



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 12, 2014, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 12, 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)
Debora Scheffel (R)
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible) are we
2 prepared? All right. State Board's come back to order.
3 The next item on the agenda is a disciplinary proceeding
4 concerning OAC Case Number ED-2013-0012. Is there any
5 discussion? Then a -- a motion is in order.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Concerning
7 disciplinary proceedings OAC Case Number ED-2013-0012, I
8 move to affirm the order of the Administrative Law Judge
9 in its entirety.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?
11 Second on each (indiscernible) is there any opposition?
12 Hearing none, motion carried unanimously.

13 Next item is 15-01. It's a request for
14 emergency rules for the administration of the gifted
15 education grant program pursuant to 24-4-1036, Colorado
16 revised statute. The State Board is authorized to adopt
17 emergency rules if it finds that immediate adoption of the
18 rules is imperatively necessary to comply with the State
19 or federal law or federal regulation or for the
20 preservation of the public health, safety or welfare and
21 delay in adoption of the rules would be contrary to the
22 public interest.

23 Mr. Commissioner, staff.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
25 This is (indiscernible) grant program (indiscernible)



1 emergency rules and (indiscernible)

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Boyer.

3 MR. BOYER: Chairman (indiscernible) Board
4 Members, Commissioner Hammond, I'm Randy Boyer, assistant
5 commissioner in the exceptional student services unit.
6 And with me today is Karen Kindig (ph), a gifted education
7 consultant out of our office in the office of gifted
8 education.

9 We are here to co-present a set of
10 emergency rules to implement the grant application process
11 described in House Bill 14-1102, passed by the Colorado
12 general assembly in the last legislative session. This
13 particular legislation permits 58 administrative units to
14 apply for funds to offset costs incurred by employing a
15 qualified person to administer the gifted program and/or
16 the cost of universal screening. The purpose of the
17 emergency rules is to provide guidance about the grant
18 program so the State funds may be released to districts
19 and to BOCES as soon as possible for use in this fiscal
20 year. The amount of funds to be released this fiscal year
21 through the grant program is approximately 1.8 million
22 dollars.

23 The proposed emergency rules have been
24 shared with major stakeholder groups. There is agreement
25 for these emergency rules and there the desire to release



1 the grant program as soon as possible for distribution of
2 allocated funds is very high.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chairman Lundeen.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good afternoon.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good afternoon. For
6 Section 12.01(23), the proposed rules began with a
7 definition for screening grants as it not yet defined in
8 any other section of the existing rules. Universal
9 screening means this is a systematic assessment of all
10 students within a grade level of an administrative unit or
11 district for identifying exceptional ability or potential,
12 especially in under-represented populations, and/or
13 screening in conjunction with the creation of each
14 student's individual career and academic plan, known as
15 the ICAP.

16 Qualified personnel or qualified person
17 means an educator who also has an endorsement or higher
18 degree in gifted education. The meaning or definitions of
19 these terms are common and familiar to staff in gifted
20 education. Section 12.09(1) of the proposed rules
21 described the particular grants that are allowable in the
22 grant program. The first one, screening grants, whereby
23 administrative units may submit an application for costs
24 of conducting screening in a K-2 grade or in conjunction
25 with ICAP planning. The tool used may be a standardized



1 normed assessment like the cognitive abilities test or an
2 evidence-based classroom observation tool, like the
3 Kingore Observation Inventory.

4 The value of universal screening is that it
5 demonstrates good intent practice in trying to discover
6 exceptional potential in all student groups, especially
7 under-represented populations. The goal is that all
8 students have access to being recognized with exceptional
9 talents and abilities.

10 The second grant in 12.09(2) is a qualified
11 person grant that offsets costs up to a .5 FTE. For this
12 grant, administrative units may ask for funds to offset
13 costs for a current employee who is a qualified person or
14 provide evidence that an employee will work towards the
15 endorsement. For each type of grant request, if a
16 district or BOCES is already supporting the grant
17 function, the universal screener or qualified personnel,
18 then the district or BOCES must retain the district or
19 BOCES monies in the gifted program if grant monies are
20 awarded. Also, every administrative unit may apply for
21 one or more of the grant uses, universal screening at K-2
22 level, universal screening at the grade when the ICAP is
23 created or employing a qualified person.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chairman Lundeen.

25 Section 12.09(3) describes grant



1 distribution. Grant monies will be distributed based upon
2 available funds. The statute is clear that every
3 administrative unit should receive funds for universal
4 screenings in qualified person -- personnel if there are
5 sufficient funds in a given fiscal year. When monies are
6 sufficient, every administrative unit request would be
7 fully funded. As mentioned earlier for the fiscal -- for
8 this fiscal year, approximately 1.8 million be available
9 for grant distribution.

10 In a budget year in which general assembly
11 does not appropriate sufficient monies, the proposed rules
12 outline a procedure for distribution of funds. The rules
13 reiterate the language of the statute. The Department
14 shall distribute monies based on the order in which the
15 Department received application. Initially, there were
16 several interpretations (indiscernible) phrase based on
17 the order in which the Department received applications.

18 To be sure the condition of order -- and
19 incidentally why we are probably running a little bit late
20 in -- in asking the Board for approval of these emergency
21 rules, we asked for an informal opinion of the attorney
22 general's office. The resulting informal opinion gave
23 guidance, but ordered an -- a portion of distribution of
24 money. The language of the proposed rule reflects the
25 guidance in the informal opinion. Order of -- order for



1 distribution of funds is a three-day application period in
2 which every administrative unit may apply for a grant that
3 may include a request for one or more of the three
4 allowable uses.

5 Grant requests will be considered
6 separately on a day one, day two and day three basis until
7 all funds are expended. If there are sufficient monies to
8 fulfill total requests done day one, then every day one
9 applicant will receive funds. Section 12.09(3) also
10 provides guidance about distribution when insufficient
11 funds are available to fulfill total request on day one of
12 application.

13 In this situation, grants will be
14 proportionately distributed on a pro-rata basis which
15 means that all applicants day one will receive monies
16 based on a portion of available funds. If there are funds
17 remaining on day two or day three, the process of
18 proportionality based on pro-rata will be followed.

19 This method of proportional distribution is
20 valued because every administrative unit receives some
21 monies towards the desired local use of screening and
22 employing a qualified person up to a .5 FTE.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chairman Lundeen.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Section 12.09(4) and



1 (5) of the proposed rules describes simple steps for the
2 application window and procedures. For this first year,
3 if emergency rules are approved, we will announce a three-
4 day application window for December 2 through 4.
5 Administrative units are aware of this potential window
6 and encouraged to submit an application if funds are
7 desired.

8 In subsequent years, the three-day
9 application period will be April 15 through 17 beginning
10 in 2015. This time of year is reasonable as it coincides
11 with the same due date for gifted education proposed
12 budget submitted to CDE for the upcoming year and prepares
13 for timely distribution of funds that may be allocated
14 during the legislative session for the new fiscal year.

15 The application itself is simple; a cover
16 page, assurance page, and an application matrix that
17 records the type of grants being applied for with costs to
18 be incurred. All grant awards are one year in duration
19 since these are State funds. Administrative units may
20 apply each year. The reporting procedures are simple
21 asking for an accounting of how the monies were used, what
22 screening tool was used and actual costs.

23 MR. BOYER: Chairman Lundeen.

24 We encourage the State Board to adopt these
25 emergency rules in the immediate release of the grant



1 program to benefit students in education.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Questions?

3 Comments? Emergency rule -- oh, I'm sorry, I looked right
4 past you. You moved so quickly, I just didn't see you
5 move.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What -- what's the
7 change? What sort of funding and how much screening goes
8 on now versus how it'll be enhanced? Do you know?

9 MR. BOYER: Chairman Lundeen.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

11 MR. BOYER: If I understand the question in
12 terms of now and allocations in the future, you know,
13 really it will be up to the general assembly to make the -
14 -

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, that's not --
16 what's going on now in school districts? How many
17 students are being screened versus the opportunity to
18 expand that?

19 MR. BOYER: Oh, I -- I misunderstood the
20 question entirely. You know, it -- it -- I think it's a
21 tremendous issue around the cost of the instruments for
22 the screening so --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there one
24 instrument that's used throughout the state?

25 MR. BOYER: There is not to my knowledge.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, there are multiple
2 instruments that can be used. It can be a cognitive
3 abilities test like the (indiscernible) or the Naglieri.
4 It can also be a standardized observation tool, so they
5 have choice in the tools that they use.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are they significantly
7 different in cost?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are, yes. The --
9 do you want to know what that is, or?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, no, I --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Yes, they are
12 different in cost.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions?

15 Okay. I've got an administrative question.
16 I don't see in the agenda a parallel notice of permanent
17 rulemaking.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct, Mr.
19 Chair. Staff (indiscernible) notice of rulemaking to you
20 all in December --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- with additional
23 rules that don't (indiscernible) involve grant --

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So this is a
25 subset of what we will deal with then --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And this is the
3 emergency portion --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. I just want to be
6 clear on process. So I -- I think at this point, then, a
7 motion is in order.

8 MS. NEAL: I move pursuant to CRS 24-4-
9 103(6) CRS that immediate adoption of the rules for the
10 gifted education grant program is imperatively necessary
11 in order to allow the release of the grant application and
12 distribution of funds so that administrative units may
13 benefit from grant funds this school year.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?

15 Second down here, Dr. Scheffel. Jane.
16 Everybody. It's popular.

17 MS. NEAL: Everybody's popular.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Is there any
19 objection? Moved, seconded and no objection. Motion
20 carries. Thank you very much.

21 MR. BOYER: (indiscernible)

22 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

24 MS. NEAL: Imperative.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible)



1 imperatively necessary a legal-termed (indiscernible)

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's imperatively
3 necessary that we use it.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. That's kind of
5 what I figured.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this the only one
7 we had imperatively on?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, any -- all of the
9 emergencies, I've noticed that --

10 MS. NEAL: (indiscernible) an emergency is
11 imperative.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) first
13 time I've (indiscernible)

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We have more
15 imperatively necessary business to attend to. Item 15.02
16 is a request for emergency rules for the administration of
17 the Colorado school's award program. Pursuant to 24-4-
18 103(6), Colorado revised statutes, the State Board is
19 authorized to adopt emergency rules if it finds that
20 immediate adoption of the rules is imperatively necessary
21 to comply with State or federal law or federal regulation
22 or for the preservation of public health, safety or
23 welfare and delay and adoption of the rules would be
24 contrary to the public interest.

25 Commissioner.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2 I'm going to turn this over to (indiscernible) so we can
3 keep this going so we can do this quickly before we lose
4 some people here that we brought in. 16.01, I think
5 that's a big item we want to talk to you about, but this
6 is both the emergency rules and then notice of rulemaking
7 (indiscernible)

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, Mr. Chair, this
9 is a relatively straightforward addition to State statute
10 that was changed. The addition of some additional reward
11 for schools in the state. I'm going to just let Lisa --
12 Alisa give a quick overview and see if there's any
13 questions.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good afternoon, Mr.
15 Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good afternoon.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So last session, there
18 was a bill that passed on the high school academic growth
19 awards. What it requires us to do is to use the
20 classifications for high school football, so the six-man,
21 eight-man, 1-A, 2-A, 3-A, 4-A and 5-A classifications
22 based on school size. And for each classification, award
23 the high school with the highest growth --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Academic --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Academic growth --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

3 athletic growth for performance, it's academic growth.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then to award a
5 trophy to each one that's similar to the trophies given
6 for athletic performance.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So -- so the intent was
8 to create a parallel, we -- we admire academics as much as
9 we admire football players and so -- okay. So that's what
10 this is about?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not soccer, not
12 volleyball.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Pam --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There was -- Mr.
15 Chair, there was a small fiscal impact that was allocated
16 to buy trophies that are similar to what CHSAA providers
17 for their awards as well so that's something that will be
18 handed out. This is in addition to already established
19 awards that the Department does for schools and districts
20 and so you could see these rules being added into that
21 area of the rules that are currently existent.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I know as interesting as
23 it sounds when you start reeling off all the -- the -- the
24 football classifications, I certainly understand the
25 intent of what's trying to be done here, so. Questions?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So it's not an
2 award for football players, it's an award for academics of
3 the entire district?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: High school.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) school
6 --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very confused -- oh,
8 the school.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: School -- the high
10 school.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)
12 confusing to me. I thought we were giving awards for
13 growth in football players.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Any --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) could
16 understand that.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other questions?

18 MS. NEAL: You got it.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't still get it.
20 I'm sorry.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, Mr. Chair, can I
22 try again?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible) try, but
24 you go --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, no, no, I -- I'm
2 tired.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So just as
4 there are classifications based on size of high school in
5 the state; there's 5-A, there's 4-A, 3-A, and then it gets
6 all the way down to eight-man football --

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible) down to
8 eight-man football. That's where the real football
9 happens.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. So from the
11 large schools to the small schools, what I think the
12 intent of this legislation was when it recognized the same
13 -- schools throughout the state that are based on size,
14 the academic growth of the school overall. So based on
15 their SPF, the -- the performance that the school
16 demonstrates, schools in each of those categories, so very
17 small schools all the way to very large schools, will get
18 a recognition for their performance for growth.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it has nothing to
20 do with football?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. Just the
22 classifications. Wanted to use the -- the same
23 classification system that's used for football.

24 MS. NEAL: It makes sense when you get --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For -- for --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So basically you're
3 getting -- going from very small schools to very large
4 high schools and there's going to be an award for their
5 academic growth.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there was a piece
7 of legislation on this?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: When they hand out the
10 football trophy, they hand out an academic award.

11 MS. NEAL: You know, Elaine, how much
12 important time they send over there.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So I believe a
15 motion is in order.

16 MS. NEAL: I move that -- I move pursuant
17 to CRS 24-4-103(6) CRS that immediate adoption of the
18 rules for the administration of the Colorado school awards
19 program is imperatively necessary in order to allow
20 distribution of allocated funds for the expenditure in
21 this school year and so that the Department may begin
22 administering the -- the award.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second that.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. There's a second.
25 Without objection. Hearing none, motion carries.



1 Next item on the agenda is like the
2 previous. Item 15.03 is a request to issue a notice of
3 rulemaking concerning rules for the administration of
4 Colorado school awards program. As few words as possible.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't -- I don't
6 that we need -- this is the -- the introduction of the
7 formal rulemaking process for these specific rules --

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Everybody understands I
9 don't really want to railroad it through. Everybody
10 understands where -- we're turning the clock on and
11 creating a formal permanent rule to do what we just issued
12 the emergency rule on. So if there are no further
13 questions, a motion is in order on that.

14 MS. NEAL: I move to approve the notice of
15 rulemaking hearing for the rules for the administration of
16 the Colorado school awards program.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Second from Jane.
18 Hearing no opposition that motion carries as well. Thank
19 you very much.

20 16.01.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I'll go
22 ahead and turn that over to (indiscernible) and Keith --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Everybody take a big
24 breath and let's come back into this conversation 'cause
25 this is regarding the federal minimum requirements and



1 important conversation.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is one of the
3 final pieces you (indiscernible) that we said we'd bring
4 back to you based upon the information --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep, you're right on
6 time --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) so
8 (indiscernible) Alisa and (indiscernible)

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chair, at the -
13 - as you -- as you might know, we've been requested by the
14 State Board to look at assessment questions, look at
15 issues that have been brought up to the 12.02 task force,
16 relationships to assessments and school districts and
17 questions for waivers that they've been asking. Last
18 month, we presented on some information we received from
19 the United States Department of Education around guidance
20 from them, around assessments, federal law that requires
21 those assessments.

22 At that discussion I think even two months
23 ago, there was a request to really look at what other
24 states are doing around assessment, how they're using
25 growth in other states, how they're accomplishing their



1 work in relationship to federal minimums and so we worked
2 with the Center for Assessment. Alaina (ph) is here today
3 to talk through some of the reports that she's done, but I
4 think Alisa's actually going to kickstart the
5 presentation. Alaina will go through the research that
6 she's done and then we're open for questions.

7 If that's okay, we'll go ahead and proceed.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sounds like a good plan.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair. So today,
12 what we want to do, like Dr. Owen said, is provide an
13 overview of the report created by the Center for
14 Assessment. You all have a few different PowerPoints.
15 You've got this PowerPoint with you. We also gave you the
16 full PowerPoint created by the Center for Assessment. We
17 didn't want to go through that today; that's got lots of
18 details in it that you may want to use for reference, but
19 we wanted to keep a high level. If you have questions
20 about that that go deeper, just know that you've got that
21 reference there.

22 The other thing that you have with you is a
23 one pager that just gives you kind of an overview of
24 different kinds of growth models. I know there were some
25 questions last time we -- we met and talked about this.



1 So the Center for Assessment pulled together just a really
2 short (indiscernible) what those different growth models
3 are.

4 So today we're going to talk a little bit
5 about that assessment coverage in other states, the growth
6 methodologies that they use and how they do high school
7 accountability, especially when they may not use growth in
8 the same way we do or have continuous consecutive
9 assessments.

10 And then the -- and we're just going to
11 talk about some of the considerations we want to make if
12 we go in some of these different directions, what we need
13 to think about and start weighing.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Alisa.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. No problem.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this on?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, it's on.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, sorry. My name is
19 Elaina Diaz-Bolello (ph) and I'm with the Center for
20 Assessment and I'm pleased to be here. So let me start by
21 (indiscernible) it's a little awkward 'cause I'm going --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) I can
23 do slides for you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. That's better.

25 Okay. So I just want to say that my colleagues and I put



1 together this multi-state review. We were just asked by
2 the Department of State as well as the assessment task
3 force to put together information that gives a sense of
4 what's happening in terms of other states with assessment
5 programs being put in place as well as accountability
6 system designs. And this gives you a sense of the
7 different states that we are looking at. So this review
8 is confined to the set of 32 states in the slide. I just
9 want to be very clear about this because there could very
10 well be different things happening in other states, but
11 it's just that our -- our review was really just confined
12 to these states mainly because these are the states that
13 we work in.

14 So we have about 32 states as I mentioned.
15 You'll notice that there's an asterisk located next to the
16 names of some of these states and what this means is just
17 simply that we do a lot more work in the technical
18 advisory committees that provides guidance to the
19 Department of Education for these particular states so we
20 know a little bit more about this.

21 I also just want to throw out a little bit
22 of a caveat here because this review is based on the most
23 accurate information that we have at this moment, but I
24 think as many of you know, especially here in Colorado as
25 well, we're (indiscernible) a lot of flux and change. So



1 there's a lot of I would say new system design
2 considerations being put into place right now in some
3 states and there are other considerations about how that
4 impacts assessment design considerations as well so I just
5 want to make sure that you understood that because there
6 are things that are currently in flux as well.

7 Okay. So this gives you a sense of in
8 general what these 32 states are doing. What you're
9 finding is that more than half of these states are testing
10 at the federal minimum. So when I'm saying that, what the
11 common configuration is that they have one grade in high
12 school being tested. They either have that type of
13 configuration which is the most common or they do
14 something a little different. And when I say a little
15 different, it's because you have states, for example, like
16 Indiana as well as Pennsylvania and they have this banking
17 system and it's a little awkward because what this means
18 is -- just to give you an example to clarify what this
19 banking system means, say the grade of interest for
20 accountability is grade 11, but it could very well be the
21 case that as a grade 9 or a grade 10 student, you took
22 that English language test, that math test, those scores
23 get banked until you reach grade 11 and then it gets
24 released and reported for accountability. So those are --
25 doesn't happen in very many states, but it's just a



1 configuration that's unusual and that happens in a few
2 places.

3 The other states more than -- well, about
4 14 in Colorado sits in this area. States -- tests beyond
5 the federal minimum requirements, and what this typically
6 means is you have more than one grade tested in high
7 school or you have additional content areas such as social
8 studies or, say, science being tested across all of the
9 tested grades.

10 So we're asked by CDE to talk about what
11 are some of the key reasons why these states are moving in
12 the direction of say either reducing the number of
13 assessments that they're offering or for moving the
14 opposite direction of increasing assessments or coverage.
15 And I think the two reasons that we're finding across
16 states that reduce -- I think this is probably pretty
17 common here because I know a lot of conversations that are
18 taking place here in Colorado as well, and it has to do
19 with this reduced testing-time issue. this notion of
20 feeling like there's too much testing taking place, it
21 takes a lot of time away from teachers, from students.
22 Those are the types of conversations we're also finding in
23 other states that we're working in, but budgetary reasons
24 is certainly another one. So for example, states such as
25 Missouri that have end-of-course tests, they're whittling



1 back on the number of end-of-course tests that are being
2 offered for fiscal reasons as well.

3 In terms of reasons for increasing
4 assessments or coverage, I think it's important that for
5 the 14 states, at least many of them have gone in this
6 direction because there is this sense that they want to
7 articulate the value of making sure that social studies
8 and science achievement is not only valued, but also
9 progress monitored in the same way that math and English
10 language arts has been under No Child Left Behind. So
11 it's just making a statement that it's really important to
12 value all four content areas.

13 In terms of this desire to evaluate student
14 achievement for more grades in high school, these are
15 places such as, for example, Wisconsin and Hawaii who are
16 now currently -- so they haven't done it before, but they
17 will now this '14, '15 year, is to administer a suite of
18 ACT tests for grade 9, grade 10, as well as grade 11. And
19 this is because of the desire to evaluate and progress
20 monitor students as they are trying to meet college and
21 career-readiness goals.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That would be the Aspire
23 program?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, in some cases,
25 yes. So in Wisconsin, yes, you do have the Aspire as well



1 as the Work Keys. In Hawaii, they're not using Aspire,
2 they're using Explore Plan and the ACT.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But that's aligned with
4 ACT?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so I think this
8 third one is a little funny. It's a long tradition of
9 testing. And the reason why I just put that there is
10 because some of my colleagues say that, well, in a place,
11 for example, like Utah, they've done a lot of testing well
12 before No Child Left Behind. And they've also continued
13 to expand their assessment coverage such that their end-
14 of-course offerings are really quite comprehensive. So
15 for example, they test chemistry, they also test physics.
16 And these are tests that are offered to all students
17 across the state. So it's this -- for lack of a better of
18 way of putting it, it's this long tradition of testing if
19 you will.

20 And lastly, educator evaluations, a few
21 places such as North Carolina, for example, have really
22 expanded mainly end-of-course tests to make sure that
23 teachers have assessments available for use in their
24 evaluation system.

25 So these are just kind of the key reasons



1 why we're seeing many of these different places either
2 reduce or increase assessment coverage.

3 Okay. So for the next set of slides, it's
4 important to note that these slides really just pertain to
5 those 18 states who test at the federal minimum. Okay.
6 So this question about how do you measure growth is not
7 really actually quite about how, it's about can you do it,
8 and the answer is yes. You can do it using any model you
9 want. You can use the Colorado growth model, you can use
10 eval ed model, you can use the gain score, you can use
11 value tables. However way you want to do it, yes, you
12 can. But I think the crux is do you want to use it for
13 accountability. So that's a different question, but
14 that's really the reason why when you look here, 10 out of
15 18 states opt in not to use it for accountability.

16 Because in these context, you're only
17 dealing with one grade. So you only have one growth score
18 available for the entire high school if you will. And so
19 many of these places feel uncomfortable using those for
20 accountability purposes. But they still compute growth so
21 -- this is important. They still compute growth. They
22 provide the scoring reports to the districts and the
23 schools and they use it for other purposes. So they give
24 it to teachers, they give it to administrators, give them
25 a sense of what growth looks like at the high school, but



1 just for that one grade.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So hold on.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So none of the states
5 that are the federal minimum that are measuring growth use
6 at the high school level, the growth for -- for
7 accountability.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, actually only 10 -
9 - 10 out of 18 have opted not to. Eight out of 18 do.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. For
11 accountability.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you say that in
13 full sentences?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, sure. Sorry.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's my fault, not
16 your fault --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. No, no, no. It's
18 been a long day for all of you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have 18 states
21 who are testing at the federal minimum. And out of those
22 18, eight of them are using those growth scores as part of
23 their accountability system. Yeah, so sorry I wasn't
24 clear about that --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, you were --



1 you were clear --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, but the other 10
3 just decided, you know what? We just don't feel
4 comfortable using it for accountability. And it's not
5 across the board so just I'll throw out one example,
6 Montana, for example, is (indiscernible) state and they
7 did a lot of field -- they did their field test last year,
8 but their field test design was such that they didn't feel
9 comfortable using any of the assessment scores for
10 accountability.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Who were the eight
12 states --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry?

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- is that in the -- who
15 are the eight states that are?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's see.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) you
18 got those four.

19 So it's the four at the bottom;
20 Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Delaware and North Dakota --

21 MS. NEAL: Nebraska, Delaware --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sorry, I didn't see --

24 MS. NEAL: I didn't either --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's on the side --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)
2 MS. NEAL: It doesn't give all eight.
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nebraska
4 (indiscernible)
5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So it -- okay, so it
6 gives four of 'em here. Well, offline question. I don't
7 have to know now --
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's okay.
9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- but I am curious
10 (indiscernible)
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you've told us the
13 numbers. What are your learnings from the -- from the
14 division of states, eight -- eight are doing it one way,
15 10 are doing it another way --
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. That's just
18 kind of facts --
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- but what's the
21 context of -- what are we learning from the two different
22 approaches in terms of what's working and what's not
23 working?
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's not -- again,
25 it's not a question of what's working or not what's



1 working, it's more like are these the type of data points
2 that you want to use with an accountability system if you
3 only have growth scores available for one grade. That's
4 it. So you're saying this is growth, it's only from one
5 grade and is it representative of the entire high school.
6 So that's the crux that many of these states are dealing
7 with in balancing out the use of this information for
8 accountability --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I was -- so
10 we've been looking -- thinking about that a lot. So for
11 example, we can simulate what this might look, and we'll
12 do that come January once we get through all of the school
13 requests and all of that where we can run our growth model
14 measuring pretending like we don't have a ninth grade
15 assessment and run from eighth grade to tenth grade and
16 see what kind of growth percentiles we get from that and
17 we can compare those, what the medians would be for a high
18 school with skipping ninth grade to what we have currently
19 when we've got eighth to ninth to tenth. And that'll give
20 us some indication of how -- what quality that data is if
21 we skip a grade and see does it still tell us about the
22 same information or is it telling us something very
23 different.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the policy question
25 here, and I think that's a good question to T up, is what



1 correlation would we accept?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Speaking to this issue
4 of rightsizing our assessment footprint, you know, if we
5 get an 85, 90, 95 percent correlation, we might want to
6 argue whether that's adequate or not.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I just want to put a
9 fine point on that. And go ahead, please.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, you might
11 go back to the discussion we had earlier today about cut
12 scores. If you have less confidence in that piece or you
13 feel like you might adjust it down, you might take that
14 percentage of the points that are earned from that and
15 reduce that, too. So there's ways to adjust the points we
16 were talking about this morning based on how you want to
17 weight that against, you know, if there's a decision to
18 just go to federal minimums --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think those
21 value, you know, judgment discussions that we could have.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. So I think
23 a follow-up question that we (indiscernible) then how do
24 you go about say evaluating adequate growth and what does
25 that mean within the context of these growth measures that



1 are being used across different places. And when you're
2 dealing with the Colorado growth model, the typical thing
3 that we do look at is the adequate growth percentile so
4 it's that growth to standard measure that tells you, you
5 know, how -- what percentage of your kids are catching up
6 or keeping up. So I think what's important to state here
7 that for all the states who are using CGMs at the federal
8 minimum, only one state uses the AGP. None of the other
9 states use it, and there's a very good reason why. They
10 don't use it because you only have one grade in high
11 school so that's the (indiscernible) so when you're
12 talking -- when you're saying anything about growth, it's
13 just really growth. They make growth, but they do make
14 proficiency or do they not. So that's really the only
15 conversation you had.

16 You can't -- what happens is if you lose
17 say those intermediate grades -- so for example, if you
18 end grade is eleventh grade and say you remove grade nine
19 and grade ten, and so you have nothing in between, but
20 just grade eight and then grade 11. So what you're --
21 what you lose, then, is the checkpoints at grade nine and
22 at grade 10 where once say in the past you're able to
23 identify the kids who are making progress toward say
24 proficiency by grade 11 that information you no longer
25 have. So that's kind of the trade off when thinking about



1 the loss of those grades if you decide to go with some
2 type of an assessment program design where you only have
3 one high school grade evaluated.

4 And then for the other types of measures,
5 it's just simply value added --

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm sorry.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Back up and walk me
9 through that so I'm understanding clearly --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No problem. Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Are you -- so you were
12 talking about the individual student there in that --
13 those comments --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- but that's separate
16 from accountability --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- so -- so please
19 separate those issues for me because that's where this
20 conversation tends to get muddled --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, no problem.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We apparently in my mind
23 have too large of a testing footprint for accountability
24 purposes. I'm all in giving teachers what they need to
25 see where the student is in the educational process --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- so explain that to me
3 'cause I don't think I got it clearly.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, no problem. And
5 what I'll do, I'll explain it within the context of your
6 framework here in Colorado. I think that'll be most
7 helpful because things are already aggregated. So with
8 the adequate growth percentiles you have, for example, a
9 target, right, that's set for school and that says on
10 average where -- what is that target that students need to
11 meet in order to be, say, proficient or to maintain
12 proficiency. So that's what that target represents.

13 And so what -- all I'm just saying is that
14 when you remove, for example, that grade nine and grade 10
15 and you only have grade 11 that information gets lost in
16 the discussion because you no longer have those
17 checkpoints. That's all. So you just -- you can no
18 longer say, you know, are these -- on average, are our
19 grade nine students on target to meeting proficiency or
20 maintaining proficiency. That conversation can no longer
21 be had because you don't have that checkpoint any longer.
22 That's all.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So a piece of our
25 accountability model is lost. A piece of it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A piece. Depending --
2 again, depending on what -- what kind of design and
3 considerations you have in mind. So there's no -- you
4 know, another thing just to -- to put out there, too, is
5 this reporting piece that I mentioned in other states.
6 Just because they don't use it for accountability, they do
7 it use it for reporting purposes. So they do distribute
8 this information to schools and to districts to look at
9 and to evaluate as well so it's not -- it's not that the
10 information cannot generated, but it is lost if you don't
11 have that test so that's a good point to make there.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I'd just add, you
14 could still have an adequate growth percentile, you could
15 put it in like Oregon does. It's just does that give you
16 any additional information and is it really -- when --
17 when you're testing at your final grade, there's no where
18 for kids to be on track or not, they're already there or
19 not. So you could have a number there, but if it's not
20 actionable and not really adding anything else then you
21 probably wouldn't -- a lot of other states have chosen not
22 to include it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This question was
24 asked -- and again, we're talking about the federal
25 minimum states -- and the question was asked, you know,



1 well, how does high school accountability look like in the
2 states where they don't use growth. And to be honest, it
3 doesn't look all that different from, say, think about
4 your own performance frameworks and when growth is not
5 available for a certain school, then the waiting gets
6 shifted around. That's exactly what really happens in
7 many of these states is that there's a redistribution of
8 those weights so it's like achievement -- achievement gaps
9 and an emphasis on the career college readiness indicator.

10 And you have a couple of metrics here that
11 fall under that indicator that are typically seen in many
12 of these states and some of these you see in your own
13 performance frameworks as well. But this just gives you a
14 sense that, you know, there's just this redistribution, if
15 you will, of weights based on what these states value and
16 typically this would be the career and college readiness
17 component.

18 So this is -- I thought this was pretty
19 interesting because this gives you a sense of the
20 weighting for states that are testing at the federal
21 minimum and that factor in growth in their accountability
22 system just for -- this is just for high schools. And
23 what you're seeing is that there's a pretty wide range,
24 right? So it's very -- it's pretty variable. You have,
25 for example, Nevada tests accounting for growth at 10



1 percent all the way to 40 percent for Pennsylvania.

2 And I think the key take-away point here
3 really is that there's no way right answer or one right
4 way to think about how much weight do you want to put on
5 growth. It's more of a matter of what are the core values
6 of your system and to what extent do you want to put as
7 much weight knowing that again this is a growth measure
8 that only represents one grade, right?

9 So I think that's the struggle that many of
10 these stakeholders have as they're trying to figure out
11 the design of their system and to think about how much
12 weight do we really want to put on growth relative to all
13 the other pieces that are in our system. And Colorado's
14 there just as a point of reference.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you just said as --
16 but it only pertains to one grade, but I'm assuming that
17 the weight is the same for the other grades as well?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. So there's a
20 different weight for the ones --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct. Yeah.
22 So -- so, I mean, for example, in -- I'm just trying to
23 think of -- Massachusetts is a good one. The growth
24 indicator is weighted at 50 percent for high school and
25 elementary school --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Yeah, so for
3 elementary middle. And so what that tells you, then, is
4 because there's a lot more information about growth at
5 those levels that they want to weight that information
6 more so than in the high schools when you only have one
7 grade tested.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just we talked
9 about this this morning, but in Colorado the 50 percent is
10 by statute, not by Department.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

12 The -- the statute says growth and post-
13 secondary workforce readiness needs to be weighed the
14 most. And then the rest was left up for stakeholder and
15 Board input on how it was weighted. So in Colorado's high
16 school and district level, growth is 50 percent. At the
17 elementary and middle, growth is 75 percent when you look
18 at overall growth and then growth gaps that comes --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what is
20 disaggregated growth?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's the growth gap --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it's looking for
24 English language learners and free/reduce lunch
25 (indiscernible) students that need to catch up.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so I think I'm
2 going to turn it over to you, Alisa, because we get into a
3 set of considerations that you want to --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we just wanted to
5 pull out for you all some of things that we think we would
6 want to consider and talk about as we -- as we go down
7 this path. One is really thinking about the value of
8 growth in high school. What should the weight be? How
9 much do we value it? Do we value just the median growth
10 percentile, that normative part of growth? Do we value
11 having adequate growth knowing if kids are on track or
12 not? Those are just -- there's not a right or wrong
13 answer to it, it's just things that we need to have
14 conversations about and discussions about.

15 Likewise -- and this probably more my bias
16 or where I come from, but it's what the validity is of
17 measuring growth between non-consecutive grades. So if
18 we're measuring from eighth grade to tenth grade or eighth
19 grade all the way up to eleventh grade, what's the meaning
20 behind that number and does that have. Is it valid in
21 terms of just the data that we get and then do
22 stakeholders -- does teachers and principals and
23 superintendents buy into that number -- into that
24 percentile and say, yeah, that's something that really
25 does reflect what we do or not. That's a conversation we



1 need to have both for school and district accountability
2 and also to think about for educator evaluation and how it
3 gets used since it's written into that statute as well.

4 And then also like we talked about this
5 morning, thinking about what other indicators are
6 available for high schools is that post-secondary
7 workforce readiness piece that we're already going down
8 that road of looking at what others measures we could have
9 to measure that. And that plays into this 'cause if
10 you're going to have less assessments at that level, what
11 other things might we value in holding schools and
12 districts accountable at the high school.

13 So we're talking about that anyway and I
14 think it just plays in -- like, that plays into the
15 conversation with and without assessment changes as well,
16 but I think it's something as we looked at what the other
17 states are doing, they sometimes have more post-secondary
18 workforce readiness measures than we currently do if
19 they're not using growth.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Such as?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're using AP,
22 percent of students with dual enrollment, IB as well as
23 with AP. Maybe the SATS -- or ACT, SAT performance we
24 use. We use just the composite score of ACT, other states
25 will use percent of students at benchmark overall and by



1 the different content areas (indiscernible)

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, remediation is
3 another area --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that a few, not
6 all, but a few states look at.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair --

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible)

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I think one of the
10 issues, and Keith can describe it further, it's kind of
11 two different issues. The main one is -- I mean, there's
12 a policy decision on what -- what 1202 and what the
13 legislature will do from a testing standpoint. Okay.
14 Then how -- what do you do based upon that decision and
15 how do you adjust your growth model? But we want to make
16 sure everybody knows going in there if they drop the two
17 grades, it does affect the accountability system and how
18 that accountability system looks and what you're hearing
19 can vary depending upon our values. And that also feeds
20 back into the taskforce so the group of superintendents
21 and others getting together to discuss some of these
22 issues to make recommendations back to us and you. So I
23 just -- I don't mean to confuse the issue, but there's two
24 different things kind of going on here, but they're hand
25 in hand.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, the other
2 thing I think that's important -- I think the Commissioner
3 hit on it -- is there's a variety of opinions about the
4 best path forward and so there's not uniform agreement at
5 least in the conversations we have had around the state
6 with superintendents about what absolutely just do this
7 one thing or we want stay with the current system. I
8 think there's a spectrum of where people fall on their
9 approach to this and there are schools -- high schools in
10 the state, and there are principals, there are school
11 district superintendents that absolutely value having
12 year-to-year information on their high school kids and
13 whether the system is making progress with those kids and
14 absolutely want the growth measures as a part of that.
15 They're adamant about it. We've heard from multiple
16 people as we've gone out.

17 Then there's on the other hand, there's
18 people that feel like they've got other ways to do that
19 internally, locally. They don't feel like they need that
20 from the state and they feel that can be accomplished
21 elsewhere and they'd like to go to federal minimum. So
22 you've got a variety of opinions I guess based on the use
23 of this current system over the past five years and I
24 think it's going to be a policy decision in -- in the end.
25 And I think as long as we've given everybody good



1 information about consequences, ramifications, choices,
2 values, and I think we've done a good justice to the
3 current system and it think people can make good decisions
4 going into next year that impact our overall
5 accountability system going forward.

6 Instructionally -- and I think what happens
7 in schools and systems is you do get some superintendents
8 and some school principals that absolutely use their local
9 data and their local assessments much more heavily than
10 they use the state information.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At the high school
12 level?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I'm being
14 specific about high school because this, you know, we
15 haven't really talked and there's not anything right now -
16 - I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Believe me.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible) stay
20 with it.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're -- there's no
24 real consideration with the current ESA configuration that
25 would really change -- alter three through eight much



1 right now. If that happens in the future, then I think
2 it's another discussion that we would need to having, but
3 since this is primarily the flexibility that's currently
4 available under federal law, it's primarily a high school
5 flexibility question when it comes to growth because
6 there's just -- there doesn't look to be any change that
7 would happen --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, but I mean,
9 that's why I asked the question whether there's schools
10 that are actually using assessments at the high school
11 level that they think are better 'cause I -- I am aware of
12 many assessments being used K-8. I don't hear a lot about
13 assessments other than AP which is just a certain
14 percentage of the students and it's -- I'm not sure it's
15 the group of students that we worry about the most, I
16 mean, I'm -- I'm a little bit worried about how do we get
17 -- how do we trigger the need for more intervention for
18 kids when we find out at the end of ninth grade, which is
19 when push often comes to shove for our students, that
20 interventions are -- immediate interventions are
21 appropriate for a certain group of kids, and they're
22 probably not the AP, IB kids. That's where -- that's
23 where I worry.

24 And then we also have the districts asking
25 to do their own graduation requirements and lower those



1 requirements, and pretty soon, we have made very little
2 progress -- pretty soon we've made very little progress
3 for kids.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's a fair
7 point, and I think it's one that we've heard lots of
8 different ideas about how they accomplish it. I think
9 some high school use end-of course, they use their
10 syllabus that teachers rely heavily on instructional
11 program that they deliver and that constitutes the grades.
12 They use AP, they use IB, they use honors courses. I
13 mean, there's a variety of ways that they get at it, but
14 they feel like that's more relevant. And then they have
15 ACT when they get into eleventh grade and they feel like
16 those pieces are more meaningful than the state
17 assessments that they're giving and they're not maybe
18 utilizing the information they get back from the state
19 around growth, those pieces as heavily, because they feel
20 like they've got it covered locally.

21 And that's not the case everywhere, I mean,
22 again, this -- I've seen opinion on this as I've been out
23 and talking to superintendents it's on everywhere on the
24 spectrum of assessment. People value that and people
25 don't value it, and there's just a variety of opinions out



1 there on it.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And I'd like to take
3 that a little further kind of following along on
4 Angelika's question. What's the -- what's the number and
5 profile of these various -- do they gather around certain,
6 you know, leadership styles or student population or is
7 there some way to figure out why they're batching where
8 they're batching in terms of their perception to the
9 situation?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair. I -- I
11 don't see patterning that way. You would think maybe
12 high-poverty districts (indiscernible) growth and then I'm
13 out in some of the rural areas and I hear how they value
14 it. I was -- you know, George Welsh, talking to him,
15 listening to him talk about Center, Colorado and how
16 that's an absolute part of the reason why they feel like
17 they're a performance district now is that they've been
18 focusing so heavily on that piece.

19 So, and then you hear some large urban
20 districts saying that they don't value the state
21 information as much, then you hear Denver Public Schools
22 saying they do. I've heard a variety like I said. I
23 can't say it's clustering. Maybe some of the other staff
24 here that have been talking to people have a better
25 understanding of that, but it just -- it hasn't seemed



1 like it's clustered anywhere for me.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

3 I'm sorry.

4 MS. NEAL: No, go ahead.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: My peripheral vision
6 gets narrower as the day --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)
8 question is probably more --

9 MS. NEAL: What?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead (indiscernible)
11 takes another direction.

12 MS. NEAL: You're going another direction.
13 Okay. I will -- I appreciate that. A lot of talk about
14 value here and one of the things that really strikes me
15 and I made the earlier reference to the social studies
16 group, and I know that they get very concerned when they
17 go to these meetings and people say, well, drop -- you
18 know, drop the state -- drop the history test, drop the --
19 and. But that is the local -- those of us who are
20 concerned about this huge big federal test, I think it's
21 really important. I really appreciate everything you said
22 because -- and I know it's difficult and I know, you know,
23 different schools are going in different directions, but
24 if you -- if you want to have something that the schools
25 value instead of just, oh we have to do this 'cause Robert



1 Hammond said you had to do this, you know, something that
2 they really could work on and value. I like, you know, I
3 know there's a lot of work to be done there, but I really
4 like that direction.

5 And I know that Angelika, you said you'll
6 find -- you don't make enough progress, but that's overall
7 progress. It's not the progress that this school does and
8 that they value and if we give them a chance and work this
9 way, I think at least it'll be something that they do
10 value and that they do -- instead of just this is
11 something that's imposed upon us from above. So I like
12 everything you've said. I think it's great and it is --
13 it brings more of that local piece back into the -- the
14 work, so.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Comment or question?
16 We'll give you a question here. You can answer both of
17 'em. Go ahead, Jane.

18 MS. GOFF: (indiscernible) recently it
19 comes up periodically two things. Has -- has anything
20 changed about the -- the match between our standards and
21 the ACT set? Have we made progress? I know when we first
22 started talking about this, 2007, '08-ish, when we knew
23 this was going to become an issue, ACT -- one gentleman --
24 it's been a while, but he did say to me -- we were talking
25 about it and he said we are starting to work on aligning



1 the standards with ACT because they're not there yet. So
2 what is -- what's the progress on that? Have we noticed
3 that? And I'm sorry I'm soundin' like I'm behind years,
4 but not really.

5 The other question that has come up
6 recently, is it -- I know that this was big in the
7 discussion with higher ed about two things actually. Tied
8 in with the graduation guidelines endorsed diploma
9 admission requirements remediation determination, was the
10 idea of something on transcripts? So as we keep hearing
11 all of these comments, we all do, this is not worth
12 anything of relevance to me. I have no interest in this.
13 I am -- I'm a senior -- we're in the middle of a perfect
14 example. I'm a senior this year. I'm already -- I've
15 already applied. I'm already in. I'm in the middle of
16 doing it. Good questions. It's fair questions, but what
17 -- what can we say with certainty about their -- their
18 performance on a test whether it's the social studies test
19 or whether it's the next PARCC, whatever. What can we
20 tell them that they can count on or not yet and is it
21 possible that that -- that we're -- we need to maybe
22 venture sooner in a different way toward really talking
23 about and talking informatively around the whole idea of
24 the endorsed diploma and our graduation guidelines because
25 I'm feeling that there's a lot of misunderstanding brewing



1 up to the top about that again out there.

2 I'm just curious. What's the -- what can
3 we tell people about the transcript or final record -- not
4 the same thing necessarily -- what can we -- what can we
5 tell people about the alignment as we know it between ACT,
6 Aspire in our standards? Those are -- those are where it
7 all falls primarily. Thank you.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

9 So I'm going to take your second question
10 first. Within the legislation, there is a requirement
11 that state assessment results are included on report cards
12 and on permanent records if the results are available in
13 time to include those. So historically, as we look at
14 TCAP and CSAP and we got those results in about July,
15 those results were not available in time to include on
16 report cards or on -- within the permanent record. With
17 the high school currently at the fall, those results will
18 be available in time to include on the final report cards
19 and included in the permanent record. ACT is the test
20 that is required to be included on transcripts. So that's
21 the requirement in terms of official documentation.

22 You referenced a couple of different ways
23 that maybe the assessment could become more relevant to
24 our high school seniors. I think we need to do that very
25 cautiously to make sure that we are not stepping on local



1 control issues, but is it a possibility that locally folks
2 could decide that the state test could play a role? Seems
3 legitimate. Again, I don't see Colorado going to a spot
4 where somebody were going to have graduation requirements
5 where kids have to pass the state tests at this point in
6 time at least.

7 Then ACT and alignment, we have ongoing
8 conversations with ACT, and literally, there's a
9 conversation going on upstairs to try to keep pace with
10 what it is that they're doing in terms of their system and
11 their assessment. They have not yet made available
12 publicly the alignment that -- alignment study that they
13 did last winter. They indicated that they're not planning
14 on making that publicly available. They will give a high-
15 level summary. They have indicated that they're making
16 adjustments to that test in light of that, but again, in
17 terms of what we've been able to see, we haven't seen that
18 information.

19 When we look at ACT specifically in
20 relationship to the high school standards that have been
21 adopted at this point in time, when you look at the ACT,
22 about 85 percent of that test deals with, like, algebra,
23 intermediate algebra, and then 15 percent of that test
24 deals with higher portions of mathematics. When we look
25 at the currently planned PARCC assessment and we look at



1 that final test, that's flipped on its head. So 85
2 percent of the final PARCC assessment is algebra two with
3 15 percent of it being the earlier content, so there are
4 some differences there.

5 We also know that historically with ACT,
6 Colorado has not included the writing assessment as part
7 of our program. Again, I think we need to have
8 conversations about what it is that we value as a state
9 and what needs to come from the state as opposed to what
10 could come from local assessments, but that would need to
11 be I think a pretty serious conversation.

12 Also, when we look at the type of writing
13 that ACT is including, they are including the same types
14 of writing that they have had historically for the last
15 decade which is that writing which is disconnected from
16 reading and processing and being able to cite evidence and
17 things like that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what I was
19 asking about I think --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I -- one --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. Follow up.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll talk fast. Back
24 to the transcripts question. Considering this year we are
25 in a transition, we're also really in -- in the -- in the



1 river -- on the bridge of accountability, because of that,
2 everything's offset. Are districts told that any CMAS
3 test taken this year which -- and then we're talking any
4 of them -- that those -- because they are going to be
5 complete or at least -- let's just narrow it to our
6 science and social studies.

7 I'm talkin' seniors in high school. If the
8 tests will have been finished and report cards and final -
9 - final report cards will -- there will have been time to
10 put something together on that, are districts required to
11 include those on their transcripts or is that a district
12 option because there's A to Z interpretations of that out
13 there. And I -- I'm concerned about how -- I -- I said
14 I'll check what we know and get back you. I haven't been
15 able to provide them with an answer, so.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

17 I will look again and pull up exact wording
18 for you --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) get
21 sent out to all of you. What is does reference, again, in
22 terms of the -- what I'll refer to as CMAS assessments is
23 if the results are available --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- districts are



1 required to include on that final report card and in the
2 student's permanent record which is different than the
3 reference that they have for the ACT test which says must
4 be included on the transcript --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's -- there's the
6 key word. It's the and/or thing --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that's got
9 everybody goofy.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So let me pull up that
11 exact language just to, again, verify. And frankly, I
12 don't think there's been a lot of conversation about the
13 fact that with this fall testing that scores are going to
14 be available.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, and that along
16 with what's the timing of revealing that to people?
17 Because if one district or one school here hears a
18 variation of the explanation to begin with and then at a
19 different time, how soon before a new CMAS test is dropped
20 on them or how -- how soon -- how soon before the scores
21 do come back, which will be a little later anyway, people
22 I think expect that. But it's -- it's becoming one of
23 those oops if only we had thought to provide details on
24 that -- that kind of thing, so thanks. Whatever you can
25 do is appreciated.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: It would seem to me that
3 what's critical in terms of what's on the transcript or
4 not has to do with what colleges want, whether they want
5 the CMAS information or not --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and are we hearing from
8 them that they would like that information for evaluation
9 for entry? And I'm not talking about just four year. It
10 could be all higher ed. I mean, that -- my understanding
11 was that was the expectation so that a university would
12 have -- or a college would have some assurance that there
13 would be no remediation needs given CMAS math and language
14 arts score.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Mr. Chair.

16 So looking at our high school graduation
17 guidelines and then the higher ed admissions policies, so
18 there was work done to align the two, and if you remember
19 in our high school graduation guidelines in the menu of
20 options, students can demonstrate minimum competency
21 through --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Through those --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- a PARCC score or
24 through the CMAS scores. They can use that. And then
25 what higher ed has done is had a policy that essentially



1 aligns the two and looks at it for admissions purposes as
2 well, looking at the PARCC scores and the CMAS scores are
3 under consideration. Of course, they have it right now in
4 sort of a draft phase because they don't have those scores
5 and they haven't been able to validate them and see how
6 they work in an admissions or placement purposes, but it's
7 teed up to be part of their conversation.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam.

9 MS. MANAZEC: Just part of the conversation
10 or (indiscernible) did you say that that was just --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's in their draft
12 policy -- admissions policy --

13 MS. MANAZEC: (indiscernible) two things
14 that (indiscernible) is their PARCC scores and their --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct, they have --
16 correct. It's in combination with the other kinds of
17 things they look at for admissions purposes.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. Berman.

19 MS. BERMAN: Well --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Gantz-Berman. Elaine
21 Gantz-Berman. You awake down there?

22 MS. BERMAN: I guess the question that's
23 kind of been circulating in my mind is I tend to look at
24 the states that are doing the best in terms of student
25 achievement and I keep going to Massachusetts. I don't



1 know if Maryland's in there, but are there any -- how are
2 they putting together their -- their package of
3 assessments and looking at (indiscernible) growth and are
4 they at the federal minimum and how are they -- just how
5 are they approaching it because they seem to be doing a
6 good job?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, yes, they are
8 doing a good job. So thinking in terms of Massachusetts
9 especially, but this is a state that is currently --
10 there's a lot of things at play so let me just say why.
11 So right now they're in the process of doing two things.
12 They -- one, they do test at the federal minimum so they
13 only do have a grade 10 test as of now.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: This is Massachusetts?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Please proceed.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they are now in
18 the process of allowing districts to either go in two
19 different directions, that is either take on the PARCC
20 assessment. It's kind of what they call choose your own
21 adventure is how they phrase it. You either take the
22 PARCC assessments or you take the current Massachusetts
23 assessments. So it's going to be interesting how that
24 plays into growth, right? Because it causes a whole bunch
25 of problems in terms of comparability across the different



1 schools, but also when you're using the legacy
2 assessments, for example, as priors for the PARCC
3 assessment. So there's a lot of places that are in
4 current conversations about how is this going to look like
5 and what -- what -- there's a lot of analysis that they
6 want to do first before they make any firm decisions. So
7 even --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Didn't they have end-
11 of-course assessments also or do the just go through --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a graduation
13 (indiscernible) it's -- yeah, so it's a graduation
14 requirement, but it's not factored into the accountability
15 rating.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, but there are
17 other assessments --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- besides just the
20 federal minimum --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that's the --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. And they

25 --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Elaine is the -- is
2 the choice that -- Mr. Chair.

3 Is the choice there a phase in, phase out
4 to allow two assessments to keep both assessments forever
5 because I -- what I had heard was that was a phase in,
6 phase out.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a phase in, phase
8 out --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- but it's still --
11 I mean, you still have this kind of strange conundrum if
12 you will where you have a couple of schools and districts
13 that are going down one path and others going down another
14 path and, you know, you can no longer take a look or stack
15 up all the schools across the -- across the state and --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So how are they norming
17 it? So I'm --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're not --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: They're not trying to
20 norm those at all?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, not at this -- I
22 mean, right now, they're in that state where they're
23 trying to figure out what -- what does this mean. What do
24 we do with these results? How do we communicate this to -
25 -



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So in Colorado speak,
2 they're using the equivalent of the PARCC and the TCAP?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep, they're using the
4 PARCC and the TCAP --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the district
6 chooses?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You choose whether you
8 want to do the TCAP or you choose whether you want to go
9 on with the PARCC and then you have to phase out
10 (indiscernible) go into PARCC.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

12 And in their case in dealing with -- I
13 think their intent is to go to their new assessment, phase
14 out their old, but they're giving districts a choice this
15 year. They're different than we are. They still have a
16 valid assessment. We don't any longer. TCAP is no longer
17 valid and so that -- they're in a different place than we
18 are. We're more in a (indiscernible) about that.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So back to an earlier
20 question. The eight that are using federal minimums, and
21 for growth, Massachusetts must be one of them?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are using growth,
23 but not for high school.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So just growth --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. They are -



1 - I'm sorry. They are using growth for high school and
2 they only weighed it at 35 percent I believe.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So we got
4 Pennsylvania, Nebraska, North Dakota, Delaware and
5 Massachusetts. I'm still lookin' for three so somebody
6 help me out with those three remaining states.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So North -- North
8 Dakota is one, but it's one -- it's a little odd because
9 North Dakota is -- they've been playing around with a
10 pilot and I think that pilot may have phased out, but they
11 still use growth results for the purpose of educator
12 evaluations. So if you're a high school teacher, you have
13 growth results, those get factored into educator
14 evaluations. So that's one state.

15 The other state would be -- I don't have
16 that information in front of me right now.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I ask a question
18 what --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You bet. And -- and
20 we'll wrap this up here pretty quick.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So for those --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Delaware, that's
23 right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Delaware?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There you go.
2 Delaware.

3 MS. NEAL: Delaware.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's on the list. I'm
5 still looking for three. That's okay. We'll get 'em
6 later.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)
8 Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon
9 Pennsylvania.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Hawaii and Nevada.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can send you guys a
12 spreadsheet --

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Oregon. I've got
14 'em all now. I'm being selfish. I only care about
15 myself; I have 'em. I'm okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So for the -- for the
17 states that are -- are members of PARCC or smarter
18 balance, will there be any uniformity in how they decide
19 to measure growth and measure achievement or is it going
20 to be all over the board like -- like what we've just
21 seen?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want to take a
23 stab at that first?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- individual states --
2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you understand my
3 question or do you want me to --
4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think so.
5 Mr. Chair, do you want me to have Joyce or
6 --
7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) part
9 of the consortium with the growth components.
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, Joyce --
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)
12 couldn't hear --
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's all right.
14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think there's a
15 couple of different possible questions that you are asking
16 so I just want to get clarification.
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure, sure.
18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: First of all, you had
19 mentioned achievement so will there be shared cut scores;
20 there will be shared cut scores at the PARCC -- across the
21 PARCC states. There is a goal of having some
22 comparability even across PARCC states and
23 (indiscernible); I'm going to push that aside for now.
24 Then PARCC does intent to also provide a growth metric.
25 More than likely, it's going to be very reflective of



1 Colorado is the conversation that I am hearing, but it's
2 important to keep in mind that the accountability use of
3 that metric or of that data is going to be determined by
4 individual states.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I think I got
6 it. I think you answered my question. Well, I guess -- I
7 guess the chart that really startled me was the one on
8 page nine where there's such variability in terms on the -
9 - on the weighting of the accountability framework. I
10 mean, I -- it's very dramatic so I -- I guess I was
11 thinking, gosh, this is where we're going once we have the
12 consortium, so.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, and that's a
14 good point. I think just to be very clearly, though, this
15 are weights that are current. These weights will change.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they will change
18 dramatically, especially right now we're starting up work
19 in Nevada. And they want a complete revamp of their
20 accountability systems so a complete revamp means probably
21 revisiting weights that have been attributed so that 10
22 percent could very well shift upwards. That's not clear.
23 We spoke with Kansas as well recently, and Kansas is not a
24 federal minimum state, but just --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I think it is.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is, but it doesn't
5 currently -- this is what -- it doesn't report on growth,
6 but they're in the process of thinking about including
7 growth now so it's going to move -- it's going to shift
8 places and they're going to generate growth scores because
9 they believe that, well, for many of our high poverty
10 schools, it's one of the few ways in which we can evaluate
11 what's happening -- really what's happening performance in
12 those schools so it's an important value that we want to
13 incorporate into our framework, so having said that now,
14 they're entering conversations right now about let's think
15 about ways in which we want to consider growth and build
16 that into the accountability framework moving forward for
17 next year.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Instead of just having
19 a score within a category, Colorado, its values
20 (indiscernible) and it's been recognized for that. Its
21 value has been based upon growth and that's what -- why
22 you see that and that's always been important that growth
23 is so important in all the different groups and subgroups
24 to see how kids are doing. That's -- that's been
25 (indiscernible) that doesn't mean that that won't change



1 in the future, but it's been important to the state.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Last question.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not exactly a
4 question, but it seems as though looking at the different
5 states, number one, we're all in flux trying to figure out
6 what's the best thing to do. Number two, if we talk about
7 Massachusetts, they may have less assessments for
8 accountability, but they have high stakes graduation. And
9 so the question is what is the driver for quality and what
10 is the driver for increased success and we can't -- we're
11 not going to do a very good job if we just look at certain
12 things.

13 I certainly worry about high stakes for
14 graduation as opposed to because, man, at that point,
15 we've either succeeded or failed our kids as opposed to
16 some earlier time when it behooves us to identify where we
17 need to be putting our resources and our efforts. So it's
18 a bigger -- I'm sorry, but it's a bigger picture than what
19 we've been actually talking about today, and that has me a
20 little bit worried. And it's very hard to get your hands
21 around the whole -- the whole picture.

22 For that reason, I hope we still continue
23 to talk about what are our Colorado values. I sure don't
24 want to go to high stakes in an effort to increase success
25 for kids because I don't think -- I don't think it



1 necessarily works. I think another piece of Massachusetts
2 is that they've been at this a lot longer than we have.
3 And we haven't even talked about Florida and some of the
4 work that they've done so it's very, very hard for us to
5 get clear direction from somewhere else. I worry about
6 that.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm going to echo back
9 what Joyce raised earlier as well. We haven't talked
10 about in this is the impact of educator effectiveness as
11 well so some states use different models for bringing that
12 piece into their evaluation pieces and so you get that
13 kind of mixture as well even though they may look at some
14 -- one growth model in one way, they may have a different
15 one for determining educator (indiscernible)

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So I'm going to
17 toss the therefore what question back to our expert, and
18 you know, by definition you've traveled the farthest so
19 you get the tough -- tough question --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So you -- I'm lookin'
22 for your summary comments, and speak some wisdom into this
23 conversation we're struggling with.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, okay. One thing
25 I would like to emphasis -- and I think is a nice way to



1 think about things is as folks are moving into these
2 conversations about testing and why are we doing it and
3 values, I think it's really important to kind of step back
4 and to take a really good systems approach that is a
5 systems perspective.

6 And this gets back to your comment, Chair,
7 is this idea about, you know, there is a bigger picture.
8 There are a lot of assessments going on. There are a lot
9 of purposes that are being served. And I think it's
10 really important for folks to think about not just the
11 short, but also the long term about what are we trying to
12 get out of the system as a whole and how can we be more
13 efficient. And the efficiency piece is a really important
14 because as many of you know, so much of the testing takes
15 place locally. There's a lot of testing that takes place
16 within districts as well and so it makes sense to think
17 about how are all of these different pieces aligning to
18 make a coherent system. I think if we can all strive
19 toward that it makes this burden piece feel less onerous.
20 You move toward something that feels a lot more efficient
21 and you don't feel like you're taking away time for the
22 sake of just simply testing.

23 So I think there are the types of
24 conversations that a lot of folks are moving into, and the
25 best advice that we can give, at least with many of the



1 states that we're working with is please just take a
2 systems-wide approach. Think about this comprehensively.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Thank you all
4 very much.

5 MS. NEAL: Yeah, thank you, great.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 MS. NEAL: Very extensive.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So the next and
9 final item on the agenda for today is public comment. How
10 many people have we got signed up because we've got some
11 travel concerns and challenges among panelists here.

12 MS. NEAL: How many?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Bizy's pulling the list
14 right now. We've got three, four at least. Probably
15 more. So I'll go ahead and map out the rules here and
16 we've got a couple of -- or at least one advanced excuse
17 or ex -- what's the word -- when you've been pre-excused.
18 Whatever that -- the proper phraseology that would be.
19 We've got four on the list, so there's not a large number.
20 The standard rules apply; three minutes. Please state
21 your name. If you represent an organization, identify the
22 organization. If not, let us know where you're from.
23 I'll run a little clock and it's going to bong and Carrie
24 will also have a visual notification also.

25 Sarah, and I don't know that I have



1 pronounced your last name properly so you get to say it
2 when you come to the --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- the podium here.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My name is Sarah
6 Sempio (ph).

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sempio. I would've put
8 an extra vowel in there. I apologize.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm from Monument D-38
10 School District. Over the last several months, there has
11 been a zealous interpretation of the statutes that the CDE
12 has been pushing onto the local school districts in an
13 effort to guarantee the obligation of schools and families
14 to comply with testing. I want to bring to your attention
15 some of the things that are happening across the state
16 when parents exercise their constitutional right to refuse
17 the test.

18 Kids are threatened to be suspended. There
19 were threats to remove a child's IEP. Threatened to
20 publicly post the names of kids who don't test.
21 Threatened to fire teachers who speak out against common
22 core. Threatened that refusal to test will be part of a
23 permanent college transcript. Threatened to test children
24 if they're on school property in direct violation of
25 parental refusal. Children were physically locked out of



1 the school when they tried to enter the school building
2 after testing was over on a day that testing was
3 scheduled. Children were forbidden from participating in
4 non-testing school activities during a testing window thus
5 forcing truancy issues. The vice-principal of one school
6 directly threatened a student personally to be pulled out
7 of every academic class until they made up the test saying
8 if your mom wants to avoid that disruption, she needs to
9 keep you out of school the whole month of November.

10 Administrators made offers to a student
11 with multiple violations at school saying I will eradicate
12 all of your detentions if you agree to take the test.
13 They put all the non-testing students in a room and
14 lectured them on why they should be taking a test. These
15 are standardized assessment tests. They asserted their
16 administrative authority and pressured the children to
17 submit to testing despite documented refusal of permission
18 from the parents on file, putting the school admin between
19 the child and the parent.

20 They inappropriately are using funds by
21 offering to give out Chipotle meals cards to kids who
22 agree to test bribing them to disobey their parents.
23 Bribing with extra credit points if you test. Bribing
24 with extra credit if you practice tests online, do the
25 practice. Bribing students who test as a senior to get a



1 free day off of the school while testing time is happening
2 in lower grades. Bribing students with free prom tickets.
3 Encouraging teachers to give extra rewards that they deem
4 suitable such as free lunch passes to get off campus.

5 My question is under what legal authority
6 are the school's administrators employing these tactics on
7 the children and what is your plan of action to protect
8 yourself and our schools from incurring further legal
9 liability and protect our children from harm. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

11 Lilly Williams.

12 MS. WILLIAMS: My name is Lilly
13 (indiscernible) Williams (indiscernible) from
14 (indiscernible) County. I'm the mother of three children
15 and currently my daughter youngest, 15, is in
16 (indiscernible) County High School in (indiscernible) I
17 have a special background as here to speak to the Chair
18 and the Board Members. I am Chinese immigrant. I do not
19 buy into common core. I'm here to oppose that strongly
20 'cause I can tell you common core in my eyes is as same as
21 (indiscernible) in China.

22 I grew up (indiscernible) region and we had
23 the communist dominated education. Nationalized testing,
24 nationalized curriculum and nationalized indoctrination so
25 I grew up in that system. I came to this country for



1 freedom and I cannot believe this happening all over again
2 in this country. I (indiscernible) what happened to the
3 America (indiscernible) here for freedom. What's going on
4 in this country?

5 So I wanted to make you know to say that
6 when you say, oh, we want our kids to be high score in all
7 the tests like Chinese kids (inaudible) they'll be career
8 ready, but I'm telling you Chinese children are not
9 trained to be independent thinkers. They are trained to
10 be passive machines. They are trained to be massive scale
11 workers for corporations and they have no idea what
12 happened in (indiscernible) 1989 when communist government
13 ordered soldiers to shoot its own (indiscernible)
14 students. Is this what we want in America? I understand
15 passing (indiscernible) improve education, but it's not.
16 The way we have (indiscernible) federal government
17 (indiscernible) international corporations hold money.
18 Okay. We have both carrots and stick to offer to our
19 students. Parents, where are the parents? We're supposed
20 to have country of our kids education and we have trust
21 our teachers and students, parents, to work together.
22 Individual rights, individual liberty; that's why I came
23 to this country for. I (indiscernible) Board Members
24 voted for common core, to adopt a standard. Did you know
25 what's going to happen later? Did you know what's going



1 to be, like, a -- on U.S. AP history test? American
2 (indiscernible) gone. America's liberty (indiscernible)
3 founding fathers are gone. Capitalism is gone
4 (indiscernible) three times. Is this (indiscernible) our
5 kids to be (indiscernible) machines, workers, cheap
6 workers for corporations? No. America is great. Don't
7 compare yourself to China. That's why lots of Chinese
8 (indiscernible) trying to come here to be free and they
9 all tell you do not go after Chinese communist education.
10 That system produced great test takers, great machine
11 workers, but not individuals with critical thinking mind
12 (indiscernible) skills. Do not challenge their parents.
13 They are brainwashed. I was brainwashed so bad it took me
14 10 years in this country to get out of it. So please look
15 at again common core and help us any way you can get out
16 of it. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

18 Rosa Trujillo.

19 MS. TRUJILLO: Yes, my name is Rose
20 Trujillo. I'm from Pueblo, Colorado. I'm here as a
21 concerned citizen. What makes America great after all
22 folks are trying to get into our country and very few, of
23 course, are trying to leave it. Endorsers of common core
24 do not appreciate the heritage and those who have died for
25 this country so that we can have our freedoms. We have



1 people who want to erase the history of great nation who
2 want to chip away the very foundation of which our country
3 was founded claiming that it's an old document that needs
4 to be replaced. There are those who want to choose what
5 amendments should be followed and which amendments are not
6 relevant. None of these amendments are negotiable nor is
7 our history.

8 I recently made a trip to London and while
9 I was there, I visited the war museum. Queen Elizabeth
10 has dedicated a floor to the Holocaust as it is her belief
11 that no one should ever forget what happened and future
12 generations will learn from it. All of our country's
13 history should be taught as it's happened, not edited or
14 written off as it had never existed. There are heroes who
15 come from humble beginnings. For example, Abraham
16 Lincoln, Martin Luther King, who give inspirations to
17 generations to anyone that has a desire to achieve
18 greatness. One must learn from our past so that we can
19 continue to be the great country that we were meant to be.
20 As John Adams stated, but a constitution of government
21 once changed from freedom can never be changed from
22 freedom, can never be restored and liberty once lost is
23 lost forever.

24 I am asking the Colorado State Board of
25 Education to take a strong public stand against the new AP



1 history framework designed by the College Board. I thank
2 you for your time.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

4 Anita Stapleton.

5 MS. STAPLETON: Hi. I'm Anita Stapleton
6 from Pueblo. And I am here today introducing into public
7 record 47 letters of opposition; the rest are at home on
8 my kitchen table. And these are the voice of Colorado
9 saying we want out of common core. Today I am asking this
10 Board to exercise its constitutional authority over the
11 CDE and require that information provided to local school
12 districts be complete and accurate. This is in regard to
13 recent documents provided to school districts pertaining
14 to the collection of student data and sharing of student
15 data. The CDE has offered a rebuttal to documents I have
16 shared with districts that demonstrate that FERPA has, in
17 fact, been revised as of 2011 which opens the door wider
18 to access to student data.

19 The American Association of Collegiate
20 Registrars and Admissions wrote the report listing their
21 grievances against the FERPA changes and encouraging the
22 U.S. Department of Education to not do this. Those
23 documents have been provided for you. I was planning on
24 reading through step by step all the documents that I
25 provide to the many districts that I visit, however, in



1 three minutes, we're not going to have time to do that.

2 So what I am going to do is read the
3 correspondence from your CDE representative, Jill, to a
4 superintendent saying Ms. Stapleton shared a lot of false
5 information. I tried to address and counter most of it.
6 I think that your staff member was fabulous when she
7 shared the actual language from the Pearson contract that
8 clearly states that data will not be shared and is owned
9 by the CDE. Please thank your staff member on my behalf
10 in her courage to share that. Ms. Stapleton then claimed
11 that PARCC will share the data; this is not true either.
12 Attached please find documentation that clearly addresses
13 this. You can decide if you think it's worth sharing with
14 your Board or just let matters lie.

15 I feel like correspondence like that is her
16 privilege, but is very inaccurate as well. The documents
17 that you have in front of you are the very documents that
18 I share. I do not manufacture these documents, I don't
19 draft them. These are documents from the U.S. federal
20 government, from the Colorado Department of Education,
21 from PARCC and from FERPA. And so I encourage this State
22 Board to do your due diligence, do your own research like
23 I challenged the districts and know where the student data
24 is being shared. And according to the PARCC co-op
25 agreement which was one of the particular documents and



1 grievances here, page 10, item six, the guarantee must
2 provide timely and complete access to any and all data
3 collected at the state level to the Education Department
4 or its designated program monitors. Technical assistance
5 providers or research -- researcher partners and to the
6 GAO. This is off of the co-op agreement between the U.S.
7 Department of Education and PARCC. And if you actually
8 take the time as would the CASBE members who didn't know
9 that FERPA was rewritten and read exactly the language in
10 there, then it all comes down to that. We go full circle
11 again. And if we go back to FERPA, then we would realize
12 that, yes, PARCC, Pearson and the CDE has to disclose this
13 information. So we are just asking for transparency and
14 accuracy.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, Anita.

16 Is there anyone else who would like to
17 speak? That's -- that's all the names who were on the
18 list. Anyone else care to speak in public comment
19 section?

20 Okay. If not, then the State --

21 MS. NEAL: (indiscernible)

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- Board will stand in
23 recess until tomorrow, 9:00 a.m., this room.

24 Thank you very much.

25 (Meeting Adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 5th day of April, 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