherever I've gone in my career, I've  
25 tried to take that as something, whether I do it in my



1 spare time or I do it from an influence perspective in the  
2 roles that I am. And I often liken healthcare to education  
3 because it quite frankly they're inseparable.

4           You can't have good healthcare if you don't  
5 have some health literacy, and you certainly can't have a  
6 great education if you're not healthy. So what I hope to  
7 bring to the Hickenlooper administration in 26 months that  
8 we have left is greater focus on how we work together  
9 aligning on providing high quality education to our  
10 children regardless of where they live, and to look at P20  
11 in a -- in a frame that I think you all recognize is  
12 critically important. So however long, I wear this hat as  
13 Acting Executive Director for the Department of Higher  
14 Education, what I've consistently said to our Higher  
15 Education Commission and to the folks that work in the  
16 department, we can't hold Higher Education accountable for  
17 everything because the process begins long before they get  
18 into their -- into Higher Education. So I am thrilled that  
19 Katy, and I, and others in our office have had some  
20 opportunities to begin having those dialogues and to share  
21 information.

22           When I think about -- and I've -- and I've  
23 said to the government sort of said, "Boy, I'm a -- a  
24 little bit -- I'm a swing for the fences kind of the gal."  
25 What I'd like to see in the remaining 26 months is how we





1 continue to do the work that you've been doing, that we've  
2 focused on in our administration that includes obviously  
3 thinking hard about the READ act, what it's accomplished,  
4 what it might continue to accomplish. I think we have some  
5 great accomplishments that we can share across Higher Ed  
6 and K-12 particularly in high school years that look at how  
7 the great successes that we've had in concurrent  
8 enrollment, and how that's helping. And certainly, you  
9 probably have heard of a passion of the governor's which is  
10 called the Business Experiential Learning Commission.

11                   As a business person, I often would say,  
12 "Our universities are turning out great graduates but  
13 that's not always aligned with what businesses want." And  
14 so that Business Experiential Learning Commission which  
15 takes our high school students who may not be traditionally  
16 going directly into college but doesn't mean that college  
17 isn't an opportunity for them at some point, and marries  
18 them with businesses for what we're calling apprenticeship  
19 programs. So in my former job, I was a Member of the BEL  
20 commission, spent time with the Governor helping to hatch  
21 that. Went to Switzerland to learn about the Swiss model  
22 of providing apprenticeships. And we're excited because I  
23 know Katy has joined us in that work and our Higher  
24 Education Department as well as our labor and employment,  
25 to be thinking about a world in Colorado where we have



1 20,000 students, who by 2025 have been in through our  
2 apprenticeship programs, and so they earn money, they are  
3 still going to school, and they have an opportunity to have  
4 a career that is oftentimes supplemented by Higher  
5 Education.

6 I really want to sort of conclude by simply  
7 saying that my approach and -- I'll go back to my days, I  
8 used to say to the UFT, you're lucky to have me on the  
9 other side because my approach to things is collaborative  
10 and not confrontational. And I look forward to building a  
11 relationship with all of you, as we go forward, and to  
12 participate not only in future Board meetings, but in other  
13 ways that we can interact. And quite frankly, that I'm not  
14 just talking at you but you're giving me input around how  
15 we, as an administration, can support the work that you do.  
16 So that concludes my remarks, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Lynne.  
18 Would you -- I don't know if there are any questions but --

19 MS. LYNNE: I'm happy to take some  
20 questions.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Very good. Thank you.  
22 Dr. Schroeder.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Of course. Welcome Dr.  
24 Lynne.

25 MS. LYNNE: Thank you.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Glad you're here. We have  
2 talked at least over the last six months at our table a lot  
3 about the significant growth in concurrent enrollment. And  
4 it causes me to wonder, if this growth continues and we  
5 have a really significant number of our high school  
6 students engaged in either Higher Education courses or  
7 coursework that leads to some sort of a career or skill,  
8 shouldn't we be speaking or visiting with the Higher Ed  
9 Institutions to look at? What is a community college look  
10 like when many of our graduates have actually completed,  
11 perhaps the coursework that's offered at a community  
12 college? What does -- how does -- what does higher --  
13 we're seeing the changes but what is Higher Ed look like in  
14 a -- in a different scenario?

15 MS. LYNNE: Yeah.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: The governmental funding now  
17 goes to Higher Ed that could -- I think would be welcome.  
18 That the folks at CDE or some of the districts can tap into  
19 some of that? Some specific grants? In other words, I  
20 think we're in need of some kind of a Higher Ed vision. As  
21 we've talked about having more students get a college  
22 degree, I've worried about the capacity at Higher Ed to  
23 grant those degrees. We have X number of facilities and I  
24 don't know what they're going to grow that much. However,  
25 this is actually an opportunity to maybe retool those



1 organizations in a different way so that our kids are  
2 graduating from high school, having taken some of what used  
3 to be at Higher Ed. So what -- how does Higher Ed now fill  
4 in some of the other needs that we have to sort of a bigger  
5 broader discussion of a vision for the next five to ten  
6 years?

7 MS. LYNNE: Yeah. I think that's a great  
8 observation, and you may know that we put together a master  
9 plan -- a five year master plan in Higher Ed. That plan  
10 expires next year. And so we are working with our -- and  
11 we have geographic representation, much like you have,  
12 across our Higher Ed Commission, and we are beginning to  
13 say -- or the things that we said quite frankly in 2011 for  
14 the 2012 to 2017 plan, are they still relevant? Do we need  
15 to adjust them in some ways? And I think this would be a  
16 great conversation. Happy to have the department also help  
17 think about it. You know, another thing I've -- I've heard  
18 some recent conversation to is about the quality of some of  
19 the courses that are being offered and concurrent  
20 enrollment and does it meet the expectations that we have  
21 of what those will translate into in terms of the ability  
22 to actually, you know, move into whether it's a community  
23 college or a four-year school. So -- so I think that's  
24 another area that we're starting to take a look at. But I  
25 appreciate your suggestion and certainly Katy and I can



1 work on that offline and I'll pull the commission in as  
2 well.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you. I would  
4 think about maybe including some of our real visionary  
5 superintendents --

6 MS. LYNNE: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: -- in that. Because there  
8 are some that see opportunities for their students that are  
9 -- that are different than -- than they have been  
10 historically. And I think getting the feedback from Higher  
11 Ed would be helpful to them as well.

12 MS. LYNNE: Okay.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much.

14 MS. LYNNE: You're welcome.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further comments or  
16 questions? Seeing none. Thank you, Ms. Lynne. We're very  
17 much appreciate --

18 MS. LYNNE: Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- your taking the time to  
20 be with us, and we look forward to the opportunity to work  
21 with you.

22 MS. LYNNE: Great.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

24 MS. LYNNE: Thank you very much.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's -- okay.  
2 (Inaudible), do you know that? All right. Why don't we  
3 continue with the report, we'll finish that up. And then  
4 for the audience, then it looks like we have a rather  
5 lengthy executive session following that, so we're -- we --  
6 yes, Ms. Rankin?

7                   MS. RANKIN: First of all, thanks for the  
8 clarification of that letter. I -- I think that'll be very  
9 helpful when we back up what we're thinking with  
10 legislation and -- and what's going on. In the past month,  
11 I've been in Montezuma County and into Cortez. I met with  
12 Brian Hanson, the Superintendent of Mancos. Went to a case  
13 conference in Avon and listened to representatives, Hamner  
14 and Rankin discussed the third quarter revenue forecast.  
15 Went to a rural charter school event here in Denver,  
16 attended the turnaround training, of course, we all did.  
17 Also address (inaudible) in Rio Blanco County, they asked  
18 me to come and talk about what's going on up here, at the  
19 State Board. Met with Superintendent Chris Sallee. Met in  
20 Pueblo with Representative Garcia, discussing situations in  
21 Pueblo. And also have attended the ESSA Hub. So that's  
22 been my --

23                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. Ms.  
24 Goff?



1 MS. GOFF: Kind of all over the place.  
2 Various things. I've been engaged on a fairly regular  
3 basis with Adams County School District some, you know, in  
4 light of some of the community efforts that are going on.  
5 Just to create the real cradle to career support system and  
6 what -- how can partnerships in communities, nonprofits,  
7 school districts, of course, their local law enforcement  
8 health -- health related agencies and institutions. So  
9 that's been very gratifying. There is -- as you know,  
10 research and setting goals and implementation and  
11 evaluation of any program takes time. But there is some  
12 indication that results are -- are coming which is of  
13 interest to a lot of Adams County right now, also from our  
14 perspective here on the Board.

15 I've also been listening in because  
16 transportation -- scheduling and coordination of  
17 transportation around my home, family life has been  
18 interesting. That's all I need to say about that. So I've  
19 been listening to Hub Committee Meetings, and the  
20 Legislative Interim Committee meetings as well, not only on  
21 the ESSA work but on some other interested -- interesting  
22 areas that I -- that I follow. Other than that, I have --  
23 the grown children related to me, mostly by way of being  
24 nieces and nephews and great nieces and nephews are all  
25 getting married for some reason. So this is -- which is



1 good. This has been a summer of young people creating new  
2 lives and coming together with -- with new spouses and  
3 establishing new homes and that's been a good change of  
4 focus for me. I've appreciated having the chance to get  
5 back to family and check in with our own values and our  
6 roots and our (inaudible) as well. So that's -- that's  
7 primarily where I've been the last month and a half. So  
8 thanks.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

10 MS. FLORES: Yes, I -- I want to speak the  
11 Denver City Council on police and policing in schools.  
12 Sorry. I spoke to the Denver City Council on policing in  
13 schools. And gave my opinion that we need more social  
14 workers and counselors and less policing in schools. I  
15 think that would, you know, that would probably stop the --  
16 that -- what do you call that? The police -- the school to  
17 -- to jail pass. I really -- I really believe that. And I  
18 spoke with Louis Palmer Board Member. I've had several  
19 discussions with Denver Public Schools on the bond  
20 proposals. And -- so that's been kind of several many  
21 discussions on that. And I've also spoken with many  
22 constituents who are very concerned about it. In fact, I -  
23 - I have -- the whole -- how every penny is going to be  
24 spent. You know, some of the people ask me, "Well, is  
25 Lincoln going to -- is any money going to be spent on





1 Lincoln schools?" And of course, constituents are very  
2 concerned about how hot, I hear this a lot, the schools are  
3 in where their kids can really learn at 90 degree weather.  
4 And many of our schools in Denver are -- are not air  
5 conditioned. So that's, you know, that's a big concern for  
6 a lot of parents. I've been, attending the -- the Hub  
7 committees, and I think those are going well. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Flores.  
9 Dr. Scheffel?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I've just meeting with a lot  
11 of groups and went to the event that Katy emceed which was  
12 great with the parent involvement.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. I will be  
14 tomorrow attending the quality data conference in New  
15 Orleans. I'll be leaving tomorrow, so I will not be here  
16 for the Board meeting tomorrow. Dr. Schroeder will  
17 preside. And I think it's an area where I need to  
18 certainly expand my knowledge based on the -- be doing that  
19 tomorrow. I think Dr. Schroeder (inaudible) did not have  
20 to report. And so that brings us to -- brings us to the  
21 executive session. Ms. Burdsall, if you'd like to read  
22 them, and -- and this is scheduled for two hours, so I  
23 don't believe we will reconvene until let's say 2:00, not  
24 before 2:00. Okay?

25 MS. BURDSALL: An exec --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Burdsall.

2 MS. BURDSALL: An executive session has been  
3 noticed for today's State Board Meeting in conformance with  
4 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific  
5 legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402-(3)(a)(II) CRS, in  
6 matters required to be kept confidential by federal law  
7 rules or state statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III)  
8 CRS.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there a motion  
10 for an executive session?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's moved.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved. Is there  
13 a second? And it's moved and seconded. Is there objection  
14 to the adoption of that motion? Seeing none, the Board  
15 will be in executive session until 2:00 p.m. Thank you.

16 (Meeting adjourned)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright  
Kimberly C. McCright  
Certified Vendor and Notary Public  
  
Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC  
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165  
Houston, Texas 77058  
281.724.8600