



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
October 8, 2014, Part 4

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 8, 2014,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman  
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman  
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Pam Mazanec (R)  
Debora Scheffel (R)  
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 MS. MELLOW: (indiscernible) around the  
2 state that are focused exclusively on getting input from  
3 and talking with members of the community and the public.  
4 They're holding meetings in Denver, Loveland, Monte  
5 Vista, Colorado Springs and Vale. I understand they're  
6 also working on one in Grand Junction, and that may have  
7 been confirmed --

8 MS. NEAL: We're working on that. Yeah.

9 MS. MELLOW: Okay. So that is, I think, a  
10 work in progress. It's going to happen, but we just  
11 don't have final details yet. All of these meetings will  
12 take place in October, or early November. They will be  
13 officially announced shortly. So, I got an update on  
14 Monday. I don't have any new information since then  
15 about specific dates, times, locations. All of that is  
16 forthcoming quite soon. I know they're working really  
17 hard on getting that figured all out.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And how will that be  
19 publicized, and can we push that out through all channels  
20 we have, social media, et cetera? Go ahead.

21 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair, yes. Is what the  
22 people who do that are nodding to your question. So,  
23 another main point of conversation at this September  
24 meeting was the creation of a tool that they might use as  
25 a task force that would allow members to kind of,



1 essentially, model the impact of different ideas for  
2 change. So just as an example, one idea for change  
3 that's been discussed quite a bit, is going to the  
4 federal minimum requirements in terms of the types of --  
5 the when we test and who we test.

6 So, you would kind of put that on one side  
7 of this big spreadsheet, and then across this part you'd  
8 have, you know, boxes to say, "Well, this might impact  
9 how we calculate student growth." For example or, "This  
10 does not impact how we" I don't know, do something else.  
11 But the point is, is I think they're trying to really  
12 work with a really complicated, challenging topic in a  
13 way that takes into account there are rippling impacts of  
14 all these different proposed changes.

15 And it's not designed to be a pro or a con,  
16 it's just designed to be kind of a factual document of,  
17 like, if you do this, then it has x, y, and z impact, or  
18 you need to think about x, y and z. So, I think it's a  
19 good development from the task force in terms of a tool  
20 that they can use to help them as they work through the  
21 material and try to reach some decisions. That is --  
22 what I was going to present to you about the 12 and 2  
23 task force, let me just pause there briefly and see if  
24 you have any questions on that body of work.

25 MS. NEAL: A comment more than question.



1 And I totally agree about what the causes and unintended  
2 causes, because it's the social studies lady that was  
3 here this morning. She and I talked about it. Nobody  
4 ever determined that they didn't want to teach history.  
5 Nobody said, "Oh, we won't." But because, you know, the  
6 importance it's placed -- based on a test has negative  
7 impacts on other subjects that aren't tested. And I  
8 think that's why the social studies group is so strong  
9 about making sure that it's included in this.

10 MS. MELLOW: Sure, and I -- and, Mr. Chair,  
11 I -- that's a great example of another thing. That just  
12 as they -- again, think through the different options.  
13 So, if you go to federal minimums, federal minimums do  
14 not require a social studies test.

15 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

16 MS. MELLOW: So that's clearly an impact,  
17 and it's good to be aware of that, right? As you're  
18 considering that decision.

19 Okay, so moving on. The Early Childhood and  
20 School Readiness Legislative Commission has completed its  
21 work. They voted as a group to move forward with three  
22 bills for the 2015 legislative session. The first one  
23 has to do with passing through child support to TANF  
24 recipients, so not really something that is in our world  
25 over here at the Department of Education, the State Board



1 of Ed.

2 But, obviously, can have a big impact on  
3 families living in poverty. So, I will tell you my  
4 opinion, this is Jennifer Mellow's opinion, is that  
5 proposal has a lot of work to do, because it's a really  
6 much more complicated topic than it might seem. So,  
7 they're trying to work through some of those details, and  
8 we'll see what happens.

9 The second bill they voted to pass forward  
10 was tax credits for early childhood educators who seek  
11 higher education, and the third was an authorization to  
12 fund 3000 more half or fulltime preschool students in  
13 Colorado school districts.

14 So those are the three bills that will come  
15 officially forward with the imprimatur of the Early  
16 Childhood Legislative Commission. Process wise they  
17 still have to go through what's called -- I'm forgetting  
18 the name. I think it's called Legislative Council  
19 Committee. So, there's kind of another legislative  
20 committee that all these interim committees feed into,  
21 and they will say -- they can say yea or nay in terms of  
22 the bill going forward as an interim committee bill.

23 Finally, the online education task force has  
24 been working hard. So far, they've been focusing on part  
25 of just, like, their own processes, like; How are we



1 going to make decisions? What are our standards? How  
2 are we going to talk with each other? Which is really  
3 critical work for these volunteer task forces. I've come  
4 to appreciate how important that work is, in watching  
5 some of this, this summer.

6 The other thing they've done is kind of take  
7 a deep dive into authorizer standards. How authorization  
8 of online schools works in other states. They've really  
9 been looking at that to get some context for possible  
10 options. At the most recent meeting the group zeroed in  
11 on their primary concerns about the current multi-  
12 district online schools. They talked about how  
13 authorizer standards and oversight might impact those  
14 concerns, and they also discussed some options for state  
15 oversight.

16 The hired facilitator is taught -- will be --  
17 -- so their next meeting is October 13, and the hired  
18 facilitator essentially kind of taking what that person  
19 heard at this last meeting about these concerns and  
20 possible solutions, and bringing that to the group, and  
21 then they will continue to discuss that work. The  
22 facilitator will put that into some sort of package, so  
23 it allows them to consider that in a more effective way.  
24 I'm not a facilitator for a living, so I don't know  
25 exactly how they're going to do that, but something along



1 those lines.

2 I'll keep monitoring and reporting back to  
3 you as those processes continue, but that's the end of  
4 that portion of my report.

5 MS. BERMAN: I'm not sure I quite got the  
6 online stuff.

7 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair, Board Member Gantz  
8 Berman -- such a mouthful.

9 MS. BERMAN: I know. Sorry.

10 MS. MELLOW: I just think you all need  
11 better titles. No, it's not the name, it's more the --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She's not only a  
13 mouthful, she's a handful.

14 MS. MELLOW: The board member.

15 MS. BERMAN: Handful and a mouthful.

16 MS. MELLOW: Okay, before I wade into those  
17 waters. Although I see that I've cleared out the room  
18 for my presentation. It's clearly not a very popular  
19 topic. One of the key focuses of the online taskforce  
20 per the legislation that created it is to look at  
21 authorizer standards. To look at how do we hold  
22 authorizers accountable for the schools that they're  
23 authorizing.

24 You heard a presentation just a little bit  
25 ago from CSI. CSI is an authorizer. Right? Based on



1 that presentation they seem to take that role very  
2 seriously in terms of making sure that the schools that  
3 they authorize are meeting certain standards and all of  
4 that.

5           Districts, as you know, can also authorize  
6 charter schools and online schools. BOCES in our state  
7 can authorize online schools. And so, the conversation  
8 at this group has been about, okay, how do we make that,  
9 frankly, a more effective system? How do we look at  
10 authorizers? How do we look at the standards they're  
11 setting -- and they've reached no conclusions yet?  
12 They're still in the discussion phase, but that's the  
13 discussion is how do we make authorizers a more impactful  
14 part of the process in ensuring quality and standards.

15           CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Vice Chair.

16           MS. NEAL: Do they ever have a discussion  
17 about whether it's necessary? Whether they -- seriously,  
18 because what we hear from many school districts, is stop.  
19 You know. "Just stop, we've got so much going on our  
20 plate right now. Why do they keep adding to it?"

21           Do they ever have discussions about if  
22 something is necessary, or if they can put it off till  
23 next year? You know it's -- my favorite example is that  
24 we did the READ Act right after we did 191, and they were  
25 both huge acts and caused the districts to do a lot of





1 work. So that's going to be my theme this year.: Is it  
2 necessary?

3 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair, Madam Vice Chair, so  
4 this is a narrower body of work than those other examples  
5 you pointed to. Right?

6 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

7 MS. MELLOW: This is really specifically  
8 looking at online schools and how we deal with them, or -  
9 - yeah, I think online schools is the right term. And  
10 the honest answer is I don't know the answer to your  
11 question of whether they've even thought about do those  
12 schools need to be authorized.

13 MS. NEAL: We might mention it to them.  
14 Okay.

15 MS. MELLOW: I do think that has been an  
16 assumption, that there needs to be some oversight of  
17 these schools. The question they're struggling with is  
18 who and how.

19 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

20 MS. MELLOW: And I don't think there's a  
21 presumption of legislation coming out of it. It might,  
22 it might not, or - and it would be legislative  
23 recommendations, obviously. This is an entity that  
24 doesn't have direct legislative authority. So --

25 MS. NEAL: Just wondered.



1                   COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair. I might point  
2 out that I was, by the legislation I had pointed to  
3 chair, and the chair task force is Nathan Hemming, which  
4 is -- was here. I'm sorry, what am I -- too much.  
5 Ethan.

6                   MS. NEAL: Nathan, Ethan, that's pretty --

7                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (indiscernible) looking at  
8 a Nathan. Is there somebody we don't know?

9                   COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah. Sorry about that, but  
10 Ethan is Chairing that for us.

11                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions, comments  
12 for Ms. Mellow, who will be making a return appearance  
13 here shortly? If not, thank you.

14                  MS. MELLOW: Thank you.

15                  COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you.

16                  UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

17                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come  
18 back to order. Next item on the agenda is consideration  
19 of the addition of assessments to the school readiness  
20 assessment menu. Mr. Commissioner.

21                  COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you. At the last  
22 board meeting we presented adding three more new  
23 assessments to the Early Readiness Plans that schools are  
24 required to do. These are optional, schools can pick  
25 which ones they want. You also asked us some privacy



1 information, to which we shared with you, it's also in  
2 your packet, we've been able to ascertain. Again, these  
3 are local decisions on how and what parts they want to  
4 implement, quite frankly, so the privacy rests with the  
5 district.

6 What's coming before you, and maybe I don't  
7 -- for the sake of time we're asking you for your  
8 approval, if you could do that today, for three new  
9 assessments to add. And that would be the Riverside  
10 Early Assessments of Learning, the Desired Results  
11 Developmental Profile we talked about, and Teaching  
12 Strategies Gold Survey we also talked about. So, I  
13 probably stole your thunder in the name of time. I just  
14 want to preface that. And staff is here to answer any  
15 questions that you may have. So, I think I'll leave it  
16 at that. You want to -- have any other comments?

17 MS. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, Ms. Olson.

19 MS. OLSON: So, members of the board, thank  
20 you for the opportunity to come before you again.

21 MS. NEAL: You can keep it brief.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She's got a deck.

23 MS. OLSON: I will be very brief. So, as  
24 the commissioner pointed out, our focus of our discussion  
25 today is to review the recommendations from the School



1 Readiness Assessment Sub-committee. To comment briefly on  
2 the questions that the State Board brought forward at the  
3 September meeting, and to take action on the recommended  
4 additions. So just to refresh our memories, the  
5 statutory requirements related to school readiness are  
6 within Cap 4-K, Senate Bill 212, which passed in 2008,  
7 required the state board to define school readiness and  
8 then adopt one or more assessments aligned with that  
9 definition, and requires local education providers to  
10 have an individual school readiness plan for each  
11 kindergartener, and to administer that school readiness  
12 assessment.

13 You'll also recall that back in 2012 the  
14 board first took action on this by voting to provide a  
15 menu of options for districts. We've conducted two  
16 different assessment reviews in order to find assessments  
17 that match the statutory criteria for that -- for that  
18 menu. And we're here today to ask the board to vote on  
19 these three additions to that menu.

20 At our September meeting we brought forward  
21 members of the subcommittee to provide the  
22 recommendations indicating that these three assessment  
23 tools meet the criteria that's laid out in statute, and  
24 at the September board meeting the board members did ask  
25 for some follow up in four different areas. The first was



1 around the online functionality, or the utility of online  
2 functionality for school readiness assessment systems.

3 Why would this be important to teachers?

4 First, it's -- as the commissioner pointed  
5 out, its important to note that local districts determine  
6 which features of an online system to activate through  
7 their contracting process. They also set the criteria of  
8 what information, if any, would be uploaded to any type  
9 of online system. The state has no role in that process.

10 So why do these systems exist online? Well,  
11 for the reason many things exist online is for utility  
12 and ease of use for practitioners. The specific  
13 component that I think is at question here is, like, that  
14 online storage piece. And this is really related to how  
15 early childhood educators tend to keep bodies of evidence  
16 for young children, which is pieces of art, artifacts of  
17 writing that children have done, and perhaps I -- a  
18 little project that they built in class, taking pictures  
19 of that. So, the online functionality is an option for  
20 teachers to use in probably substitution for, perhaps, a  
21 box that they keep in the classroom, or a binder that's  
22 just kept -- absolutely. Absolutely.

23 So, the -- what teachers do with all of  
24 those artifacts is that at certain points of the year  
25 they kind of report out on a child's progress and they



1 use those artifacts to kind of explain why they think a  
2 child is in a particular place along a learning  
3 continuum. So, finally, these online features provided  
4 by these assessment tools are not dissimilar to the  
5 features that are provided in many educational resources  
6 right now.

7 A question was asked whether paper or pencil  
8 versions of these assessments are available, and all of  
9 these assessment tools could be utilized without the  
10 online features, this would just require that teachers  
11 would take the paper versions. It's important to note  
12 that these systems and early childhood assessment is not  
13 a direct assessment. Children aren't sitting down and  
14 filling out bubbles. Instead, early childhood assessment  
15 is really about a teacher being able to document a  
16 child's progress through their -- on the actual work that  
17 they do in class and not stopping to test or assess.

18 So, the -- it's -- children are not  
19 accessing anything online, or wouldn't be doing any  
20 paper, pencil. Question related to data privacy and  
21 security, as the commissioner, noted, we are able to  
22 provide all that security information. That's also  
23 uploaded on board docs for public viewing as well, and  
24 the department does provide resources to districts on how  
25 to make decisions related to data privacy and security.



1                   The final question that the board asked was  
2                   in relation to consequences for districts who did not  
3                   implement this specific provision of Cap 4-K, and like  
4                   any provision of statute, districts who do not implement  
5                   would be out of compliance with the law, and pursuant to  
6                   Section 22-11-206(4)(b) of Colorado Revised Statutes, if  
7                   the Department has reason to believe that a district is  
8                   not in substantial compliance with a statutory or  
9                   regulatory requirement, the department goes through a  
10                  number of steps first. We notify the local school board  
11                  and give 90 days for the district to come into  
12                  compliance. If, at the end of that period, the  
13                  department finds that that the district has not come into  
14                  compliance the school district could be subject to  
15                  interventions specified in Article 11 of Title 22, which  
16                  could include, but is not limited to reduction in  
17                  accreditation ratings.

18                  So, these were the questions that were  
19                  brought forward by the board at our last meeting. We'd  
20                  like to reiterate before the board votes, that as part of  
21                  the work of our Office of Early Learning and School  
22                  Readiness, of which Sharon Trela Maloney (ph) directs.  
23                  We are able to provide some support to districts for this  
24                  work. We have a School Readiness Assessment Guidance  
25                  Document which helps districts figure out some of the --



1 given that there's so much flexibility within Cap 4-K for  
2 how to implement, we've provided some guidance and  
3 resources on how -- suggestions on how districts might  
4 approach this.

5 We do have funding for school readiness  
6 assessment subscriptions through 2015-'16 from the Race  
7 to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant, and also  
8 through that grant we're able to provide some technical  
9 assistance for implementation. We're working very  
10 closely with the literacy office to ensure that our work  
11 is integrated with the support for the Read Act, so that  
12 our kindergarten teachers can see how these two pieces of  
13 legislation actually can work very nicely together in  
14 providing a solid system of supports for young children.

15 So, with that, we would put before the board  
16 the action that's requested, which would be to add these  
17 assessments to the School Readiness Assessment Menu.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other questions?  
19 Angelika.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Prior to our approving these  
21 three, what's the feedback so far?

22 MS. OLSON: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

24 MS. OLSON: Feedback in terms of the  
25 implementation to date, or these particular assessments?





1 MS. SCHROEDER: Actually, both, please.

2 MS. OLSON: Okay, Mr. Chair, the feedback  
3 that we've heard from districts, and I believe that  
4 Sharon could probably elaborate a bit on this, we gave a  
5 survey to our first-year implementers last year from  
6 teachers. And we did see some significant concerns that  
7 were brought forward by teachers in regard to the time it  
8 takes to learn a new system, questions that they had in  
9 relation to how this works in relation to the READ Act,  
10 and that's actually informed our technical assistance and  
11 support.

12 The other feedback that we've heard is  
13 actually for teachers who've been through that first year  
14 and are now beginning a second year, is really kind of a  
15 change in attitude and a change in understanding in that  
16 we recognize that with anything new there's a learning  
17 curve. And as teachers kind of adjust to that, they're  
18 starting to see the value of the information that can be  
19 provided by an assessment tool such as this.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: All right, so the -- if any  
21 of the current users move to one of these three new ones,  
22 does that begin the learning curve all over, or is there  
23 enough similarity between the systems that this is not a  
24 big -- potential hinderance?

25 MS. OLSON: Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

2 MS. OLSON: These assessment tools are very  
3 similar to one another in that they're based on kind of a  
4 continuum of development for children. And so -- and, in  
5 fact, they're very similar to what teachers typically do  
6 already in terms of a report card. In fact, I would say  
7 these assessments are very similar to the practices that  
8 teachers use for report card in that they gather evidence  
9 of a child's development and at particular times of the  
10 year you kind of rate where kids are.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. I just have a  
14 question about these three new assessments. So, if  
15 parents are wanting to -- are concerned about the privacy  
16 issues, and the school chooses to do one or more of  
17 these, how would that work? Would the district have  
18 policies that say, "Look, we're not doing the paper or  
19 pencil version, this is too expensive and our teachers  
20 don't want to use it?" And the parent would deal with  
21 that? Or, I mean, is there anything that says parents  
22 have a right to opt out of the online digital version of  
23 the assessment, or is that just a local district issue?

24 And I see the privacy policies, you know,  
25 but some parents still will say, "I don't want the



1 information collected that way." What is their recourse?

2 MS. OLSON: So, Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

4 MS. OLSON: We would -- we would see that  
5 would be a local decision, but we also don't see that  
6 that would be a very difficult decision to carry out, in  
7 that a teacher could simply not enter the child's  
8 information onto an online system, and simply record that  
9 through the recording sheets that are provided through  
10 the assessment tool.

11 But, again, that wouldn't be for the  
12 department to weigh in on.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, the best that's happening  
14 here is to say, "Hey we've chosen, or recommended, some  
15 assessments that have that option, with the way they're  
16 set up."

17 COMM. HAMMOND: Right.

18 MS. OLSON: That's correct.

19 COMM. HAMMOND: Quite frankly it offers the  
20 district a lot of flexibility to meet those needs.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, other questions?  
23 I've got a kind of a question. Walk me back through --  
24 take me back through the history of how we ended up here  
25 with three different assessments instead of just one



1 assessment.

2 MS. OLSON: So, CAT 4-K allows for the state  
3 board to adopt one or more assessments in -- for  
4 measuring school readiness. Back in 2012, as we came  
5 forward to the board to help the board move forward in  
6 terms of implementing this part of statute, we presented  
7 the first recommended assessment tool, and presented to  
8 the board that the option of voting for a menu, and  
9 that's when the state board voted to have an option of --  
10 to create options for districts.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And so, the  
12 rational, the reasoning -- I'm trying to remember the  
13 history of why we would want multiple assessments.  
14 What's the benefit to the field, or the benefit to the  
15 districts or parents and students? Where's the benefit  
16 in having multiple assessments?

17 MS. OLSON: I think the benefit for the  
18 field and for districts is that they're able to choose  
19 something that they feel suits their district best.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And I guess I'll  
21 stop my line of questioning at this point in have --

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We all caught on.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Having identified the  
24 fact that there is value, there's substantial and  
25 significant value identified by the folks who actually



1 they're in the classrooms, they're in the schools where  
2 the rubber meets the road, where the students are, in  
3 fact, achieving their learning opportunities, to have  
4 flexibility in assessing how they go about doing that.  
5 So, thank you for that. And with that, I guess I would  
6 ask for a motion.

7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And it's not covered by  
8 the fed law.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. She did start with  
10 flexibility.

11 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, I move to approve the  
12 addition of the following assessment systems to the state  
13 board approved menu of school readiness assessments. The  
14 Riverside Early Assessment of Learning, the Desired  
15 Results Developmental Profile and the Teaching Strategies  
16 Gold Survey.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That is a proper motion.  
18 Is there a second? Dr. Scheffel's second. Is there any  
19 opposition? Hearing none motion carries. Thank you.

20 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you all.

21 COMM. HAMMOND: Easy.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Next item, I believe, is  
23 strategic plan. Is that correct?

24 COMM. HAMMOND: Yes, sir.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, we're going to review



1 CDE's Strategic Plan, and I will be brief and turn it  
2 over to the commissioner.

3 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you, sir. As we do  
4 each year; good, the bad, the ugly. Always the good, I  
5 hope.

6 MS. NEAL: That's our word for the day.

7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Why do you say that before  
8 I came on?

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Because you're such a  
10 good representation of "the good".

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Oh, thank you.

12 COMM. HAMMOND: We always present the data.  
13 Okay? Now, kind of a hallmark of what we do is our  
14 strategic plan, and a very important part of that is to  
15 update you with all the data and what we've learned, and  
16 that's what we're going to go through today. So, I think  
17 you've appreciated what we've done, and how we reviewed  
18 it in the past, and so with that I'll turn it over to  
19 Jill.

20 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay, Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You're always welcome.

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Great. Thank you very  
23 much. Just as a reminder, we go through this annual  
24 process with our strategic plan. And it begins in the  
25 late spring, early summer, with the cabinet staff coming



1 together and looking at what happened in the past year.  
2 How did we do, how are we progressing on our strategic  
3 goals. Revisiting the plan itself, looking at  
4 legislation that passed that maybe we need to integrate  
5 some new initiatives or bodies of work into the plan. We  
6 make revisions as cabinet members. Then those revisions  
7 go out to the entire department, and we request every  
8 unit to review the plan, and every unit then has feedback  
9 and input into the strategic plan. All of that input is  
10 then gathered.

11 We put it together, finalize it, bring it to  
12 you all to see it, and then we submit it to the Office of  
13 State Planning and Budgeting, OSPB, who then uses it and  
14 posts it for our requirements pursuant to the SMART Act.  
15 So, that's how all of these pieces kind of go together.  
16 At CDE we continue to work on and use this work and this  
17 strategic plan.

18 We have goal teams that meet regularly to  
19 advance the goals, and then every unit is required to do  
20 unit plans that are aligned with the strategic goals for  
21 the organization. So that process is ongoing. It kind  
22 of just lives and it's on a cyclical nature within the  
23 department.

24 So, with that, I'll share with you where we  
25 are and let you know, last year when we presented, we had



1 made a significant pivot in our strategic plan with our  
2 goals. When we first kind of came on when Commissioner  
3 Hammond was here, we did a strategic plan that involved a  
4 lot of organizational effort that was focused on the  
5 strategic initiatives that we were trying to implement.

6 After two years we've pivoted, and last year  
7 really transformed those goals into student-centric  
8 goals. So that's what you see before you. That did not  
9 change. In fact, there were very minimal changes this  
10 year from last year, so I'll speak to what those look  
11 like.

12 So, we're going to do a quick review of our  
13 progress. How did we do on our goals? Then we'll talk  
14 about some of the focus areas for '14-'15, the  
15 refinements that we made to the Strategic Plan, our  
16 performance reporting requirements, the Office of State  
17 Planning and Budgeting is implementing some new reporting  
18 requirements, which are a little different and a little  
19 challenging for us at the department. So, I'll talk to  
20 you about those. And then, we'll finish up with just  
21 some of the next steps.

22 So, you'll see that our goals of every  
23 student every step of the way remain with those goals of  
24 start strong, read by third grade, meet or exceed  
25 standards, and graduate ready.





1                   So, how did we do on those areas? Let's  
2 first just kind of take a look back at a couple of  
3 meetings ago when we were talking about the TCAP results.  
4 You saw some of these slides, and I wanted to include  
5 them again because I think they provide an important  
6 framing and context for when we then go in and look at  
7 our goals. The specific goals and what progress we made.

8                   This first slide is the 10-year performance  
9 history of how we did on TCAP. It was CSAP to TCAP in  
10 math, which is blue, reading, which is yellow, and the  
11 writing, which is green. And you can see, for the most  
12 part, it's fairly flat, but it is an upward tick. There  
13 is an upward leaning to the lines over time.

14                   So, that's kind of what our performance  
15 trajectory has looked like. When we look at another  
16 statistic that we spend a lot of time with, which is  
17 catch-up growth, and that growth, as a reminder, is kids  
18 making enough growth to get proficient. So, these are  
19 kids who are not proficient. It's kids making enough  
20 growth to become proficient in three years, or by Grade  
21 10. Okay?

22                   So, you can see that our numbers are pretty  
23 low. What that would say, is that in 2014 in reading,  
24 about 30.9 percent of our kids are making enough growth  
25 to reach proficiency within 3 years, or by Grade 10. And



1 those numbers go down in writing and in math. So, what  
2 that tells us, is that overall the system is challenged  
3 when kids fall behind with getting them back on track.  
4 It's a persistent challenge that our system has struggled  
5 with, and you can see that in the data over the 10 years.

6 When we look at Keep-Up growth, that's  
7 another statistic that we look at, which is saying a kid  
8 is already proficient, how do they do in maintaining that  
9 proficiency? Because you need to continue to grow to  
10 stay proficient.

11 And you can see that the numbers also are  
12 somewhat flat, with a little bit of an upward tendency,  
13 but again it -- reading about 80.7 percent of kids who  
14 are proficient make enough growth to stay proficient, and  
15 you can see how then that varies across the content  
16 areas.

17 So, for us it also says, "Gosh, we'd like to  
18 see that be 100." We would like to see that when a kid  
19 is proficient there's not -- they're making enough growth  
20 to continue to maintain at. So those are important  
21 pieces of information that we use as we're thinking about  
22 the work that we're doing.

23 And we share with you, in the meeting -- a  
24 couple meetings ago when we went over the TCAP results,  
25 that it's important to keep that 10 year projection and



1 trajectory kind of in -- to continue to think about it in  
2 light of some of the statistics happening with our  
3 demographics.

4 So, over that same 10-year period we saw a  
5 15 percent increase in the number of students that we're  
6 serving, so Colorado schools were growing. That increase  
7 also meant a 61 percent increase in the students of  
8 poverty entering the system. I think it's really  
9 important to be aware of. And a 38 percent increase in  
10 our English learners.

11 So, when we go back to that trend line that  
12 was fairly flat, but sort of upward leaning, keep in mind  
13 that the system at that time is absorbing a lot more  
14 kids, and a lot more kids with needs, and yet maintaining  
15 performance. So, I think there's an important story  
16 there that provides some important context. It's not good  
17 enough, and we need to do more, but I think it's part of a  
18 fuller story, and it's something that we've been looking  
19 at a lot is how do we support our schools and districts  
20 with the growth that's occurring, and yet elevate  
21 performance for all at the same time.

22 So, with that context, how did we do on our  
23 goals? So, the first goal we've actually needed to reset  
24 the metric. Our previous metric had a national  
25 comparison, and we learned that the national comparison



1 group they -- the researchers have discovered some errors  
2 in their metric. So, we wanted to re-calibrate our  
3 metric when we learned that.

4 So, we're keeping this very close to our own  
5 program, which is the Colorado Preschool Program. It's a  
6 new metric, you can see what we're focused on; it's  
7 increasing the readiness of our youngest learners by  
8 increasing the percentage of four-year-olds served by the  
9 Colorado Preschool Program who are meeting age  
10 expectations in literacy and math by 3 percent in 2016  
11 and 5 percent in 2018.

12 So, this is a new target, new goal, that  
13 we're setting. The preschool program, because of some of  
14 the statutory changes that have occurred that have  
15 increased the number of slots for those kids, so we have  
16 more kids who are served. There're more kids with more  
17 needs, so you can see over time in 2012 we were serving  
18 about 9000 students. We're now serving 13,500 students,  
19 and we're hoping to move those literacy scores up and  
20 those math scores up. So those are two focused areas for  
21 our Start Strong goal.

22 For goal two, this is read at or above grade  
23 level by the end of third grade, and our target has been  
24 trying to move those third -grade reading scores up. And  
25 you can see we were really trying to get them to 80



1 percent proficient or advanced in 2016 with the goal of  
2 85 by 2018. We did not hit any of our targets this year.

3 As you know, our reading scores -- the TCAP  
4 scores in general went down slightly and so, as a result,  
5 that's going to trickle through every one of our goals.  
6 It's going to impact every one of them. So, on the third  
7 grade we did not hit our targets.

8 For goal three, also, this goal is deeply  
9 tied with performance on TCAP. So, again, we're going to  
10 see a missing of our targets. This goal focuses a great  
11 deal on that catch-up growth I was talking about earlier,  
12 and so one of the things that we said, is that 30 percent  
13 number, or 10 percent of kids catching up. It's not  
14 okay. Can we double that percentage of kids catching up?  
15 So, a pretty aggressive goal that we're trying to set.

16 And, as you saw from the TCAP data that we  
17 shared, because the scores went down, we did not hit our  
18 targets. There were two out of the 36 targets that were  
19 met, and that was students with disabilities and middle  
20 school in both reading and math and at the high school  
21 level in reading. So those were two of the targets that  
22 we did meet with our students with disabilities.

23 For goal four, how did we do on our  
24 graduation goal? This one is a little bit more of a  
25 bright spot. We hit four out of our six targets. And



1 those were met for our students on free and reduced  
2 lunch, our Hispanic students, our English Learners and  
3 our students with disabilities. And you can see those --  
4 the data that shows up in the chart for you there.

5 So, that's a bit of a review. We've spent a  
6 lot more time as a staff digging into the numbers,  
7 pulling it apart, and thinking about where leverage  
8 points might be. We've also talked to the field and  
9 asked questions about what some of their needs are.

10 And so, with that in mind, we gathered all  
11 of that information to help inform a tightening and a  
12 greater focus of our strategic plan and efforts in the  
13 coming year.

14 And so, here were some of the things that we  
15 were hearing from districts about their needs. First,  
16 instructional support focused on implementing the  
17 Colorado Academic Standards. Number of districts  
18 reported to us just the challenge of access to  
19 curriculum, support materials, resources that are aligned  
20 with the standards. Improving student's literacy skills,  
21 continued interest from the department on how to help  
22 their teachers be better at teaching students how to  
23 read. And then developing and using quality assessments.

24 Just general questions about assessment  
25 literacy. How to use assessments well, how to use



1 assessments that are moment in time, to gather good and  
2 quick feedback for how their students are doing.

3 Leadership support focused on instructional  
4 leadership as well as conducting observations and  
5 providing quality feedback. I think something that'll be  
6 interesting, a little preview of what you're going to  
7 hear in November when our Educator Effectiveness Team  
8 comes to share with you some of the preliminary results  
9 from our pilot, the last year of the pilot, is that the  
10 two areas that both our principals and our teachers are  
11 rated lower on in the evaluation process.

12 For principals it's the instructional  
13 leadership standard, and for our teachers it's actually  
14 in instruction. And the main pieces within instruction  
15 that their lower ratings are, are on use of assessment,  
16 literacy, and high expectations for all kids. So, it's  
17 really interesting how those tee up and support what then  
18 we've also been hearing as feedback from the field, if  
19 these are areas where we'd like some more support.

20 Connecting and networking with other  
21 districts, so we get a lot of requests, "Could the  
22 department please help us connect with folks who are  
23 doing this well, or is anybody using this? Could you  
24 connect us with them?"

25 So, how we can help share promising



1 practices and co-create, or leverage some of the  
2 resources and tools that districts are developing.

3 And then communication support. A lot of  
4 requests still for, "We just need help getting better  
5 information out to our communities. Help us with  
6 materials. We don't have a communication staff. We don't  
7 have the ability to put some of these -- these -- these  
8 pieces out. Can you do -- can you help us with that, be  
9 better at communicating with our community?"

10 So, those were some pieces that, really, we  
11 took to heart as we looked at our strategic plan and  
12 worked on some of the refinements. So, I'll speak to  
13 those in a little bit. But I want to first have you just  
14 pull up this strategic plan, which you have in your  
15 packet, and share with you some of the changes that we  
16 did make.

17 So, one of the pieces that's different from  
18 the plan last year, we went ahead, we were trying to  
19 follow very much the Office of State Planning and  
20 Budgeting format, which did not include the -- it  
21 included vision and mission and organization description,  
22 but it didn't include values. We have always had  
23 department values, those have been very important to us,  
24 and are on a card that we all keep. But it hadn't been  
25 in our plan, because it was not part of that template.





1 Well, we learned we have flexibility to add it, so it was  
2 very important us -- important to us to have that  
3 reflected in our strategic plan. So, you'll see our  
4 department values are listed on page 3 and 4.

5 And then, the whole plan has been updated to  
6 reflect the data from this past year that I just reviewed  
7 with you so that it's transparent and public about where  
8 we met targets and where we didn't. There is also a  
9 little descriptor, or paragraph added, under every chart  
10 that explains what happened this past year, why we met  
11 our targets, or why we didn't.

12 And then, each goal team met, and using some  
13 of the information that I shared with you about where  
14 districts were saying their needs were, each goal team,  
15 and you'll see the goal work starts on page 13, did some  
16 revisions of their key activities to try to reflect the  
17 needs in more high leverage areas. It's much more  
18 succinct than it was a year ago.

19 We were kind of showing everything we were  
20 trying to do to support that particular goal. This year  
21 we said, "Let's focus on what's going to have the  
22 greatest impact that we think we can do, that we think we  
23 can do reasonably well, and that will help us with our  
24 performance trajectory." So that was work that each of  
25 the goal team spent time refining. So, each goal section



1 reflects the work of a number of people, cross-unit  
2 teams, from around the department that have put those  
3 together.

4 Obviously, there is much more fleshed out  
5 action plans behind these. This is much more high level.  
6 But that gives you kind of an idea about how the plan is  
7 structured and how it drives our work.

8 In terms of what we need to share with the  
9 Office of State Planning and Budgeting, we will be  
10 sharing with them this document. They do post it online,  
11 but they're also moving to a four-page document that  
12 they're putting on their state reporting system. It will  
13 include just a summary of our strategic goals, but then  
14 it will focus on this piece of the plan that's called --  
15 let's see -- it is essentially the Department -- it  
16 starts on page 7. Major program areas and descriptors.

17 So, the Office of State Planning and  
18 Budgeting is very interested in what we call here  
19 organizational excellence and organizational efficiency.  
20 So --

21 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Where are you?

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is on page 6 of the  
23 Strategic Plan. And so, they are asking us to report on  
24 what we consider our major program areas, and what the  
25 processes are in those areas, and whether we're reducing



1 cycle time, eliminating waste, those sorts of -- kinds of  
2 metrics. So, we certainly monitor those at the  
3 department. The ones that we place a high value on are  
4 student performance results. That is not what they're  
5 asking us to report. They're really asking us to report  
6 programmatic process metrics, so we will report those,  
7 but I just want to share that's something where we're  
8 balancing what we consider sort of organizational  
9 excellence with our strategic goals.

10 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Our priority students.

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, we feel like it's  
12 important to share both, and actually feel like it's very  
13 important to talk about student performance as a  
14 department and what we're doing to try to support student  
15 performance. That said, we also care a great deal about  
16 ensuring that we're operating efficiently and using  
17 taxpayer dollars efficiently. So, we will report on  
18 that. An example is licensure.

19 It's very much a process, how many  
20 applications do we get, how quickly do we process them,  
21 how much waste is in that process, how much backlog do we  
22 have, how quickly do we move through it. So, we will  
23 report all of those. We're happy that we're continuing  
24 to maintain our two-week cycle time, for the most part,  
25 on applications that come to us.



1                   So, those are the kinds of statistics you're  
2 going to see, and so when we present in December for the  
3 joint budget committee, you may hear more of an emphasis  
4 on some of those metrics, and I just wanted to give you a  
5 head's up. Its' the first time all departments are doing  
6 this reporting, so we're going to learn this year with  
7 it. And those reports are due -- the initial draft of  
8 them area actually due next week, and then they will be  
9 posting those in a public website on November 1st.

10                   So, the next steps, our goal teams are  
11 continuing to work and flesh out their action plans.  
12 That November is that OSPB submission that I just  
13 mentioned. The November, December timeframe is when  
14 we'll have our joint house and Senate Ed Committee  
15 presentation. That has not been scheduled. It won't be  
16 scheduled until after the elections.

17                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. Well, it's -- our  
18 JBC is December 18th, but --

19                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Joint Budget Committee has  
20 been scheduled, which is December 18th. Yep. Yep. And  
21 usually it is right -- sometime before the JBC hearing.

22                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

23                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And then between January  
24 and February our unit plans will then do their re-  
25 alignment and refinement of their unit work in alignment



1 with the strategic plan.

2 So that's kind of a quick overview of where  
3 we are. Any questions?

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So, help to explain the  
6 major program here is descriptions, because you didn't --  
7 well, with the rest of this (indiscernible) that makes no  
8 sense.

9 Well, so in relationship to a couple of  
10 areas, I have some comments. When you -- when we talk  
11 about the fact that hey haven't been dramatic increases  
12 their -- or perhaps even decreases this past year. You  
13 explain that by growth in student numbers, growth in  
14 poverty?

15 Two things that we're not actually  
16 mentioning is that our school districts, I understand,  
17 have about a billion dollars less the last four to five  
18 years, and part of that is to serve -- most of that is to  
19 serve student needs. So, that's not an unrealistic  
20 reason as you try to find some explanation.

21 The other one that I haven't heard anyone  
22 talk about, but it has been a discussion in some school  
23 district, which is what some people call the  
24 implementation dip. And I think, in all fairness to  
25 school districts that have been changing their curriculum



1 as a result of the standard, the changes in standards  
2 that we've adopted. It might be helpful to look into  
3 that particular concept, I don't know what it is, I just  
4 remember that for Adams 50, when they changed their whole  
5 system to a competency-based system, the initial, I  
6 believe, two years were a real struggle. (indiscernible)  
7 is just helpful to have the conversation that doesn't  
8 mean we should be doing things in a different way, but I  
9 think it broadens some of the thoughts that we have about  
10 what's going on, and how do we move forward effectively.  
11 And, I'm so sorry. I apologize.

12 Now I want to go on to a couple of my pet  
13 peeves. So, when we talk -- when you articulate all the  
14 various things that folks are going to do for districts.  
15 I don't read much the talks about using technology,  
16 either in helping students learn in a blended way, and  
17 there's a really helpful report from the Independence  
18 Institute that we just received about districts that are  
19 doing some blended learning efforts. But how could we  
20 help get the word out, so that when schools are adding  
21 individual technology, how can teachers use that really  
22 effectively for student learning, and also for class  
23 management, et cetera.

24 And I don't see that -- it's not  
25 articulated. Your terms are very general, but it sure is



1 one of my thoughts when we're thinking about how do we  
2 support school districts.

3 Because we are going to see, partly because  
4 of the assessments, an increase in the amount of  
5 technology that's being acquired in school districts.  
6 But how teachers use that technology other than for  
7 assessments is a huge potential. Because we're not going  
8 to get much more money. So, folks do have to do things  
9 differently.

10 So, I'd love for you just to talk about that  
11 and think about that; what ways to we support teachers in  
12 making that really useful? My other pet peeve is math.  
13 Which is, there's some research out that I've been  
14 reading recently about preschool math learning and what  
15 that means for the long term. And one of the studies  
16 that I read suggested that a deeper understanding of very  
17 early math, for early childhood, is a better indicator of  
18 reading at the high school level than early preschool  
19 reading capacity. That kind of research suggests to me  
20 that it's not just about can all kids read or are they  
21 ready in terms of their -- those skills, but I think math  
22 skills.

23 And we might, I mean, tomorrow we're going  
24 to hear a little bit about preschool, but I really think  
25 we probably ought, as a state, ought to be looking into



1 that whole notion, so that maybe there's some emphasis  
2 also then on fourth-grade math scores as an indicator for  
3 kids. Early childhood math skills, and then as a bit of  
4 a barometer, how are kids doing in math.

5 And I confess that I am a math person, and I  
6 realize that's why I get on that. I think that's all the  
7 notes I took.

8 I'm very impressed. I'm not being critical.  
9 I just felt like it was partly my job to put in here some  
10 of the things that I think about when we're doing goals  
11 that may or may not help our kids, thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. Neal.

13 MS. NEAL: Couple of months ago, I think it  
14 was two months ago, when we got the test results, we  
15 entered into a long conversation about why haven't the  
16 scores risen. You know, we've been getting these tests  
17 back every year, and the scores have not changed  
18 substantially, or even very much.

19 And I brought up the subject of why is it  
20 that we never have any high stakes for the kids. And I  
21 was promptly ignored by everybody else in the panel. So,  
22 I'm back to that subject. If you look -- and, again, as  
23 Angelika said, this is not a complaint or a -- but you  
24 look at all those figures that we just looked at,  
25 proficiency remains just below 70 percent for 10 years.





1 And that means that there's been no change. We have not  
2 increased proficiency in reading, or in academics at all.

3 And then there is the graduation rate, which  
4 is better, and I have to ask, again, having been in the  
5 classroom; what kind of proof do we have that all of  
6 those students who graduated were competent? Because I  
7 can tell you I know that there are always kids who  
8 graduate every year who are not competent. So, they're  
9 getting, you know, that's not a real good count right  
10 there.

11 And so, I just would come back to that, you  
12 know, have we ever talked about, or where is the role of  
13 the student?

14 And I recently attended a rural schools  
15 meeting, which one of the superintendents said something  
16 to the effect that, you know, these kids that are taking  
17 these tests, particularly middle and high school kids,  
18 they have no buy-in. There's no reason for them to do  
19 well. What are the -- they get their diploma anyway.  
20 And he was quite sincere that they don't care. And we  
21 all -- we know that there are a lot of kids that will  
22 play tic-tac-toe with their little faces.

23 So, have we ever entered into that  
24 discussion? How do we let them share in this  
25 accountability that you guys are all working and striving



1 for, but they are not? And until they are -- and another  
2 comment someone made to me recently was about we always  
3 say, "well, Finland did this." And, you know, all these -  
4 - well, they all have high stakes testing that includes  
5 high stakes for the students. And I -- have we ever  
6 talked about that? Have we ever gotten, you know, or are  
7 -- because we just keep saying, "Gee, we're just working  
8 so hard and they're not -- they're not learning!" And we  
9 have given them no reason, I feel, (indiscernible) no  
10 particular reason to share. Those who have, you know,  
11 really good families and are really pushing, they --  
12 their parents, their families are doing it.

13 But I just think we have to find a way to  
14 make it relevant to them, too. We can't be 99 percent of  
15 the job. And I know I pretty much alone on that, but  
16 that's just the way I feel.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm not ignoring you.

18 MS. NEAL: Well, you did that day I  
19 mentioned it.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm going to give Jill a  
21 chance to respond, and then I'll come (indiscernible).

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just, so just to -- just  
23 to pick up on -- to go back for a second on the math and  
24 technology pieces. So, I will definitely share that back  
25 with our goal teams and make sure they consider and think



1 about your comments as they're fleshing out their action  
2 plans.

3 And the piece about technology and using  
4 technology, that is another piece that does pop as a  
5 lower rating for our teachers in their teacher  
6 evaluation, so it does bear out exactly what you were  
7 saying about a need to provide more supports on how to  
8 effectively use it. So, we'll definitely pass back those  
9 comments.

10 And then in terms of your comment about  
11 graduating and what does the graduation rate really mean  
12 and how do you know if they're ready; one of the things  
13 that we've talked a lot about at the department is our  
14 graduation metric right now does not necessarily tell us  
15 if they are ready. It tells us they graduated.

16 MS. NEAL: Yes.

17 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The remediation rates at  
18 higher ed could give you a sense of readiness. They're  
19 not as -- they're not reflective of all our students, so  
20 trying to come up with some metrics around readiness that  
21 might get at workforce metrics; two of early entrance  
22 into the workforce, and then broader metrics around  
23 higher ed. Readiness. Those are all some things that  
24 we're talking about. Because you're exactly right. The  
25 graduation rate isn't quite as full a measure as we'd



1 like. So, we're exploring that.

2 MS. NEAL: And that's one of the things the  
3 colleges always hit us with, is their remediation rate.

4 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes, yes.

5 MS. NEAL: They let us know.

6 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: How about the ACT. You  
7 didn't include ACT in any of your data, your 10-year  
8 data.

9 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. And, so Mr. Chair  
10 --

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is it flat -- is it flat,  
12 too?

13 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I can go back and look at  
14 that. It's -- I think it's actually been a little bit  
15 more of ticking upward over time.

16 COMM. HAMMOND: It's just (indiscernible).  
17 It's not really anything to write home about, but it  
18 doesn't prove --

19 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. And then the last  
20 piece on the high stakes for kids, just to let you know,  
21 that popped as an issue in the West Ed Report. Some of  
22 the focus groups folks in the field said he -- we're  
23 curious about how we could give kids more stake in the  
24 game. And there were some ideas generated in the West Ed  
25 Study that were passed on to the House Bill 1202 task



1 force.

2 I'll also mention, so that -- so you may see  
3 some conversation happen there around how to give kids  
4 some skin in the game. Also, remember that our  
5 graduation guidelines now, because of the menu of  
6 competencies that they have to show, the state tests are  
7 one way kids could show competency, minimal competency,  
8 so they could use that to support their graduation  
9 requirements. And I think that's new. We've never had  
10 that before. And the PARCC tests will also be considered  
11 for -- by -- there's about 600 institutions of higher ed  
12 across the country that have said that student scores  
13 will be used for placement purposes.

14 So, again, if kids score well on that it  
15 will signal to higher ed institutions that they don't  
16 need remediation and can enter into credit-bearing  
17 courses.

18 So, a couple of good, positive things headed  
19 that way. And then, lastly, the local districts do have  
20 flexibility, so this really can be a local decision to  
21 determine how much they might want to give kids a skin in  
22 the game in those. That's -- there's nothing prohibiting  
23 a district from making some of those decisions.

24 MS. NEAL: That's a good point. Because  
25 when I was on a local board, when I left, they were



1 talking about that. Having something like you got GPA  
2 and ACT and, you know, PARCC or whatever. You give them,  
3 like -- you've got to meet two of these three metrics, or  
4 something like that in order --

5 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

6 MS. NEAL: Because right now they're just  
7 using GPA and that's frequently inflated.

8 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I just appreciate the  
11 report. It's great to, you know, see the focus of what's  
12 going on in state and that CDE. I wonder if you can  
13 address page 11, which talks about the if we  
14 (indiscernible) then we can expect of these results, and  
15 it's in the plan, there's two documents there. This one  
16 is in the Performance Plan.

17 I wonder what kind of discussions you've had  
18 among the staff about those assumptions. I mean, can we  
19 really expect that kind of change based on those upfront  
20 characteristics? And then attaching them to change. And  
21 if you -- what kind of discussions the staff has had  
22 about the assumptions underneath that assumption. Which  
23 is, if we do this, these other things will occur.

24 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Sure. Mr. Chair. So,  
25 you'll actually see that framework. That's -- that comes



1 from our performance team, our School and District  
2 Performance Team that works on school turnaround. You'll  
3 see that framework actually on every -- for every goal,  
4 as a theory of action, "if" statements, so you'll see it  
5 for the literacy goal. You'll see it throughout.

6 And we moved to that because we wanted to  
7 make sure that we articulated what we think were the  
8 drivers to make change happen. So, it's built on some  
9 assumptions. Each goal team that has experts around --  
10 from the department, around that content area, crafted  
11 those theories of actions, and they worked on it through  
12 -- using research that they had that said, "These are  
13 some of what research or promising practice has shown.  
14 That if you move these levers, you should be able to see  
15 some action."

16 So, what you see on page 11, is work from  
17 our performance -- school and district performance team,  
18 doing that work together, and identifying that those are  
19 the kinds of levers they want to move.

20 The same is the case for each goal area, so  
21 each "if" statement becomes a key strategy, or action,  
22 that the team is trying to drive.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And, I don't know, maybe you  
24 know this, Robert, what is the -- what is the history of  
25 the Board's involvement in embracing these theories of



1 action. Adult (indiscernible) we really touch this  
2 document. Is this really the staff work, or --?

3 COMM. HAMMOND: It is, and then we review it  
4 with you. I mean, this is primary our CDE's departments,  
5 goals of trying to do the things we've, you know, we've  
6 talked about. So, it isn't -- it isn't a board document,  
7 but we take your suggestions, comments.

8 MS. NEAL: Well, we have (indiscernible).  
9 Didn't remember the year we did that in the retreat. I  
10 think Deb was there, because I wasn't paying much  
11 attention, because most strategic plans don't go anywhere  
12 the next year around (indiscernible), because they're  
13 really paying attention.

14 COMM. HAMMOND: If you have any comments or  
15 questions, I'd be glad to take into account.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I'm just thinking  
17 about the theories of action that are assumed in this on  
18 pages 11 and following. Is that something that the board  
19 would want to dig deeper into, or do we embrace the  
20 theories of action that you've situated underneath these  
21 "if/then" statements. The question before  
22 (indiscernible).

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, did you want to --?

24 MS. GOFF: It was about the graduation  
25 scheduling in (indiscernible). Endorse diploma, but we





1 can follow up with those (indiscernible).

2 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm actually confused by  
3 the -- by Deb's question.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

5 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, what understanding  
6 what it is Deb?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, we're just looking at  
8 data, and then we're trying to figure out what the goals  
9 for the CDE are, you know, 400-plus-strong staff, looking  
10 on pages 9 through 11, and if we do these things then we  
11 assume these other things will occur that touch on the  
12 goals. That's based on theories of action and  
13 assumptions.

14 Question; does the board have a role in  
15 looking at that and saying, "We embrace these theories of  
16 action?" We do believe that if these happen, if these  
17 things are in place, these other things will occur. But,  
18 broadly speaking, fold into what we want to see happen in  
19 Student Achievement Colorado, or do we just look at it  
20 and say, "Looks good." But, I don't know, I just never  
21 feel like sometimes we have time to go deep on the  
22 assumptions of, "We hope these things will happen. We  
23 hope these improvements will occur."

24 We looked at the data statewide couple weeks  
25 ago and felt that we hadn't made a lot of progress in



1 terms of data over the time that we've been on this  
2 board. And sometimes I think it's unpacked in the  
3 assumptions that are situated in these documents that  
4 drive the work of the huge staff at CDE. I mean, never  
5 enough, but still it's a lot of people. So, I just  
6 didn't know if the board has an interest in looking more  
7 deeply at these documents.

8 MS. GOFF: Oh. I guess I did look at it and  
9 look for my little agendas.

10 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It seems to me that when  
11 you're looking at the (indiscernible) I would -- I would  
12 want to be comfortable with the "then". I would want to  
13 be comfortable with the outcomes that you're expecting to  
14 have happen. The "ifs" are kind of a decision of the  
15 staff. I mean, I don't want to tell the "ifs" or the --  
16 what they're going to do and how they're going to do it.  
17 And that's not my skill. That's not actually what I  
18 (indiscernible) in either. I certainly should agree -- I  
19 think I should agree with (indiscernible), that the  
20 things that you expect to see are things that we want --  
21 the board also want to see. I don't -- is that --

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I guess I would --

23 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Is that -- is that what  
24 you're talking about with the "thens"?

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. And I think the "ifs",



1 too, only in the sense that a couple of weeks ago we  
2 looked at the data, and we didn't see the "thens" we  
3 hoped for over a number of years that we've been on the  
4 board. So, we expressed dismay at not seeing the needle  
5 move much, and that would be the "thens" and so then we  
6 have to back into that and say, "why"? Perhaps it's in  
7 the "ifs", you know, maybe those connections.

8 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But you're talking about  
9 the "hows" and I don't think that's our job. Right? I  
10 mean, we -- that's not the kind of expertise --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, are there other  
12 questions? Because I want to come at this from a  
13 slightly different way, but, Pam, did you have questions?

14 MS. MAZANEC: I do.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Or, I'm guessing --

16 MS. MAZANEC: And, I apologize, I stepped  
17 off of a -- but and this is maybe a question that should  
18 have been asked, but I find it strange that because of  
19 how poorly our students are doing in, say, kindergarten,  
20 that our response is -- sorry. One of our responses to  
21 children not being sufficiently ready for school in  
22 kindergarten, that our answer to that is to add more  
23 students to a preschool program.

24 My question is, what are we doing  
25 differently, and it's -- I know it's not "we", it's --



1 but how does CDE support teachers in our districts to  
2 improve how they are teaching the children in  
3 kindergarten? You know. That's my question, is what can  
4 be done to improve the outcomes of those children in  
5 kindergarten that is within CDE's power to help with?

6 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, Mr. Chair, I think  
7 that's a great question, and a team that's work --  
8 focused on goal 1 is looking at school readiness and  
9 really thinking of that P through grade 3, so it's kind  
10 of -- a lot of research shows that that early learning  
11 goes all the way to third grade, and how are we  
12 supporting those teachers.

13 So, particularly with the school readiness  
14 work, there is -- has been a lot of training from the  
15 team you saw earlier, working on school readiness with  
16 our kindergarten teachers. And focusing on not only how  
17 to support them with identifying student needs and  
18 developing strong readiness plans for kids that enter  
19 kindergarten, but also on what you'll often hear Dr. Owen  
20 talk about, which is first-grade instruction. You know,  
21 how do we provide that solid instruction for kids when  
22 they come right out at the bat, so that we're able to  
23 ensure they're getting the best literacy instruction, the  
24 best numeracy instruction, and so forth so that we're not  
25 identifying kids for Special Ed or other things when



1 really it's just a kid that needs good instruction.

2 So that focus of kindergarten teachers and  
3 support on really what we're calling school readiness has  
4 been an effort that the teens really focused on last year  
5 and will continue through this year.

6 In terms of the metric that you see in the -  
7 - in the report, we don't have school readiness metrics,  
8 so it's really hard. Those assessments that you all  
9 approved on the menu at some point we'll have some  
10 metrics around how ready are kids, in what areas, and  
11 where do we need to shore that up. But, absent that, one  
12 of the levers in our control is the Carda (sp?) Preschool  
13 Program, which we are by statute required to run, is  
14 ensuring high quality, and that kids that at least go  
15 through that program are getting those readiness factors  
16 that they need to move into kindergarten ready. So  
17 that's the metric we chose for that goal.

18 I don't know if that answered your question.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah --

20 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: But it's some complexity in  
21 there about availability of metrics and where we can --  
22 what we can track and follow.

23 MS. MAZANEC: And obviously, you know, the  
24 quality of teachers in the classrooms, critical here. Be  
25 nice to be able to have some effect on that, too.



1 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thanks (indiscernible).

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Does Elaine want  
3 to chime in before I come back to Angelika for a third  
4 bite at the apple.

5 MS. BERMAN: Sure. Jane, you didn't hear  
6 that (indiscernible) --. I'm going to go a different  
7 direction, I think. You talked about -- oh, wait, hold  
8 on. The word "change" is in the title.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're going to change  
10 everybody in this side of the dais into somebody who  
11 turns their microphone (indiscernible) when they speak.

12 MS. BERMAN: My mic is on. My mic is on.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's' the change we're  
14 looking for here.

15 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Be the change that you  
16 want to see.

17 MS. BERMAN: So, you were -- you were -- did  
18 a great job of presenting what the data showed, and then  
19 getting feedback from the field in terms of what the  
20 department could be doing more of, better off. So, on  
21 page 16, which is the overview of the changes, I guess my  
22 question is, what is realistic in terms of what we can do  
23 more of, and what is it going to take for us to respond  
24 positively with the districts, and help them and in the  
25 areas they're asking for help? Is it more staff? Is it



1 -- what is it going to take?

2 Because I think the field has been very  
3 clear about what they need and what they're asking for.  
4 And I just don't know if we have the capacity currently  
5 to respond adequately to their needs.

6 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, Mr. Chair, on a couple  
7 of levels, what we've been able to look at is we have a  
8 little bit more time on our one-time funds from the state  
9 that we're provided through the governor's office a  
10 couple of years ago to support the educator effectiveness  
11 work. So, specifically, we've re-prioritized some of  
12 those funds to go right out to districts.

13 We didn't need them for some of the online  
14 system we were using. The timing just was off, so what  
15 we've been able to do is re-prioritize some of those  
16 funds to be used to go to the field to help support what  
17 we're calling educator effectiveness liaisons that we're  
18 providing specific training and support to do principal  
19 coaching and mentoring around quality teacher  
20 evaluations.

21 What does great instruction look like? How  
22 do you know it? How do you identify it? How do you  
23 ensure better inter (indiscernible) agreements on your  
24 evaluation system and how do you deliver quality  
25 feedback? So, those were some pieces you saw folks



1 asking for help around observations and feedback, and  
2 using those systems well, identifying good teachers, and  
3 knowing how to coach people.

4           So, this is going to allow us to,  
5 essentially, allow us to provide districts with some  
6 money to offset salary so that if an individual in their  
7 -- in their district could get trained, be supported, and  
8 be part of a cohort for a year that has more intensive  
9 training and support around principal coaching and  
10 principal leadership. So, that's one example.

11           On the standards side, and implementation of  
12 the standards, what we heard was that our standards are  
13 not very accessible to the general public. They're meant  
14 for educators. They're really hard for people to take  
15 and use.

16           So, you'll see in the next couple of weeks  
17 in readiness for parent-teacher conference time, is very  
18 brief one-pagers of, "Here's what my kid needs to know  
19 and be able to do in reading this year for first-  
20 graders." "Here's what my kid needs to know and be able  
21 to do in math for first grade." Really easy -- when they,  
22 "What can I do as a parent?"

23           So those are some resources that we're  
24 focusing on to make it much more accessible. Also, folks  
25 saying, "Can you show me what the standards look like





1 when a teacher is really engaging in them in a meaningful  
2 way. So, we'll be highlighting teachers that have been  
3 working deeply with the standards, and having them share  
4 a learning task, probably once a month, or once every  
5 other month, to engage not only other teachers, but also  
6 a broader community, and what does it look like to teach  
7 the standard.

8 So those are some examples that are using  
9 our current funds, but sort of pivoting them a bit to  
10 focus on these areas of need that the districts have  
11 asked for.

12 MS. BERMAN: So, you and the commissioner  
13 and other staff believe that with current resources you  
14 can re-allocate the resources and re-focus the resources  
15 we have and adequately meet the needs of the districts?

16 COMM. HAMMOND: No.

17 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, I defer to the  
18 commissioner.

19 COMM. HAMMOND: You know, I would -- that's  
20 impossible. I mean, within the -- what we try to do is  
21 very strategically, within the limited -- and within our  
22 limited resources, do the best we can to get this stuff  
23 out in the field. We know there's power in being out in  
24 the field and helping the field. I mean, it is key that  
25 they understand those standards. That's one of the more



1 critical things we do in the Educator Effectiveness work  
2 we're doing, in the turnaround work we're doing. All  
3 tied back to those goals.

4 But, you know, we'll never have enough  
5 staff. The key is, is how do we strategically get out  
6 there and prioritize where the need is and try to get  
7 other people involved in this effort to help -- that they  
8 start helping themselves. I mean, I can't tell you how  
9 much people rely upon us now and, "Come help. Can you  
10 come help?" And, you know, as much as we try it's never  
11 enough. So, it's not a full answer to your question. I  
12 mean, but within our powers we're trying to be out there  
13 as much as we can working with our district. Those that  
14 really need us.

15 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes. And, Mr. Chair, I  
16 think we've learned some really valuable lessons in the  
17 last couple of years that we've had --

18 COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah.

19 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Had been working with some  
20 of these one-time funds where we've been able to get  
21 resources out to the field. One, was that small amounts  
22 of money out to the field and encouraging collaboration  
23 among districts really works. We've seen BOCES come  
24 together in exciting ways, and we've seen districts  
25 partner in some really interesting ways to create



1 resources that can be spread across multiple districts.

2 COMM. HAMMOND: And it's not the large  
3 amounts, in many cases. It's just a small amount of  
4 money to, especially in our rural areas, that really,  
5 I've been amazed what they've been able to accomplish in  
6 just getting together and starting to help themselves.

7 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. Yeah. And the  
8 teachers that have been involved in some of our work, I  
9 think this is what's excited us about our ability to  
10 maybe start to get at the teacher level, is teachers  
11 who've been involved, for example, in our content  
12 collaboratives where they were meeting in their content  
13 groups, reviewing assessments and creating an assessment  
14 resource bank for the field.

15 Those teachers had a chance to come and  
16 present to us about what the impact of that experience  
17 was, and I think it surprised us because, one, they said,  
18 we first had to learn and up our assessment literacy, and  
19 so the tool and the process that we had to go through to  
20 evaluate assessments was really valuable to us. But  
21 then, what we didn't know -- of course we knew everything  
22 about how much value they'd provided to the state by  
23 creating this resource bank, but we didn't know that then  
24 they went back to their districts, because they'd been  
25 part of that work they were kind of viewed as a lead for



1 their district on some of this assessment work. And  
2 they're developing formative assessments and interim  
3 assessments for the entire music department in Boulder,  
4 let's say, or the entire art department for another  
5 district.

6 And then, because a nearby district knew  
7 that that person was on it, then they're going and  
8 presenting to another district. That kind of work's  
9 really exciting, and so that's what we're also trained to  
10 look at, is how did we create more networks of  
11 individuals who have co-created content, shared it  
12 statewide, but then can go out and be resources with  
13 their peers.

14 MS. BERMAN: So, just before I give up the  
15 floor, I'm going to ask this question in one more way.  
16 So, when we -- when you get next year's Strategic Plan,  
17 you believe that the department will be able to have  
18 moved the needle sufficiently that the results will be  
19 improved?

20 COMM. HAMMOND: I'd say no. I think we're  
21 on a continual process. But what you have to understand,  
22 we're right in the midst of changing out systems. And  
23 all of these things are now being implemented. And  
24 Angelika brings up a good point. There will be a dip.  
25 You're going to see a dip. It's a matter of hanging with



1 the current system, because I think there's a lot of good  
2 things that are in place.

3 For example, the READ Act, I think we're  
4 going to see differences in that, in our literacy. I  
5 think we're going to see differences everywhere. But  
6 that takes time. And right now, we're going from an old  
7 system into a new system with all new (indiscernible).  
8 And so, I don't think you're going to see a substantial  
9 difference next year. Plus, we're re-norming all the  
10 tests. I mean, that's not the right word. But, you  
11 know, you're -- really if you look at the second year  
12 out. I believe you'll see changes.

13 MS. BERMAN: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think this is a great  
16 discussion. Because it kind of speaks to what I was  
17 trying to express, which is when we look at the gains  
18 that we hoped to see, based on the "if/then" statements,  
19 the theories of action and the leverage points, are we  
20 going to see the change we hope? And, I think when we  
21 look at, if the past is any kind of predictor of the  
22 future, I think it's going to be difficult to see  
23 substantial change in achievement and growth. Right?

24 And I would say having done lots of works in  
25 districts, as you have, and as many folks on the board



1 have, if we just attach more money to it, more coaches,  
2 more professional development, more people regionally  
3 situated to support schools. More, more, more. You  
4 often don't see the metric of change based on that,  
5 either.

6 And that's why I'm questioning the theories  
7 of action. Have we looked at them deeply, you know, and  
8 really examined whether or not they would translate into  
9 the change we hoped to see? And that's a longer  
10 discussion for a short meeting like this, but I think  
11 it's a pretty important one, because it has to do with  
12 the outcomes of all the work at CDE.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And let me kind of cut in  
14 at this point and pick back up on exactly where I wanted  
15 to go. Is as one whose bias is toward distributed  
16 authority as opposed to centralized authority, I view  
17 this effort as a Sisyphean task. I mean, I am always in  
18 incredible admiration of the work product that is  
19 produced trying to understand and manage and have  
20 influence over a system as large as this system, with as  
21 many articulating points within the system as it has.

22 So, the question that I come to, which is  
23 where I kind of bounce back up against what Deb was just  
24 talking about, is my question is regarding the root cause  
25 analysis, specifically with regard to the failure to



1 achieve goals. And as I look at the four goals, the  
2 first goal is kind of a moving target. Some have passed  
3 on that one. The last goal's a smush target. We're all  
4 in agreement, the graduation, yeah, that's good, but  
5 that's of the previous generation of educational  
6 understanding. And so that's not so important.

7           So, the two middle goals that we're not  
8 hitting the bar on, not hitting the mark on, the question  
9 is where is the root cause analysis of failure on those  
10 goals? Is it at the gold team? Does it belong, more  
11 broadly or more appropriately, located throughout this  
12 building, perhaps, and at this board, to some extent?  
13 That's the question that I come out of this particular  
14 big conversation with, is how are we doing our root cause  
15 analysis, or to characterize the different way the  
16 "if/then" statements to identify our theory of action,  
17 because we keep coming back to this same thing month  
18 after month.

19           It isn't getting much better, and we don't  
20 know what we're going to do to make it better. So, how  
21 do we get at that? How do we put our hands around that?  
22 How -- or as Elaine just said, how do you put your hands  
23 around that? Because I'll be engaging this issue, but  
24 from a different chair, I suppose.

25           COMM. HAMMOND: That's true.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So that's a big question.  
2 I don't know if you want to take a crack at it, or what.

3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So, I agree  
4 and certainly welcome the board's input on where you --  
5 where and how you want to support that root cause  
6 analysis. And we'll certainly be responsive to that. It  
7 is the work that the goal teams have spent a lot of time  
8 on, as they meet in their cross-unit work, is digging  
9 into the data. So, you're not seeing a lot of the  
10 paperwork, the data, the action plans, all of those kinds  
11 of things that go into each goal team's work.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But in this document we  
13 do see the roll-up of the conclusions.

14 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You see the roll-up of it.  
15 Exactly. So, it's a higher level, more -- you're not  
16 seeing the, "Okay, here's the specific action. Here's  
17 who's doing it by when." That kind of stuff. But that  
18 work -- that work is definitely something that if there's  
19 a particular one you want to say, "Let's dig into the  
20 root cause. Let's explore it. Let's see where you all  
21 came up with. Let's inform that process." We're  
22 certainly open to having that conversation and digging in  
23 further. Because, as Dr. Scheffel said, we really want  
24 to make sure that we see the dial move on this.

25 It is going to be challenging, because we're





1       resetting metrics. So that's going to be hard. We'll  
2       have to see if we can do a bridge between the TCAP and  
3       the new assessments and see if that -- if we can make  
4       comparisons, or if we start with a new baseline. So, all  
5       of this is going to get somewhat complicated. So, one of  
6       the pieces we've worked at internally, is what are  
7       metrics that don't change that we can be capturing. So,  
8       with the READ Act, there are some various metrics we can  
9       look at that we have insight into that we can start to  
10      share and monitor to see if we're moving the dial while  
11      our tests start to change and transition. So, we can try  
12      to inform the board with those sorts of metrics.

13                COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah. I'd say the READ Act  
14      was probably a good example. Because we're in that  
15      awkward stage of changing the systems. Okay?

16                UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

17                COMM. HAMMOND: And so that makes it real  
18      difficult to get to some questions you all --

19                UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. Right. But it's  
20      not an excuse at all.

21                COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah.

22                UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We're definitely open.  
23      We've definitely been digging into root cause, and we  
24      could bring that forward on a particular goal and have a  
25      conversation about it.



1                   COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah. But the READ Act  
2 would be a perfect on. Because that, I mean, as we all  
3 know, early literacy is critical to all the things we're  
4 -- we've talked about, to see that. So, anyway.

5                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fourth bight at the  
6 apple?

7                   MS. SCHROEDER: Thirteenth. Thank you.  
8 You're very generous.

9                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not what she said earlier.

10                  MS. SCHROEDER: That's right. Two things.  
11 One, if you go back to that 10-year spread, that 10-year  
12 data, if you would look at the math 10 years ago, 9 years  
13 ago and 8 years ago, have we ever peeled back what  
14 happened when we had a jump, a really large jump, and  
15 then we found out? Or -- I'm not saying you personally,  
16 because I'm not sure you were here.

17                  UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yep I -- nope.

18                  MS. SCHROEDER: But I think that -- we saw  
19 incredible movement. And I don't think those were the  
20 first years of the assessments. If you listen -- if you  
21 listen to the psychometricians they'll say in the first  
22 couple of years you see some huge jumps because students  
23 are learning how to take the test, and that those jumps  
24 are more about learning about the structure and how to  
25 take the test rather than reflections of knowledge.



1                   But if, unless I'm wrong, those were not the  
2 first couple year, and we didn't see it in reading or  
3 writing, we just saw it in math.

4                   UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Saw it in math, yep.

5                   MS. SCHROEDER: So, it might be helpful to  
6 have that thought. But my real question related to --

7                   MS. NEAL: (indiscernible).

8                   MS. SCHROEDER: Pam's questions about early  
9 childhood and readiness. And that is according to the  
10 Colorado statutes and constitution, we have no control  
11 over curriculum K-12. How much control do we have pre-k?  
12 In other words, the schools that get the slots, the state  
13 slots, what is our authority in terms of what the kids  
14 are learning and how they're being taught? Is it the  
15 same, so that it's a local control issue, or do we  
16 actually have the opportunity?

17                   And then, aligned with that to my mind, I  
18 think it'd be hugely helpful -- not all our kids go to  
19 preschool, not all our parents want our kids to go to  
20 preschool, but I do believe parents do want to prepare  
21 their kids for schools. And so, what can we provide for  
22 parents? How do you teach numeracy to a two-year-old,  
23 three-year-old, four-year-old, so that that deeper, early  
24 understanding -- what are the literacy strategies that  
25 parents use other than just reading? There's more than



1 just reading to your children, et cetera. I mean, I  
2 don't know if we have that authority, but if we did, or  
3 somebody else did, wouldn't that be awesome if we could  
4 provide that? Because I do believe that families do want  
5 to know that.

6 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mm-hmm. So, Mr. Chair.  
7 I'm going to refer us to the early childhood learning  
8 panel tomorrow, where you'll have a number of experts who  
9 can speak to those two questions. And if those aren't  
10 answered we can certainly get those for you.

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Would you (indiscernible),  
12 because I (indiscernible).

13 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I certainly will, and I  
14 will also talk with our staff, because they'll have good  
15 answers for you on both of those as well.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent. Any further  
17 questions? Angelika?

18 MS. NEAL: Have we grilled her enough?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well thank you very much.

20 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

21 MS. NEAL: Thank you, Jill.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Appreciate it. We'll  
23 take a brief break, and then we've got a kind of a  
24 floating schedule waiting to come back and pick up our  
25 legislative priority's discussion. We've got an



1 assessment discussion, board reports, and do we have a  
2 second section of public comment?

3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So, there we have  
5 it. Take a brief break.

6 (Meeting adjourned)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of May, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600