



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 9, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 9, 2017,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: -- consideration of --
2 of the Safe Communities - Safe Schools research request.
3 Before we get in discussion is there a motion on the floor,
4 please? Board Member McClellan.

5 MS. McCLELLAN: I move to approve the
6 research request for student PII to evaluate the Safe
7 Communities - Safe Schools program.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second it.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Proper motion. Thank you
10 for seconding it.

11 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Questions or comments?
12 And I don't think we need another presentation as --

13 MR. DURHAM: I thought we were gonna get a
14 presentation.

15 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Well, we had
16 presentations. If you had a question --

17 MR. DURHAM: Oh, I got lots of them.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Ten minutes, Steve.

19 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: We have the researcher,
20 Dr. Alison Dimnicky (ph), here to address any questions you
21 guys might have on the document that we provided to you from
22 our -- from out last board meeting.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do
25 have a -- I did -- Dr., I did just re-read the document. I



1 think there's some case made for personally identifiable
2 information. I don't think it's the strongest one I've ever
3 seen, but I do have more questions about the subject being
4 researched in particular, and I wonder if there're any
5 representatives of the -- now and let me ask one question.
6 You're not associated -- you're doing strictly research. Are
7 you associated in any way financially with the people who
8 are doing this program, and is -- is your research to
9 evaluate the success of the program?

10 DR. DIMNICKY: It's to evaluate the program,
11 yes. I'm not associated financially with the people doing
12 the program.

13 MR. DURHAM: How about any other way? Do you
14 have any other contact, relationship with them? You're not
15 at CU, then?

16 DR. DIMNICKY: No, I'm not. I have no
17 affiliation to CU.

18 MR. DURHAM: Okay, so -- so this program's
19 been in existence since 2001. To your knowledge has there
20 been any research done in the last 16 years as to the
21 effectiveness of this program?

22 DR. DIMNICKY: Great question. So they had
23 worked with some schools in an earlier version of it. It
24 wasn't the exact same model we're talking about now, but
25 they worked with probably about 20 schools, or so, to do



1 this model, and to start to collect the data and to start to
2 understand more about it.

3 They didn't do any kind of formal evaluation like we're
4 trying to do now of the program, which is why they are
5 really interested in doing this work.

6 MR. DURHAM: And so they -- they have a 6
7 million dollar grant, I guess -- that -- that's not the cost
8 of the evaluation.

9 DR. DIMNICKY: No. Oh, no. We have very
10 little smart -- part of that evaluation. Most of --

11 MR. DURHAM: You wish you had more. Maybe we
12 could evaluate something extra.

13 DR. DIMNICKY: You're welcome to increase my
14 cut of it. But -- but really, it's -- most of the work is
15 going to the schools. There's -- they're (indiscernible)

16 MR. DURHAM: So is there -- is there someone
17 here from this program?

18 DR. DIMNICKY: There is not, actually. The
19 person who's supposed to be here's father broke his hip
20 yesterday and is in the hospital, so --

21 MR. DURHAM: Well, Madam Chair, I have a
22 couple of ethical questions that I wanna pose to the people
23 who have -- who are doing this research, and I am very
24 uncomfortable voting for this until I have a chance to ask
25 Ms. Beverly Kingston about some of her comments in an



1 article in the Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph about this
2 program. And particularly about some of the inconsistencies.
3 First of all, the -- the article, which I'm sure the
4 reporter stumbled on accidentally, the subject matter by
5 themselves. I'm also sure the moon's made of green cheese.
6 That -- that she's -- they name the schools in Colorado
7 Springs that have been chosen for this program, and then on
8 the front -- this is from the front page of the middle
9 section of the Gazette; she then said that currently 23
10 middle schools are involved, adding that she cannot disclose
11 which schools have been chosen, but then we have in an -- an
12 article on the front page of the local section of the paper
13 disclosing two of the schools.

14 I think I know why this article appeared in the paper,
15 but I want the opportunity to question that, and there are a
16 number of other statements and claims in this article I'd
17 like to have an opportunity to probe directly with the
18 researcher, so I'd request that this item be tabled until
19 that opportunity is afforded me.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well how does this
21 affect the researcher?

22 MR. DURHAM: Well, I think it will give the
23 board the opportunity to evaluate the efficacy of this whole
24 concept and program, and -- and -- and to evaluate the
25 ethical conduct of the people conducting this research.



1 MS. RANKIN: Madam Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes.

3 MS. RANKIN: Could I ask a question, please?

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sure, Board Member

5 Rankin.

6 MS. RANKIN: Board Member Durham, can you
7 give me the date of -- of that newspaper article, please?

8 MR. DURHAM: Friday, November 3, 2017. Timing
9 was a little suspect, as well as the substance and comments
10 of the article, and -- and I -- as I remember from when the
11 CU people were here they didn't disclose to us any of the --
12 and made it clear that they didn't intend to disclose which
13 schools were being surveyed, but in Colorado Springs it is
14 on the front page here, Sabin Middle School, and Jenkins
15 Middle School, and the Jack Swigert Aerospace Academy. The -
16 - goes on to say that -- that we had -- one of the many
17 incidents we've had recently in Colorado Springs about two
18 13-year-old students who were suspended and charged, I think
19 one of them with a felony, one of them attended Sabin Middle
20 School.

21 So I think -- I think the conduct of these researchers
22 may be unethical, and I wanna be able to probe that
23 question.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: You are challenging the
25 conduct of the American Institute of Research?



1 MR. DURHAM: No.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Or you are questioning
3 the conduct of the University of Colorado programs?

4 MR. DURHAM: CU program. It's (indiscernible)
5 I wanna make that clear. I don't -- I --

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. That's not --
7 that's not -- yeah. That's not our motion, though. Our
8 motion is whether we are going to provide the protected data
9 to the American Institute for Research for the program. I --
10 I don't know whether we have the authority to bring up the
11 other issue, but that's a different agenda issue and I'm --
12 if we can, if legal counsel says that's within our sand box
13 to question that I'm glad to bring that up next month.

14 MR. DURHAM: Well, Madam Chair. First of all,
15 I don't think this -- this program is likely to go on and be
16 continued absence the research evaluation, so I think the
17 two -- I think the program is married to the research, and
18 the conduct of the program and the way it's being conducted,
19 can affect the research outcome. So I don't think they're
20 separate issues. I think -- I think this is a package, you
21 are voting -- if we -- if we're voting for this --

22 F: May I?

23 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, please help yourself. If -
24 - if you're voting for this you're voting not only to give
25 PII to evaluate the program, but you're also putting a stamp



1 of approval on the program. Otherwise we wouldn't bother to
2 provide evaluation.

3 So I'm -- I may get outvoted on this, but I can say
4 that -- that if you just look at the inherent conflict,
5 which in this article which says, "Well, we can't name
6 schools, but oh, by the way, here are two of them that are
7 being named." And I think -- I think the board has a right
8 to probe the efficacy of this program, and I think it has a
9 right to probe why this article appeared in the Colorado
10 Springs paper, and why it named two schools that they said
11 they weren't going to name. And I think we oughta do that.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. Counselor,
13 help me out here.

14 COUNSELOR: You know, the statute provides us
15 very little guidance. I mean, the -- the general framework
16 under which it falls is data security, and so the reason
17 we're here is because the statute directed the department to
18 develop a process by which it would review research
19 requests, and ensure there was adequate security for the
20 student data. The statute doesn't really talk about that that
21 then being expanded to sort of in -- include a judgement on
22 the merits regarding the substance of the research, but of
23 course, it doesn't prohibit it either.

24 Now already you all have kind of gone a step further,
25 because what the statute envision; the department develop a



1 process, the board would approve the process, and then the
2 department would go use it. We put in our process, this step
3 where the requests are coming to the board, again, I don't
4 read that as having been envisioned, necessarily, in the
5 statute, but nor prohibited, and so here we are. But, you
6 know, whether a substantive review of sort of the -- the
7 value of the research and all that; it's -- it's just --
8 it's not, sort of discussed in the statute.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's not there.

10 (Chorus of "yeah")

11 COUNSELOR: But I don't -- I don't mean to
12 suggest it's prohibited, so there's not a clean, legal
13 answer except I -- I would say that in terms of the intent
14 of the statutory framework we're a bit afield.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member McClellan.

16 MS. McCLELLAN: I think as -- as you probably
17 heard in my line of questioning when we discussed this issue
18 the last time, my primary concern is whether or not the
19 parents and students in question were given proper notice,
20 and whether they have consented to have their data used. And
21 if the answer to that question is "yes" than I am prepared
22 to vote "yes", because the people whose data is in question
23 have -- have had appropriate protocols. They've had the
24 benefit of appropriate protocols in terms of notice, as well
25 as the ability to object and opt out in the event that it



1 was objectionable to them in any way. So I'm comfortable
2 voting "yes", and I hope that we can dispense with this
3 matter today. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: I -- I believe -- I go along
6 with Board Member McClellan. I think this is very important
7 research, and I -- I mean, they asked for the PII, it's
8 going to be anonymous, and I think the board -- the
9 department looked over it, they agreed to it, and -- and we
10 do need to have good research and I think that the American
11 Institute of Research is an excellent organization, and I
12 think they would do that kind of work. And they -- they've
13 done it in this country. And I think they would continue to
14 do so, and what better, you know, institution, or
15 organization to do it. But if it's not ETS, then it's the
16 American Institute for Research. Thank you, and I'm
17 definitely for it.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Durham.

19 MR. DURHAM: Well I would -- I would simply
20 suggest, based on the article, that the -- the research is
21 unnecessary. So I'll read a few Paragraphs from this
22 article, and -- and then we can -- I'll ask the Dr. here
23 about her comments. But a quote -- this is the quote from
24 the same lady I mentioned earlier, Ms. Kingston, yes. I do
25 wanna see Ms. Kingston, but let's see if I can start with a



1 quote. "We're excited to have schools participate to better
2 understand how we can help support social-emotional needs
3 inside our school settings, so students have the skills that
4 support their academic success. The program injects social
5 and emotional components into everyday school activities to
6 teach students how to recognize and manage emotions, develop
7 positive, caring relationships, solve problems effectively."
8 and then it goes on to say, "The program has been so
9 successful that there's a school waiting list."

10 DR. DIMNICKY: There is, so --

11 MR. DURHAM: So why do we need to do the
12 research? We know the answer. We can -- how much are you
13 making on this? We can save that much in the grant?

14 DR. DIMNICKY: So what she means by the
15 program is so successful, is that we were hoping to actually
16 originally recruit 22 schools to the program, and I think 52
17 expressed interest in participating in the program, so we
18 had to actually put some on a wait list, and we have 46 in
19 the study now, because we really wanted to try to meet the
20 needs, like, the interests of all the schools that were part
21 of it. So success, and what she's talking about, is the
22 interest of the schools to partner and to receive the
23 program. I don't -- success is not deemed by the external
24 evaluation done by the American Institute for Research,
25 because it's way too early to have any outcomes yet.



1 MR. DURHAM: So that statement that she made
2 that the program has been successful, would be inaccurate,
3 because we don't know if the program has been successful in
4 achieving the objective of the program.

5 DR. DIMNICKY: I think there are many
6 different ways to define success here. So we've had 10
7 schools that have already gone through a year and a half of
8 the program, and those schools consider the program to be
9 very beneficial to them, so I think there's different ways
10 to define success.

11 MR. DURHAM: Well do we really need to do the
12 research? I mean, as long as it's already been defined --

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's not -- that's not
14 our decision, Mr. Durham.

15 MS. GOFF: That's not our problem today.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's the decision of
17 those folks whether they wanna spend part of their 6 million
18 to do the research. That's really not ours.

19 MR. DURHAM: This is -- thank you.

20 MS. FLORES: It's another institution.

21 MR. DURHAM: This is a monumental waste of
22 taxpayer's money to be doing this study, and it's --
23 reflects poorly on the University of Colorado the -- and the
24 conduct of the people in charge of this, in placing this
25 newspaper article. So I intend to be a "no" vote, and I'm



1 going to move to amend the agenda for next month to include
2 an appearance by Ms. Kingston, if you'd make a note of that,
3 Ms. Cordial, please.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We ready to call the
6 vote?

7 MS. RANKIN: I -- I'd like to make some
8 comments here.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, Ms. Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: An article came out in the Wall
11 Street Journal after the Equifax situation with PII data
12 being taken, and the article in the Wall Street Journal
13 talks about schools, and PII specifically being taken by
14 hackers, or humans that are not really versed in security,
15 and recently -- this is a very recent article, too, October
16 23rd. There are school districts that have had the
17 personally identifiable information of students taken and of
18 course the -- they have gone back to the school to get money
19 if they want that information returned. And because of the
20 amount of work that has gone into whatever the school has
21 done with the students, many of these schools and school
22 districts have paid an exorbitant amount of money in order
23 to get the information back. Not to say that it isn't gonna
24 continue to come back at them that they -- the hackers want
25 more money. It's extortion, is what it is. It's a very



1 serious problem. I'm not sure -- no matter how much we
2 guarantee that this information is gonna be safe, even in
3 our building, even in our state, we cannot guarantee that
4 our student information is safe.

5 I agree with Mr. Durham on one of the PowerPoint pages
6 from October. Safe schools and safe communities improve the
7 safety and academic achievement. We've been at this study
8 long enough to know; is this program specifically related to
9 academic achievement? How many years is it gonna take till
10 we can specifically say this program is related to academic
11 achievement, and how can we single out that this is the
12 program that was able to improve the academic achievement?
13 Go back to safe community and safe schools. That's the name
14 of this. I'm talking about the safety of the person --
15 personally identifiable information of the students. The
16 students should always come first.

17 So let's take all of this stuff off the table right
18 now. What is our charge? What is our charge as educators on
19 the State Board of Education? It's on the wall. What's our
20 vision? We have gotten so much of the social issues creeping
21 into what the teachers do.

22 It was our commissioner said 20 percent are -- or chair
23 -- twenty percent of the time spent in a day. That's all the
24 teachers have to educate the students, and they have an
25 inordinate amount of things to do to accomplish that. Yet we



1 continue to put -- and this time a 17-page checklist on how
2 students feel about certain things, and these are middle
3 school students. Many of the things that they feel about are
4 things that are just part of being a middle school student.
5 That -- that's very difficult to put their personally
6 identifiable information on the line in this type of a
7 program.

8 Now you may say we've gone on for 10 years with it, so
9 therefore we should continue on. I'm not so sure. With
10 technology we may be going down the wrong path. At least we
11 can see this in other parts of the United States in school
12 districts, and we do not wanna have -- we wanna keep this
13 information as safe as we can. We want to keep to our vision
14 of academics, and what it is our purpose is in our schools
15 in Colorado. I'll be a "no" vote, just because I really
16 believe, strongly, about safe schools and safe communities
17 start with the information of safe students, and the
18 information that's gathered at the school.

19 And I -- even the way it is now it may be in jeopardy,
20 as we can see across the nation, but why do we wanna take
21 another step forward and allow more of that information out
22 there? So I'll be a "no" vote.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Ms. Goff, do you have
24 your hand up? I can't tell sometimes.

25 MS. GOFF: Well, I'm not a fan of taking up



1 more time on something that probably is not germane to this
2 conversation, but I'll forge ahead a couple, little points.
3 Same author of those -- both those articles?

4 MR. DURHAM: What articles, I'm sorry.

5 MS. GOFF: In the newspaper.

6 MR. DURHAM: What do you mean the same --
7 there's only one article that I have.

8 MS. GOFF: Then what do you -- why did you
9 refer to two articles where in one schools were not named,
10 the other schools were named.

11 MR. DURHAM: No. I said in this article they
12 say they won't name the schools, and then they've named two.
13 It's in this article. Not two articles, just one article.

14 MS. GOFF: Alright. So are -- are there some
15 quotes, or something within the articles -- not having seen
16 them I feel like I'm at a real disadvantage, but is there
17 any reference to the -- to the AIR as the researcher of this
18 work?

19 MR. DURHAM: No. No, there is not.

20 MS. GOFF: Is there a direct reference to the
21 University of Colorado?

22 MR. DURHAM: No, there is not.

23 MS. GOFF: Okay, and just as a side note, is
24 -- is the work being conducted by UC -- CU Colorado Springs,
25 or is this through the --?



1 MR. DURHAM: I -- let me correct. The
2 University of Colorado is mentioned. I'm sorry. It says,
3 "the prevention program led by the University of Colorado",
4 so it is in -- it is in the article.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's Boulder.

6 MS. GOFF: Are there any direct quotes from
7 someone who's on the CU part of the work?

8 MR. DURHAM: Yes, this Beverly Kingston is
9 quoted, and a... what's this person's name? Last name is
10 Norstien (ph)?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

12 MR. DURHAM: Norstien? Does that ring a bell?

13 DR. DIMNICKY: I'm sorry?

14 MR. DURHAM: Person -- the other person
15 quoted in this is Notestiene, N-O-T-E-S-T-I-E-N-E, does that
16 ring a bell?

17 DR. DIMNICKY: What was the first name, I'm
18 sorry?

19 MR. DURHAM: I don't know, somebody who's
20 quoted.

21 MS. GOFF: Cory, Mr. Cory Notestiene?

22 MR. DURHAM: It doesn't say. I don't -- I
23 don't see a first name. That's --

24 MS. GOFF: I'm just -- my point is, I guess I
25 agree with Dr. Flores when she mentioned earlier that really



1 this is not -- I'm not perceiving this problem we're having
2 in the purview of the AIR, or -- or the point of what the
3 research is all about.

4 Also probably not germane to the commentary here is
5 that the Safe Schools -- Safe Community - Safe Schools -- I
6 can't remember what the acronym used to be -- acronym used
7 to be, but in the early 2000's when this work stated, it was
8 one of the results of post Columbine work. And so what came
9 from that and some -- some of the professional educators,
10 administrators, content area experts in the way of psycho --
11 psychoanalysis and social workers within the school
12 districts and people we know here at the department were
13 involved in the early days of that work. And the point was
14 to see if -- if schools and districts in areas could be --
15 could be guided going forward in how the -- the issues of
16 young people -- adolescent issues of wellbeing, mental
17 wellbeing, and if they -- if they had help -- if they were
18 able to access help, avenues for help, for encouragement,
19 for support, some programing, that could keep us further
20 away from the general suicide, bullying, context that was
21 becoming kind of a problem in our own backyard, literally.

22 So the work that -- that has sprouted from that has
23 been of value to schools in setting up some of the programs
24 that are now -- they continue, like Links, which is a -- in
25 the high school level it's an upper class, lower class



1 program where the support's given to help, literally, help
2 kids get inducted into high school, go through a hard period
3 of life, and so forth. Lots of benefit has come, and the
4 kids that have been involved in that, and I -- I don't wanna
5 say any certain numbers, but to a -- to the extent that it's
6 okay, and it's true. There are parents and -- and other
7 family members that have benefited from that, as well as
8 school staffs and how to interact within the classroom with
9 children's potential issues of growing up and adjusting.

10 So I'm -- I just point being made that this is -- this
11 -- the question of who's handling it well professionally and
12 whether there's ethics involved in this or not, to me is
13 separate from the fact that the American Institute of
14 Research are going to do a good -- the brunt of this work
15 through the University of Colorado, but the actual decision
16 about the work will be made independently, in my view. And I
17 -- I can't deny that opportunity, so I will be a "yes" vote.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Mr. Durham.

19 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
20 it -- it would be important to admonish parents who are
21 given the opportunity to sign these consent forms that --
22 I'm doing this from memory, and when I read the survey last
23 month, but I think, "Your child will have an opportunity to
24 confess to six felonies and two or three misdemeanors. So
25 you might wanna be a little careful about -- about whether



1 you authorize that.”

2 And, finally, I would say even after reading this
3 explanation of -- I still don't see what it is you're gonna
4 find out, and I don't think it's slightly possible to tie
5 any of the things -- any of the conclusions that you're
6 trying to reach to any of -- to, to the success of this one
7 program. Which it appears to me that you're attempting to
8 do. And I don't think -- I don't think you can bleed out all
9 of the other variables to get down to this one, even given
10 this very cleverly done explanation. I also will bet anybody
11 that wants to take the bet right now 1000 dollars and put on
12 my Great Carnac hat that I can write the report for the
13 American Institute of Research and I'll do it cheaper than
14 they'll do it. Because I think we all know what the results
15 going to be. So I will vote "no".

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. Board Member
17 Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Like so many other surveys,
19 research projects that we have that are purported to be
20 about improving things for children, making sure they have
21 safe communities, I find that they are largely a job
22 security for adults who bring these programs to schools and
23 constantly need the data in order to prove themselves a
24 worthy program that again must be funded, because they need
25 to help children.



1 And I would just say that as Director Goff mentioned,
2 you know, since Columbine we probably have a lot of data,
3 but yet we're still having a lot of the same problems. I
4 don't -- I don't think a lot of these efforts are gonna
5 change the home lives of children, and they're not gonna
6 change the culture that we're living in, so bottom line,
7 though, I'm concerned about personally identifiable
8 information being used for these purposes that I think
9 benefit adults far more than they're benefiting children. So
10 I'm a "no" vote.

11 MR. DURHAM: Chairman I think I -- I'll have
12 one, final comment, maybe five.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Nobody's gonna let me
14 make a comment but go ahead.

15 MR. DURHAM: Well you -- you're welcome to. I
16 -- I'll yield.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No, go ahead.

18 MR. DURHAM: I think we've had -- we didn't
19 have any of these programs before Columbine. There's been a
20 proliferation of them. We see them all over in various
21 aspects, and I don't think you need to do a research
22 project, just have to read the newspaper in Colorado Springs
23 every day about the various shootings of school children by
24 other school children to know that whatever we're doing
25 isn't working. So, you know, you may find, and I'm sure you



1 will find, this program to be an overwhelming success, but I
2 can promise you that if you just look at the results, and
3 that is do we have an increase or a decrease in violence in
4 schools? The answer is there's an increase, and I'm not
5 convinced that these programs, given what they attempt to
6 do, aren't in large measure responsible for that. That's not
7 their intent, they don't intend to be responsible, but the -
8 - the social and emotional things they push, in my
9 judgement, lead to violence rather than to the resolution of
10 conflict.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

12 MS. FLORES: Yes. I just want to let Board
13 Member Steve Durham know that in the 1980's I did the
14 evaluation for Quest International, which was funded by the
15 Kellogg Foundation, and it was a life skills program, and it
16 was a -- a program all over the country. And so we've had
17 programs like this before, and that particular one was
18 dealing with gangs in -- in the -- in the small, rural and
19 large city areas. So these programs have been there before.
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I -- I am hearing a
22 couple of different conversations going. One of them is that
23 there are a number of board members who just don't like this
24 program, and I understand that, and I respect your point of
25 view. You don't think the program -- having these programs



1 is of value to our students. But that's not our decision.
2 Our decision is about do we have an organization here that
3 does research that's been asked to do some research about a
4 program, has requested data from us, is not going to get
5 student names, and is that an appropriate thing for us to
6 do?

7 The reality is that total data security will probably
8 not to collect any. It's less secure, actually at the
9 district level, as Board Member Rankin just pointed out,
10 then it is with us, generally speaking, and there's no
11 evidence that I've ever seen that AIR has any data security
12 challenges. And so I don't know that we can solve all of
13 these concerns, but I do think that we need to get forward.
14 I am very worried that this board means to hide data, and
15 everything that we read about how to --

16 MS. MAZANEC: Means to do what?

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Hide it, to not share it
18 with researchers who can help us learn from that.

19 MS. MAZANEC: an interesting way to term it.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I know, but that's how
21 it feels. Which is why I -- I am fearful that we're gonna
22 get legislation that tells us how to do this as about --

23 MS. MAZANEC: No doubt.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: As opposed to we
25 figuring out and hearing from the research and, basically,



1 implementing what we set out to do in our procedure. So I'm
2 a little nervous about that, but there's nothing that I've
3 heard today that tells me that what we're going to share
4 with AIR is at deep risk. I totally sympathize with your
5 concerns about the programs. That's another topic, we might
6 bring it up next time, I respect that. But that's not the
7 piece I'm voting on. I'm voting on whether we share this
8 data for the research, because supposedly they wanna find
9 out whether this program has an effect on academic
10 achievement.

11 MS. McCLELLAN: I have a question actually.
12 Are they allowed to get this data from the individual
13 schools that are signing up to participate?

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Please answer.

15 DR. DIMNICKY: Yeah. So -- so there's a few
16 different ways to get this data. We could ask each of the 46
17 schools for it. We were trying to reduce the burden on the
18 schools, and because schools usually pull data in different
19 ways, and share it in different ways, we were actually
20 trying to be more safe in terms of data security. We thought
21 it would be a lot safer procedure to have CDE pull all of it
22 in a secure way in the one file, versus have 46 different
23 files that had to be merged and had to -- essentially we had
24 to understand the discrepancies or the similarities in the
25 way they were reporting information.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I'd like to call the
2 vote, please. Am I supposed to repeat the motion?

3 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, please.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I am supposed to repeat
5 the motion. I will probably never learn. I move -- the
6 motion on the table is to -- to approve the research request
7 for students PII to evaluate the Safe School -- Community --
8 Safe Community - Safe Schools program.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

10 MR. DURHAM: No.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

12 MS. FLORES: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

16 MS. MAZANEC: No.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

18 MS. McCLELLAN: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Nope.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes.

23 MS. CORDIAL: That motion passes four to
24 three.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do we need a break?



1 MS. McCLELLAN: No.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I don't, but if -- okay,
3 let's go to item --

4 DR. DIMNICKY: Thank you for your time.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. Thank you for
6 coming.

7 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, can I ask that we
8 get a presentation of this research when it's done?

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes, I would love that.

10 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Good idea, thank you.

12 MS. FLORES: It is, thank you, Steve.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, this is the one
14 where I'm totally lost. Board Member Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Just an info question.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah.

17 MS. GOFF: This not a report -- not
18 necessarily -- could it be called an expectation, but
19 reports from these research projects? Isn't that something
20 that's' sort of in the standards of this anyway?

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Say that again. I don't
22 think I heard all -- everything you asked.

23 MS. RANKIN: I think she's asking if the
24 report from those people is (indiscernible)

25 MS. GOFF: Not just these people, but



1 anything in general. Any report request that we -- research
2 request --

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, that's not something
4 we've ever clarified. It's a good idea if they're -- I just
5 think it might -- it might help us. They're gone. Busy.
6 Well, the same thing that you asked for that -- but that
7 when we provide --

8 MS. GOFF: There are policies already.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: -- data that we are
10 given report -- example Credo always sends us the reports as
11 a matter of --

12 MR. DURHAM: I (indiscernible) a report. I'd
13 like to have them in front of us with the report. Id don't
14 think -- I mean, I -- I read the Credo report, it was 100
15 and some pages.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I know, forever, yep.

17 MR. DURHAM: But -- but I'd like to have
18 these people in front of us.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are you willing to pay
20 for them when they come from out of town?

21 MR. DURHAM: I think it's -- with 6.2 million
22 you'd think they could get here on their own.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well they're not --
24 that's not their money.

25 MS. FLORES: Yeah, they're just --



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's not their money,
2 Steve.

3 MS. FLORES: And also they don't get that
4 much money. They're doing the research. I mean, the
5 evaluation on the research, so probably 10 percent.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So we --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) our
8 follow up, and then we can -- when we get to that point,
9 which could be a couple of years (indiscernible).

10 MS. GOFF: I just -- we can all take our part
11 in finding out some of this stuff. It's -- I believe it
12 might be referenced in our data and security and usage
13 policies. I just have read it more than once, more than in
14 the Credo papers, that -- I don't know if you'd call it a
15 requirement, or an assumption, a right, privilege, a
16 prerogative, that this board can ask for reports about
17 anything, on any of these data research projects.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, sure. Especially
19 if we (indiscernible)

20 MS. GOFF: And I think it's written that way
21 someplace, that's all.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Can we move on?

23 MS. GOFF: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The next item on the
25 agenda is a presentation on the accountability and educator



1 support for English Language Learners. Commissioner.

2 COMMISSIONER ANTHES: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 Yes, this is part 3 in a series. You all had asked us
4 several times to present you the information on how we
5 support English Language Learners in Colorado. It was too
6 bit to put in one, big session, so we've been splitting up
7 the different topic areas for you, so this is the last --
8 the last installment of the three-part series, and we're
9 working on accountability and educator development. So I
10 will turn this over to Ms. Pearson to kick us off.

11 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. So yes, you are the
12 season finale today. Aren't you excited? You guys need some
13 popcorn or something, I think. We are welcome -- we're happy
14 to come back, if you want us to come back in the future, but
15 this is the season finale as we have it planned out.

16 So what we're gonna do today is, like the Commissioner
17 said, this is the third series. In September we talked about
18 the demographics of English Learners, where students are in
19 the state, what languages they speak, where they come from.
20 October we talked about standards and assessments, and this
21 month we're gonna talk about accountability and educator
22 development.

23 So our goals for today are to kind of build
24 out from the information you all have already learned in the
25 last two study sessions, give an overview of how schools and



1 districts can be, and are, held accountable for the
2 performance of English learners, and answer some of your
3 questions as well from last month about the timelines and
4 how long it takes students to exit. And then we'll discuss
5 the skills educators need in order to be able to provide
6 effective instruction to our English Learners.

7 We tried to do a one-slide recap of the last
8 two sessions, just to kind of show you where we are. Of our
9 100 -- about 125,000 English learners in the state we --
10 students speak 262 different languages. They arrive in the
11 U.S. at different times, and some English learners are
12 native born, in the United States, others come to the U.S.
13 at different times, and their previous education experience
14 varies.

15 But English learners have two sets of
16 standards to master; the English Language Proficiency
17 Standards, as well as the ten academic content standards.
18 English learners are assessed on both of these sets of
19 standards. We talked about the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0, is the
20 assessment we use now for assessing English language
21 proficiency. We use CMAS for English language arts, math,
22 science and social studies. We have the READ Act assessments
23 for K-3 literacy, and then the SAT suite of assessments are
24 used at the high school level. That's just high-level recap.

25 So we're gonna start off with the



1 accountability for English learners, and this is really --
2 it's -- we're gonna talk about accountability, but we're
3 also gonna go into some data, because you all asked for how
4 -- "What does this look like in Colorado?" So we'll walk
5 through it. We'll walk through it slowly, so I can try and
6 make sense out of it, but If you have questions as we go on
7 the data, if I'm not being clear, let me know.

8 Marie Hetchton (ph) ran all of this data.
9 Unfortunately, she had some health issues, so she's not here
10 today, so I've been doing my best to channel her and make
11 sure I understand everything. If I can't answer anything I
12 will get back to you, but I'm trying to pinch-hit for her on
13 some of these, and you know how that goes sometimes.

14 Again, as a recap, we've got standards, both
15 the Colorado Academic Standards and the Colorado English
16 Language Proficiency standards for students. We have state
17 assessments that measure both those sets, and then there's
18 accountability that can be associated with each of those.

19 So as you know, with the Colorado Academic
20 Standards, we look at achievement and growth, and in the
21 past we've looked at growth to standards, we're hoping to do
22 that in the future. And I'll go through this in more detail
23 in a minute. This is just a good overview slide. And then
24 for Colorado English Language proficiency the same thing; we
25 can -- we can have accountability around achievement,



1 measures for that for growth, and growth to standard, and
2 I'll talk about what that looks like a little bit.

3 So this slide tries to show what the
4 accountability metrics, the types of accountability metrics,
5 you can have for English learners on the Colorado Academic
6 Standards. Okay, so this is content standards of English
7 language arts, math, and science. So the first idea is
8 around achievement. We've talked a lot about that, and we've
9 talked a lot yesterday about this, too; how well students
10 are doing at meeting those expectations in English language
11 arts, math, science, social studies, measured on CMAS and
12 then PSAT and SAT, so that's the achievement idea.

13 Then we've got the concept of growth, which
14 is how well students are progressing in meeting those
15 standards compared to other students like them. That's that
16 peer growth measure. And then across the --

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Alyssa, just real
18 quickly.

19 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: All these assessments
21 you're talking about; they're all in English.

22 MS. PEARSON: They're all -- well, there are
23 third and fourth grade -- there's third and fourth grade
24 Colorado Spanish language assessments for the students that
25 are in bi-lingual programs. There's very few students in the



1 take taking that test.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, so let's just say
3 generally speaking.

4 MS. PEARSON: Generally, it's all English,
5 and math is all in English, and science is all in English,
6 and there's accommodations for English learners, but they're
7 English assessments.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you.

9 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. And then across the
10 bottom, because it kind of -- this is an idea that spans
11 between achievement and growth, is this idea of growth to
12 standard. In the past we've called it "adequate growth".
13 It's really are students making enough progress within a
14 certain amount of time to reach a level or proficiency, or
15 to maintain that proficiency that if you're already there.
16 That kind of -- it's a -- it's a hybrid of achievement and
17 growth.

18 So in the past, when -- before we
19 transitioned to the new assessments, we had an adequate
20 growth measure in our accountability. We're looking to add
21 that back in, in the future, now that we've had comparable
22 data for a few years. Okay? So that's on content. The rest
23 of this we're really gonna talk about accountability in
24 terms of the -- oh, let me just show you real quick.

25 This is just what it looks like on the frameworks. Now



1 we're in the past, to that first section, is achievement.
2 And I know it's hard to see, but it's got English language
3 arts there, all students, and then what's circled there are
4 the English learners. So we've got accountability for
5 content achievement for English learners, and English
6 language arts, and math, and science. And then further below
7 is the growth section, and growth again, for English
8 language arts and math, we have that growth metric for all
9 students, and then for English learners, as well as for
10 other desegregated groups, but that's part of what's in
11 accountability right now. And again, that's on the content
12 assessments.

13 Okay, so now I'm gonna talk about the rest of
14 the presentation's really about the accountability metrics
15 for English language acquisition. So we talked content, this
16 is about --

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So now it's ACCESS.

18 MS. PEARSON: This is on ACCESS, yes.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And the other ones were
20 eon the other assessments.

21 MS. PEARSON: On CMAS, and PSAT and SAT, yep.
22 So this is really about how well students are meeting those
23 Colorado language proficiency standards as measured by
24 ACCESS. How -- what types of metrics can we use to measure
25 how well schools and districts are doing in getting students



1 to English language proficiency. Does that make sense? Sorry
2 to -- you guys are tired.

3 So the first idea, again, achievement. You
4 can have an achievement metric that says what percentage of
5 kids are kids attaining English language proficiency, and
6 I'll talk through my little silly graphics in a little bit.
7 Sorry for the silly graphics. And then, again, same idea;
8 growth. You can look at the -- how students are doing,
9 making progress towards attaining English language
10 proficiency compared to students like them.

11 And finally, again, we've got that across the
12 bottom idea of growth to standard. Are students making
13 enough progress within a set amount of time to reach English
14 language proficiency in a timeline that we define for them?
15 We'll talk about the timeline.

16 MS. MAZANEC: What timeline is this based on?

17 MS. PEARSON: So I'll go into that with you,
18 and I'll talk about what we're seeing in the data for
19 students.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do you have examples of
21 the assessment?

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Of the ACCESS
23 assessment?

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Mm-hmm.

25 MS. PEARSON: I do not have examples with me.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What does it look like?
2 Tell me what a question looks like.

3 MS. PEARSON: So there's four components, and
4 I am not the person to give you a lot of detail, so I'm
5 gonna give you the detail up here, and then if you want more
6 we can get somebody else. But the assessment includes four
7 components; speaking, listening, reading and writing. So
8 there's sections on it where students need to speak English,
9 and they get scored on that, where they need to listen and
10 hear somebody speaking English and respond to that to show
11 their comprehension. There's reading sections and writing
12 sections, and that's about all.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So is this done on the
14 computer?

15 MS. PEARSON: The are paper and online
16 options in Colorado right now.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So the reason I'm asking
18 this, is because I'm trying to figure out whether the -- I
19 mean the -- we're attempting to have the questions determine
20 the level of English proficiency, but are we also getting
21 stuck on -- can -- can our kids also be getting stuck on the
22 fact that they're a poor reader?

23 MS. PEARSON: Yep, that's a good question,
24 and it's got a reading component, but it's measured -- it's
25 reading for the sake of understanding English language



1 proficiency.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Right, and so is it --
3 I'm sorry. Is -- is it by grade, so that the complexity of
4 the question is appropriate for a first-grade reader?

5 MS. PEARSON: There -- this is where --
6 there's section -- I don't know if they're individual grade,
7 or if it's K -- like, if there's a kindergarten test at 1.3
8 or 3.5. Morgan, do you remember?

9 MS. COX: Yes.

10 MS. PEARSON: Do you wanna come on up?

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I'm sorry, I just --

12 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The reason that I ask
14 for all this is to get an understanding of what this is and
15 what does it actually mean. Because I don't know when we're
16 talking about all these years that it takes for English
17 acquisition, and are we muddling it with the potential of
18 reading deficiencies, or kids just being so far behind that
19 that -- we're not getting -- we're not able to -- to
20 separate the difference, the English language acquisition,
21 from the other stuff.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. And I think, actually, as
23 we dig in you'll see how we've looked at the data, and how
24 it relates a little bit to the -- the content assessment
25 base.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

2 MS. PEARSON: But do you want just real quick
3 on the -- how the assessment's given in terms of grade
4 spans?

5 MS. COX: Hi.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Hi.

7 MS. COX: Good afternoon, my name is Morgan
8 Cox. I work in the Office of Culturally and Linguistically
9 Diverse Education. And the ACCESS assessment is by grade
10 spanned, and so it's kindergarten, first and second grade,
11 third through fifth grade, sixth through eighth, and ninth
12 through 12th, so it does adjust for the level of content.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Somewhat.

14 MS. COX: Mm-hmm.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

16 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So, theoretically, a
18 sick -- I just forgot what you said, six through eighth; did
19 you say that?

20 MS. COX: Sixth through eighth grade.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's not unrealistic to
22 think that a sixth grader would -- might not score as well
23 as an eight grader just based on where they are in their
24 reading skill development?

25 MS. PEARSON: I think we need to get somebody



1 from the assessment unit here to come answer. I'm sorry.
2 They kind of, they (indiscernible) assessment and classroom
3 --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Maybe it's not a
5 relevant question, but I --

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. No, I think it's a good
7 question and I think we'll get them.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I think if we have set a
9 standard for the time span to acquire English then we need
10 to have a deep understanding that --

11 MS. GOFF: Of whether the assessment is
12 gauging it?

13 MS. FLORES: Well that's why I thought IDRA.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Whether that assessment
15 is gauging it, or whether it's -- whether it's actually
16 measuring something else. These are questions that Deb used
17 to talk about, too, about the -- what is it, stupid density,
18 or something?

19 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I have a text from one
20 of our assessment folks; scored based on score.

21 MS. PEARSON: What?

22 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: It's scored based on
23 score. Okay, I'll -- no that's not helping me.

24 MS. PEARSON: I don't know what that means.

25 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: No I'll -- I'll get



1 them to come in and --

2 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Okay, that would be
3 great. Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sorry.

5 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Okay. Let me go talk
6 through some of these measures with you a little bit more.
7 Okay? But first, in order to do that, we really need to
8 define what that language proficiency is. How are we
9 defining when a student reaches that language proficiency
10 level? So we're gonna talk about that first for a little
11 bit. Sorry.

12 MS. GOFF: Isn't that determined by the local
13 education provider?

14 MS. PEARSON: It -- so there's two pieces to
15 it.

16 MS. GOFF: We have a -- we have an idea of
17 what it is, and they can have their own?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Scored based on grade. That
20 darn autocorrect.

21 (Laughter)

22 MS. CORDIAL: What problem -- this is what
23 happens when you start communicating by text.

24 MS. PEARSON: Yes. Do you wanna --

25 MS. CORDIAL: Did you wanna have the



1 discussion?

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No, I -- I get that it's
3 in -- it's in chunks.

4 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I know I'm not trying to
6 make this more complicated. I'm trying to get a deeper
7 understanding, and I --

8 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

10 MS. PEARSON: So we wanna -- okay. So to --
11 students are considered English language proficient, or
12 fluent English proficient; there's a few criteria that are
13 used for that.

14 Some of that is absolutely local decision and
15 local body of evidence. Its how students are functioning in
16 traditional classrooms and if they can be in a traditional
17 English language classroom with minimal support for
18 language, so that's one criteria. That's something that the
19 local school and district need to define, because that's not
20 information the state has.

21 Another criteria is if they're scoring
22 "proficient" on the state English Language Proficiency
23 Assessment, and that's the state's responsibility to work to
24 set the cut score on that assessment to determine that
25 component of identifying a student as fluent English



1 proficient. And then it also -- students need to show
2 proficiency in a locally collected body of evidence. Again,
3 that's left up to local.

4 So what we're talking about today is really
5 what that "proficient" mark is on the English Language
6 Proficiency Assessment. Because that's the data we have
7 here, and that's how we're looking at the information to
8 present it.

9 MS. MAZANEC: is English language proficiency
10 as opposed to proficiency when it comes to significant
11 reading.

12 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Opposed to proficiency when it
14 comes to significant reading?

15 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

16 MS. MAZANEC: That's when the local education
17 provider gets to decide what is "partially proficient" and
18 --

19 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20 MS. MAZANEC: And therefore, the student must
21 now start taking an assessment in English.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, so that's a --

23 MS. MAZANEC: That's a totally different --

24 MS. PEARSON: That's a different -- it's
25 somewhere on the continuum of English language -- gaining



1 English language proficiency, but today all we're talking
2 about is this silly little picture of what we consider the
3 top of the -- the mountain for English language proficiency.
4 Where we're trying to get students to that level that based
5 on the state assessment, the English language proficiency
6 state assessment, what we consider English language
7 proficient on that assessment. Okay? Does that make sense?

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yep.

9 MS. PEARSON: Okay, maybe. Okay.

10 MS. MAZANEC: That doesn't mean I'm not gonna
11 get confused again, but --

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Right.

13 MS. PEARSON: No, it's -- there's all these
14 different components and I know it's -- it's totally
15 confusing. So you all know we transitioned to that ACCESS
16 assessment. The ACCESS 2.0 assessment in 2016. When that
17 happened we needed to reset cut scores of what that
18 proficiency level was on that assessment, so a whole lot of
19 English language development stake holders from K-12
20 schools, from higher ed, came together and looked at the
21 data, looked at how students were doing, both on the state
22 assessments and then also on local assessments, and they
23 recommended that we use a score of 4.0 overall -- So the
24 ACCESS assessment's on a score of 1 to 6. So they looked at
25 a 4.0 overall score, as well as a 4.0 literacy score.



1 So at the beginning when I talked to you
2 about the components of speaking, listening, reading and
3 writing; they take the reading and the writing components
4 together, and that becomes the literacy score on that
5 assessment. And what stakeholders have found is when you
6 look at how students function in classrooms outside it's not
7 just a 4.0 overall score, but they also need to be that
8 strong in literacy to be able to be ready -- to be
9 considered fluent English proficient on this -- based on the
10 assessment itself.

11 So looking at that data for 2017 of 4.0
12 overall and 4.0 literacy, that's the percentage of students
13 that met that criteria that took the ACCESS assessment in
14 2017. So it's about 21, 22 percent of students.

15 MS. COX: And they took it in 2017 because
16 they had been identified as English Language Learners.

17 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this is
19 (indiscernible) of 125,000?

20 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. So these are where
21 we're at with 2017. It's very similar to what the numbers
22 have been historically, and that's also what they looked at
23 when they were just trimming the cut scores. They looked at
24 where students had been historically in terms of exiting,
25 they also looked how students were doing by proficiency



1 level on the ACCESS assessment on the content assessments,
2 because they wanted to make sure once students were hitting
3 proficiency on... or where that line was for proficiency on
4 the English Language Proficiency Assessment, that they were
5 able to -- to score comparably on the state content
6 assessments. They weren't just throwing them in and they
7 weren't able to access those. Okay?

8 MS. MAZANEC: So I wanna make sure I'm
9 reading this right. The -- the percentage of current EL
10 population; that's the percentage that are considered for
11 re-designation as...?

12 MS. PEARSON: As fluent English proficient,
13 so it's the ones that meet that middle bullet there.

14 MS. MAZANEC: And that's (indiscernible) say
15 22.6 percent of the 125,000 (crosstalk)?

16 MS. PEARSON: It's not -- I think it's 22
17 point --

18 MS. MAZANEC: (Crosstalk) that percentage of
19 whatever -- what's the percentage?

20 MS. PEARSON: I think it's the percentage of
21 students that tested on ACCESS that year, which is less than
22 the overall. Because the overall number can -- includes the
23 students that have hit fluent English proficient that are
24 being monitored for two -- two years.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So being monitored does



1 not mean taking that test again.

2 MS. PEARSON: When they're monitored they do
3 not take the test again, unless during the monitoring
4 they're found to still be in need of support, and then
5 they'll go back in program, in EP or LAPN and they would
6 take the test again. Right?

7 MS. COX: Mm-hmm.

8 MS. PEARSON: Okay. (Indiscernible) sure I
9 got that right. Okay. So I wanna talk to you a little bit
10 about accountability and measures around this. This one I'm
11 gonna move through kinda quickly. Just like we talk about on
12 CMAS assessments about students meeting expectations in
13 math, we could talk about it the same way in English
14 language proficiency and say there's -- when you've hit this
15 level on English language, when you hit that level 4 on the
16 ACCESS assessment we could count kids as meeting that
17 "proficient" benchmark. We don't currently use this in
18 either state or federal accountability, and there's not a
19 federal requirement anymore. It's -- it's a hard measure to
20 use well. There used to be federal requirements around it.
21 It's hard because if you think about populations of
22 students; we don't have a homogeneous population in all
23 school districts. The students -- some districts have a lot
24 of kids that just arrived that are all NEP, other districts
25 have students that come in and tend to be more LEP, because



1 they've lived in the country and are closer to exiting. So
2 to set one percentage of students that needs to meet
3 proficiency in a single year it's a hard measure to have be
4 a fair and comparable measure across districts.

5 You could do some on, like, the students -- a
6 measure based on the students that you expect to exit, but
7 that gets on -- we can do that a little bit better using
8 growth to standard. So right now, we don't have an
9 achievement metric in state accountability, and we have no
10 federal requirement for it. But it's just -- it's a way that
11 you could hold schools and districts accountable.

12 MS. McCLELLAN: But aren't we supposed to
13 come up with a measure?

14 MS. PEARSON: We do not need this. This is
15 not a component of SF4. We need to know what proficiency is
16 in English language, but we don't need to say x percent of
17 students will hit proficiency every year. We used to have to
18 do that federally and we don't know. Just because it's a
19 hard one for schools and districts to have. It's a good data
20 to look at. It's good for schools and districts to look at.
21 It's good for the state to look at and see how things change
22 over time, but for accountability it's a hard measure to
23 use.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do they measure it and
25 report it?



1 MS. PEARSON: I don't know if we need to -- I
2 don't know that there's a requirement for us to measure it
3 and report it anymore, but it's definitely something we
4 kinda do. So, that'd be something for you all to think
5 about.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Put that on our list,
9 please.

10 MS. PEARSON: Oh, you got it Bizy? Thank you.
11 I can't take notes now up here. I'm sorry.

12 Okay, so I wanna talk a little bit about the
13 timeline for English language acquisition. Because I know
14 you all had a lot of questions about this. We're trying to
15 answer those questions with the data we have and with these
16 slides. I know you'll have a lot more and it's not perfect
17 data that we have, but we'll do our best to answer with what
18 we have for you.

19 Okay. You all saw this slide last month, I'm
20 just -- put it in as kind of a placeholder of -- that I --
21 that process of identification, instruction, re-designation,
22 and that's the point where students hit that top of the
23 mountain, hopefully on the ACCESS assessment. Then
24 redesignation starts; they go into monitoring for two years
25 and then to exit. So just a reminder of that's what it looks



1 like for a student.

2 Okay. This is historical data on the slide.
3 This is what we used to do with progress students were
4 making and our expectations for them, but this was on ACCESS
5 -- the first round of ACCESS, the 1.0. So I just wanna show
6 it to you for historical purposes, but where we're at now
7 with the new assessment, because it is very different in
8 terms of the way students are progressing through levels,
9 it's different than this. But we just wanted to kinda give
10 you this baseline.

11 So on the first round of ACCESS that -- that
12 score on the state assessment was a 5.0 for overall and for
13 literacy. That was the expectations that the state set for
14 that criteria to look at a student for fluent English
15 proficiency status.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Our cut score was 4, but
17 --?

18 MS. PEARSON: For -- for a local -- for
19 students to hit that criteria for looking at moving into the
20 monitoring status; being fluent English proficient, based on
21 the state English Language Proficiency Assessment.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So why are we looking at
23 5? Because you don't test them anymore after they're at 4.

24 MS. PEARSON: This is the old test.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.



1 MS. PEARSON: And on the old test they were
2 at 5.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, so just explain --

4 MS. PEARSON: This is -- I'm just -- it just
5 gets more complicated.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, so just explain,
7 because I -- I couldn't follow this.

8 MS. PEARSON: Okay, yep. So what these
9 percentages are; it's the percent of students that in 2013,
10 within the next year, moved up at least one level, if not
11 more. So in 2013 the students that tested at level 1, 93.6
12 percent of them had moved at least one level, if not more,
13 on the ACCESS assessment when they tested in 2014.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

15 MS. PEARSON: So most kids, if they started
16 at level 1, they were moving up. Level 2 students that
17 tested level 2 in 2013; 73.5 percent of those moved to level
18 3 or higher when they tested again in 2014.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh.

20 MS. PEARSON: So still a lot of them are
21 moving up a level, not quite as many as level 1 in that one-
22 year time frame.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

24 MS. PEARSON: Does that make sense? Level 3,
25 you can see it starts to slow down a little bit, 55 percent



1 of students that tested level 3 in 2013 moved up one level
2 to level 4, or high -- or higher within a year. And then
3 students that were at level 4 in 2013 only 45.2 percent of
4 those students moved up to level 5 or higher in 2014, so you
5 can see --

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And what -- what
7 explains that decreasing growth?

8 MS. PEARSON: So the level of rigor on the
9 test in terms of how hard it is to gain that English
10 language proficiency increases. Like the early levels are
11 much more --

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Basic.

13 MS. PEARSON: Yes, so students move up
14 faster. And again, this is the data on the old ACCESS test,
15 it looks a little bit different now, but this is what it
16 was. So based on that, and the other years of data, we set
17 expectations for student progress that students would move
18 at least one level. If they were at level 1 they would get
19 to level 2 or higher in a year. If they were at level 2 they
20 would get to level 3 or higher in one year. If they were at
21 level 3 they'd get -- they had one year to get to level 4,
22 higher, but if they were at level 4 we gave them two years
23 to hit that level 5 overall, and level 5 on literacy, to hit
24 that top of the mountain, because we knew it was -- it took
25 a little longer at that point.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So has anybody analyzed
2 why it takes longer?

3 MS. PEARSON: To -- for that other language?
4 Yes. But I think that's a whole other conversation. If you
5 don't mind us going through this a little bit more, then we
6 can bring back more the "why" to you.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, fair enough.

8 MS. PEARSON: Is that fair?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: See that's what's gonna
10 divert your attention.

11 MS. PEARSON: I'm gonna divert your
12 attention.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No, I'm -- I'm asking
14 Bizy to keep track of all these questions that I keep
15 asking.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Because this is from
18 where I get this concern that we just don't get there very
19 fast.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yes, yeah.

21 MS. FLORES: And we don't.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are there thing -- are
23 there increasing levels of intensity that we oughta be
24 offering as the -- as the students get closer, or are we --

25 MS. FLORES: Sheltered English.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: You know.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think those are all
3 really good questions and I am not the best person equipped
4 to answer them, I'm sorry.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But you're gonna get us
6 the answer.

7 MS. PEARSON: But I'm gonna show you the data
8 and then we'll --

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Now we're gonna get a
10 part 4.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Letting me know.

12 MS. PEARSON: I know, I think you guys are
13 gonna have the season finale plus the teaser for next year.
14 Okay, and so as you can see, if you add these up you get to
15 five years, so five years to get from level 1 to level 5.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But at five -- but at 5
17 years you've got almost 55 percent of the kids still not
18 there.

19 MS. PEARSON: No, because that -- and this is
20 where it's confusing in the slide. I tried to put a lot of
21 information on one slide, instead of having lots and lots of
22 multiple slides of data, you know. That -- those percentages
23 are just the percentages of students that moved -- moved
24 from one year to the next year, not over time.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.



1 MS. PEARSON: And that started at that
2 specific level. The next slides are gonna show you over
3 multiple years what happens for students. So let me walk
4 through the next slides and see if that gives you a little
5 bit more of what you wanted to know. Okay.

6 So here we're gonna talk about kids over a 4-
7 year time period. Okay? To see when students hit that mark
8 on the assessment where they're eligible for re -- for
9 fluent English proficient status. When they hit that 4.0
10 now, or 5.0 on the old assessment. So what this shows is
11 here; this column over here of level 1 -- Sorry, Morgan, I'm
12 getting this on your head. Level 1; those are students that
13 started at level 1 in 2013 on the ACCESS assessment. Okay?
14 And the --

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So - just, you need to
16 slow down for me.

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I just -- I really
19 struggled with this. I get -- I'm not understanding.

20 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So in level 1...

22 MS. PEARSON: So these are the students that
23 in 2013 scored at level one, and then the color codes, and
24 I'll walk through them, are what happened over the next four
25 years for students, where they ended up over time.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

2 MS. PEARSON: Okay? And then it's level 2 and
3 level 3, but let's just talk -- take level 1 and walk
4 through it. So this is level 1, that light gray at the top
5 are students that didn't test again. They might have --
6 yeah, no.

7 MS. McCLELLAN: Is it okay to interject a
8 question here?

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I think we need to.

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, yep.

11 MS. McCLELLAN: I apologize. Why would we see
12 a leap in year -- it to level 5? Why would we see such a
13 huge increase in not -- in kids not testing? I was assuming
14 that this not retested might be kids that they reached the
15 proficient stage and so they topped off, or they moved out
16 of district, or they were opt out? Am I -- am I not --?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yep, exactly. So the -- so the
18 not tested, again, are for a bunch of different reasons,
19 just like you said. It could be that they moved out of state
20 and we just -- they weren't here anymore. Or it could be --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are the
22 (crosstalk) though.

23 MS. PEARSON: These are the same kids. Of the
24 kids that tested level 1 in 2013 what happened to them as
25 time went on, and that small about 10 percent of level 1



1 students didn't test again. There's a lot more at level 5,
2 and I think a good prediction about why is because they hit
3 that level 5, right? They were already there; they're not
4 gonna take the test again.

5 MS. GOFF: That's what I was -- so these are
6 been successful then.

7 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

8 MS. GOFF: They've moved --

9 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

10 MS. COX: They don't need this program
11 anymore, so...

12 MS. PEARSON: Yes. The -- the level 1's it's
13 highly unlikely that they hit that level of proficiency if
14 they're starting at level 1, but level 5's, absolutely, they
15 wouldn't test again, because they hit that level of
16 proficiency.

17 So that's the light gray. The dark gray is
18 that over the next four years they never hit that -- that
19 5.0, or the 4.0, to reach that fluent English proficiency
20 designation, or to be eligible for that. So it makes sense
21 that level 1 and level 2 there's a lot more there that would
22 never reach that, because they need some more time, but
23 level 3 and 4 and 5 there's fewer as you go on. It's weird
24 that there's more at level 2 than level 1.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Lost, lost, lost, lost.



1 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So the dark gray --

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What's -- tell me again
3 what's level 1.

4 MS. PEARSON: Level 1 is that they scored in
5 2013, level 1, that first level, the lowest level of
6 language proficiency in the ACCESS assessment.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And they were kids who...?

8 MS. PEARSON: They're kids that are coming in
9 non-English proficient.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: These are all -- these
11 are all kids?

12 MS. PEARSON: These are all students K-12
13 that were tested in 2013 and scored at that level 1
14 proficiency; lowest level of proficiency on the ACCESS
15 assessment.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what is "eligible
17 within four years"?

18 MS. PEARSON: That means if they hit that
19 mark, that top of the mountain mark, on the ACCESS
20 assessment; it used to be 5.0, which is now 4.0, if they hit
21 that within 4 years, or if they never got there. Those dark
22 gray ones on there never -- within four years they did not
23 reach that level on the ACCESS assessment.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: When you say "not
25 eligible" --



1 MS. McCLELLAN: Yeah, I think the word
2 "eligible" has made totally --

3 MS. PEARSON: Okay, so put that out of your
4 head. Think about it as hitting -- just picture it as the
5 top of the mountain. Did they climb all the way up and get
6 to that top-of-the-mountain mark?

7 MS. GOFF: No, not if they're level 1.

8 MS. PEARSON: Exactly, so that's where you
9 see the majority of those ones that are dark gray; they
10 didn't get to the top. Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So then what's level 2.

12 MS. PEARSON: So -- so let me finish going
13 through that bar chart real fast. There is a little, tiny
14 bit of yellow that you can't really see there, but you'll
15 see it more in those others, and that means that they were
16 eligible within one year to hit that --

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What's "eligible" mean?

18 MS. PEARSON: Meaning they got to the top of
19 the mountain. They hit that top-of-the-mountain mark within
20 one year. So it depends on how close they were -- I need a
21 little -- where's the white board? I need a better picture.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're on video, aren't
23 we?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Only internally.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Only internally.



1 MS. PEARSON: So - yes. Can I draw -- I think
2 that'll work. Is that okay? Thank you, yeah. If there's a
3 flip chart I could just draw on a flip chart.
4 (indiscernible) a flip chart (indiscernible) back there do
5 we?

6 MS. CORDIAL: Nada.

7 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Nothing.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) board
9 in.

10 MS. PEARSON: Okay, yeah, can I get a board.

11 MS. GOFF: When you say "eligibility" what
12 you mean is eligible to graduate.

13 MS. McCLELLAN: To exit the program.

14 MS. GOFF: To exit, yeah.

15 MS. PEARSON: Okay, so let me go back to this
16 slide. So remember these are the three criteria for students
17 to be considered attaining English language proficiency, and
18 that one in the middle, when they score "proficient" on the
19 state's English Language Proficiency Assessment, that means
20 they're eligible to be designated as fluent English
21 proficient, so that's what that eligibility, "eligible" word
22 means.

23 MS. GOFF: Okay.

24 MS. PEARSON: So I'll draw a picture, though,
25 because I think that might make it easier. In the meantime,



1 while we're talking about it, these other colors are -- the
2 light green is two -- like a two-year time frame students
3 reached that level, the orange is a three year and the blue
4 is a four year, but --

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So it took them four
6 years.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So the kids that's
9 actually scored at level 1, the blue ones it took four years
10 to get to 4, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

11 MS. PEARSON: Yep, exactly. The orange it
12 took three years.

13 MS. McCLELLAN: So you can replace the word
14 "eligible" with "proficient"?

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Yeah. For this, yes. I
16 think we just wanna remember that it -- that there's local
17 criteria to fully move a kid on, and this is just based on
18 the assessment. Okay. What should we do with this?

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Has staff ever looked
20 and compared to differences between districts? Do you think
21 it's significant in the criteria that we use? I realize it
22 was not ideal, or not easy to compare, but...

23 MS. PEARSON: There are difference from
24 district to district.

25 MS. FLORES: Different programs?



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And what does that mean,
2 then? That means that they may or may -- they are
3 identifying a different rate of achievement, so you can't
4 compare apples to apples. Between districts is how long it
5 takes to get kids --

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, which is why we like to -
7 - why for all this analysis we used the state assessment cut
8 score instead of all the criteria and the local criteria to
9 move it. So we just wanted to look based on the state
10 assessment.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Makes sense.

12 MS. PEARSON: So see if this makes any sense.
13 Okay, so basically what we're saying; the level 1 kids are
14 starting all the way down here. We wanting to get up here.
15 How many of them get all the way up there within the 4
16 years. The level 2 kids, they're closer, right? How many of
17 them get up? The level 5 kids that are already, you know,
18 starting here in level 5; lots of them don't test again,
19 because they're already there and we looked at just the few
20 that did test again. Does that make a little bit more sense?

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It does.

22 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But that means that kids
24 that already are testing at level 5...

25 MS. PEARSON: They may get tested again if



1 they're not meeting that other criteria. Right? The local
2 district may say, "This kid isn't quite -- they might have
3 hit the level 5 on the test, but we're not seeing it in the
4 classroom. We're gonna test him again, because we're not
5 ready to -- to move him into monitoring."

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I don't get why if
7 you're already at level 5 you've got all these different
8 time frames. Is it the time frames it took for them to get
9 to level 5? So this is --

10 MS. PEARSON: I think it's if they -- that's
11 a good question. Let me find out. Not --

12 MS. McCLELLAN: Yeah, how could you be
13 eligible in four years if you are already at level 5?

14 MS. PEARSON: Let me -- I will follow up with
15 Marie and make sure I get those for you guys.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We are not -- I am not
17 proficient in this language.

18 (Speaking in background)

19 MS. PEARSON: What else did I want to talk to
20 you all about on this? What I want -- one thing I do wanna
21 point out for you is within that time frame of four years
22 only level 4 and level 5 students that started there did the
23 majority of them hit that redesignation -- or hit hat
24 fluency within those years. Although some of them we just
25 don't know, because they didn't retest again. They might



1 have (indiscernible). Thanks, Katie.

2 So the next slides are just like this. We
3 just split it up for elementary and middle and high school
4 level for you, because you asked about age and does it
5 differ by age of student, and it does to some degree -- to a
6 large degree. Before we get into that, though, I just wanna
7 say there's 67 percent of students are in the elementary
8 category. Most of our English learners come in starting
9 elementary. There's some that are in middle and high school
10 in this analysis, but the majority of students, 64,000 of
11 them, were at the elementary level, looking at that.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's a good thing.

13 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, because they're making
14 the most progress, if you look at it, too. So most of the
15 English learners in elementary level started at level 3. As
16 we try to simplify the data down you don't have the -- the
17 counts of students in here, but here was 19,000 students
18 that started in level 3, that was the largest amount. And
19 the fewest students were at level 2, where there was about
20 7,000 students at level 2. And more than half of students
21 that started at level 3, 4 or 5 met their -- that
22 proficiency mark within 4 years. Okay. So you see that
23 pattern in elementary school.

24 When you move to middle school it start to
25 look --



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: How long did it take the
2 kids that were non-English speakers in elementary?

3 MS. PEARSON: The level 1's?

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yep. Yep, the level 1's.

5 MS. PEARSON: And level 2's, so you can see
6 that less than half of them hit that within 4 years. We need
7 to keep tracking them to see when -- how long it is until
8 they do hit that level. Because we started in 2013 with this
9 analysis, so we need -- we need some more years of data to
10 see where they go.

11 The next slide shows the middle school level.
12 There was about 18,000 students represented over all in
13 here, which is about 19 percent of the English learners. The
14 majority of them at the middle school level started at level
15 4, so there was almost 8,000 students starting at level 4,
16 and then the fewest were at level 1. There was only about
17 300, little over 300 students, starting at level 1 in middle
18 school in 2013. So just to keep it in perspective, I know
19 those results don't look strong at all for those level 1
20 students, but they were very few of them that came in middle
21 school that low in English language proficiency level.

22 And then more than half of the level 4 and
23 level 5 students hit that proficiency mark within 4 or 5
24 years at middle -- that started at middle. Some of those
25 clearly moved on to high school within that time frame.



1 And then high school it looks -- it's a very
2 different picture. Again, we gotta remember that these are
3 students that started in 2013 in high school, if they were
4 seniors they -- they may or may not have continued based on
5 what their schools are doing to keep them enrolled beyond
6 the four years. But there was about 14,000 students in the
7 high school level. Most of them started at level 4. There
8 was four -- almost 5,000 of those -- the students at high
9 school in 2013 started at level 4. The fewer, fewest were at
10 level 1, 591, so again, students were at a higher level of
11 language proficiency that were in here when they came into
12 high school. And this is where it was most challenging, or
13 most unlikely, for students to hit that proficiency criteria
14 within four years, and I think there's a lot of reasons for
15 that when they're at high school level.

16 You guys survived those okay? Do you wanna
17 ask questions --?

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I'm gonna need three
19 more times at this, but let's just keep going.

20 MS. PEARSON: Okay, okay.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Unless other people have
22 some questions (indiscernible).

23 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So the next slide after
24 this I just -- we wanted to show you some -- some of the
25 data on the ACCESS 2.0. So we only have 2016-2017 data on



1 that, so we don't have as long of a historical kind of
2 profile of students that way.

3 MS. FLORES: Two years?

4 MS. PEARSON: We have two years.

5 MS. FLORES: Okay.

6 MS. PEARSON: So we can show progress from
7 '16 to '17, but we've only got that. So we wanna keep
8 looking at this as we have more years of results. So --
9 sorry, here's another stacked chart, but let me -- similar
10 to the other one, but it's a little bit different. Again, we
11 have students at the bottom by their 2016 level on the
12 ACCESS assessment, so what did they score in 2016 on ACCESS,
13 and then the colors represent the score that they received
14 in 2017 on the ACCESS 2.0 then. Okay? And then the bars
15 drawn around it show the students that moved up at least one
16 or more levels, so you can see at level 1 and level 2 more
17 than half of students moved up more than one level between
18 2016 and 2017. At level 3 and level 4 and level 5 that gets
19 much smaller.

20 MS. FLORES: Mm-hmm.

21 MS. PEARSON: Okay? The majority of students,
22 again, were at level 3. There was about 35,000 students that
23 tested last year at level 3 -- or in 2016, level 3. The
24 fewest students were at that level 6. Most of them are at a
25 program it makes sense that a student wouldn't likely test



1 in and be at that super high level 6.

2 Show -- let me how you this is a little bit
3 of a different way. Back to how we talked at the beginning.
4 Again, this is the progress now in the ACCESS 2.0 of
5 students moving from level 1 to level 2 in that one year is
6 about 77 percent of students moved from level 1 to level 2
7 or higher in that first year. Students that started at level
8 2, a little more than half of them moved up to level 3 or
9 more. Students at level 3 only 27.8 percent of them moved up
10 level 4 or higher. Students at level 4, only about 11
11 percent moved up a level or higher, and level 5 about 5
12 percent moved up or higher.

13 And then you all, again, wanted that
14 elementary, middle and high school breakdown, so you can see
15 that in the chart below. Elementary students, again, the
16 majority; there was about 47,000 students were in elementary
17 compared to 17,000 at middle at 14,000 at high school. But
18 the elementary students are making the greatest progress in
19 that compared to the middle and the high school. Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So is this test that
21 much harder, that you're getting such different results?

22 MS. PEARSON: The -- yes. The test is more
23 rigorous and more aligned with the content expectations.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

25 MS. PEARSON: So that's why -- that's why we



1 did all this relooking at data, because we knew the test
2 changed quite a bit, or the expectations on the test changed
3 quite a bit.

4 So we needed, again, to come up with a
5 proposed timeline, and this is part of our ESA plan, and
6 something that can absolutely get revisited. We just took
7 what we had for now, we wanted to share with you all where
8 we're at now. We can change any of this, so know that this
9 is all open for conversation.

10 But we had stake holders come together and
11 look at the data. Again, people that are teaching English
12 learners, people with backgrounds in it, people working in
13 higher ed, came together, looked at the data, and the
14 proposed expectations are for students to move at least from
15 level 1 to level 2 in one year. For students at level 2 to
16 move to level 3 or higher in two years, and students at
17 level 3 to move to level 4 or higher, to reach that
18 proficiency cut point, in three years.

19 So, again, we just have one -- one set of
20 data transitions for students. We need to see what happens
21 over time more. You all need to be able to talk about it,
22 but the proposed expectations, what went into our ESA plan
23 for now, was this one year, two year, three year. So let me
24 show you that on another slide, because it's easier to see
25 int his table here. That moving from level 1 to level 2



1 would be one year, 2 to 3, two years, 3 to 4, three years,
2 for a six year total. Again, that's longer than it was, but
3 the expectations really are a bit higher now for getting
4 students there.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member McClellan.

6 MS. McCLELLAN: So this 77.3 percent, for
7 example, that you see between level 1 and level 2.

8 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

9 MS. McCLELLAN: Is that our estimate of how
10 many are currently reaching that benchmark within that time
11 period?

12 MS. PEARSON: It's the percent of students
13 that in 2016 tested at level 1, that in 2017 moved to a
14 higher level in the assessment.

15 MS. McCLELLAN: So these -- but what I mean
16 is, so these number represent how successful we've been in
17 meeting these goals in the past?

18 MS. PEARSON: No.

19 MS. McCLELLAN: Okay.

20 MS. PEARSON: They're -- they're a little bit
21 separate, so look at it on -- no. It's totally -- you're
22 good.

23 MS. McCLELLAN: I'm so sorry.

24 MS. PEARSON: You are not -- don't be sorry
25 at all. It's the slides and how it's represented. So it's



1 the percent of students, the actual results from '16 to '17.
2 It's the same thing that's on this slide, just flipped in a
3 different way, that if they scored level 1 in 2016, 77
4 percent scored level 2 or higher in 2017 when they retested.

5 MS. RANKIN: Or higher.

6 MS. PEARSON: Or higher.

7 MS. RANKIN: So there are some kids that
8 jumped.

9 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So you can see the organ
10 ear the ones that scored at level 2, but then we had
11 students -- a good chunk of students that scored level 1 in
12 2016, but they scored at level 3 in 2017, and a few that
13 scored all the way up at level 4.

14 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

15 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So you see a lot of
16 movement with those level 1 and level 2 students especially.

17 MS. RANKIN: we know anything about the ones
18 at the higher levels? Do we know anything about what
19 programs they're in, and what schools, what --?

20 MS. PEARSON: That they're in. That's a level
21 of analysis we can start doing. And we've done some of it --

22 MS. RANKIN: Because I hope I'm reading that
23 right. That indicates in 2016 they're down here somewhere,
24 2017 they got to level 5.

25 MS. PEARSON: 2017 -- the --



1 MS. RANKIN: Or am I reading -- do I have the
2 right years?

3 MS. PEARSON: Which -- are you looking at
4 this chart, or the next one?

5 MS. RANKIN: Maybe I'm looking at the wrong
6 chart.

7 MS. PEARSON: You could be -- I'm probably --

8 MS. RANKIN: It says 2.0, right?

9 MS. PEARSON: Are you looking at this one, or
10 the next one?

11 MS. RANKIN: I'm avoiding that one.

12 MS. PEARSON: Okay. This one?

13 MS. RANKIN: That -- that one has us -- it
14 hurts my eyes.

15 MS. PEARSON: That one has you confused. I
16 gotta learn which way you guys like to see data.

17 MS. RANKIN: I mean, basically there's --
18 there's smaller amounts getting to the higher levels. Of
19 course, that can be a variety of reasons, right?

20 MS. PEARSON: Yep. Yes, and that's just the
21 ones that started at level 4 the prior year and where they
22 go the next year, if they go up a level or more.

23 MS. RANKIN: Only started at level 4, and
24 (crosstalk)

25 MS. PEARSON: So the gray, that 10 point --



1 that 10.7 percent are -- of the ones that tested level 4 in
2 2016 what percent of those level 4 students moved up to
3 level 4 or higher in 2017, and not many did.

4 MS. RANKIN: So there's 27.8 percent that --
5 that were at level 3 moved up.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yes, of the ones that were at
7 level 3 only -- so if you're looking at -- if you take a
8 step back, if you -- we're trying to look at what percent of
9 students we should expect to move up a level or more within
10 a year. We know that level 1 and level 2; more than half do
11 that, but then it starts dwindling off, the percentage of
12 students, at least from 2016 to 2017 that were able to move
13 up that full level on the assessment.

14 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

15 MS. PEARSON: Because what we're trying to do
16 is figure out what those expectations should be for students
17 to move between levels.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

19 MS. FLORES: Who developed this test, ACCESS?

20 MS. PEARSON: It's part of what I -- we --
21 what's...? Wisconsin Center for Educational Research. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well there you have it.

24 MS. PEARSON: Okay, so let me --

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What does that mean?



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Is it WISK? I mean, the
2 --?

3 MS. PEARSON: No. No WIDA is the -- the name,
4 but doesn't actually stand anymore, for --

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But it's Wisconsin,
6 Indiana, Delaware and Alabama, thank about that.

7 MS. RANKIN: Sounds like diversity to me.

8 MS. PEARSON: Okay, so let me talk to you a
9 little bit on how that data can translate into
10 accountability measures. Alright? So as we talked about in
11 the beginning we can have a growth measure, just that pure
12 comparison, how much does a student grow compared to other
13 students like them that have scored similarly. That's
14 something we've used on the state frameworks for school and
15 districts since 2012. We -- it was also part of the Title
16 III accountability waver, and previously part of NCLB
17 accountability as well, so that's a measure that we've used
18 for a -- a long time of how well students are growing
19 relative to other students like them on the English Language
20 Proficiency Assessment.

21 So that -- what that looked like on our
22 frameworks when we just had pure growth, was like this; we
23 had -- our academic growth section had English language
24 arts, it had math, it had English language proficiency, as
25 measured by the median growth percentage. Just like we



1 measure all the other content areas. Okay?

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: This say 38 is -- it's
3 pretty low.

4 MS. PEARSON: Thirty-eight is pretty low.
5 That's why I have an "approaching" rating, yeah. We can also
6 talk about using measures that look at the growth to
7 standard, so not just how you grow compared to other
8 students like you, but are you growing enough to reach where
9 we want kids to get in a certain amount of time and build in
10 that timeline for kids. So --

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And that's where we
12 start talking about years.

13 MS. PEARSON: That's where the years matter,
14 that's where the time from one level to another level
15 matters that all -- that's where all those pieces come into
16 play, so we used adequate growth in the frameworks from 2012
17 through 2014 on English language proficiency, and I'll show
18 you what that looked like in a sec. It was also part of
19 federal Title III waver, and in NCLB requirements. It also
20 requires a goal and targets for students making progress, so
21 what percentage of students are making progress. We've gotta
22 define what that -- what that progress looks like.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Is that based on that
24 one, two, and three year?

25 MS. PEARSON: Mm-hmm, that's what we have



1 right now, yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

3 MS. PEARSON: So when we had adequate growth
4 in the frameworks it looked very similar. Again, we had --
5 this was back when we had reading, math, and writing growth,
6 and then we had English language proficiency as well, and it
7 was a measure we looked between the median growth percentile
8 and we looked at what the "adequate" growth percentile was
9 and we did this whole comparison thing and I won't go into
10 any more details now, because you guys don't wanna hear that
11 now. But that's -- that's how we've done it in the past.

12 Now ESA requires us to develop a timeline for
13 attaining English language proficiency, and what we put in
14 right now is that one, two, and three. We need to set goals
15 and targets for where students are gonna get, and I'll show
16 you what we put in -- into the plan for now. And those
17 metrics are used -- need to be used for identifying schools
18 for the comprehensive, or targeted, support and improvement.
19 That ESA requirement about identifying schools.

20 So what's in ESA right now if we proposed
21 again don't --- can absolutely be changed, and we wanna look
22 at the data again this coming year to see what happens, but
23 is that one year, two year, three-year timeline. Currently
24 our baseline data shows that we have 67.6 percent of
25 students in grades K-5 that are making that progress target,



1 so if they started at level 1, did they move to level 2 or
2 higher within a year? If they started at level 2 did they
3 move to level 3 within two years. We don't have two years of
4 data, so we look at whether or not they made enough growth
5 that they'd be on track to reaching that level 3 within two
6 years. So we can measure it annually and decide whether a
7 student made enough growth to be on track to make their next
8 benchmark. Students in grades 6 through 12, as you saw, it's
9 very different at the secondary level compared to the
10 elementary. So currently only 43.7 percent of students 6
11 through 12 are making those progress benchmarks. Okay.

12 So for ESA what we did is we set long term
13 goals, or 5-year goals. We used that same methodology that
14 we used with the others, but we said that we're doing a gap
15 closure to 80 percent, so we wanna say we wanna close the
16 gap with where we are currently to 80 percent and make
17 progress towards that over the five years. So where that
18 comes down to is that students in grades K through 5 would
19 get to 70.7 percent, and grade -- students in 6 through 12
20 would get to 52.8 percent. So again, all of this can be
21 changed. We just put something down based on what we were
22 seeing and how we were doing things historically for the
23 plan for now. Okay?

24 So this is the last slide. You guys got
25 through it. Or the last slide of the accountability stuff.



1 Alright?

2 COMMISSIONER ANTHES: This is the worst.

3 MS. PEARSON: This is the hardest and the
4 worst, I know. I know. But you all have discretion around
5 the time frames, the one, two and three years for reaching
6 English language proficiency, for what those benchmark
7 measures should be, what those overall goals and the interim
8 targets should be to get there, and how we include that in
9 state accountability, so that's all -- all in your purview
10 and we're very happy to come back and talk with you about
11 that. If you'd like to see things differently, if you'd like
12 some ideas how that could happen, if you don't ever wanna
13 talk about this again.

14 (Laughter)

15 MS. PEARSON: Whatever you would like with
16 it, that's all -- that's all for you to decide.

17 MS. GOFF: So what have we had --

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

19 MS. GOFF: Sorry. What have we had in the
20 past? What was our time frame before? Was it five years?

21 MS. PEARSON: It was five years before to
22 move -- let me go back and find that slide.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: On an easier assess --
24 on an easier assessment.

25 MS. PEARSON: It was -- yeah, it was on that



1 different assessment. It was one year from level 1 to level
2 2, one year from level 2 to level 3, one year from 3 to 4,
3 and then two years from 4 to 5.

4 MS. GOFF: And it was an easier assessment?

5 MS. PEARSON: That's probably not the best
6 way to describe it.

7 MS. GOFF: Different assessment.

8 MS. PEARSON: First do you wanna describe --?

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well it had better
10 results let's put --

11 MS. PEARSON: You guys are here. I'd rather
12 you (indiscernible) to it than me.

13 MS. COX: Madam Chair. We may have Heather
14 come up here in a little while, too, we'll see how many
15 people we can get at the table.

16 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: There's room.

17 MS. COX: So, it is fair to say that when we
18 look at those cut scores what is expected at a -- for a
19 student at a level 3, or at a level 4, or a at a level 5
20 more is being expected of a student at each one of those
21 levels.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, I get that, but
23 what does that mean in -- relative to what it meant under
24 the other test? Maybe it's a more rigorous test, but the
25 question is does it mean more than it did? As far as



1 proficiency.

2 MS. COX: Madam Chair, so -- exactly. So if -
3 - perhaps oversimplifying, but as we worked with our English
4 learner experts from the field; as they looked at things,
5 what they essentially said is that what used to be required
6 at a level 5 is now being required at a level 4. What in
7 part would be rationale for that; the expectations for
8 students in terms of language to be successful without
9 English language support has actually increased in response
10 to what is required under our content standards.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So in other words we
12 used to say at a 4.0, "Go on, we're not gonna do a whole lot
13 other than monitor, and then you'll probably re..." What's the
14 word? Re-designating the kids back, because it wasn't enough
15 to be successful. Is that close? So -- so the expectation
16 was increased of proficiency?

17 MS. PEARSON: Do you want to take this, or do
18 you want me to take this?

19 MS. COX: So --

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, I mean, I think
21 that's the essential -- were they really not successfully
22 proficient before, or have we just moved the goal posts?

23 MS. COX: So in part when we'd look at what
24 we were expecting historically that is also related to what
25 we were expecting historically for content, and if we would



1 look at, again, perhaps oversimplifying, but what we were
2 expecting under the Colorado Model Content Standards. And
3 under CSAP are very different expectations than what we are
4 expecting under the Colorado Academic Standards and under
5 CMAS. What we are expecting our students to be able to do in
6 terms of language has increased. And I think in part even in
7 terms of as you have had conversations about our standards
8 there's been conversation about while there seems to be an
9 increase in terms of language expectations even within, say,
10 math, and that's true. The standards themselves are
11 demanding higher expectations in terms of language, even for
12 our native English language speakers.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's that density --
14 that's that density thing that -- that Deb was always
15 talking about. What was it called? Linguistic -- I forgot
16 what the terminology was.

17 MS. COX: I believe one of the phrases is
18 "language load".

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I like that one better.
20 The other one was some -- something else. Mr. Durham.

21 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
22 the -- I think the rub is that -- that at least I don't
23 have, and I suspect most of the members of this board,
24 really don't have a way to judge whether standard A is
25 better than, or more appropriate, in assessing opportunities



1 for success than standard B. I think the -- the concern is
2 that we have these cut scores that are being set largely by
3 people in the field who really have a -- who really benefit
4 by identifying, or being able to identify, an increasing
5 number of people who need to have the service on a
6 continuing basis. And while you -- you don't wanna accuse
7 any one, or group, of self-dealing, they may -- they may
8 have motives that are not really self-dealing, but just
9 their own, "Gee, people oughta know more, oughta do better."
10 But maybe -- maybe the old standards were adequate in -- in
11 trying to ensure success.

12 And I -- I just wonder if we're going to --
13 if we're going to have standards that are set that drives
14 significant funding if we shouldn't find a way to -- or a
15 group that we could believe did not have a financial or a
16 self-interest in -- in raising standards unnecessarily. I
17 mean, I think the standards should be appropriate, I just
18 think the people -- it's difficult to say that the people
19 that are setting it don't have any interest in a particular
20 outcome, because they do benefit from a particular outcome.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I did ask that
22 question at the last meeting about -- is it ELP funding? And
23 that was answered to me to clarify that there's not an
24 incentive to keep kids, because the ELP funding is only a
25 very short time period. So it doesn't go on for six years.



1 MR. DURHAM: But -- but somebody still has to
2 be -- maybe the funding from the state doesn't go on, but
3 somebody has to be responsible for teaching these kids in
4 the second language, or in English.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No, for the most part
6 it's being done -- I mean, that's what we've been talking
7 about is the fact that we want this teaching to be done
8 within the classroom, rather than -- and we don't -- we
9 don't know that yet, but we're trying pretty hard to talk
10 about continued English language acquisition at the same
11 time that students are learning content. Am I close on that
12 one?

13 MR. DURHAM: I mean just -- I think just the
14 increased number, though, that you keep in that category,
15 drives a, a sense, and it drives a -- you know, if nothing
16 else it could drive a, you know, we have -- we've identified
17 a failure and failures require more funding, and --

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, I'm not -- but I'm
19 -- you're gonna have to show that that -- we have to show
20 that that's the case, as opposed to that there's a real
21 incentive to get kids out of -- out of that.

22 MR. DURHAM: So there's -- there's no funding
23 -- isn't the funding per pupil on this?

24 MS. PEARSON: On ELPA.

25 MS. COX: ELPA funding -- Madam Chair, ELPA



1 funding is per pupil, and just for 5 years across, and we
2 track that across districts, so --

3 MR. DURHAM: Five years --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah, it doesn't -- so
5 there's no incentive to...

6 MR. DURHAM: But then if you -- a district
7 that is responsible for a kid that is in year six and still
8 not proficient is going to have to allocate some resources
9 to that, so the -- the beneficiary is the -- the teachers
10 who are involved in, in language acquisition, you know, they
11 have -- they have created demand, whether artificially or
12 appropriately, and it's just -- I -- I'm not capable of
13 judging that. I don't know if anyone on the board is. And,
14 and I just wonder if we shouldn't have an independent look
15 at -- at this.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well I -- I'm getting
17 ready to talk about that, too.

18 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

20 MS. FLORES: No, if we started at the 4-year-
21 old level and we're funded for kindergarten, first, second
22 and third, and to expect them to be at third, and we should
23 expect them to be at third at -- and by that I mean at --

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Five, at level 5, or
25 what?



1 MS. FLORES: Well, they -- they would be --
2 they would be reading just like everybody else. They would
3 be proficient in their schooling, and I -- I think we could
4 do much better. But, I mean, other states have done it. Look
5 at -- I -- I'm just thinking of Texas whose done it for --

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's a great idea, but
7 that's not where we are right now, so my --

8 MS. FLORES: Well, the thing is we should
9 look at other states that are more proficient than we are
10 for -- in doing -- in doing -- in -- in being -- in getting
11 second language learners, which we're basically having
12 problems with -- with -- with them in not getting them to be
13 proficient. That gap -- if we're gonna close the gap, I
14 mean, we should really be about opening up and thinking, how
15 can we get these kids -- and we should really think about 4-
16 year-old program, and 4-year-old program, first, second and
17 third. And third is when, you know, everything goes to --
18 they gotta be reading at third grade -- at fourth grade they
19 have to be reading, you know --

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: For content.

21 MS. FLORES: For content. At fourth, fifth,
22 and sixth and so.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. Okay, so let's get
24 back to the real world.

25 MS. GOFF: I was just trying to read this



1 Denver Post article.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: About (indiscernible).

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So are there -- are
4 there -- are there -- there are different strategies that
5 are used for English acquisition. Are there studies that
6 identify in general what's the time span? Have there been
7 efforts to bring in intense language acquisition in certain
8 --

9 MS. FLORES: Yeah, there has.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. I would think
11 that there would be some pilots out there of some other
12 things to talk about. I don't disagree with your idea, but
13 we don't have that as yet.

14 MS. FLORES: We could.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So what are some other
16 things that districts can --

17 MS. FLORES: Might even be cheaper.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Can try before we decide
19 -- I mean, we can decide six years is right, but maybe
20 there's a way to do it in four years, and what is that way?

21 MS. FLORES: Three years.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Et cetera.

23 COMMISSIONER ANTHES: Part of the next mini-
24 series, four.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, good.



1 MS. McCLELLAN: Would you repeat that?

2 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I said that would
3 certainly be, I think those questions, we can follow up on
4 for sure, and identify, and it could be part of the next --

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I mean, don't you agree
6 that that's the kind of information that we need to have? We
7 keep reading about the research, but the research seems to
8 me, generalizes on a certain strategy of English
9 acquisition, as opposed to some different things.

10 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Larger options.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Mm-hmm. Does dual
12 immersion, Spanish-English, for kindergarten through 5th
13 grade do something significantly better than ESL, or all the
14 other things. I don't know what's out there, but I am
15 interested in knowing what's out there in order for us to --
16 you know, six years is a real groaner for me. Just makes me
17 think "oh my goodness". And I wanna remind you I'm an
18 English -- English is my second language, so I've kinda been
19 through it, in a completely different environment than we're
20 offering today. So -- and I -- and I think it is very unique
21 for the -- each of the -- each of our students what they
22 have in that 80 percent of their time when they're not in
23 the class -- when they're not in classes with us. So that's
24 another factor that we, I think, worry about. Board Member
25 Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: With all due forgiveness what --
2 what is our -- what question are we answering today? Us,
3 what's our purpose?

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Our purpose is to learn
5 enough about this so that when -- that we decide what should
6 be the time span, apparently it was five years, now under
7 the new assessment we're suggesting that should be six years
8 to become FIP.

9 MS. GOFF: Is this in relation to our ESSA
10 continued conversation?

11 MS. PEARSON: Yes, that's where that timeline
12 needed to get written in, and so we -- we moved to where it
13 was --

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But I mean, it's for all
15 kid -- it doesn't have to be just for ESA. It's a -- it's a
16 statewide decision that we need to make.

17 MS. PEARSON: No. Yeah, because if we wanna -
18 -

19 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, because if we wanna put
21 it back in state accountability then we'd want -- we'd
22 probably want alignment with the two things.

23 MS. GOFF: Not knowing exactly -- if we're --
24 if we're talking -- if we're brainstorming sources of ideas,
25 or things we should look at, I'd like to know -- I guess DPS



1 would probably be my first thought; how far into the CLA bi-
2 literacy -- how far down grade-level wise does that go, and
3 if there are some possible programs, or techniques. I -- I
4 know the answer. Because I do know how it works, but if they
5 would be -- if they would be willing to -- if they can yet,
6 I don't know. Depends on how -- which lower grade levels are
7 involved in that, but you know.

8 The idea there's, to me, I think we're talking
9 two tracks here a little bit. One of them is what is the
10 reasonable evidence-based -- because we do care about that,
11 length of time for proficiency to settle in. Typically, as far
12 as legislation's been connected in Colorado, I think it's been
13 right in the six-year range, so there's been five to six years
14 whenever there's been funding conversations for whatever
15 purpose, five to six years.

16 Recently, couple of years ago, the suggestion
17 to move -- I can't remember what it was in connection with,
18 money, but it might of been part of the school finance
19 conversation, was 7 years, which seemed like a pretty big
20 stretch to everybody listening to it. So if that's one -- the
21 one thing that's --

22 MS. FLORES: That's Montreal, that's Canada.

23 MS. GOFF: Yeah, well, if that's one thing
24 we're trying to pin down our move on, along with --

25 MS. FLORES: And that's coming.



1 MS. GOFF: Whatever else around the ESSA
2 work; that's one thing, as opposed to talking about the
3 cost. I -- I -- I'm -- I'm sorry, Mr. Durham I'm not -- my
4 head's just not going in there right. So we can talk later,
5 but I -- I had to ask. What's the reason we're talking about
6 this right now? Because I'm feeling like we're getting
7 scattered on some of the points here. And if it solely is
8 the length of time -- do you have something?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

10 MS. GOFF: If it's the length of time before
11 proficiency is reached then just tell me that and I'll re-
12 center my mind. I'm -- gotten a little off track here.

13 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Board Member Goff, I
14 can just give a little bit of context. So over the past
15 several, I don't know, it could be over the past year, we've
16 brought various things to you from different units that
17 relate to English learners, and so we started to get a lot
18 of requests from you all saying, "I don't understand a lot
19 of the things you're bringing." So we said that we would do
20 either a study session that would be like a day long study
21 session where it would be an extra meeting to come in and --
22 and talk about all of the ways that our different units
23 interact with English Language Learners.

24 MS. GOFF: Right.

25 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: And we kinda thought,



1 okay, folks didn't have the appetite to have a whole other
2 meeting, so we would separate out the information in
3 multiple meetings. So that's why we've been sort of
4 affectionately calling this the mini-series, where first we
5 gave you some information on the data, and then we gave you
6 some information on assessments and standards at the last
7 meeting, and now we're giving you information on
8 accountability and teachers at this meeting. But one of the
9 specific board member requests was to talk about this length
10 of time, because it had been something that had come up time
11 and time again.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: So that's why so much
14 time was spent today on that issue, because it was a board
15 member request.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thanks. We're ready.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we ready? Okay,
18 sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Educators. I believe so,
20 are we ready? Yep. Board Member Rankin.

21 MS. RANKIN: So is all of this online so that
22 the public can see it and understand it as much as we do,
23 and the parents of the ELL students have an opportunity to
24 see what their students are -- I'm sorry, I just had to ask.

25 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: They'll be watching



1 these in replay and studying them carefully, I think, so --

2 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

3 MS. COX: I am --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do we need a five-minute
5 break? I just realized that we did not have a break at all.

6 MS. FLORES: Let's continue.

7 MS. GOFF: Yeah, let's go.

8 MS. McCLELLAN: I'm okay.

9 MS. COX: I will do my best to move us
10 through this fairly quickly. I'm not gonna probably tell you
11 a whole lot that you don't already know, but I just wanna
12 confirm a little bit of it. So we're gonna move on to
13 educators and English learners. So one of the questions that
14 keeps coming up often really is how do our educators serve
15 our English learners, and what kind of educators, meaning
16 what are their fortes, as we think about that, serve our
17 English learners. So although there are many ways our
18 educators serve our students, when it comes to our English
19 learners there are kinda two specific types of teachers that
20 really deliver services to -- to our English learners.

21 The first one is really our English Language
22 Development Teachers, or we call them ELD's, I will try not
23 to use that acronym, but they -- they are really the folks
24 that are teaching our English learners about the Colorado
25 English Language Proficiency Standards. So these are the



1 folks that are really digging in and helping -- helping our
2 students learn how to read, write, speak and listen in
3 English, regardless of what level they're at. Those are the
4 folks that are digging in to help that.

5 They support our academic language, so they
6 help support our classroom teachers, who is our next group,
7 and our classroom teachers are the ones that are teaching
8 the Colorado Academic Standards. Those are our math
9 teachers, our science teachers, our P.E. teachers, our music
10 teachers, all of those folks that are really focused on the
11 -- the Colorado Academic Standards. In those contexts, they
12 teach academic language. And we're gonna talk about some
13 examples of what we're really talking about when we say
14 "academic language" versus "acquiring English" and we'll --
15 we'll see a few examples.

16 Our classroom teachers are really looking at
17 reinforcing -- sorry, clicked a little fast -- reinforcing
18 English -- English language development. So they're working
19 -- both teachers are kind of working on both ends. They have
20 a little bit of a specialty.

21 So let's go back and review very quickly what
22 we -- what we've heard about our standards assessment
23 accountability in our educators. So if we think about
24 standards; the first one is our Colorado English Language
25 Proficiency Standards. We've talked about ACCESS 2.0, we've



1 talked about the achievement growth and the accountability
2 that Alisa just discussed. What we're really looking at here
3 is that English Language Development Teachers are the ones
4 that are fully trained to teach our reading, writing,
5 speaking and listening. They're the ones that collaborate
6 with the teachers, so this is kinda how it ties all
7 together.

8 Colorado Academic Standards are different
9 standards. Those are our core content teachers. Joy
10 Sarcowski (ph) was talking a little bit about those are
11 measured by the Colorado measures of academic progress and -
12 - and standards. So those are achievement growth to those
13 specific standards. Those are our classroom content teachers
14 and I'm gonna give you an example. They use strategies to
15 help our English Language Learners access that content and
16 master the academic content that goes through that. In an
17 ideal world they're able to have the English language
18 development teacher at their disposal and they can -- they
19 can collaborate with that individual on an ongoing basis.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Is that what used to be
21 ESL?

22 MS. COX: Yes. So when I say --

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So EL --

24 MS. COX: English Language Development
25 teachers, I mean English as a second language teacher, and I



1 mean English Language Learner teacher.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

3 MS. COX: So I -- and several of us, and I
4 also mean culturally and linguistically diverse endorsed
5 teacher. So I try to just limit it to English Development,
6 because over the course of the last 10 years we have called
7 them English Language Learner teachers, we have called them
8 English as a Second Language Teachers, and we have called
9 them Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Teachers, and we
10 have called them English Language Development Teachers, and
11 they're all in that group.

12 MS. FLORES: May I just say something here?

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Just -- just real quick.

14 MS. FLORES: Angelika, you and I went into
15 sheltered English. That's what --

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, no I didn't. Believe
17 me. Shelter was -- there was nothing -- so..

18 MS. COX: So I will -- so -- so sheltered
19 English is a -- a strategy, for sure. So when we -- when we
20 do talk about our English Language Development Teachers and
21 our English Language Learners there's a specific time of the
22 day that our English learners really work intensely on their
23 language acquisition skills, and that is the work that they
24 will do with our English Language Development Teachers, but
25 it's a really small portion of the day. It's usually a



1 snippet of time. The vast majority of a student's day is
2 spent with the classroom teacher. They're spent in math, in
3 science, in social studies, in music, in art, and all of
4 those things. So what that really leads us down to is that
5 our English Language Learners are really embedded in the
6 Colorado Academic Standards when they're in their core
7 content classrooms. They're really embedded in the English
8 Language Proficiency Standards when they are in that
9 intensive time with their English Language Development
10 Teachers.

11 In an ideal world -- and we've heard some of these
12 strategies in the past from some of our districts. In an
13 ideal world those two teachers would be able to co-teach
14 every single student, every single part of the day. In our
15 reality world, because we are not on reality TV, so in a
16 real reality TV - or in a real reality world, that doesn't
17 happen that way. So our English language students are very
18 much embedded in their classrooms.

19 So what's an example of the academic content? Classroom
20 teachers focus on the academic standards. We know that. That
21 includes our relevant academic language. As an example, last
22 month Dr. Colesman (ph) said -- talked a little bit about
23 her math class and how she taught perimeter to her students,
24 and how she could have taught perimeter a little bit
25 differently had she been thinking about the context of her



1 English Language Learners. Because not only are we talking
2 about learning the concept, the math concept of perimeter,
3 we're talking about the vocabulary word "perimeter" and when
4 we don't know English we may not necessarily use that word
5 in every day conversation. How many of us use the word
6 "perimeter" on an ongoing basis in our conversation?

7 So we're gonna take a little bit of an
8 examples. We're gonna go -- go kinda way back a month ago to
9 one of our student examples. And this is our sixth-grader.
10 Her home language is Vietnamese. It -- the -- the survey
11 reveals that she is a -- a student who has limited English
12 proficiency. Okay, so sixth grade middle school. During her
13 day she sees all kinds of teachers, so she has time with her
14 English language development teacher, her math teacher, her
15 science teacher. She's actually in P.E. and art this year
16 and she has social studies. So in this particular case a
17 vast majority of her day is spent with her classroom
18 teachers.

19 So let's pretend that our sixth-grade student
20 has just gone to math class. In that math class what she is
21 actually learning about today, is she has been introduced by
22 her math teacher to the concept of the academic content of
23 the word "gross". How many of us know what the word "gross"
24 means? In math we know it is one thing, and if you're an 80s
25 kid you know it as, "Ew, gross, icky." So we have a



1 conversational "gross", and we have a math "gross". So as we
2 see, we have lots of things on this chart that talk about
3 the different meaning in every day life. But if I'm my
4 sixth-grade student and the word is "gross" I know for a
5 fact that I've heard it probably in the halls as offensive,
6 or disgusting, or icky. And then I get to my math class and
7 I'm limited English proficient, and I'm listening to my math
8 teacher talk about "gross" not as disgusting or icky, I'm
9 listening to her talk about it as the total income from
10 sales.

11 I'm brand new to the school. As a Vietnamese
12 student I am brand new, with that as my home language. In
13 addition to understanding the math concept of "gross", not
14 just the language word of "gross", but the math concept
15 "gross", I have a hard time communicating in English, so I
16 have a hard time speaking in English back. The classroom
17 teacher at this point in time has to work with my sixth-
18 grade student and as the classroom teacher I would have to
19 figure out if my student understands the mathematical
20 concept of the word "gross" and just doesn't know how to say
21 it in English, or if my student doesn't speak -- or doesn't
22 understand the concept of math, or the math concept of
23 "gross", and I have to figure out how to teach them. So in
24 this particular example I -- I could, as a classroom
25 teacher, if she had learned the mathematical concept of



1 gross, then I can really dig into that. Even if she's not
2 part of that language -- or even if we have that English
3 language barrier, by really helping her understand math by
4 giving some really concrete examples. So I might be able to
5 put up, you know, examples, money, pictures of money, to
6 help her understand the concept of gross when I pull all
7 these things together. Whether she understands English or
8 not, but I have to know that strategy to be able to help
9 her.

10 So how do teachers get the strategies and the
11 skills to help them actually teach these concepts? There are
12 a multitude of ways that teachers get this. Currently all
13 educator preparation programs actually focus on some
14 strategies for teaching the Colorado Academic Standards to
15 all students. Those strategies are embedded since 2011 in
16 our educator preparation programs in the state of Colorado.
17 Remember we have 50 percent of our teachers that are
18 graduates of the Colorado educator preparation programs, and
19 50 percent of our teachers that are not, that are coming
20 from out of state. But what we can say; since 2011 all
21 educator preparation programs have a minimum, minimum, set
22 of standards in their actual endorsement areas that say,
23 "You, as an educator preparation program are gonna help our
24 teachers in some content areas understand those strategies."
25 They're not spelled out incredibly specific at this time.



1 The other ways that I might be able to get
2 this as a teacher, these strategies, is professional
3 development in my local district. I could be working with my
4 ELD teacher, I could be working side-by-side with someone
5 who has these strategies, so there's other professional
6 development.

7 I think some of the important parts there is
8 that districts have their choice as to what they give our
9 teachers in professional development. So some of them
10 absolutely have the local resources to be able to do that,
11 and some don't, but those are a few ways that our teachers
12 can gain those strategies to help. So where we are right now
13 when we think about teachers in general is there is a
14 decision point that the Board of Education has actually
15 given to us. You all gave us direction in early 2017 to
16 bring together a stake holder group to make some
17 recommendations for two specific professional development
18 pathways related to our teachers and to teaching English
19 learners. One of those pathways was related to recommending
20 possible English learner guidelines and rules for educator
21 preparation programs, and the other was for possible rule
22 recommendations for current educators around English
23 language. That specific request is still outstanding today,
24 so this is one of the things that we'll be looking at going
25 forward.



1 The stake holder group was convened and we
2 have taken a significant amount of board feedback as well as
3 stake holder feedback across Colorado and are prepared to
4 come back to the board in December with some options at the
5 board's direction and will to take a look at deciding
6 whether there are some additional professional development
7 pathways for our educator preparation programs around
8 English Language Learners and for our current teachers
9 around English Language Learners. Those will come back to
10 you in December.

11 With that, I move to questions, thoughts, and
12 further -- further inquiry.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I have a question. How -
14 - there -- there it an endorsement in order to become an
15 English language development teacher? Was that the right
16 word?

17 MS. COX: Yes, yes.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What does that require?

19 MS. COX: Absolutely, so that is a program
20 only endorsement. In 2011 the Board of Education at that
21 time approved a program only endorsement, so there's no
22 assessment, there's no content assessment to get that. It is
23 24 semester hours, it focuses on language acquisition, the
24 strategies for acquiring, or for helping the students
25 acquire, content knowledge, as well as teaching students



1 specifically how to read, write, speak, and listen when they
2 do not have English as their first language.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So that's eight
4 additional courses above and beyond the teacher prep
5 program.

6 MS. COX: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I'm -- I'm guessing
8 that's what the ESL endorsement also used to be?

9 MS. COX: It is, so English -- yes.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: My - my recollection is
11 that we had schools where every teacher was an ESL teacher
12 when we had -- we're not seeing that very much, are we?

13 MS. COX: We are not, and -- and there are
14 some -- some districts that still require not necessarily
15 endorsements, but a certificate, or a pathway, a
16 professional development pathway, but it is not necessarily
17 aligned to the endorsement criteria, or the programmatic
18 criteria, but does meet their individual district needs.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you .
20 Questions, folks?

21 MS. RANKIN: Did I -- (indiscernible)

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Please, Board Member
23 Rankin.

24 MS. RANKIN: Did I hear you correctly; did
25 you say 24 semester hours, but there's no test?



1 MS. COX: Correct. So the -- the culturally
2 and linguistically diverse, which is -- and I apologize for
3 all of the various names, but today our endorsement is
4 called Culturally and linguistically diverse. That is
5 program only, and of course that's authorized by the Board
6 of Education in the State of Colorado to be a program that
7 provides English Language Learner strategies, acquisitions
8 to our teachers. There's no content test.

9 MS. RANKIN: I'm sorry, that last --

10 MS. COX: There is no content test.

11 MS. FLORES: For Colorado, but in other
12 states there are. EPS did a --

13 MS. RANKIN: So -- so you just -- it's seat
14 time for 24 semester hours?

15 MS. COX: Its competency based, really, is
16 what it is. So when we -- we look at the programs; so the
17 programs that we have in the State of Colorado right now are
18 very much competency based when they graduate. Meaning I can
19 teach an English Language Learner the mathematical concepts,
20 or I can teach them how to read in English.

21 MS. RANKIN: Oh, okay.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: How many

23 MS. RANKIN: Who determines that?

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah. How many school --
25 oh, go ahead.



1 MS. COX: So the school -- so it's local
2 control, but we authorize and re-authorize in the Board of
3 Education. So this -- this goes into a little bit of
4 educator preparation authorization. So the unit, the
5 Educator Talent Unit, oversees and authorizes, so we conduct
6 reviews of that, including the outcomes of our teachers in
7 educator preparation and how effective those teachers are in
8 the work that they do. So this is really an outcomes-based
9 model that is a little bit different than the rest of some
10 of our core content.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So do districts also
12 give this endorse -- provide the coursework for this
13 endorsement, or is it a higher ed?

14 MS. COX: Yeah. Some districts have already
15 partnered with higher ed. districts at this point in time
16 could -- could apply to become alternative agencies to offer
17 the culturally and linguistically diverse. Most districts
18 have chose -- we -- let me rephrase that. No districts have
19 chose to do that yet. Could they? Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: In which case it could
21 be tuition -- tuition free.

22 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

23 MS. COX: Correct.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Interesting. Questions?
25 Thank you very much.



1 MS. COX: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. Are you guys ready
3 to go on, or do you want to take a quick break?

4 MS. McCLELLAN: What's left, the educator
5 shortage?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Shortage.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, there are three
8 items in there.

9 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: There's -- there's two
10 more left; the educator shortage --

11 MS. MAZANEC: So that last one was part of
12 the first part?

13 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah, I say five
15 minutes.

16 (Break in audio)

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: So then we have the
19 rule making thing.

20 MR. DURHAM: We do?

21 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: So teacher shortage and
22 then the little presentation on rule making.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It'll be short and
24 sweet.

25 MR. DURHAM: Okay.



1 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I'll be quick.

2 MR. DURHAM: Right, yeah. Oh, I see, educate
3 -- oh, okay. Oh, I see.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The next item on our
5 agenda is a presentation on the educator shortage report.
6 Commissioner -- pardon me.

7 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Thank you. Yes, I - I
8 realize this has been two long days of a lotta heavy
9 content, so we're -- we're gonna try to streamline these
10 last two items a little bit. But this is -- you've been
11 hearing a lot about the teacher shortage, and the educator
12 shortage, and how we have to -- really the Department of
13 Higher Education is the lead agency on this, but from
14 legislation last year the Department of Higher Ed. was
15 instructed to, in partnership with us, write a report, or an
16 action plan, for potential options to deal with the teacher
17 shortage. And so the -- as I said, the Department of Higher
18 Ed. is taking the lead, and that's why you've gotten this
19 material so late. Not -- I'm not blaming the Department of
20 Higher Ed, we're just in the throes of putting it together,
21 and this -- this report is not due till December 1st, so
22 we're in the very final stages, but this is the last time we
23 come before you before the report is due, so we're trying to
24 give you kind of the meat of what's in the report without
25 the final report. So --



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: A preview.

2 COMMISSIONER ANTHES: Sort of we're just --
3 the e-mails are flying on this right now, so we just kinda
4 put this together at the last possible second. So we
5 recognize you've had a long couple days, so we'll take your
6 lead on how quickly you want us to go through. My suggestion
7 is we kinda stick to the high level, strategic, and
8 objectives, and you guys can read the potential strategies
9 and if you have questions, you know, stop us, or we can --
10 we're happy to meet with you, or after this meeting, if
11 you're just getting too tired to take in information at this
12 point in the day. So with that I'll turn it over to Dr.
13 Neil.

14 DR. NEIL: Thank you, Commissioner Anthes. So
15 I'm gonna -- I will jump in as quickly as possible, and then
16 I will highlight as we go through. If you have questions
17 please let me know, but I do welcome any and all feedback;
18 whether it's here today, or whether it's over the course of
19 the next week, so that we can definitely embed that in the
20 feedback that goes to the Department of Higher Education as
21 well.

22 So a quick recap about the educator shortage
23 facts. And you do have, I believe, an -- a fact sheet as
24 well that you can review.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes, yes.



1 DR. NEIL: So I just wanted to call that out
2 in case you -- you needed more information. But this was
3 House Bill 17-1003, and it was authored last spring. It did
4 instruct, or require the Colorado Department of Higher
5 Education in partnership with CDE to develop a collaborative
6 action plan that out -- outlines necessary steps to resolve
7 our educator shortages. There were approximately 14 townhall
8 meetings across the state that drew about four -- more than
9 400 participants. In addition to those 14 town halls there
10 were some -- several small team meetings, like the
11 Commissioner Superintendent's Cabinet had the opportunity to
12 have conversation. The Colorado Association of School
13 Personnel, so several large and small group meetings for
14 that. There was also a survey which yielded about 6,000
15 comments that was collected around this, and then of course
16 our small group meetings that yielded about 100 participants
17 -- additional 100 participants.

18 These have been arranged into strategic
19 action plans, and I -- and goals. And I think it's important
20 to note that these are very much goals, and they are
21 strategic in their -- their thinking and in action. So what
22 you will see is you'll see four individual goals as we go
23 through this, and they are all at a high level, so I'll run
24 through the strategic goals very quickly for us and not dive
25 into the strategies as deeply yet.



1 So our first strategic goal is, of course, to
2 retain educator talent by increasing teacher retention. This
3 -- our objective around here is to ensure teachers are
4 supported by providing initial and ongoing training and
5 professional development necessary for impactful teaching.

6 There were three large items that we heard
7 from the town halls. The first one was "I need more support
8 as an early-career teacher, and I also need support and
9 opportunity as a veteran teacher." And we heard that very,
10 very clearly. I will also say that we heard "money". I'm
11 surprised at that. I was, I was surprised. So we'll talk
12 about that one.

13 So there are a series of five strategies that
14 really work with that, including a focus on our rural
15 context as well, which we really heard. We heard, of course,
16 a lot of feedback around how hard it is to recruit our
17 teachers and retain them in our rural areas.

18 The second strategic action goal is to retain
19 and attract educator talent by increasing teacher
20 compensation and benefits. The objective here is to create
21 state legislation that requires, potentially, a minimum
22 teacher salary at or above school district's cost of living.
23 The report itself is going to talk a lot about -- or we hope
24 the report itself is gonna talk a lot about the cost of
25 living, and that's what we heard from our -- from our stake



1 holders across the field; is that they literally were not
2 able to meet the cost of living, because their salaries did
3 not compensate them fairly enough to be able to find
4 housing. So that was part of -- of that strategy.

5 Objective two, is to potentially create
6 compensation incentives to subsidize -- subsidize, that's a
7 hard word to say, district cost of living. So there are
8 student loan forgiveness options in there, as -- as a
9 potential housing incentives, and then compensation
10 incentives specifically for teacher shortage areas.

11 When we were out listening to folks what we
12 heard very clearly was not only do we have a teacher
13 shortage geographically, but we also have teacher shortages
14 around content areas; including up to elementary. We've
15 never had a teacher shortage in elementary teachers, but we
16 now are experiencing it not only geographically, but we are
17 experiencing it in some of even our hard to fill areas in
18 large, urban districts, but even in some of our -- what we
19 could consider usually easier to fill options there.

20 Strategic action goal three, is to attract
21 educator talent by increasing the number of teachers in
22 shortage areas. So this particularly starts highlighting
23 early hire projections and increasing the number of
24 licensure programs that are really dedicated to attracting
25 individuals in those shortage areas. So that's what you see



1 is the two objectives there. And potentially identifying
2 dual licensure endorsement programs, so teachers are dually
3 endorsed to teach things like math and science right off the
4 bat, which can increase their attractiveness according to
5 some of our districts.

6 As part of strategic goal three, of
7 attracting our educator talent by increasing the number of
8 teacher short -- teachers in shortage areas, we wanted to
9 also prepare more teacher candidates in teacher shortage
10 areas. A few of the strategies there are scholarships
11 specifically aimed at that, as well as diversifying our
12 teacher workforce. Aligning student teaching practicums with
13 actual anticipated openings. So some of these strategies dig
14 into the district, as well, abut also at the educator
15 preparation level, that -- that the legislature, of course,
16 oversees those for Department of Higher Education and the
17 Colorado Department of Education.

18 Then there are some other options in there
19 around encouraging retired teachers. We have found success
20 this year in the retired Para benefits for our teachers.
21 Right now, we have a survey that yields about 61 districts
22 that have responded to us, most of them rural, that have
23 utilized 56 retired teachers to date, many of them in the
24 rural settings, but a few in our urban context have inquired
25 as to whether that is an option for them or not, especially



1 in their hard to fill areas. So you will see that
2 highlighted here from the Department of Higher Education as
3 a potential benefit.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do they have to go
5 through a process?

6 DR. NEIL: Describe that to me, I'm sorry.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: In order to come under
8 that bill, to be able to come back into classroom teaching,
9 is there a process for them to do that, or do they just
10 notify...?

11 MS. COX: They notify Para.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

13 DR. NEIL: It's a pretty simple, to be
14 honest, and we had to actually conduct a survey, because
15 it's not something that we get at the Department, nor does
16 --

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, I see what you're
18 saying. In order to find out. Okay, now I understand.

19 DR. NEIL: Yeah, yeah, nor does Higher Ed.,
20 so it's really something that's worked out with, with Para,
21 on that end, so --

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

23 DR. NEIL: The district and Para.

24 MS. FLORES: And they don't come back if
25 they've missed certification and come back to -- to --



1 DR. NEIL: They do have to be certified
2 still, yeah, so they have to have an active license still.

3 MS. FLORES: Yeah, okay, so they do.

4 MS. GOFF: I hope I didn't miss --

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I hope I didn't miss
7 it. Are there -- are there -- is -- is the Para plan,
8 teacher coming back, is that specifically for rural areas,
9 or can -- can urban -- urban retired teachers get involved
10 in that program to go teach in a rural area?

11 MS. FLORES: That's a good question.

12 MS. GOFF: Is there -- is there some
13 flexibility there?

14 DR. NEIL: So right now, it is specifically
15 for rural districts to use, and an urban teacher could leave
16 and choose to, you know, retire and choose to go to an urban
17 setting right now, or a rural setting, but right this second
18 it is just for rural districts. What is a -- a strategy that
19 the Department of Higher Education has identified is really
20 that we could extend that to all districts if that was an
21 opportunity.

22 MS. FLORES: So there could be full movement
23 either way.

24 DR. NEIL: It would be kind of -- yeah. They
25 could go however direction they want to go and not have it



1 negatively impact their PRA Retirement.

2 MS. FLORES: Because if the -- if one of the
3 goals is to get and keep teachers in the rural areas
4 probably wouldn't wanna have a lot of back and forth
5 (indiscernible).

6 DR. NEIL: Back and forth. Yeah. Okay. The
7 strategic action goal 4 is to attract educator talent by
8 increasing of course enrollment into our educator
9 preparation programs, and that -- those objectives really
10 look at the increased positive perceptions and messaging
11 around teaching as a career. One of the things that we heard
12 very clearly from teachers in the field and educators as a
13 whole is that they feel like they are not treated as
14 professionals, and so that is part of -- of this particular
15 strategic goal is to really increase that.

16 Objective 2 is, of course, the financial
17 assistance incentives for potential educator preparation
18 program majors; very clearly identifying how we can help
19 folks with the cost, and I think that cost/benefit analysis
20 of how much it costs us to get a degree to teach and, or how
21 much we're gonna be paid, and especially in some of our
22 rural districts.

23 And then consider educator preparation
24 provider policies related to the practicums that affect
25 student's employment. And this is -- is not overtly obvious



1 what that means in this particular presentation, but what it
2 really means is getting exposure to students in their
3 practicums to different environmental settings in which they
4 can become educators, and making those connections right
5 away, especially in their student-teaching and, or their
6 alternative teachers being able to match-make that a little
7 bit differently. A lot of times we have teachers that are
8 coming in, and this was another thing our stake holders said
9 to us, is "I want to become a teacher, and I need help doing
10 that. Where can I do that?" So this is really kind of a -- a
11 specific goal that helped us -- helps us optimize what I
12 would consider the match maker part of the Department of
13 Higher Education, Colorado Department of Education
14 preparation programs in our districts.

15 There are a few additional no-cost
16 recommendations. The legislature was very clear that we
17 needed to take a look at no-cost recommendations. There are
18 a couple of them that we did our best to -- to take a look
19 at and we had some really strong high school students and
20 middle school students that actually said, "You know, I
21 really want more exposure to teaching as a career besides
22 just my teacher and what I hear from my teacher." Education
23 is an interesting place, because it's the only place that
24 for 13 years students get a preview of what the profession
25 looks like. No other profession actually does that. So for



1 upwards of 13 years, if you go to preschool, you get a
2 preview of that every, single, day.

3 We had several students that came to our town
4 halls that were very clear of they would actually like to
5 try it. How can we create more teacher cadet programs, more
6 mentorship opportunities, and those are things --?

7 MS. GOFF: That's great.

8 DR. NEIL: Educator's Rising is what we used
9 to call the Future Teachers of America; those particulars,
10 but Educators Rising, so they were very clear about those
11 opportunities, and -

12 MS. MAZANEC: Do they still have those;
13 Future Teachers of America?

14 DR. NEIL: It's Educators Rising now, and I
15 will say in Colorado it has dwindled significantly, and
16 that's --

17 MS. MAZANEC: But do they -- do they go to
18 classrooms, and...? My sister -- my sister was in that and she
19 used to -- I was in, like, the second grade and she came to
20 my classroom for, like, an hour a day to help the teacher
21 and learn, you know, about it.

22 DR. NEIL: Yeah. They do --

23 MS. MAZANEC: Do they still do that? I don't
24 even see -- I don't think they did that for my -- my --

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well they're not



1 necessarily in formal programs. I -- when I first came on
2 this board we did have a teacher cadet and she took an --

3 DR. NEIL: We still have one, not heavily
4 supported, and I think this is where the -- the no-cost
5 recommendations is that it's hard when it's not supported,
6 and the districts are kind of trying to do it a piece at a
7 time. So it -- we definitely have places where we have
8 teacher cadet --

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We had a state-wide --
10 we had a statewide person in charge of it. Right?

11 DR. NEIL: Yep, and concurrent enrollment, so
12 our community college system actually is the ones who really
13 help with the teacher cadet program.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

15 DR. NEIL: So what -- what this particular
16 ask is, is for us to be more systematic around what that
17 looks like, and potentially offer more supports, so that
18 there are really true, concurrent enrollment opportunities
19 for our teachers with serious pathways into how we can do
20 that and then the, you know, the opportunity to really
21 experience that. So in teacher cadet programs they are
22 learning about how to teach, but they're also practicing,
23 and by being able to go to elementary schools to help with
24 (indiscernible).

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But what Pam is



1 describing does still occur in an ad-hoc manner in
2 communities. The high school -- the high

3 MS. MAZANEC: To me it should be a local
4 issue, you know, mm-hmm.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah, somebody in the
6 high school creates that, and there's plenty of opportunity
7 then to come down to the elementary school which is close
8 by, and the kids adore it.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

10 MS. FLORES: And there used to be clubs, and
11 then --

12 MS. MAZANEC: Right it was a club. You're
13 right. It was -- yeah.

14 MS. FLORES: If you were a member then you
15 helped -- you tutored.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

17 MS. FLORES: You know, during your -- some
18 period during the day.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: All different -- yeah,
20 all different, yeah.

21 DR. NEIL: And Educators Rising is similar to
22 what DECA, Distributive Education Clubs of America, FDLA,
23 Educators Rising is similar to that, so there's kinda three
24 different layers here of teacher cadet programs that are
25 really focused on getting our experience early on and then



1 being able to do some concurrent enrollment with that, and
2 then actual kind of competitions about "How well am I being
3 prepared to do that?" when we think about Educators rising.

4 And then there's also, of course, we just
5 talked about that, actually, is stronger district-level
6 opportunities for middle and high school students to support
7 elementary learning programs where, you know, those are --
8 those are just some recommendations, and those are district.
9 Those are local opportunities for that.

10 Where are we going? Our next steps the CDE
11 Board of Education, of course, informational item is -- it
12 says November 8th. Apparently, I don't know my days, it's
13 actually November 9th. The final document; we are hoping
14 there's a review and editing period over the course of the
15 next couple of weeks. Somewhere in -- around November 17th,
16 and then over, you know, final review of those documents
17 into the end of November with a release date of December
18 1st. And so there is a few other pieces that are happening.
19 There's the superintendent forum, which has been a common
20 occurrence over the course of several years. That
21 superintendent forum is an opportunity kind of to display
22 that, and Commissioner Anthes and Dr. Kim Hunter Reed will
23 be able to join that as well.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, good.

25 DR. NEIL: And then, of course, we have



1 legislative, House and Senate, Education Committee review.
2 This will go to the legislature on December 1st and we will
3 be ready at their will if they chose to have us report on
4 it. And then we have some very specific CDE recommendations
5 and action planning that we heard very clearly from stake
6 holders, and I can give you just one example and I'll be
7 prepared with more examples at the next board meeting. But
8 one example is things like identifying reciprocity with
9 other states. So we had some very clear CDE strategic action
10 pieces that were aligned and they said, "You know what, what
11 can CDE do?" So we took those to heart and are listening and
12 are compiling those and the efforts around them to see if
13 those are meaningful and very strong steps that we can take
14 forward to help the educator shortage as well.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. I do have a
16 question.

17 DR. NEIL: Please.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The cost of living in
19 relationship to the salary. I believe his name is Doug
20 Basset (ph).

21 DR. NEIL: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Extended his salary
23 document to include a column for the cost of living -- a
24 cost of -- some kind of a cost of living factor.

25 DR. NEIL: Yes.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And then whether the
2 average teacher salary exceeded or -- the cost of living, or
3 was less then, et cetera. Is that a part of this -- is that
4 the data that is being used here?

5 DR. NEIL: It is.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And did teachers -- I
7 don't know how to say this exactly. When teachers are
8 concerned about the cost of living, but the salary being
9 inadequate of the cost of living in that community, did that
10 resonate so that there are -- I mean, I looked at the
11 Boulders, and that was very, very different, and yet there's
12 still the concern that it's inadequate.

13 DR. NEIL: I -- I think it did --

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I'm just trying to get
15 the alignment between the perception of that data by -- by
16 our teachers and what was shown on that table. Do you know?

17 DR. NEIL: Mm-hmm. So I -- I think we didn't
18 -- during the town halls we definitely didn't highlight
19 those specific data, because we were kind of looking for
20 them to give us feedback. I can tell you that there's
21 alignment between -- Douglas's kind of -- his whole theory,
22 and all of his research that has gone into that, into what
23 we were hearing in the field from our educators as a whole.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

25 DR. NEIL: So there is a symbiotic



1 relationship there, I believe, and that documentation will
2 be in the report at a high level, and then is always
3 available for further information.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. It was very
5 helpful. He's been working on that for a while over time.

6 DR. NEIL: Quite some time.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yep, thank you.

8 DR. NEIL: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Any other questions?

10 DR. NEIL: Questions for us?

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Mr. Durham.

12 MR. DURHAM: Quickly, I don't personally
13 support a lot of these objectives stated, and this is the
14 Commissioners decision, it's not ours, but I would just
15 encourage the Commissioner to take a look at particularly in
16 Strategic Action Plan goal to -- a lot of these are unfunded
17 mandates; which essentially, you're asking the legislature
18 to impose on school districts. I don't think we ought to
19 advocate that (indiscernible) given our constituencies that
20 I think if -- if we're gonna advocate creating minimum
21 teacher salaries, which I am really deathly opposed to, I --
22 I wouldn't even be in favor of that if the legislature
23 funded it. But they're not -- they don't have the money to
24 fund it, and so I think for us to -- for, for us to lend any
25 weight to any unfunded mandates is a -- a mistake. And I'd



1 hope that we would -- I mean, this may be so far down the
2 road it's gonna be hard not to, but I -- I would try and
3 strike all of those. I mean, the loan forgiveness, for
4 example; as a general rule, only a note holder can forgive a
5 loan. The note holder is generally the federal government. I
6 suppose we could ask, but I -- I wouldn't hold my breath on
7 it.

8 MR. DURHAM: Bernie said he would do it.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: There are districts
10 (indiscernible)

11 MR. DURHAM: Oh, Bernie will do it. Well
12 perfect. Good.

13 (Laughter)

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So what were the loans
15 that we -- in, in my generation that we received that we
16 paid off 10 percent every year?

17 MR. DURHAM: Mine -- well mine was an NDSL
18 loan.

19 DR. NEIL: Go ahead, please.

20 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, National -- let's see.

21 MS. FLORES: Defense --

22 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, it's a National Defense
23 Student Loan. They were -- they were part of the --

24 MS. FLORES: We're old.

25 MR. DURHAM: They actually may have been part



1 of the Department of Defense budget, I'm not sure, but they
2 were NDLS, National Defense Student Loan, yeah. So --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are a couple. The
4 TEACH grant is still out there from the Federal perspective.

5 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. So I think -- I think,
6 but, you know, the federal government's taken over all of
7 the college -- they're not even banks that hold this much
8 anymore. It's all -- it's all Department of Ed. that holds
9 it.

10 MS. FLORES: No, some --

11 MR. DURHAM: There's some banks, but --

12 MS. FLORES: There's some districts do.

13 MR. DURHAM: So I think I would look at all
14 of these with, A, is their funding, and, B, if there's not
15 we should advocate it only if there is funding provided by
16 the legislature.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Well first I would say that I -
19 - I think I just read the other day that there are districts
20 who -- I mean, when you say "loan forgiveness" it's not
21 technically a forgiveness. They're paying for the loan.
22 You're not listening to me, Director Durham. Director
23 Durham, you're not listening.

24 MR. DURHAM: Sorry I'm -- I apologize.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Sorry. When -- when it comes to



1 loan forgiveness not technically did they forgive the loan;
2 they are offering to pay off the loans in exchange for them,
3 you know, agreeing to stay and teach for, you know, some
4 number of years. They're -- they -- they are already doing
5 that sort of thing.

6 MR. DURHAM: But -- but the reality is if you
7 do that you gotta give them a 1099, because you've created a
8 taxable event for the -- for the teacher without providing
9 any income. It -- it's not --

10 MS. MAZANEC: No, no, no. They're still gonna
11 provide income, too. That's part of their benefit. They
12 still pay them for teaching --

13 MR. DURHAM: No, they pay them for teaching,
14 I understand, but -- but they're not, you know, if you pay
15 off a 10,000 dollars' worth of loans you've created a
16 taxable event for the, for the teacher. So, it's, it's
17 complicated.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Anyway, they're doing it. I
19 don't know the details of it, but that is one way they're
20 attracting teachers is to -- offering to pay off their
21 loans.

22 MR. DURHAM: Yep.

23 MS. MAZANEC: What I -- the question I have
24 is one of the strategies is to establish and implement a
25 differentiated pay scale for content teacher shortage areas.



1 I'm assuming that means science and math.

2 DR. NEIL: For educator shortage, yeah, the
3 identified educator shortage areas, which actually --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's only been around
5 for 30 years, that recommendation.

6 MS. MAZANEC: It has?

7 MR. DURHAM: I introduced a bill to do that
8 in -- when I was in the legislature.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I see an awful lot of
10 resistance to it.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes, there's a lot of
12 resistance to it (crosstalk)

13 MR. DURHAM: Only see --

14 MS. MAZANEC: (crosstalk) it make sense to
15 me, but --

16 MR. DURHAM: Only CEA, CASE and CASB will
17 oppose it, so it worked just fine. They did, they all
18 opposed my bill. I had a bill to do that.

19 MS. GOFF: Yeah, I did.

20 MR. DURHAM: Yep.

21 MS. GOFF: It was based on the fact that --
22 not only money --

23 MS. MAZANEC: It was probably based on the
24 fact that it was Steve Durham's bill.

25 MR. DURHAM: That's a factor, yes.



1 MS. GOFF: Oh, who knows. Not only money, but
2 the idea --

3 MS. FLORES: (indiscernible) in an area she
4 (indiscernible).

5 MS. GOFF: You know, that it to be expected
6 kinda content; the value of various learnings and
7 (indiscernible)

8 MS. MAZANEC: Differentiated pay? More
9 differentiated?

10 MR. DURHAM: It's just -- it's just the
11 refusal -- it's just the refusal of the education
12 establishment to recognize the existence of market forces.
13 And not, not all skills are equal -- are of equal value.

14 MS. GOFF: Well then -- then eventually it
15 got down to the discussion about is a high school teacher of
16 P.E. worth more than an elementary teacher of P.E., so it
17 was --

18 MR. DURHAM: The answer to that question is -
19 - there's a market -- there's a market answer to that
20 question, Jane.

21 MS. GOFF: I know. Some of us don't go to
22 market.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, you don't have to
24 go to market.

25 MR. DURHAM: And when you -- when you don't



1 you overcompensate some and undercompensate others, so --

2 (Chorus of "right")

3 MR. DURHAM: And that's why you have
4 shortages. There's a -- there's a good capitalist saying
5 that there is no such thing as a shortage. There can be very
6 high prices.

7 MS. FLORES: Interesting.

8 MR. DURHAM: And it's true.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Yep.

10 MR. DURHAM: The right price there's no
11 shortage.

12 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: So I -- thank you, Mr.
13 Durham, for those suggestions. I think you're right that we
14 have identified that we need to talk about the funding and,
15 you know, unfunded mandates and those sorts of things, put
16 some language in there about that, because I -- I do agree.
17 I don't think we wanna put this all on the backs of
18 districts at, you know, some of these ideas are shiny
19 objects.

20 I would also say we're trying to strike the balance
21 between putting in the report what we heard from folks that
22 are experiencing this on the front lines and -- and maybe
23 not agreeing with every, single strategy, but saying --

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But it's what they said.

25 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: But it's what they



1 said, so trying to put some strategy options in there for
2 selection if the legislature so chooses that they wanna
3 select anything. But I think it's a good point to put some
4 context in there around "This is what we heard, we think
5 that if you choose any of these they would need to be
6 considered with funds."

7 MR. DURHAM: I think it -- if I would say, I
8 do think it would be inappropriate for a report to advocate
9 a tax increase, because that has to go to the ballot and
10 that's by definition involvement of state agencies in ballot
11 questions is forbid -- strictly prohibited by law.

12 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Okay.

13 MR. DURHAM: That's another bill I carried,
14 actually.

15 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Thank you.

16 MR. DURHAM: Keep helping.

17 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: We will look at that.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are we ready to move on?

19 MR. DURHAM: Yep.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Last items on our agenda
21 is a presentation on the educator preparation and licensing
22 rule making.

23 MR. DURHAM: I don't have that.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We'll just skip the
25 Commissioner again and welcome you back, Ms. Neil.



1 DR. NEIL: Thank you. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Is it Dr. Neil? It is
3 Dr. Neil.

4 DR. NEIL: It is. So I -- we have heard
5 several times that as -- as we come to the Board of
6 Education the educator preparation licensing rules are very
7 large. And we want to be able to come to the board as well
8 as the public and be able to say what's coming, so that --
9 that we are prepared to know kind of what that overview is.
10 So today our goal is to update the board on upcoming
11 potential educator preparation and licensure decisions and
12 the rule making for the next eight to 12 months.

13 I am also bringing to you some educator
14 effectiveness potential rulemaking as well, because under
15 educator talent we have educator preparation and licensing
16 and we have educator effectiveness, so I just wanted you to
17 know where those kind of cross, because they do cross in a
18 couple of ways, and then they are separate in a couple of
19 ways. So as I go through the road map what I am -- I'm
20 calling a road map here for today, I will try to be very
21 clear about those two things.

22 So there are multiple areas that are coming
23 up for discussion, and they can get a little bit confusing,
24 so we wanted to be able to draw out a very clear timeline
25 and what some of those items are. And these are potential.



1 Please know that they are still potential as they come
2 forward and the timeline is -- we're trying to be clear with
3 the timeline, but it could -- could change depending on the
4 board's direction and will. We wanna share the -- the --
5 what's coming forward in the context, and then we wanna
6 gather some initial feedback or information needed from the
7 board to be able to go forward. So what are the educator
8 preparation and licensure rules? They are the rules that are
9 established by the board to provide the parameters by which
10 the Colorado Department of Education maintains quality and
11 accountability for our educator preparation programs
12 licensure and educator effectiveness.

13 There are about 250 pages long, so they are a
14 large group of rules when we speak about the educator
15 licensing rules only. The educator effectiveness rules are a
16 little bit shorter.

17 The rules cover licensure requirements, they
18 cover educator endorsements and alternative preparation
19 requirements, educator standards, educator preparation
20 program reauthorization standards, those induction
21 standards, the renewal of licenses and enforcement. That is
22 just a preview of why they are so long and involved, and I
23 think it's just important to know that they are
24 comprehensive, because they cover a lot of content. And to
25 help we -- we often have to open up individual sections to



1 be able to help them, or to be able to update them, not help
2 them.

3 So why are we considering opening the rules,
4 or why would we ever consider opening the rules? There are
5 reasons to consider opening the rules. New legislation often
6 requires us to make adjustments to the existing rules,
7 because they -- we get new legislation in the spring, it
8 impacts our rules, we adjust. The rules continue to be
9 reviewed by the Office of Legislative and Legal Services, so
10 OLLS, which you heard me talk about a couple of months ago.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do they keep going over
12 the same rules, or --?

13 DR. NEIL: They do. So every time we make an
14 adjustment to the rules they go through and they review them
15 again to make sure that we are not out of statutory
16 compliance. So they -- they do. Every time there is a change
17 they -- it's an on --

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So just keeps going,
19 okay.

20 DR. NEIL: Yes. The OLLS review is an
21 ongoing, annual cycle.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Talk about continuing
23 employment opportunities.

24 MR. DURHAM: Yes, permanent employment.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sorry.



1 DR. NEIL: So those -- those are the
2 technical revisions that we are actually in the midst of
3 today, and I'll talk about those. And then, of course, why
4 else would we ever consider opening up the rules for new, or
5 amended, rules that actually come from an express need from
6 the field. We'll talk about a couple of those today, as
7 well. And then the State Board has also asked questions
8 about certain aspects of the rules, and you asked questions
9 to us about the rules we wanna review those, make sure that
10 they are on target, and if we aren't that we bring them back
11 to you for further information and, or decision points. The
12 other reason we would open up the rules is teacher shortage
13 issues provide us a really good opportunity and a reason to
14 review, to make changes that might help.

15 Whoa, slow her down. Issues to consider --
16 issues to consider in the rules. We -- we often have the
17 OLLS current technical statutory fixes, so we know that for
18 a fact. These are a few things that are coming forward;
19 English Language Learner educator preparation pathways. We
20 have already talked about those. What else could impact our
21 educator preparation and licensing rules? The fact that we
22 have some rule updates and potential new endorsements that
23 the stakeholders in the field have asked us to take a look
24 at. And when I say stake holders in the field I mean
25 districts and school hiring managers, our principals, to be



1 able to employ a specific group of teachers. And then, of
2 course, educator effectiveness potential rule and updates
3 after several years of learning and feedback from our
4 districts around what that could look like.

5 So this particular slides shows a timeline
6 that helps us think a little bit about educator talent in
7 the plan for presenting some rules to the Board of
8 Education. And so you see at the top, from October to
9 January, is really in red are the technical fixes. We've
10 already noticed those technical fixes. Those are the Office
11 of Legislative and Legal Services fixes. We will have a
12 hearing on those in December, and then we can do either a
13 potential adoption then, or an adoption in January.

14 We also have been talking about our English
15 Language Learners, and our English development and educator
16 preparation pathways. I've already mentioned that we had the
17 presentation today and then I will come back in December to
18 talk to you a little bit more and get more direction from
19 you about options for English Language Learners and our --
20 our teachers.

21 The purple piece that starts in February is a
22 new piece for you, and these are educator preparation and
23 educator licensing rule revisions and added endorsements.
24 I'm gonna go through each one of these in a slide as we go
25 forward so that you understand what's kind of in those, but



1 from a timeline perspective you can kinda see how they have
2 been juxtaposed so that they are not completely overlapping
3 each other.

4 And then educator effectiveness rule
5 revisions are in the green at the bottom there, and
6 potential notice dates, hearing, and adoption dates. So our
7 legislative Office of Legal and Legislative Services and the
8 new legislation that came in, again, we are right in the
9 middle of that. In October we included a notice of rule
10 making for the technical fixes. We are still in that -- that
11 period. Those were specifically for OLLS, that was Senate
12 bill 17-096 and 17-1332. The hearing will take place for the
13 board in December. I think we remember that one.

14 English learners and educators; and, again,
15 I've already talked about this in the gray, that was on --
16 in November was the third board session, so we talked about
17 that today. We will be coming back with the outstanding
18 Board of Education items for you to give us some feedback.

19 So let's talk about the actual new pieces
20 that show up here for your information and feedback. So when
21 we look at the purple part of educator preparation and
22 licensing, so this is very clearly around educator
23 preparation and the licensing rules only. We have a couple
24 of recommendations that are gonna come forward to the Board
25 of Education. One of them is to actually flip the rules



1 between business rules and endorsement rules. Right now
2 those 200 and some pages are mixed together, so every time
3 we open up for, like, a technical fix that may be a business
4 rule specifically, we have to open up all 200 and some pages
5 of those. Even endorsements that do not have anything to do
6 with that fix.

7 One of the thoughts from -- from the Colorado
8 Department of Education staff is that if we split those
9 rules between business rules and endorsement rules we're at
10 least starting to -- to streamline a little bit to be able
11 to let people know exactly what those would be.

12 MS. GOFF: So when you say "business" you're
13 talking about the basic licensing?

14 DR. NEIL: Yeah. I am. I am.

15 MS. GOFF: Okay.

16 DR. NEIL: So -- and it would help, probably,
17 if I would have given a few examples of that when I didn't
18 do that, but kind of at the beginning of our educator
19 licensing -- preparation and licensing rules it talks about
20 the types of licenses, like an initial license, or a
21 professional license, or a master's teacher's license. And
22 so that is different than the endorsement for math. How do I
23 get a math endorsement on my professional license?
24 Enforcement rules, so when we think about investigations, or
25 things like that, for teachers; those sit an entirely



1 different part than an endorsement. So separating those was
2 one of the thoughts that we had. There are a few other
3 pieces that are coming forward.

4 If you recall, and this is -- I'm gonna ask
5 you to go back about a year and a half. And you're thinking
6 "So a few of us may not have been around the table." But a
7 year and a half, about a year and a half. We brought forward
8 the Praxis and PLACE assessments. Okay? So you remember we
9 adopted the Praxis assessment and replaced what we called
10 the PLACE assessments.

11 At that time, at the very end of the
12 presentation we had a couple of slides that talked about the
13 fact that we felt like the elementary content assessment
14 that we were adopting did not dig deeply enough into
15 teaching reading. And at that time the board instructed us
16 to go forward and take a look at what it might take to adopt
17 an additional assessment to ensure our new teachers know how
18 to teach reading.

19 We have since convened a group of stake
20 holders to do that, and we are look -- continuing to look at
21 that process. One of the things that we feel we want to
22 bring back to you is that potential outcome of that process
23 and whether that would be something that you would want to
24 adopt or not, so that is rolled up into this. So there's
25 lots of little pieces there. The other --



1 MR. DURHAM: Can I question --

2 DR. NEIL: Oh, please.

3 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, are these
4 endorsements -- if -- if we actually do this then is it --
5 let's say let's try the middle school mathematics.

6 DR. NEIL: Mm-hmm.

7 MR. DURHAM: If we put that endorsement in
8 place does that mean a teacher in order to teach middle
9 school mathematics has to have that endorsement?

10 DR. NEIL: Mm-hmm. So it will continue to be
11 a hiring choice. One of the things that ESA gave us was
12 flexibility in who hire for those content areas. So we're at
13 least --

14 MR. DURHAM: But then aren't they out of
15 field if they don't have it?

16 DR. NEIL: Correct. They can still be out of
17 field.

18 MR. DURHAM: Right.

19 DR. NEIL: The middle -- the middle school
20 math -- so I can jump to the middle school math with the
21 (crosstalk) of endorsements (indiscernible) to tell you all
22 --

23 MR. DURHAM: Well, let me at just make -- let
24 me just make an observation that -- that I think these are
25 all bad ideas in the face of a teacher shortage. They'd



1 simply make it worse. So if -- if we're serious about the
2 teacher shortage we might recognize these are good ideas
3 whose time has not yet come.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, I didn't hear
5 anything in the recommendations from the teacher shortage
6 study that suggests that we should lower the standards for
7 our teachers.

8 MR. DURHAM: These are raising the standards,
9 and -- and we will have people -- you will have people who
10 will not -- not comply. The school districts will want them
11 to comply, because they'll now be out of field, and those --
12 those teachers will be pushed to get these endorsements,
13 which gives them one more reason to quit. Particularly a
14 math teacher. Lot of them have other options.

15 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

16 MR. DURHAM: So I think this is a serious --
17 I mean, you know, if we're serious -- either -- either we're
18 -- we wanna do something about the teacher shortage, or we
19 don't. And this'll do something about it. It'll make it
20 worse.

21 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Can I just -- Board
22 Member Durham; there is a little additional context on the
23 middle school math, because that one actually we think will
24 help the teacher shortage. Right now, the way the math is
25 the license for math is, it's -- it's a larger span, so we



1 think that this will be easier to get that endorsement area.

2 And maybe Coleen can --

3 DR. NEIL: Sure.

4 MR. DURHAM: Well it may be easier -- Dr.
5 Anthes, it may be easier for someone coming out of college,
6 but somebody that's already teaching that doesn't have the
7 endorsement that's harder, because now they've got an
8 endorsement they have to go get.

9 DR. NEIL: So -- so they would have an
10 option, so we would continue to keep our seven through 12
11 math endorsement -- so there is overlap. What these
12 endorsements are trying to do, and one of the things that I
13 -- we heard from the educator shortage is that there's not
14 enough overlap actually in some of our endorsements to be
15 able to open up the doors, especially for reciprocity. So
16 the -- the whole story around at least middle school math,
17 and I have a little bit of a story around why each one of
18 these have come forward that I will not bore you with today,
19 but I will bring back to you when we start talking about
20 these more deeply.

21 The middle school math story is -- is
22 probably three-fold. The first one is, is that several of
23 our math teachers that enter into educator preparation
24 programs do not want to teach high level math like
25 trigonometry and, therefore, they actually leave their



1 programs before they complete a seven through 12 math
2 endorsement. They -- the field has very clearly said to us a
3 middle-school math endorsement would open that door up,
4 because that's kind of up through algebra, high level
5 algebra, and -- and would open that door up. Then a district
6 could choose -- so hopefully more influx of math teachers
7 coming in that either have a middle school or a 7-12, or
8 potentially both, if they choose.

9 But overlap our middle school math so that it
10 is somewhat of a six through -- through an eight, or a nine,
11 and those are all to be determined what those -- those ages
12 would be, but a lower level of math to allow more math
13 teachers in, and then allow the districts to choose what
14 level of math they're looking for. So if it's a small, rural
15 district where a math teacher does need to teach seven
16 through 12 then they would go looking for a 7 through 12,
17 but if they have a middle school and, or they can divide up
18 just their 6th, 7th and 8th grade, or something along that
19 line, they would be able to -- to take a look at that. So
20 that's -- and the -- the other reason. I'm sorry. I said
21 there were three-fold.

22 So the -- the last reason is really that
23 many, many, many states -- and I want to say that's just
24 under 20, it could be a few more than that, have a middle
25 school math endorsement. So what stops teachers from coming



1 in from other states is sometimes the fact that they have to
2 demonstrate that they can teach seven through 12 for the
3 State of Colorado, and that is a content assessment where
4 they have to know trig, and they have to know trigonometry,
5 and they have to know calculus, but they were not trained in
6 that. And so being able -- we would have some reciprocity
7 with other states to be able open those doors just a little
8 bit.

9 Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: You don't believe her,
11 or what?

12 MR. DURHAM: Well, provided that -- that it's
13 clear that if you have a -- if you have an existing you're
14 automatically grandfathered to it --

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We can ensure that.

16 MR. DURHAM: I -- well we'll see.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Course we can.

18 DR. NEIL: It would definitely not go away.
19 The endorsement that we have today will not go away.

20 MS. FLORES: What about --

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Just a minute. Board
22 Member Mazanec.

23 MS. MAZANEC: What is Educational Interpreter
24 Specialist? Have we talked about that before?

25 (Chorus of "Yes")



1 MS. MAZANEC: It's ringing a bell, but I'm
2 almost afraid to ask.

3 DR. NEIL: And it's coming back around.

4 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

5 DR. NEIL: The Educational Interpreter
6 Specialist when we did the rule review two years ago come
7 this spring, so now I'm going back even further than a year
8 and a-half ago, I'm going back, like, a year and three-
9 quarters. We adopted kind of new rule -- not new rules,
10 updated rules that actually met legislation at that moment.
11 During the course of that conversation lots of feedback came
12 to us around the level of Educator Interpreter.

13 In state statute we have an Educator
14 Interpreter authorization. Not a teaching license, an
15 authorization, which is similar to substitute. Substitutes
16 have authorizations. So this is particularly trying to
17 address that concern that educator interpreters have a
18 licensure, professional licensure, pathway that raises it --

19 MS. MAZANEC: What do they do?

20 DR. NEIL: Those are our deaf and hard-of-
21 hearing interpreters that interpret sign.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

23 MS. FLORES: Oh.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Can't they just say --

25 MS. FLORES: Not like (indiscernible).



1 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

2 DR. NEIL: That was a smart-aleck remark, I
3 apologize, but I can't go from -- what is it, I understand
4 that. I'm sorry. I -- I will put our deaf and hard of
5 hearing educational interpreters is who that is.

6 MR. DURHAM: It's a secret.

7 MS. MAZANEC: That would be very helpful.

8 MS. FLORES: Well, New Mexico has a different
9 one, but that's --

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores, you
11 had something you wanted to say?

12 MS. FLORES: What was it that I had to ask?

13 MS. GOFF: Well it's not only sign language,
14 is it? Is it limited to sign language? That's it?

15 DR. NEIL: Our educational interpreters in
16 this context is -- in this context is limited to sign
17 language. Audiology might be what you're thinking about, and
18 our mobility specialists also fall into some of those
19 ranges.

20 MS. GOFF: If -- I assume this one will stay
21 the same; speech and language (indiscernible) right?

22 DR. NEIL: Yes. Speech and Language Pathology
23 are different as a Special Service Professionals educator
24 endorsement.

25 MS. GOFF: Yeah, that's different.



1 DR. NEIL: That's different.

2 MS. GOFF: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: What about people that have K
5 through 8th grade?

6 DR. NEIL: So one of the -- this is not on
7 here, Dr. Flores, but it is something that we have been
8 asked to take a look at from our stake holders around having
9 a general license in a K through eight environment, so you
10 don't see that here because it's something that just came to
11 us from the teacher shortage, and so we'll continue to
12 investigate that.

13 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

14 DR. NEIL: The -- the last piece here is
15 really around educator effectiveness and I just wanted to
16 remind you that over the last five years we have learned a
17 lot from senate bill 10-191 around educator evaluations. So
18 in '16-'17 we did a comprehensive review and feedback of the
19 state model system, as well as the educator quality
20 standards, or the teacher quality standards and the
21 principal quality standards and had great feedback from the
22 field around some of the updates that they would like to see
23 around those specific standards as well as kind of the
24 educator effectiveness rules as a whole.

25 So we did some piloting this year. We have piloted some



1 revisions for the state model system that can be used as a
2 springboard into changing some of the rules. And quite
3 honestly it is -- it's really streamlining them, because we
4 have learned so much in the last five years, and our
5 districts have been so helpful in giving us quality feedback
6 So those will be coming forward to you around the March,
7 June area. Here is -- I said I would tell you where these
8 two rules intersect, because I think it's important context.
9 They intersect around the teacher quality standards, and the
10 principal quality standards, and our special service quality
11 standards. So that's important to know, because we expect
12 our educator preparation programs to be ensuring that they
13 are preparing our teachers to those teacher quality
14 standards. And so -- but they live in the educator
15 effectiveness realm, so there is some overlap there, which
16 is why we wanted to have a little bit of overlap in the rule
17 making opportunities as well.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Great.

19 DR. NEIL: So what's next? We -- we've
20 already talked about this several times. We will bring some
21 English Language Learner options back to you. December 17th
22 through February 18th we'll be working on those educator
23 preparation pieces that we talked about; adaptive physical
24 education, I guess we did not get to adaptive P.E., but
25 educator interpreter, math middle school endorsements, and



1 we will continue to get stake holder feedback.

2 Approximately in the February 2018 time frame
3 then we will bring that whole very large package of educator
4 preparation rules and some changes to you as a whole for
5 licensing and for rule making notice, and continue through
6 on that.

7 I did want to just let you know that one of
8 the reasons that we have amassed all of these things,
9 instead of bringing them one by one by one over the course
10 of the last several years is to put us on a schedule so that
11 we can open them up and reduce the burden on districts for
12 constant review, and that has been a piece of feedback that
13 has come to us as well, is they would like to see it in one,
14 full package instead of incrementalized, because it impacts
15 the way they hire and, or the educator preparation programs
16 who prepare their teachers. And so we are trying to put it
17 on a schedule to where it would come to the Board of
18 Education and for rule making to the districts every spring
19 as needed and over the course of the next year, so that's
20 why it's kinda all lumped together in one package coming
21 forward.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

23 DR. NEIL: Questions.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Any more questions,
25 comments? So I -- one more item of business?



1 MS. GOFF: I was just gonna say it's like --
2 brings back memories of working the 191 rules
3 (indiscernible)

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No, no, no. That's PTSD,
5 or whatever.

6 (Laughter)

7 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: That's even PTSD for
8 me.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah.

10 DR. NEIL: Okay, I was gonna say -- Dr.
11 Anthes is going there.

12 MS. GOFF: Yeah, it's an unavoidable de ja vu
13 moment (crosstalk).

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So we have one more item
15 of business, which is future business. Next month the staff
16 is going to ask the board to vote on the school type plans.
17 We've already talked about that today. Because of the number
18 of schools' requests to reconsider staff is working very
19 hard on that, but we will not get the information until very
20 late on those schools, and so I wanna prepare you for, what,
21 maybe a week? I can't remember what Alyssa said.

22 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yeah. We're -- we're
23 shooting for --

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Not enough time.

25 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: We're shooting for a



1 week in advance rather than your normal two weeks, just
2 because we have somewhere 200 and we're reviewing them as
3 quickly as we can, but we wanna be sure we're consistent,
4 because there are high stakes decisions. And so it just
5 takes us a little bit longer.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you say 200?

7 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Ish, 175 -- 145. I
8 can't read your --

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And -- and we probably
10 need to vote on them at that meeting, so that's a little out
11 of my --

12 MS. GOFF: Seriously are we gonna be able to
13 do anything else?

14 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: No, sorry, 145.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, the --

16 DR. NEIL: We usually provide you
17 recommendations on a spreadsheet and so, you know, if you
18 look at them when you get them, and you have questions for
19 us we can do that. The reason we asked you to vote at the
20 same one is because this is in your own rules that we
21 approve these by December, and so that's the challenge --

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We may -- we may need to
23 look whether we can change that, so that staff can breathe.
24 Although I don't generally like to move things over beyond
25 the holiday, because then staff is working throughout the



1 holiday season, which isn't -- which is --

2 MS. MAZANEC: We can ask question ahead of
3 time, though, then so we'll know whether we'll want to --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: If you get it, yes.

5 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes.

7 MR. DURHAM: I have one more issue.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Please, this is the
9 time.

10 MR. DURHAM: One of the things we forgot.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, thank you.

12 MR. DURHAM: I'd like to -- I'd like to move
13 that -- that the board instruct Ms. Cordial to place in her
14 personnel file the evaluation of the board for her
15 employment performance for the last -- was it year,
16 Elizabeth? For the last year. The board awarded her a
17 performance rating of Superior Performance, and that she
18 include in that file her self-evaluation and the survey
19 results from the members of Dr. Anthes staff from whom she
20 solicited comments.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. I need a second.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. All in favor?

24 (Chorus of "aye")

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Unanimous.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Mr. Durham, we're -- we
3 also need to talk about the item that you wanted to put on
4 the agenda next month regarding the program.

5 MR. DURHAM: Mm-hmm.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So let's -- let's
7 connect and see and -- and I'd like Ms. Tolson to tell us
8 also what it is whether we just talk about it, or how we can
9 resolve your concerns about the newspaper article.

10 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Any other new business
12 for next time? The meeting is adjourned.

13 MR. DURHAM: Yay.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yay.

15 MR. DURHAM: Oh, yes. Amen.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We're pretty close to on
17 time, right?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF TEXAS)

3 COUNTY OF TRAVIS)

4 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and
5 Notary in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that
6 the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

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

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
13 and seal this 5th day of October, 2018.

14

15 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

16 Kimberly C. McCright

17 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

18

19 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

20 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

21 Houston, Texas 77058

22 281.724.8600

23

24

25