



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
April 13, 2016, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 13, 2016, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Order. Come back to order,
2 and I know we're running a little late. We're -- we're
3 gaining on it, we're catching up, we're catching up. So
4 when we come back to order, Ms. Burdsall, are we on record
5 here?

6 MS. BURDSALL: Yes, we are.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So let's start
8 Commissioner -- let's start with -- wherever -- whoever you
9 got here. Yes. Yeah. So let's start to -- and do you want
10 to introduce staff who's handling this?

11 MR. ASP: Yeah. Me too. Mr. Chairman,
12 Members of the Board, our -- visiting again now are elevated
13 performance, frameworks, framework targets. There's a --
14 there's a lot of information that we're gonna be talking
15 about today. So we have Allyssa Pearson, Marie Huchton, who
16 are gonna be presenting. I'll turn them over to you. Staff
17 is more familiar with it.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson?

19 MS. PEARSON: Good morning, everyone. Okay,
20 you guys ready? This is conversation number four on these
21 targets. We talked February, we did our work session after
22 that in February. We met again in March and talked about
23 targets. So our goals for today where we're at, and we're
24 gonna review your role, so you're really clear on what we're
25 asking of you all to do today. We need to finalize the



1 methodology for the sub-indicator targets. We need to do
2 that today because we want to be able to get the spring
3 information or reports to districts so they can get a sense
4 of what their data would look like in the frameworks and
5 give us feedback that we can then share with them. But we
6 need those targets today so we can get that -- those reports
7 out to them before the end of the school year, collect
8 feedback before the end of the school year, so we have it
9 back. We can use that to make some decisions before June.
10 Because at the June meeting, we have a lot. We need to make
11 sure we've wrapped up a lot of information for you.

12 So that's the main thing we need to make sure
13 today, is to make sure you all are comfortable with
14 methodology for setting those targets. We also want to
15 start having a little more in-depth conversations on two
16 other topics that we'll need to finalize by June, which are
17 determining the weights of the performance indicators,
18 really talking about our priorities and our values of growth
19 which is achievement post-secondary and workforce readiness,
20 how we want to balance those indicators in the performance
21 frameworks, what's the most valuable to each of you. We'll
22 share some feedback that we've gotten from a stakeholder
23 groups that we've gone around to so you can see where --
24 what we're hearing so far and what the recommendations are
25 so far.



1 You don't need to make any decisions today,
2 this is just information. We need to know that -- we need -
3 - at the June meeting, is when we're gonna need to have a
4 solid direction from you all on that topic. And the same
5 thing with the cut points for the plan types. So we're
6 gonna need to work with you all to determine what percent of
7 schools, or how we identify which schools and districts are
8 getting turnaround ratings versus priority improvement
9 rating for system improvement performance and for district
10 distinction. So we'll talk about some ways that we can do
11 that. Again, you don't need to make any decisions today,
12 it's just the kind of talk about the ways that we could do
13 that. But by June, we're going to need to have a decision
14 and a direction from you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had a quick question.
17 The first thing you said, those was that we do have to make
18 a decision today. Which decision is that?

19 MS. PEARSON: On the sub-indicator target.
20 So what level of achievement on English Language Arts would
21 count for what points on the frameworks. You don't need to
22 vote on it, we just want to know that you all are
23 comfortable enough with the methodology. We're gonna talk
24 through too, that you're ready for us to go give an example



1 of that and give data to the schools and districts to
2 collect feedback on.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you say that again? The
4 sub-indicator targets, meaning?

5 MS. PEARSON: The sub-indicator targets. So
6 English Language Arts achievement, math achievement, science
7 achievement. Does that make sense?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: And what are the sub-indicator
9 targets also --

10 MS. PEARSON: Those are the sub-indicators so
11 that --

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- for the criterion level
13 below it and for each of the buckets?

14 MS. PEARSON: So the indicators are
15 achievement, growth for secondary workforce readiness. The
16 sub-indicators are the specific contents. So English
17 Language Arts achievement, math achievement, science
18 achievement.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Give me an example of a sub-
20 indicator target.

21 MS. PEARSON: English -- English Language
22 Arts achievement would be one of --

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. But what would it be?
24 Thirty eight out of 100, I mean?



1 MS. PEARSON: Oh, sorry. Sorry. Like the
2 mean scale score of 750 would be the needs target, and a
3 mean scale score of 730, we'll show you the exact ones,
4 would be the approaching target. And then those translate
5 to the points that get rolled up for the frameworks.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

7 MS. PEARSON: I think if when we get through
8 and show the examples, if -- if we're still not being clear,
9 please let us know.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because once we set those, all
11 of the others are aligned. So in some ways it's kind of
12 high stakes what we vote on today, right? Because how those
13 targets get set determine how the other decisions get made.

14 MS. PEARSON: Not necessarily. I think those
15 -- those are one set to provide a sense of how -- of
16 performance on the specific sub-indicators. Those decisions
17 that will make later on the cut points and the weights,
18 those have a huge impact on the frameworks, and those are
19 things that'll come later. They're -- they're not -- the --
20 the direction we go with the sub-indicators doesn't lay a
21 specific path for those other two decisions.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

23 MS. PEARSON: Does that make sense?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do we have an hour set aside
25 for this discussion?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're an hour and a half,
2 we're a little behind schedule but we'll -- we'll take the
3 time is needed, Dr. Scheffel.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Please proceed, Ms.
6 Pearson.

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay. And then please --
8 please, if we're not being clear on something, please stop
9 us. Make sure -- we want to make sure you guys understand
10 all these pieces. And you know, we get to a lot of details
11 in here, so just please tell us, "We're not getting it,
12 translate it for us." Then we'll stop and do that. Okay?
13 So the sub-indicator targets are where we're gonna start the
14 specific achievement targets, growth targets that we're
15 looking at for the points in the frameworks. This is where
16 your statutory responsibility really comes in, this is where
17 statute -- state statute is really specific about what the
18 State Board needs to do. This is language that we've showed
19 you all before about the, "State Board shall set, reaffirm
20 or revise as appropriate, ambitious, yet attainable,
21 statewide targets for the measures used to determine the
22 levels of attainment of the performance indicators for the
23 coming academic year.."

24 So translating that as a specific indicator -
25 - sub-indicator targets, okay? And at the end it says, "To



1 the extent possible, ensure that the targets meet federal
2 law requirements." So we've been working to try and
3 understand what's in the Every Student Succeeds Act, in
4 ESSA, to make sure that what we're proposing or putting
5 forward will meet those requirements as well as we
6 understand that now. And then the Every Student Succeeds
7 Act, the ESSA requirements, what they're asking for is long
8 term goals. Which we'll talk about in the future, that'll
9 be part of the ESSA plan development. So those are kind of
10 your lofty high goals where you want to get in the long term
11 and then interim progress measures to get there. And those
12 interim progress measures of the targets that we're talking
13 about today, the sub-indicator targets. How we're gonna get
14 to those big lofty goals, what we're expecting in the
15 meantime from schools and districts.

16 The sub-indicator? Of the -- again, the --
17 the reading -- oh sorry, the English Language Arts, with the
18 math, the science, specific targets. We were talking,
19 again, which targets, we've talked about this before, we're
20 talking right now about the red circle. That's what the
21 sub-indicator targets really are. Those specific parts on
22 the framework, in the past it's been reading, math, writing
23 and science, it'll be English Language Arts, math, science
24 in the future for achievement. What those specific targets
25 are, how well we expect to see schools or districts doing in



1 terms of their achievement on English Language Arts, math,
2 science. And then for growth, and then for post-secondary
3 workforce readiness.

4 Today, we'll really focused on the
5 achievement targets because that's wherein we've had lots
6 and lots of conversation with you all. Okay? So right now
7 we're talking about those, we're not talking about the --
8 the bigger cuts whereas over here that determine the plan
9 types. We'll talk about that later in the presentation but
10 that's not what we need direction, okay? And then, again,
11 this is just another way to see what those targets are. The
12 sub-indicator targets are that we need, elementary level,
13 middle level and high school levels for academic achievement
14 growth in post-secondary workforce readiness. Okay. So how
15 do we determine these targets? So we've talked through a
16 few -- a -- a few different methodologies.

17 In the past, at the March meeting, we really
18 narrowed down to two other ways that we wanted to look
19 through this. Okay. The first one, norm reference, which
20 is really -- meaning looking at how do you -- how does the
21 school district compare to other schools and districts in
22 the state. We're using how we are performing as a state,
23 how our schools and districts are performing as the
24 comparison points. So we can do that using the school
25 distribution and looking at how schools and districts



1 compare to that school distribution using that for setting
2 our expectations. The other option that we were talked
3 about in March was looking at criteria and reference points.
4 So saying, using what we expect students to know and be able
5 to do like, how we set the expectations on the PARCC
6 assessment or the CMAS: Science and Social Studies
7 Assessments, to be our points of reference.

8 So on the CMAS-PARCC scale of 750, means a
9 student is college and career-ready, or on track to be
10 college and career-ready. So you could use that criteria
11 that was set by the PARCC scales score to say, that's what
12 we expect from our schools and districts. We want
13 everybody, we want a mean scale score on average, everybody
14 to be -- everybody to be at that 750, and that's the other
15 way. So we ran both scenarios that --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What's the range of the
17 scales? I'm sorry.

18 MS. PEARSON: Sorry. For CMAS-PARCC at 650-
19 850.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

21 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. Make sure I get it
22 right, CMAS -- And 750 and all the content areas is the --
23 the -- let them mind to level four, which is what we -- what
24 our expectations are. So we went through, we're gonna go
25 through both options, just talk about the impact of both,



1 some pros and cons of both. And then to get from you all at
2 the end, what recommendation, where you feel comfortable
3 headed. Again, you don't need to vote on the targets today.
4 We just want enough comfort level from you that we can put
5 this out to districts, feeling like it won't necessarily
6 turn upside down unless they give feedback to us that says,
7 we should turn it upside down. Make sense?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: A couple of questions. I know
10 we've a lot of discussions about norm-referencing,
11 criterion-referencing, and so forth. Is there a way to
12 simplify this and so that it's some version of a percentile
13 rank and a Pass/No Pass. I mean, there's just so much
14 complexity inside this slide, and the public struggles to
15 understand it, the Board struggles to understand it. You
16 know, I mean, the -- the statutory requirement for this work
17 is -- strikes me as far simpler than what we're doing. And
18 we can continue to do what we've been doing. But I -- I
19 guess I don't know that it serves us well and I'm wondering
20 if we have an option as opposed to option A and B. Do we
21 have an option C?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is?

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Which I just said.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pass/Fail?

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Some version of Pass/Fail or
2 non-percentile ranks. I mean, it used to be that we -- we
3 would --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's -- that's
5 criterion referenced.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- we would report percentile
7 ranks because they're comparative --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- and they -- they, but
10 they're not -- I mean, in -- in some ways, that is a
11 combining of norm reference and criterion reference. But
12 this complexity inside this matrix is substantial. I'm just
13 wondering if there's other options beside those that are
14 depicted on the slide.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Flores?

16 MS. FLORES: And if we're really going to go
17 by the -- if we're going to really follow ESSA, I'm not
18 saying we should but if we are, there is that component that
19 we should help the kids that need it the most. And wouldn't
20 it be easier, if we had Pass/No Pass given where they are in
21 -- in -- in those areas in Pass and No Pass. We could still
22 have the others. I mean, giving indication as to, you know,
23 you need to be -- work harder on this. Or -- and seriously,
24 I would be more on the areas that they need work on, than a
25 point you need to work, you know, and -- and not give any



1 information as to the area, the concepts that they need to
2 work on. That's, I think, would be most beneficial in a
3 test other than just a point system and you need to, you
4 know, get further on the point. But Pass/No Pass, that's
5 criterion referenced.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes. Ms. Pearson?

7 MS. PEARSON: Dr. Scheffel and -- let me just
8 clarify the percentile ranks, the norm reference really is
9 that --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

11 MS. PEARSON: -- based on new report, this
12 percentile ranks right there. So as we get in, we can show
13 you a little bit about how that looks. But if there is a
14 way to simplify it, please offer your suggestions because we
15 would like to --

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because aren't you
17 standardizing that, though, with these other standard
18 scores? Because you said the mean range is what? Four
19 something to what, what is it?

20 MS. PEARSON: The scale --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Scale is.

22 MS. PEARSON: That for a student level, the
23 scale ranges from 650-850.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: The mean --

25 MS. PEARSON: No, that's just the student.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- the whole scale?

2 MS. PEARSON: So a student's scale, and you
3 jump in if I'm not getting this right, the 650-850.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so --

5 MS. PEARSON: And so then --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So lowest score you can get
7 is 650, the highest score you can get is 850?

8 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's the range?

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

12 MS. PEARSON: And then --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And that's what parents and
14 kids see?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

16 MS. PEARSON: That's what parents and kids
17 see on the parent report.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And doesn't it strike -- do --
19 I mean, doesn't it seem, why would we choose -- why those
20 numbers, why we're standardizing on that scale? Because not
21 intuitive, parents see 650, it's like what is --

22 MS. FLORES: You mean got to 100.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, yeah. I'm just saying
24 something more intuitive that makes sense, that people might



1 think that they can use. The way it is now, it's just so
2 convoluted. I just don't know why we're --

3 MS. FLORES: Same of the -- the SAT. That's
4 not on 100 people see it.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: I agree, but I mean, this is
6 in our wheelhouse, where the SAT is.

7 MS. FLORES: Yeah, the SAT is at the end, and
8 that's college.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm not saying that. I'm just
10 saying, is there a way to make this more usable and I just,
11 I'm asking if we have other options.

12 MS. PEARSON: And I think the -- the
13 percentile ranks will do that. And I think the fact when we
14 -- I get the point about having a Pass/ No pass, it's just
15 that one point. That's what we had with AYP. You know,
16 there is one target, and you were either above it or below
17 it. Having that range of the four categories, really helps
18 people dig in a little bit better and understand how far
19 away they are from expectations or how much better than the
20 expectations they are doing. So I think it helps them be
21 able to go a little deeper in understanding where their
22 strengths and weaknesses are by concentrating. But that's
23 just my -- my opinion on that. So let's go into these
24 options a little bit. These are the options that came from
25 the Board meeting in -- in March about where you all want to



1 go a little deeper into. And so let us go through that and
2 see where we're at. And then we'll take some feedback at
3 the end.

4 MS. HUCHTON: So for Option A, is sort of the
5 norm-referenced option using the school distribution. Just
6 to give a little bit of a more context, we're talking about
7 setting targets. There's actually four targets that we use
8 for the performance frameworks. It does not meet
9 approaching needs and exceeds. And there's a different
10 number of points allowed into each of those categories to
11 try to help differentiate among the schools and the
12 districts in the state, and how they're actually doing on
13 average with their students.

14 So we've -- we've talked through this with a
15 lot of stakeholders and with our technical advisory panel,
16 and we have a recommendation for the following targets for
17 norm-based percentile rank system. And so that does not
18 meet expectations, would be the first through the 14th
19 percentile. So it's the bottom 15 percent of the schools
20 and districts. Approaching expectations is 15th-49th
21 percentile range. So it's -- so it's above the 15th
22 percentile, but below the state average. And meeting
23 expectations means that you are at the state average or
24 above up to the 84th percentile. And then to exceed state
25 expectations, you have to be at the 85th percentile to the



1 100th percentile. So this is pretty clearly cutting the
2 scale into four buckets, although they're not entirely
3 equal.

4 The approaching and the needs buckets are
5 slightly larger to indicate that we do have more schools
6 that sort of cluster into the middle of the distribution.
7 And our intention is that the targets can be baselined for
8 the first few -- but for the first few years of a new
9 assessment, we'll want to look at the percentile
10 expectations and see if they change as sort of student
11 familiarity with the test increases. So when we actually
12 look at what the targets would be for this normative system
13 on the English Language Arts and Mathematics and Science
14 assessments for elementary, middle and high school, you can
15 see that the ratings are -- sorry, the mean scale score
16 expectations are pretty similar.

17 You know, for the 15th percentile at 722, 723
18 and the meeting expectations expect a cut would be around
19 730, 8739 and that is pretty consistent across all of the
20 content areas at- at least for English language arts and
21 mathematics and the different grade levels. Science is on a
22 different scale. It's a different test and we scale it
23 differently, so it has slightly different cuts. But in
24 general, this provides us with, you know, a pretty
25 consistent message around, you know, what scale scores are



1 considered in meeting state expectations and -- and what
2 needs improvement. So we actually look at the impact data
3 from -- from this methodology. You can see that write about
4 for schools, about 15 percent of our schools would receive
5 and exceeds rating, about 35 percent of schools receive a
6 meets rating, 35 percent approaching, and then 15 percent
7 does not meet, and that holds true across all the content
8 areas and, you know, all the grade levels with a little bit
9 of variability.

10 When we apply the school distribution to the
11 district ratings, we don't see quite as perfect
12 differentiation amongst the -- the categories. We have a
13 slightly smaller number of districts in the exceeds and does
14 not meet categories, and of few more districts in the
15 approaching and meets categories. But this is the
16 consequence, sorry, I've just using one system in text.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was gonna ask a
19 question, what's the impact of these ratings if there's a
20 large opt out? In other words, does that indirectly punish
21 the schools?

22 MS. HUCHTON: Sure. It depends on what the
23 consequences and -- and it really depends on how many
24 students opted out, and who opted out.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.



1 MS. HUCHTON: We've -- we've looked into this
2 a little bit to -- to see, you know, what the consequences
3 would be if it's a random sort of sample of students within
4 a school who opt out. You know, students who are low
5 performers, middle performers, high performers, and that
6 really doesn't wind up having much of an impact. If we did
7 have a school that's largely their highest performing
8 students opted out, you would see an impact on their
9 achievement results because that does wind up lowering how
10 their school looks overall, just because it's not- their
11 results are no longer representative of their entire student
12 population. You have kind of this self-selection.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, more linking --
14 if we link achievement targets solely to standardized tests,
15 we have, I think some unintended consequences. Have we
16 contemplated that and other ways we might think about this?

17 MS. PEARSON: I think that's why we have the
18 request to reconsider process so that if there's issues with
19 the -- the state assessment results in terms of
20 representativeness of students, there's another way for
21 schools and districts to be able to submit additional data
22 that shows about the achievement of their schools.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And how much what
24 percent does that figure into the ultimate bucket they end
25 up in?



1 MS. PEARSON: That's something we're gonna
2 talk through with you all. We haven't had accountability
3 ratings since we've had such a large opt out, so we're gonna
4 to think with you how about unintended consequences of how
5 much you wanna weigh that, and take that into consideration
6 so we'll -- that's -- that's for future meeting.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Crandall?

8 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

9 MR. CRANDALL: And this kind of a general
10 question, it's one. The weaknesses in -- in this bucket are
11 just Colorado students, correct? And so, this is -- this
12 more of a long term conversation but as -- as Dr. Scheffel
13 just talked about down there, one of the unintended
14 consequences is this whole group think and the danger of
15 comparing ourselves only to ourselves. We're not
16 benchmarked against any high performing group that we know
17 of per se or country or -- or outside groups. So 15 percent
18 of New York City, okay, compared to -- to what? And so, as
19 we think long term about what -- what assessment rule it
20 needs to look like, what accountability needs to look like,
21 we need to make sure we bring in that outside, something
22 that keeps us honest there.

23 MS. FLORES: Well, more so. I think we need
24 to really help. We -- we really need to help the group of
25 students that are not doing well. And I -- I think that's



1 kind of the issue and we're not going to do -- we're not
2 gonna find out how we're gonna help those students that are
3 not performing well. If we're gonna to Finland or Denmark
4 or wherever, it's going to have to be with other states that
5 are doing well. We're gonna to have to compare ourselves
6 with states like Massachusetts and -- and other states that
7 are doing much better than we are, because I -- I think
8 we'll be talking about elephants and giraffes if -- if we're
9 doing it across, you know, in -- in other continents and
10 other nations.

11 So I -- I think we have a big problem here
12 already, and that is, we have so many students that are not
13 doing well, that we have to help those students do well.
14 And I -- I don't know, I -- I just think this whole thing
15 reinforces. Yes, you know, I just go back to the PARCC test
16 and -- and the assessment that I did on the test, and I
17 would never give that test to anybody, to any student.
18 That's a poor test. We really need to start thinking about
19 other kinds of assessments to give our students, a fair
20 assessment, and PARCC is not a fair assessment.
21 Commissioner, have you thought about other -- other tests,
22 other avenues that we're going to take other than PARCC?

23 MR. CRANDALL: Mr. Chair, you'll hear about
24 it at my report today.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Tell me. You will --
2 you'll cover the subject. Okay, thank you. Is that right,
3 Dr. Flores?

4 MS. PEARSON: I just want to clarify before
5 we go on about that the -- the parent opt out kind of
6 excuses. Those are not in the denominator. They're not
7 counted as zeros. They're excluded completely because of
8 your Board motion last year. I just want to make sure that
9 there's not confusion out there, that somehow they'll get
10 counted as a zero. They're not in those calculations
11 whatsoever. So the only real impact is what Mary was
12 talking about depending on who those kids are, and how that
13 we'll adjust scores, but we're not penalizing school
14 district because a student knocked it up in his calculations
15 here.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And -- and Ms. Pearson,
17 these ratings are always appealable, correct?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yes. Absolutely, in any aspect
19 of that.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: If you'll get a high
21 performing group opt out --

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- that would be evidence,
24 could be presented to not take adverse action, for example.

25 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

2 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. And we'll --
3 Again, we'll come back to you all with those requests for
4 reconsideration considerations just to make sure that we're
5 in the same page about that.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

7 MS. PEARSON: Thanks.

8 MS. HUCHTON: Yep.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

10 MS. HUCHTON: All right. So just some of the
11 pros for option A, we've talked about some of this before,
12 we'll just go over it again. So using the normative system
13 directs attention to areas of performance that are
14 exceptional or concerning compared to other schools, and
15 that informs improvement planning. It allows for meaningful
16 differentiation of plan types based upon the total points
17 distribution. It helps us interpret the results of the
18 assessment and for our schools. It's consistent with the
19 previous performance frameworks that we -- we have had. It
20 meets the state statute requirements for setting targets,
21 and it also aligns with the Every Student Succeeds Act
22 expectations.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Could I add something to
25 that? Something that continues to bother me, is that as we



1 are analyzing results, we are comparing students in the
2 lower grades who have had the benefit of our Colorado
3 standards throughout their- possibly, throughout their
4 education system with kids in higher grades for whom there's
5 been this shift, and it's been a catch up, and the higher
6 the grade, the greater the catch up, so to some extent, by
7 being norm referenced, I'm looking at all kids of our state
8 who have had this new system for X number of years and not
9 that many. It seems fair even though philosophically, I
10 might want to go differently.

11 MS. HUCHTON: Yeah.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Philosophically, I've been
13 really bothered about the expectation that everybody is on
14 standard on our Colorado standards in all our grades, when
15 in fact the time for teachers and the time for kids just
16 hasn't been there. So I would add that honestly as a pro.

17 MS. HUCHTON: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, and I would say that the
20 language issue is so implicit in that shift that and the way
21 PARCC test is so heavily loads on language, that what we're
22 really looking at is a heavy load on language in terms of
23 the scores. So I think we have to think about that when we
24 look to interpret them and replace schools, or districts, or
25 kids in buckets --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible) doing this the
2 way we're doing it.

3 MS. FLORES: Well, you're not -- you're not
4 really measuring math. You're measuring language. It's not
5 a math test.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, I think.

7 MS. HUCHTON: All right. Yes. So then,
8 there are some cons to this methodology by categorizing
9 performance into four levels. Some detailed data is sort of
10 lost and not including the frameworks. The districts are
11 not as likely to earn, exceeds, or does not meet ratings,
12 the schools are, and the targets are based on relative
13 performance, and they're not tied directly to the
14 performance levels of the assessments, like we have just
15 been talking about. And then, we have some options for sort
16 of mitigation of those cons, and as we've discussed also,
17 the request to reconsideration process allows for schools
18 and districts to submit additional data, particularly local
19 data. If the school and district performance ratings do not
20 reflect their level of performance or potentially their
21 entire student population, so that is the -- the avenue that
22 we have, you know, to -- to really address a lot of the
23 participation concerns.

24 And then, also the specific percentile ranks
25 are considered in the Red Cross to reconsider. So if a



1 school is at the 83rd percentile, you take that into
2 consideration how close they are to the 85th, so there's a
3 much, sort of more of a -- a dialogue in the process for --
4 for making those decisions. And then, after our last
5 meeting, we had heard a request for some examples and to be
6 able to see sort of what different kinds of schools look
7 like under -- under each of the different scoring options,
8 and we have some examples for you here today. So I went
9 through and I picked out, you know, a small suburban school
10 who's extremely high performing. And on a norm system, you
11 know, the schools is at the 99th percentile and receives and
12 exceeds rating. You know, there are small elementary school
13 but they're doing exceptionally well. And then, we'll show
14 you sort of with the contrast, and this looks like under the
15 other system in a little bit, but we also have an example of
16 a large urban district. And so, you know, this school is
17 sort of almost of their percentile ranks are in the single
18 digits. Thanks. And you know, they do not meet the
19 expectations for achievement for the state and -- Yes,
20 Ma'am.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry.

22 MS. PEARSON: Do you have any questions about
23 it?

24 MS. HUCHTON: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, please proceed.



1 MS. HUCHTON: Then, we have a small rural
2 example, and you can see in this situation is what we kind
3 of expect to have with the -- the new super subgroup or
4 aggregated combined subgroup category that a lot of small
5 systems have enough students to get an all students rating,
6 and then a super subgroup rating, but do not actually have
7 enough students within each of the individual categories to-
8 to receive a rating, but we don't get information.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Talk to me about the super
11 subgroup.

12 MS. PEARSON: So this is something we've had
13 a lot of conversation on. We've heard a lot from our
14 schools and districts. They do not like how we had -- has
15 students we count multiple times in the framework if they
16 were an English language learner and also eligible for free
17 or just lunch, and maybe also a minority student that felt
18 like they were getting dinged --

19 MS. FLORES: Dinged.

20 MS. PEARSON: -- time after time after time.
21 So what other states have done is they've created this
22 combined subgroup, where students or in any of those
23 desegregated groups that we have been paying extra attention
24 to are prioritizing. They only count once and then the
25 points are only given once. So this is something that the



1 districts in the schools are really, really supportive
2 about. We've heard from advocacy groups to have concerns
3 about that because they feel it masked some things. So part
4 of what the conversation was -- was you do points. So
5 you'll see on this row, this is not -- let me go back to the
6 other one is a better example. The points are assigned --

7 MS. FLORES: Let me -- let me get back
8 because I --

9 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, let me --

10 MS. FLORES: -- do that. I'm sorry.

11 MS. PEARSON: Sorry. The points are
12 assigned. You can see this one has .5 out of two points
13 right here. Points are assigned just to the combined
14 subgroup level. Okay? But all the individual groups of
15 English learners, free and reduced price lunch, eligible
16 students, minority students, and students with disabilities
17 that's reported that right there. So with the transparency
18 in the reporting is right there, so everybody can see the
19 performance of the individual groups, but the points,
20 they're not dinged multiple times, are only assigned once
21 and once per student. We've also talked about making sure
22 that the equivalent rating for the groups is reported there,
23 so you can see what the performance would be like even
24 though the data is not there, or the points aren't there, so



1 that the attention is still on the individual groups that
2 need the individual attention.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Help me with that
4 because this -- this is so hard to read anyway because of
5 the funky type.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. There's a border on
7 there.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: That's not your fault, I
9 know.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can I ask a maybe
11 clarifying questions that --

12 MS. FLORES: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- might help. I don't
14 know. You have a student that is English language learners,
15 free and reduced lunch and minority.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It makes more sense at
18 least on the surface to say that's one student --

19 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- and should count one
21 time.

22 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

23 MS. FLORES: And that's the combined --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And that's what we're
25 doing?



1 MS. PEARSON: And that's how it is in the
2 combined -- in combined group.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And so, there are people
4 who object to that?

5 MS. PEARSON: Yes, because they are worried
6 that -- they're saying that what I have heard is that those
7 students have multiple needs. So they are English Learners,
8 they are free reduced lunch. We are funding them multiple
9 times for those different needs, and so that the
10 accountability should be for each time that student is
11 getting funded, it's getting reported there. I think --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We can certainly --

13 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- treat those students on
15 an individual basis. But in terms of aggregate scoring and
16 the effect on performance ratings, it seems unfair that they
17 should be more than one student.

18 MS. PEARSON: And that's what this proposal
19 represents, is the --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't know whether you
21 agree or disagree.

22 MS. PEARSON: -- counting only once.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm trying to -- I'm
25 trying to kinda try to understand --



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, yeah.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and how it comes up --

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- comparatively --

5 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: -- how it comes out, and I
7 can't quite tell from this report, but maybe I -- maybe I
8 need some personal coaching, because everything looks the
9 same to me.

10 MS. PEARSON: This were --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: What are the examples where
12 it would come out differently?

13 MS. PEARSON: In terms of the score results?
14 We've actually run the data and that looked at the
15 differences. I'm just gonna go stand up here.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, take the
18 microphone with you.

19 MS. PEARSON: Got it.

20 MR. CRANDALL: Just two numbers.

21 MS. PEARSON: I'm fine, I think. Okay. So
22 this combines where did you go. The combined subgroup right
23 here is made up of a student that would be in any of these
24 groups but only one -- one time. Okay? And so, there's no
25 points that are getting assigned here. We're just reporting



1 it so it's transparent, so people can see, and this is not a
2 great example because all the disaggregated groups are doing
3 the same level.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: That's my problem.

5 MS. PEARSON: But you could see in a school,
6 or maybe your students with disabilities are really
7 struggling, but your minority students, your free lunch
8 students might be at approaching or mix, and this would help
9 you see the difference there, on there. But in terms of
10 accountability and what they're getting held accountable for
11 points, it would only be up here where the student is kind
12 of one time --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And that score --

14 MS. PEARSON: -- even they're multiple
15 groups.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that score is always gonna
17 to be higher?

18 MS. PEARSON: This score is always --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: The combined is always going
20 gonna higher.

21 MS. PEARSON: Than the individual?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Than -- than the way we've
23 been doing it.



1 MS. PEARSON: Not necessarily and actually.
2 When we ran the data, the -- the overall results came out
3 virtually the same.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MS. PEARSON: And that's what also gave us
6 some sense of we're not losing accountability there.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

8 MS. PEARSON: We're gaining a sense of
9 fairness --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

11 MS. PEARSON: -- but we're not losing
12 accountability for student performance. Does that make --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. It does make sense.

14 MS. PEARSON: -- little sense? Okay.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: But I'd love it if you keep
16 monitoring that.

17 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. And we're actually
18 gonna build -- if this is the way we go and this is we've
19 heard consensus. I think we've gotten most people to feel
20 okay, like we've -- we've found some middle ground.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Who people?

22 MS. PEARSON: There's people that aren't
23 happy on either side but I think --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Who are the people?



1 MS. PEARSON: Who are the people? Schools
2 and districts for the most part all really wanted combined
3 super subgroup.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MS. PEARSON: Advocacy groups we heard from
6 are concerned about their not being points for individual
7 groups of students. But I think the -- the reporting of it,
8 and having the color-coded labeling, and then some of the
9 requirements that are- come with ESSA that -- how we -- we
10 need to look at how individual groups of students are doing.
11 I think that balances that out to some degree, still some
12 concerns but I think we've worked- we've worked to a
13 compromise, at least.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Do you have the
15 capacity to continue to -- I mean, I'm assuming this is all
16 done on the computer?

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So that you would have the
19 capacity to continue to monitor that and if you start seeing
20 information falling out and not --

21 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely, and I think we're
22 gonna build in, we do an, we do some annual evaluations or
23 reviews of the accountability system because we wanna
24 monitor, we wanna see the impact it's having. We're gonna
25 build this in from the beginning to see what kind of impact



1 going in this direction this has since it's different from
2 where we've been, to see if we can measure in some way or
3 some capturing of, is this taking away attention from making
4 sure kids who need the most help are getting most help and
5 attention there. So because I think it's an opportunity we
6 should learn about it, and if it doesn't work and if it's
7 taking away attention from kids that need attention, then we
8 wouldn't, we probably wanna change our policy in the future.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

10 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, I'm sorry, Ms.

12 Mazanec.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Have we done that in the past
14 where we signed kind of students -- students PLL, free and
15 reduced, did they essentially get...

16 MS. PEARSON: They're counted multiple times.
17 Yep, that's how it's been in the past because it's really
18 historic from No Child Left Behind in the way of thinking
19 that No Child Left Behind inadequate yearly progress.
20 That's how we've always done it, and from when we went out
21 on our listening tour and as we've been getting --
22 collecting feedback on the framework on how to improve them
23 and respond to the needs of the field, we heard that loud
24 and clear. Do not double count anymore. So we took what
25 other states have done. We've seen this other option. We



1 think it's a way to -- to address that concern. But again,
2 it's something we need to learn about and see what the
3 unintended consequences might be of it.

4 MS. FLORES: But they will be counted and
5 districts, I mean, ultimately, districts will have to report
6 each one.

7 MS. PEARSON: We will report each one.
8 Districts will have the data to look at. They'll be asked
9 to look at that. We will figure out what the requirements
10 are with every student succeed at and what we want as a
11 state in terms of what we want them to address in their
12 improvement plan. But the data will not be hidden.
13 Performance will not be hidden. We'll be very, very
14 transparent so people can use that and access it. It's just
15 hopefully a way of making the accountability system feel
16 more fair to the people that are being held accountable.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Schroeder.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So that's it. This is not
19 the topic for today and I know it's off topic for today, but
20 how these reports are presented I think really matters.

21 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: This one -- this one I'm
23 gonna admit just had me all confused until today, and if I
24 have to asked having looked at these several hundred times,
25 looking at my districts and stuff that I think that's a



1 topic Mr. Commissioner and I would like for us to take on
2 and to get feedback. What's the best way to put some
3 format, best presentation for page one and then for the
4 detail? Because I find it, I mean, I can't tell that you've
5 only included the first two. There's got to be some --
6 some, I don't know what the right word is.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and that would be great.
8 We've been working with --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Formatting, thank you.

10 MS. PEARSON: We've been working with
11 accountability work group and other, that ACEE group which
12 is the Association for Colorado Education Evaluators. We've
13 been to a few other groups to share the draft reports and
14 get feedback on them, and try and revise. But if any of you
15 would like to sit down and give us feedback on that, we
16 would love that.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Everybody -- everybody knows
18 this is not my skill, whatsoever.

19 MS. PEARSON: Well.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: However, there -- I mean, I
21 look at other state, some other state reports and there's
22 some really cool stuff out there that grabs me and gives me
23 in just 30 seconds, some basics, and then I know where to
24 look for.



1 MR. CRANDALL: Just to clarify though, who
2 uses this report?

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

4 MR. CRANDALL: This --

5 MS. PEARSON: So thank you Mr. Commissioner,
6 yeah.

7 MR. CRANDALL: I know that, but I mean, who's
8 it sent to?

9 MS. PEARSON: This is sent --

10 MR. CRANDALL: Who is it designed for? I'm
11 sorry. That's the question.

12 MS. PEARSON: I mean, I'll step back, and
13 then I'll answer your question, I promise. The
14 accountability work group came up with a recommendation of
15 having three layers of reporting and really thinking about
16 stages and depth. So the first level would be a parent-
17 friendly high-level, easily accessible, not all the detail -
18 -

19 MR. CRANDALL: Yeah, who is this?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Angelika's friend.

21 MS. PEARSON: -- and points. This is not
22 that. We're gonna work with them. We have an
23 accountability work group meeting on Monday. That's gonna
24 be part of that group is conversation, that agenda to work
25 on the design and talk about what would be in that super



1 high-level. This is intended for schools and districts to
2 understand how they got the rating that they got. So it's
3 very specific to the points.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: But it's also the first thing
5 you see when you get on website.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: When I'm looking for my
8 school --

9 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: -- I'm getting this.

11 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: And then I'm --

13 MS. PEARSON: Which is why we want to build
14 that first level which we haven't had in the past.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry, that is diversion.
16 But this is really extensive explanation.

17 ALL: No, the problem that --

18 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. So we want to
19 create because we knew that's been a missing need of having
20 that high-level and easily accessible. This would be the
21 very technical how-did-you-get-your-points, and then on the
22 third level, I think we've shown you all that -- that
23 district dashboard that has much more detailed data and has
24 trend data that we wanna make available for schools and
25 districts and that school accountability committees and the



1 district accountability committees and the local boards to
2 use as they're doing their improvement planning and
3 understanding their performance and understanding their
4 relationship to others. So we're working on that three
5 level. Thank you, Dr. Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And the presentation does
8 make a huge difference in terms of usefulness.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, and the number of
10 questions I have Mr. Chair.

11 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely, and if you have
12 examples of reports from other states you'd like us to look
13 at, that would be great. Please, send us the logs. We're
14 in that design stage. You can use us.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: We might ask this -- we might
16 ask your association?

17 MS. PEARSON: Okay, that would be fantastic.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: The choice of statewide --
19 statewide information.

20 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: They might have some ideas of
22 recommendations.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

24 MS. HUCHTON: All right. So I'm gonna go
25 ahead and skip onto option B, sort of the criterion



1 referenced methodology for setting targets, and in this
2 case, we would be using the CMAS part performance levels to
3 actually set the expectations for schools and districts in
4 Colorado. So this is the criterion-based option, and you
5 see in the table on the screen that that does not mean cap
6 point would corresponds to the CMAS PARCC level one which is
7 a mean scales for less than 700. The approaching target
8 corresponds to levels two and three on the PARCC assessment
9 which is between the 700 and the 750, and then the meet's
10 cap point which is the most important so that's your
11 meetings and expectations corresponds to PARCC level four
12 which is their at proficiency.

13 You're on track to be college and career
14 ready, and that is a score of 750, and then it exceeds
15 rating corresponds to a PARCC level five which is around
16 800. It very slightly by content area and grade. But this
17 was the our way of linking the state directly back to the
18 PARCC criteria and those performance descriptors and the
19 expectations for college and career readiness. There are
20 some challenges with that though, and when you look at the
21 impacts data, you can see that we wind up with pretty much
22 zero schools and districts it exceeds. A small proportion
23 of schools and a much smaller proportion of districts it
24 meets, you know, so like less than 25 percent.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No one invited me.



1 MS. HUCHTON: Exactly. The vast majority
2 just sort of cluster and not approaching category. So you
3 can see that especially when you look at, you know,
4 mathematics, 97 percent of all districts would be -- would
5 receive an approaching rating. So -- so it really -- with
6 the pros using this methodology is that it, you know, aligns
7 with the student expectations for college and career
8 readiness. It does help interpret school and district
9 results in relationship to the assessment and his
10 performance expectations, and it does meet the statutory
11 requirements for the targets. But the cons of this, so the
12 first one is actually that these CMAS part criteria applied
13 only to the achievements.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: May I interrupt you?

15 MS. HUCHTON: I'm sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: These are -- this is actual
17 data from last year test.

18 MS. HUCHTON: Yes, this is from 2014-15.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they will use this
20 criteria that would be results if there were no improvement.
21 Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. HUCHTON: Exactly.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: They will be. It will be
24 interesting to look at this.

25 MS. HUCHTON: Yes.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: The third time, the kids take
2 it.

3 MS. HUCHTON: Uh-huh. Yes, I do think that
4 as we -- as we get more sort of accustomed to the Colorado
5 standards and the assessments that we will see some changes
6 in the results. But the problem is that at the moment,
7 these targets are ambitious but not necessarily attainable.
8 Certainly, you know, they -- they do not differentiating in
9 our schools level because the majority of schools and
10 districts wind up sort of in that approaching category, and
11 that from a -- from a state accountability framework
12 perspective causes some, some challenges.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Does the laws say
14 challenging but attainable? One of the words is managed?

15 MS. PEARSON: It better then. It says be
16 ambitious and attainable.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ambitious and attain ---
18 it's an and. So these criteria would not necessarily mean
19 meet the letter of the statute.

20 MS. PEARSON: So it says ambitious but
21 attainable statewide targets.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Attain.

23 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.



1 MS. FLORES: They might be but not right now,
2 I mean, it's really hard.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, that's how we should
4 look at this in three years and then -- and then say to what
5 extent are norm results comparing then. Even then, I'm
6 gonna make the argument that depends on a grade level
7 because you don't know how fast it's gonna catch up to much
8 different, much higher standards. Our kids and teachers, I
9 mean, this is -- this is an evolving effort that needs a
10 reasonable amount of time. Massachusetts had 20 years.
11 We're just -- we just haven't.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

13 MS. HUCHTON: And then, so in terms of, you
14 know, mitigation strategies, we choose to go with this --
15 this method. We can way achievement last in the overall
16 frameworks, and we can encourage schools and districts to
17 look at their percentile ranks for improvement planning
18 because as I said, sort of that everyone at approaching does
19 not provide you a lot of information for your own planning
20 processes. And so then we have again -- it's the same set
21 of schools that we showed you examples of before, now just,
22 you know, scored using this criterion method and you can see
23 that in the small suburban school which was one of the
24 highest performing elementary schools in the state at the 99
25 percentile, now only receives a meets rating because that



1 PARCC level five exceeds cut is so rigorous, and then we can
2 also see that the -- the large urban school, now the vast
3 majority of their student groups fall into the approaching
4 rating. The students with disabilities does still fall into
5 the does not meet.

6 But there's also -- there's still a lot of
7 work on schools that wind up getting that -- that lowest
8 target level -- our grading, sorry, and then the same thing
9 happens with a small rural district. They are also, you
10 know, in those first percentiles and they do receive does
11 not meet in approaching ratings, but -- and the midsize real
12 district is also approaching across the Board. So really,
13 the problem for -- for me is that we don't promote -- we
14 don't provide enough information for you to be -- be able to
15 tell parts if we're doing a better job versus, you know, the
16 rest of the population. So that's kind of the challenge.

17 MS. PEARSON: So what we need from you of
18 today, and we don't need a formal vote, but we just want a
19 sense from you all if you're comfortable enough with one of
20 these methodologies, what we would probably recommend is
21 using a school norm targets because it provides greater
22 distribution and an ambitious and attainable, and ambitious
23 but attainable, both of those. Who we want to get your
24 sense of your comfort level with that because if you're not
25 comfortable with that, we don't want to put out reports that



1 are based on those targets to get feedback knowing that it
2 may change. So I think we just kind of need, I don't know,
3 however you want to do it, Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Members have been asked to
5 -- to express at least to have an opinion as to whether or
6 not they should be sent to the districts and which of the
7 criteria you would like to use, and I -- I think that's a
8 very fair request on part of our staff. So how we can deal
9 with this. You want to comment just in turn starting with
10 Dr. Schroeder, and then we'll just go around the room.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I think there are enough
12 con, significant cons to the criterion referenced even
13 though as I said I'm philosophically aligned with that
14 notion. There'll be a time when that's appropriate, and
15 this isn't it. I am confident that the public would not
16 accept a pass-fail accountability system. And so, I'm happy
17 to have Dr. Scheffel design something but I just -- I'm not
18 willing to defend that because I know that's not what
19 parents want. They really want to know more detail than
20 that which means that we have a percentile where the kids
21 are -- their kids are, and that we also look at it in terms
22 of districts because taxpayers are also gonna care more than
23 just the pass-fail. They don't wanna state this as a pass
24 state. I just don't see that as being us -- us doing our
25 job.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

2 MS. GOFF: Question, first. Though I have to
3 know, have -- have some of those stakeholder groups and the
4 bill that I've been working through this, they've obviously
5 seen both what both appear as truth behind whatever. How
6 difficult would it be this to take both -- both of these
7 methods and -- and try -- and have both available for -- for
8 each district even so that, I mean, I can understand where
9 the pitfalls come with opening up a lot of different types
10 of options to look at, and I'm curious of even, even of the
11 major districts or the districts that took part in the -- in
12 the pre-work you've all been doing, whether they would be
13 interested in having that both type shared with their public
14 or not? I -- I'm -- I can recognize the dangers in doing
15 it. I can also recognize the benefits sometimes, but some
16 of that kind of depends on who's aware of what it looks like
17 and -- and how to read it. So I'm just curious if that's a
18 lot preference for me.

19 Now, for the same reasons Dr. Schroeder said,
20 is the -- the normed referenced approach, for a couple
21 reasons, I -- I think the timing is better for that right
22 now. It's a better transition for -- not only to later when
23 we have more time with the use of the standards and things
24 like that, but also, this -- this transition we're in right
25 now with basically our former way of doing it, moving into a



1 new way. We're still operating on 2015 and '16. ESEA,
2 they're still that going on. We've got this bridge to ESSA.
3 We want to set up something that is -- is a good transition
4 for down the road piece. So -- so that's practically --
5 that's where I want to go. I totally agree. I do think
6 that the level of a performance, basic competencies as it
7 ties into the bigger world of career and college and after
8 high school life readiness is really the point. But I think
9 for now, this is a good way to reach that, and people are
10 used to looking at similar. I'm not -- I'm not real big on
11 constant disruption of everything right now. Anybody, stop.
12 Thank you for this work. Appreciated it.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

14 MS. RANKIN: I -- I would agree with Dr.
15 Schroeder about the normed reference but I wanna go back to
16 your three points at the beginning of your presentation,
17 30,000 foot view from parents. I think when this comes out,
18 something like that has to accompany it because we're gonna
19 be in lot of trouble if we just present the -- I mean,
20 because it'll be readable to the voice. So there would be
21 two things. It would be the -- the parent explanation, but
22 then one more thing Dr. Schroeder brought up that I really
23 agree with and that is the transitions, the reason that we
24 chose this and the reason that it's being presented with
25 this 30,000 foot view. I -- I think if we lead into it and



1 then the last part are the details because we have to know
2 how to improve our kids at the school and district level.
3 You know, I'm probably leaving a lot out but I do see kind
4 of a -- a three-point roll out. So -- so we -- we kind of
5 foresee what the questions are will be.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I like the -- the
8 normed referenced and agree that we need to explain. I -- I
9 actually thought that the explanation here today was pretty
10 good. You know, the -- the pros and cons, and how if we had
11 done it the other way, it would have looked like this, and
12 that this was an attempt to get the most fair representation
13 of how our students in our districts or schools are doing.
14 And do we look at this in three years for sure or?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're look at it every
16 year.

17 MS. PEARSON: Every year, exactly.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're changing the
19 frameworks or?

20 MS. PEARSON: Well, it's always an option.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: In theory.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and the targets

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And maybe.

24 MS. PEARSON: We set targets every year.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Maybe we, you
2 know, put that information in there too, that this was what
3 we came up with. There's always room for improvement and
4 change in the future. So nobody thinks that it's set in
5 stone.

6 MS. FLORES: For sure.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is right.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll make it sure.
10 Next year.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So I would wanna add to
12 Joyce's 3,000 foot overview for parents. The notion of, we
13 want, it's our goal to set high and achievable goals for our
14 schools and districts. Now, I think that is our view and I
15 think we wanna make sure our parents know that's our goal
16 because there'll be some question about why we have this
17 normed system. That's what works right now.

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think we can also work
19 with their parents in the SSA around the long term goals
20 versus the interim private schools, and we can talk about
21 how our long term goals are up here as we develop our state
22 plan wherever we land those if it's 750 but something
23 higher.

24 MS. RANKIN: And they are closer to that.



1 MS. RANKIN: Yes. And they are gonna work
2 their way up to that.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Crandall, do you have a
4 comment?

5 MR. CRANDALL: I do. But I want to make sure
6 that --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Okay. Well, I thank you for
9 explaining this. But I agree, I think with Dr. Schroeder.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You know that's her name.
11 I have the same problem.

12 ALL: That's her name. That's for sure.

13 MS. FLORES: Excuse me. I agree with Dr.
14 Schroeder. I just can't see why we can't have a pass and
15 not pass with then a percentage point of where you are. I
16 mean, you could have that too and should have that too
17 because I don't think parents are gonna understand these
18 cuts course if we leave it at 600 to 800 and something, they
19 are not going to find meaning in that. So we need to have
20 some percentage point up there so that they understand.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: But we have the 100 percent.
22 We have the 15 percent, 84 percent I mean, the percent
23 earnings. It's all in there. We have 100 percent.

24 MS. FLORES: Well, all right. Well, okay.
25 We need to give that. We need to give that too. And I



1 think that students and districts deserve a privacy. I
2 mean, we cannot continue on this business of not having
3 privacy for those students who don't do well. And with it's
4 -- it's not about them. We need to do better by them just
5 because they're poor, just because they're minority, just
6 because they're ESL. They have more to overcome to do well.
7 And so I think that if on any scale, and especially this
8 scale, we're gonna have five percent of these school
9 districts who are not going to do well just by the scale.
10 You're gonna have to put them in that place. And I think
11 that the present Secretary of Education had been talking
12 about it even before he became the Secretary of Education
13 that there weren't going to be, you know, losers in kind of
14 a scale like this.

15 And I think when kids see that and feel, and
16 I have taught at those schools where kids just, we didn't do
17 well, you know. And to overcome that, it's reported
18 everywhere. And I think we need to do something more maybe
19 within the district we know and to help those kids not have
20 this self-concept, this defeatist concept which we do. You
21 remember it when you didn't get a good grade at school. And
22 it's not fair. I mean, this business of approaching, we
23 know it's economics, we know it's language. And I think
24 there should be kind of a privacy for those districts. We
25 know who they are, and we know why they do not do well. And



1 then when we kind of even added on when we have exceeds, and
2 or exceeds, I mean, it's like, it's razor sharp and it
3 doesn't feel good.

4 So I think we should start thinking about
5 what we put out there and think about feelings, feelings for
6 these poor kids. Not that we're not going to do the best
7 that we can to help them and that's why I keep, you know,
8 repeating myself and saying, we need to help those schools.
9 Yes we give awards to all these people that that don't, and
10 I think that we need to start looking. I'm frustrated,
11 okay. And I think we should have been looking for
12 alternatives to this a long time ago. It's just not a fair
13 test. It's not a good test. And I think we should just get
14 on with reporting this and go on to something else. Another
15 test. I'm sorry. That's what I think. And I think we're -
16 -

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're all good.

18 MS. FLORES: I think we need to look at other
19 alternatives to what we have right now. I'm sorry. It's
20 not gonna do. I just think we're going down a path that's
21 not going to lead to success for all kids. And that's what
22 we want. We want all kids to be winners and --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes.

24 MR. CRANDALL: Yes. I have to too. Thank
25 you for this. Just a couple of minutes. Well, I'll preface



1 this by saying, we love you all. And I know it is a
2 privilege to get to working for you. There's a challenge
3 here that we need to recognize and that is the norm
4 reference is safe, it is comfortable, it has no risk and as
5 mentioned over here, it is non-disruptive. I have a problem
6 telling districts that they are exceeding, number one, when
7 we have a high opt out of high achieving students.

8 And number two, when we go to the criterion
9 basis, they're not exceeding. And the only reason why I --
10 my only comment I want to make is that we will never be --
11 safe, (inaudible), and non-disruptive will never get us
12 where we want to be ten years from now. And so it is
13 difficult. I always equate it to when Utah and Colorado
14 jumped into the back 12. They didn't win at all the first
15 two, three years, they didn't win, and they didn't go to
16 ball games.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Colorado is still didn't
18 win.

19 MR. CRANDALL: Still didn't go to a ball
20 game. But it's fine because they had presentations to the
21 Utah State Board. I use the last six years of Utah they
22 went three and nine that first year, then they went five.
23 And you know, the next thing you know, they're beating
24 Stanford and they're beating Morgan. Parents deserve the
25 right to know, I as a parent want to know that my kid has



1 some serious room for improvement compared to other kids.
2 Whatever you do normed reference there's always those kids
3 who exceed when that's not a true representation of the
4 picture. And so at some point, we have to find a much
5 better assessment that is closer to the instruction, but
6 we're gonna have to go to criterion at some point.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Agreed. But just not
8 now.

9 MS. FLORES: Do you guys -- do you guys
10 remember a time when we knew all that. We took achievement
11 tests. We took them every year. But there wasn't this
12 whole thing of, this is a loser school. And we need to, I
13 mean, we're talking about privacy here. Two, we just
14 started with privacy this morning. There should be some
15 privacy about that and that they're working. And then we
16 need to do the work with giving them the help so that they
17 get out of that -- of that area and where they are
18 succeeding. Or maybe I'm thinking that -- so I'll just say
19 that at that time we didn't highlight the fact, we just
20 aggregated everything and we didn't highlight the fact that
21 we were not serving so many kids. The kids that you say
22 need our help have to be identified. That has to be honest
23 and transparent.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Everybody knew who those
25 kids were, at that time.



1 MS. RANKIN: No, they didn't.

2 MS. FLORES: Yes they did. Everybody that --

3 MS. RANKIN: I said, that's not true.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. RANKIN: I said in a high performing
6 district where we never acknowledged that we had 100
7 percent.

8 MS. FLORES: Now, that was your fault.

9 MS. RANKIN: We didn't have the information.
10 It's got to be out there, it's got to be transparent. And
11 if it's not transparent, it's so easy to aggregate and pat
12 yourself on the back, when in fact we didn't have a growth
13 even for our best kids, best students. And we weren't even
14 serving some of those who are neediest. That's where all
15 this comes from. And it's hard to have that conversation
16 but we hope ultimate is gonna make a difference with this.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Flores.

18 MS. FLORES: I don't agree with you. I think
19 when you took an Iowa test of Basic Skills or a California
20 Achievement Test, kids knew. I mean the parents knew that
21 some kids were at the 35 percentile, other kids were at the
22 77 percentile. And in fact, it was even better then because
23 all those kids were together in this in one school, whereas
24 now we segregate those kids. I mean, we put all poor kids
25 in one school and then we have these other schools where,



1 you know, the middle in kids go and then we track them, not
2 by trucks within schools, but we track them, we segregate
3 them by schools and that just doesn't seem fair.

4 We have always known that we didn't do
5 anything, that districts didn't do anything to help poor
6 kids do better. I can believe that. But I mean, having
7 gone to -- having gone to a segregated system, I attended a
8 segregated school. We were segregated. There was a black
9 school, there was Latino, Hispanic kids, and then there were
10 the white schools. And I mean, you can't get any more
11 segregated than that. But even then, there was still the
12 chance in high school because there was only one high school
13 where you would get a chance to get into other classes,
14 advanced classes, and such. And I think we're not doing
15 that anymore. But the chance was there for districts to
16 help those poor kids. We always knew where they stood. We
17 always knew that score.

18 And we can have a better test. I'm not
19 saying let's go back to then, but I am saying that we should
20 have a much better test than we have now. And PARCC is not
21 -- is not a good test for Colorado. And our parents are
22 telling us by not sending their kids to take that test, and
23 we're going to have more this year. So we need to do
24 something to really get this -- this idea that you're not
25 even, you know, the business with a zero that was



1 understood. What about those kids in Boulder, 50 percent of
2 them in those high schools that didn't take the test, does
3 that mean that those kids in Boulder got cited as being
4 above because we know those kids are smart? Is that what we
5 did?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't think so.

7 MS. FLORES: Well, I mean, somebody was
8 talking about we already know that those kids do well in
9 those schools. But I just don't think it's fair. And I
10 think we need to do something about teaching our kids and
11 this business of talking about standards and all when
12 teachers do not understand, you know, these standards when
13 we have these very young people that are coming in and are
14 not being trained, when we don't have the textbooks, we
15 don't have the materials. It's just not right. And I think
16 what's out there and what I'm seeing in materials I would
17 just, you know, I wouldn't put a seal of approval on that.
18 I think we have a messed up system, and we need to change it
19 as quickly as possible to something that's gonna work for
20 all our students. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Currently as concluded by
22 Ms. Pearson, Unfortunately, I think if we were to use the
23 criterion method, the Board would be overwhelmed by the
24 number of turnaround schools and districts with which we had
25 to deal, and I suspect that would consume more than 100



1 percent of our time going forward. I think it does lead to.
2 And I do wanna agree in part with Dr. Flores that I'm not a
3 fan of the PARCC test. I'm not sure that, particularly in
4 math, that it measures what it should but it's the test we
5 have. And so, I don't get to live in a world that I'd like
6 to live in. I get to live in the world that we have. And I
7 think probably we ought to work on seeing if we can develop
8 a test that might pass Masters, that could meet our own
9 standards and criteria, but that's an expensive and
10 proposition doesn't mean we shouldn't be started on.

11 So I think -- I think we're -- we're going to
12 agree with I think the majority of the Board that the normed
13 is the only practical solution that we have at the moment.
14 But I think it's fair to say to some of the reform community
15 and others who I think fervently believe that we're simply
16 measuring the slowest turtles, doesn't. That there is and I
17 think as Mr. Crandall noted, we are ultimately entitled to
18 be able to compare our results with other states and see how
19 we're actually performing across state lines and that has to
20 be a long term objective. But In the short run, we clearly
21 cannot practically deal with criterion references. And so,
22 I think you're on the right track and it will probably
23 require some refinement. It's certainly not perfect. The
24 test's certainly not perfect by any means and I hope we'll



1 work as a Board on the testing question. So I think, did we
2 answer your question Ms. Pearson to your satisfaction?

3 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you very much.
5 All right.

6 MS. PEARSON: Unfortunately, we had two other
7 sections.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Only two other sections?
9 Well, what's it?

10 MS. FLORES: Yeah. Do you want to keep going
11 or take a break first?

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

13 MS. RANKIN: We will.

14 MS. PEARSON: I know.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's a great dangerous
16 place to be.

17 MS. PEARSON: I know. It is. But we don't
18 need to make any decisions we just want to put these little
19 things in your head to start thinking through so that by
20 June we can have interaction from you all and you're not
21 caught unprepared by it.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

23 MS. PEARSON: So I apologize for being --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There's no reason to
2 apologize. You're not the cause of the tardiness and we
3 started 20 minutes late.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 MS. PEARSON: There you go. Okay. So
6 there's two other big questions that we're gonna need to
7 work on to be able to get the frameworks out, and one of
8 those is the indicator weights. That means, how much would
9 our values in terms of how much we value achievement,
10 compared to growth, compared to Postsecondary Workforce
11 Readiness. What should we weigh those individual pieces in
12 the frameworks? So your state Board rules have some
13 language around this which say, "In this analysis, the
14 greatest emphasis is put upon the longitudinal growth on the
15 growth measures and the Postsecondary Workforce Readiness
16 performance indicators." So that's what's currently in
17 Board rule, growth and Postsecondary Workforce Readiness
18 weigh the most. Okay? And then that says that for
19 districts, it's the same for the schools, the language
20 merits.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And so you're asking us to
22 consider whether we wish to maintain this particular
23 weighting?

24 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So that's what is in
25 there currently that we've been working off on and the --



1 the policy has gotten more specific than that in terms of
2 the exact percentages for each indicator, but we're basing
3 it on what's in that Board policy. So if you wanted to
4 change growth and Postsecondary Workforce Readiness from
5 being weighted the most, compared to achievement, then we
6 would wanna go back to Board rules to do that.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And that would be for the
8 overall ranking of the schools?

9 MS. PEARSON: Yes. It would be, yes.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We probably ought to at
11 least have a discussion and perhaps vote on that at some
12 point.

13 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right.

15 MS. PEARSON: Okay. For what's in the Every
16 Student Succeeds Act because we just wanna make sure you all
17 know what's in those pieces. They require the state to
18 attribute substantial weight to the achievement growth, the
19 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness. We'll get into the
20 details with you all, about ESSA, as time goes on. There's
21 another component in ESSA that looks at the student success
22 indicator, these other indicator of student success for
23 school quality. That's something that's gonna need to get
24 determined by the state about what indicator- indicators we
25 want put into that, what measures we want to look at, and



1 that will come over the coming months. But ESSA says the
2 other indicators achievement growth and Postsecondary
3 Workforce Readiness need to weigh more than that one
4 student's success school quality indicator. So that's just
5 what's in the ESSA. We're not there yet. That won't be in
6 the fall framework.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So you know, this is just a
8 question of timing. At the NASBE conference, we heard three
9 examples of accountability systems that were different. The
10 most intriguing one was one that had been a-- had been
11 developed by some teachers. They were all part of that
12 contest that (inaudible) had, design and they were
13 intriguing and thoughtful. What I'm wondering is, when do
14 we have that conversation? Do we go ahead and do our vote
15 now based on what we have, and then give ourselves time to
16 change it for another year, or do we open this one now.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead, Ms. Pearson.

18 MS. PEARSON: My understanding of where we
19 are with law and requirements, and our ability to get
20 frameworks out in the fall, we need to go forward with this
21 plan now as we work on the ESSA --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So we operate under the
23 current system, and then we'll have time to --.

24 MS. PEARSON: We'll operate --



1 MR. DILL: Well, we won't even have all the
2 rules till December.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Good point. Okay.

4 MS. PEARSON: So we'll just try to make this
5 better for now, then we can think long term.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So don't think long term, just
7 think about getting through this year and then that actually
8 gives us the option whether we take one year or two years to
9 develop another system.

10 MS. PEARSON: The ESSA wants, I think for the
11 -- it needs to be that 18 frameworks that would be based on
12 the '17-'18 school year data.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So we don't have that much
14 time?

15 MS. PEARSON: We've got some time.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: But not a lot.

17 MS. PEARSON: But we can always improve it as
18 time goes on and there's nothing that says that you're set
19 in stone and you can't make any changes to your system.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Because I think people
21 are very hopeful about that.

22 MR. CRANDALL: Correct. And you'll hear
23 about that in my report today.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Sorry. Thank you.

25 MR. CRANDALL: We'll talk about it all.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go right ahead.

2 MS. PEARSON: So these pie charts just show
3 how it's currently been weighted in the system. The green
4 is growth gaps. We had growth split up between growth and
5 then growth gaps which was just aggregated growth. Combine
6 growth and growth graphs that in the middle level was 75
7 percent of the weighting. Remember when we talked about
8 this last time. I know it's complicated. The way growth
9 has been calculated in the past has included that adequate
10 growth which is highly connected to achievement. So it's
11 not this pure idea of growth and then it's got this
12 connection to achievement. Achievement's been 25 percent
13 for elementary and middle. High school it's a little
14 different, because we have the Postsecondary Workforce
15 Readiness indicators, which have been at 35 percent,
16 achievements at 15 percent at high school, and then the
17 growth and the growth gaps combined was 50 percent.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Give us a list of
19 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness standards.

20 MS. PEARSON: Sure. They're pretty blunt
21 measures. It's graduation rate, disaggregated graduation
22 rate and that includes the four, five, six or seven, the
23 best of rate for kids who need longer to graduate. Dropout
24 rates and the composite ACT score. That's what it's been.
25 House Bill 11-70, is that the right number from 2015, added



1 a measure of matriculation rate which will go on for 16,
2 which looks at the percent of students, the year after they
3 graduate that enroll in a two year program, a four year
4 program or a CTE program. SO that's getting added in there.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So part of this is
6 statutorily pro -- prescribed?

7 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. Exactly.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. PEARSON: There's room for other measures
10 and we've looked into them. We have a conundrum in that
11 they're very localized and there's local priorities, so one
12 district may really emphasize AP, another district may
13 emphasize IB and other districts may look at concurrent
14 enrollment. So we're looking at ways, how can we recognize
15 those local priorities in the framework, when we don't have
16 something consistent across the state.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

18 MS. PEARSON: So we've gotten a lot of
19 stakeholder feedback on the weightings and the weights, and
20 this is a high level summary of it. Over 70 percent of
21 respondents when Eliot and I spent the fall going out,
22 talking to district superintendent groups and other
23 stakeholder groups about meetings and everything. They
24 weighed growth having the highest weight. It's what they
25 wanted with achievement and Postsecondary Workforce



1 Readiness following. Most stakeholders, although there are
2 some that we hear from, but very few, but most really value
3 growth in the state, you know, important part of our history
4 and our history of accountability too. But there are some
5 people that feel like achievement is all that should matter.
6 So there are some voices out there, I just want to make sure
7 you know that.

8 We've worked with our technical advisory
9 panel for longitudinal growth, and really talked with them
10 about what they thought weighting should be, and this is
11 what they recommended. For elementary and middle school,
12 thinking about growth being 60 percent, achievement 40
13 percent, high schools and districts 40 percent growth, 40
14 percent Postsecondary Workforce Readiness, 20 percent
15 achievement. That was just the recommendation coming from
16 them. And then we talked to their accountability workgroup
17 as well, which is made up of district representatives, CASE,
18 CASB, charter school, CSI. We both talk to a lot of
19 representatives on there.

20 They were comfortable with the top
21 weightings, what those suggestions were. They also thought
22 you could do growth at 66 percent, achievement at 33
23 percent. Do it two thirds, one third. The high school,
24 they again agreed with the technical advisory panel, the
25 longitudinal growth suggestions. They had some more



1 concerns about Postsecondary Workforce Readiness and
2 achievement, maybe being weighted too high with the measures
3 that are in there now. So those weightings, if you go back
4 and look, PWR, the Postsecondary Workforce Readiness was at
5 40 and achievement at 20. You combine them, it's a lot of
6 status, and we knew that those measures are more highly
7 correlated with distinct demographics generally. So that
8 was the concern from them. So that's high level.

9 We pulled some other states to just look at
10 how other states do some of their weighting. This is just a
11 selection of some. You can do more research if you all
12 would like. You can see the varying degrees. The weights
13 are really about your priorities for education and what you
14 value in the system. So while the state Board rules and the
15 statute doesn't require these weightings to go through you
16 all, I think you all are the decision makers. This is a big
17 policy decision about what we value for outcomes for our
18 schools, and so I think it's really important that you think
19 about what these weights should be, and where do we like to
20 see them. How much do we value growth, compared to
21 achievement, compared to Postsecondary Workforce Readiness
22 in terms of the measures we have right now in Postsecondary
23 Workforce Readiness.

24 So you can see other states have a- have a
25 wide range from 35 percent for growth in Nevada up to 60



1 percent in Washington. And then you can see some other
2 states have some other indicators in there as well that they
3 use. Those are the elementary levels and then high school
4 it's a little bit different. Just to note, Nevada doesn't
5 have growth at the high school level because of the grades
6 they test in. They skip a bunch, so it's not that they
7 don't value growth, it's just that they don't have tests
8 they have been able to do that. Wyoming has a little bit of
9 a different way of pulling things together. It's really
10 interesting. It's a decision table. So they say, if you're
11 at this rating for growth and this rating for achievement,
12 you would get this rating. So it's more value laden, that
13 if you're struggling with achievement, struggling with
14 growth, then you'd be the- the lowest overall. If you're
15 doing well in growth but struggling with achievement, then
16 maybe you'd be in the middle level. So I don't know. If
17 you've got more questions, we've got a Wyoming expert in the
18 room.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They change it every
20 year?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Schroeder.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I think the discussion for us
23 is in terms of the high school. I -- I don't disagree with
24 the growth notion, but this is for kids when the rubber
25 meets the road. And so, there's gotta be achievement, and



1 there's gotta be postsecondary success. And the time
2 allowed for growth is kind of diminished by this point. And
3 so I'm very much in agreement at the elementary and middle
4 school, that that's where we wanna see the greatest
5 interventions, and strengths for kids. But boy, we hope by
6 ninth grade, we're not trying to make up three or four
7 years, and are trying to measure growth. If we have that
8 kind of an approach for many kids, maybe not for all kids
9 but certainly for many kids, we're not gonna make it for
10 them. So I -- I want to keep that in mind based on how
11 we're looking at that. I appreciate that they are different
12 and I -- I personally see them differently, so I'm worried a
13 little bit about the whole lot of growth at the high school
14 level. I also worry about not being able to measure growth.
15 So I hope we don't go down that road, but that's another
16 discussion.

17 MS. PEARSON: High school may be a challenge.
18 I think what we'll -- we'll be able to do assuming we keep
19 ninth grade testing as measure for eighth to ninth, and then
20 as we have PSAT and SAT both implemented, we're gonna look
21 and see if we can measure growth between PSAT and SAT
22 scores, and maybe a challenge to do ninth grade assessments
23 to PSAT. That may be a hard thing.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, we should -- we should,
25 if they're aligned to standards, it should be a possible



1 thing to do. I mean we may not be able to do it
2 individually, we may need some help from the College Board.
3 But it seems to me that there might be something in there
4 that allows us to do that. I'm not opposed to growth. I
5 just want the focus to be on growth at those grades K
6 through eight, and then to start looking at well, how- how
7 close are you to being there in order to be college and
8 career ready. I mean, that might be a discussion we all
9 need to have, whether that's something we agree on or don't
10 agree on.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think those -- an
12 important discussion point down the road. Proceed please.
13 Oh, I'm sorry.

14 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, we just wanted to stop
15 and get your input.

16 MS. GOFF: Just -- just add on, quick
17 comment. The whole high school years, everything that we're
18 talking about in terms of high school and earlier, but
19 especially focused in high school. The whole concurrent
20 enrollment world of opportunity and engagement, other
21 workforce development readiness avenues. GT, I mean, I
22 think the conversation with higher advanced learners and in
23 gifted education and identity and all of that is it -- is it
24 works throughout the whole system, some of those types of
25 indicators, I know that we have to talk about it, it's a



1 little sensitive and tricky sometimes, but it's important.
2 And as far as growth, they're not necessarily in that track
3 all the time. They're looking for what can I do, how can I
4 make the most of it and that's- that's a little down the
5 road but it's coming and we -- we can always consider that
6 as well.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

8 MS. PEARSON: So I think we just wanted to
9 ask, is there information or additional data, anything that
10 we can provide to you all to help you with this
11 recommendation on the weightings coming forward, because we
12 really will need some direction from you come June so that
13 we can get those three months out in August, September.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any information any member
15 of the Board would specifically like to see or have? I'll
16 start by saying, I thought what other states were doing was
17 helpful, and they would get that and get that chart in
18 advance of -- of our decision making. Some of those ideas
19 looked particularly interesting, and no wonder I couldn't
20 find that.

21 MS. GOFF: Well, it's in whatever the old
22 (inaudible) is.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So are we, anybody else
24 have any- anything they think would be particularly helpful?
25 Maybe also just a discussion of growth measures beyond grade



1 nine, maybe that really has to be deemphasized in high
2 school. Yes, Miss Mazanec.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you explain the
4 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness, the good detail on, all
5 the parts within the parts, and what they mean would be
6 good.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What that entails.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Discuss all that.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

10 MS. FLORES: I mean, when we think about the
11 quality of the test, the PARCC test, I don't know if you
12 looked in the want ad at sections this Sunday. There was an
13 announcement for graders, people who would do tests. You
14 know what the pay was? It was \$11.50. So that was in
15 Lakewood. I mean, I guess that's where the center is going
16 to be, and that's where I guess we wanted to have the test
17 graded here. So they're going to do it here in -- in
18 Lakewood. And if you are interested for a dollar, \$11.50,
19 you can apply and be a grader to test this -- this PARCC
20 test, art test.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why don't you sign up?
22 Are you gonna sign up?

23 MS. FLORES: You can only -- you can only
24 kind of wonder at the quality, if that's what they pay.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, Ms. Pearson.



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. We've got one more
2 section.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, go right ahead.

4 MS. PEARSON: You guys love us, I know. I'm
5 sorry. So this last part of the decision is about the cut
6 points for the final plan type readings. So what does that
7 mean? It's this circles. So we move from, you know, the
8 red over, earlier we're over here. It's deciding what those
9 cut points are and how we decide which schools and districts
10 are at turnaround and priority improvement, improvement,
11 performance and distinction. And it really does. It has a
12 lot of impact on you all in terms of the schools and
13 district that you're hearing about the clock.

14 So this all connects to all those other
15 pieces, because this will determine who stays on the clock
16 or becomes off the clock for '16 and it'll determine who you
17 hear coming forward and who we have to direct action for it,
18 coming forward in the '16-'17 school year. So this is a
19 hard one. So statutory requirements say that the Department
20 shall review assigned school plan types on these levels,
21 State Board rules lay out the accreditation levels that the
22 department has to sign. The Every Student Succeeds Act that
23 talks about identifying schools for comprehensive
24 improvement. It's one of the categories. They define that



1 as not less than the lowest five percent of all schools in
2 the state that are receiving Title 1 funds.

3 So just, we're keeping in line, we don't need
4 to base everything on ESSA but I just want you to have that
5 information there, to know what those expectations are gonna
6 be, because we've heard feedback from the field that as much
7 as we can have it single system, we're not sending different
8 messages about performance of schools, that's what they
9 want. So that's in the ESSA requirement. There are some
10 other ESSA requirements that we'll get into it another time
11 in the future you don't need to worry about today. So there
12 are some options of what we can do. We could look at the
13 current distributions of where schools and districts are
14 from 2014 that was the most recent and we can match that.

15 And I'll show you some examples of what that
16 data looks like in a minute. We could be re-norm and start
17 back where we started in 2010, with distributions we had in
18 2010. We could look at a criteria and reference. We can
19 look at the data and say these are the schools based on this
20 kind of performance and the indicators that we think should
21 be turned around. Things should be distinction. Are there
22 some other -- I'm sure there's lots of other possibilities
23 we could talk about. Again, you are not to make a decision
24 today were just trying to start giving you a little bit of
25 background.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder

2 MS. SCHROEDER: So which one -- which one
3 would align -- which one of your options that you suggest
4 other than other --

5 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: -- aligns best with what the
7 field told us which is they wanted to school one. If I
8 understood your comment that you want the school one and the
9 District one to be aligned.

10 MS. PEARSON: So that --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Isn't that what you said?

12 MS. PEARSON: Yes. The confusing part of
13 which set of targets, that's where the other details target,
14 that's where they wanna make sure there's alignment
15 especially. So that when we tell them that for Math
16 achievement that it does not need the school and districts
17 have the same rating. They are not -- does not need for
18 school and approaching for the -- the districts 'cause
19 that's where the most of the misaligned has been so far.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

21 MS. PEARSON: There's been a little bit of
22 misalignment and a few situations where a district has been
23 identified on the clock but not a school. And that's led
24 some to some confusion with no district is in the clock but
25 no district is on the clock, so they wonder how can that



1 happen. Yeah, we can go into details later I don't think
2 that's something else that we can make sure we can build and
3 checks for it.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: And I appreciate that you
5 guys just look at all the different districts you see where
6 there are aberrations. Are there aberrations?

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. So if we went to the
8 2014 distributions. This is where we were, you can see,
9 sorry. I flipped the wrong side. This is 2014 and you can
10 see it in 2014 for schools. We had 70.5 percent of our
11 school was using a performance plan about 20 percent
12 improvement, 6.7 percent of priority improvement 3.2 percent
13 turnaround. And then you can see what it was for districts.
14 On the other side. So we can match that and say, you know,
15 2014 was that so for the 2016 ratings we'll set a cut point
16 to make sure that no more than 3.2 percent of schools that
17 turnaround. And you could set it that way just to line up.
18 That would be one way to do it.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: It is interesting for the
20 ESSA five percent.

21 MS. PEARSON: Yes. And what we need to go
22 June and we haven't had a chance to do it yet it won't take
23 too long as broad the Title 1 schools because for ESSA it's
24 the first -- the -- the 5 percent of Title 1 school which is
25 33 schools about in the state the so -- and so it'll --



1 it'll look pretty little different and they will get their
2 pilot quicker than turnaround priority improvement with the
3 numbers. But we need to go run that for you. Or you could
4 go back to 2010 and what we had set in 2010 there's lots of
5 conversations running about how to set those cut points and
6 what percentage of schools in these different categories
7 could be and who we could serve, with cities these capacity
8 was to provide support services to schools identified.

9 So you can do it that way. You could see the
10 numbers are much higher. You'd see 4.1 percent of schools
11 in turnaround, 80 percent in priority improvement. I'm
12 sorry that the percentage is missing from performance plan.
13 It's just saw that it's less than 17 percent of that. I'm
14 doing this stuff going back to 2010. The impact is that
15 we've had schools and districts that have worked really hard
16 to find out a turnaround priority improvement. They've had
17 these really nice study gains that have worked out. They
18 might end up like it.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: It has to be some good reason
20 for picking 2010 for me, it's close to what we've been most
21 recently. I mean, I think one of our thoughts today has
22 been some kind of consistency since things are not- had not
23 been consistent. We have a new assessment etc.. We have a
24 new Federal Act et cetera. And that to the extent that we
25 can still offer some comparability to the most recent past.



1 But I don't know if my colleagues agree. I know you don't
2 agree you want to get- you don't want to be safe but- we
3 bear -- we bear the brunt of the confusion and the push back
4 that we don't want to create. I mean, I don't want to
5 create it. It's -- it's about moving forward in a measured
6 way as opposed to you know, for me in a very abrupt way.
7 I'm not the biggest first day profit.

8 MS. PEARSON: And then though the last main
9 one that we just kind of mocked up for you all. There is
10 other ways that you can do. This is where you could really
11 do a continuous reference more of a standard setting one.
12 And so we could go take a color process where you look at
13 profiles of different schools and you say "Okay, this school
14 is ending does not mean ratings on achievement and growth of
15 a secondary workforce readiness. We think that a school
16 that has that profile, should have maybe a turnaround
17 rating. Or we have a school that needs achievement and
18 exceeds for growth exceeds for post-secondary workforce
19 readiness that kind of school we want to be performance.

20 So we can have a very valued centered
21 conversation that way and have the discussion on what we can
22 do a step to like the standard groups get educated-
23 educator, present other stakeholder experts together and put
24 some profiles and make decisions that way. I think- so
25 that's another option and I'll take a look a little bit of



1 time but is that something you are interested in let us know
2 that it has to be so we can start planning for that.
3 Because again we need to by June know what we're doing
4 because we- you not meeting in July and needs to be able to
5 get the -- the frameworks adversaries as soon we can. I
6 will guess through September. Don't let me enjoy.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: This criteria replica is this
8 one that will argue about in terms of what will be varied.
9 I think word, objective will -- when we create -- will the
10 objective measures or will we have just explain that and say
11 "I have got two these and one of these or not more than one?"

12 MS. PEARSON: I -- I think it would have to
13 be really clear and objective, right? We'd have to really
14 specific the about whatever different possible combinations
15 this is what comes out. That it would be very value based I
16 think, and a lot of ways.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: But according to the values
18 that we gonna sit and weigh.

19 MS. PEARSON: And does. It does go to that
20 but then it also goes to you know, we may have and we have
21 mark the data yet we don't have the new data to look at.
22 But we may have a lot of schools that are does not meet
23 across the border approaching at the last Board and
24 depending on where that standards committee says. Maybe
25 they say every bill that it's approaching across the Board



1 should get a priority improvement rating. That would
2 probably lead to a much greater for set and priority
3 improvement than what we have there. I don't know we've got
4 to look at the data. So I think that's -- that's the trade
5 off if you don't want to see a huge influx of schools and
6 districts in the lower categories. You don't have as much
7 control over that if you do criterion reference. Or you
8 might want to do both but then that kind of takes away from
9 the criterion reference process. So pros and cons again,
10 the amount of stability you want all of those pieces. It is
11 not easy stuff. I'm sorry. It is not easy.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Comments folks or lunch.

13 MS. PEARSON: Or if there's other things you
14 would like to do and go look at so we can bring that back to
15 you and help you make your decision to make your
16 recommendation.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pam.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My comment would be that
19 we definitely -- I would like to have this discussion when
20 Dr. Scheffel is here. Because she can explain a lot of the
21 stuff the rest of us. But I really like -- I like the
22 options but I do like the idea of delving into this path
23 separately or next me this is April, so we have May and June
24 we may need to touch on it both meetings.



1 MS. PEARSON: I think so, or do a study
2 session if you'd rather do it that way. However you all
3 would like to do it.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 MR. CRANDALL: Just an important point
6 because it happened just this morning. The 20 big -- big
7 districts in this area have asked for a study session half
8 day with a Lisa of I and couple others because they do not
9 see this as the model going forward. And they want to --
10 they want to completely overhaul the kinda blame model under
11 ESSA. And every, you know, from Douglas County to JeffCo,
12 to DPS --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: That's what I was suggesting.

14 MR. CRANDALL: Pardon.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: That's what I've been
16 suggesting.

17 MR. CRANDALL: Yeah, but to just say no we
18 got an e-mail either it came in last night or this morning
19 asking for a half day study session because they -- they met
20 with me two weeks ago and they're not happy with what is in
21 place right now.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They -- they want to
23 overhaul it for now.

24 MR. CRANDALL: No, no, no. It is part of the
25 evidence.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're talking about is
2 this coming for.

3 MS. FLORES: And could we be involved

4 MR. CRANDALL: Yeah, we done here.

5 MS. FLORES: In here, in there?

6 MR. CRANDALL: No.

7 MS. FLORES: No.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's talk about could -
9 -

10 MS. FLORES: Could you videotape us.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- of course If we can
12 listen. But is there --

13 MR. CRANDALL: We will be having multiple
14 meetings like this all across the state because this is
15 probably the most important things will be the next two
16 years will be the -- because of you and wait your incentive.
17 Right now we don't incentive a career component. We don't
18 because somethings are missing. I like that we're doing the
19 very best with what we have right now, but it is not what
20 will lead us to the Promised Land.

21 MS FLORES: But you will report to us as to
22 what they think. Well now we attend. I think he was
23 joking.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I think they're
25 health not good for us to be there because then they're



1 speaking to us rather than speaking to the commissioner. So
2 it's up to them actually to decide whether any one State
3 Board members there.

4 MR. CRANDALL: This is the first of many,
5 many, meetings. We will definitely have our State Board
6 members and superintendents talking. Because I need you to
7 hear I need -- I need them to speak straight to the Board
8 also because the Boards are who -- who vote yes or no the
9 accountability model.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I think I want to add
11 something just in your presentation today. And thank you
12 very much it's been great. I'm perfectly comfortable if we
13 build what we want and if we're doing something that we fear
14 won't meet the federal ESSA then let us know. But I don't
15 feel a great need to be directed by it. We need to be
16 thinking about what it is that we want to see for Colorado-
17 for our kids in Colorado. It's an accountability system
18 that satisfies our taxpayers as well as our districts and
19 parents. And if we start going down a direction that gets
20 us in trouble.

21 By all means flag it but I don't want it to
22 be. I don't want that to be the blinder that tells me how
23 to do it. Because I think part of the frustration with what
24 we've been doing in every particular area has been --
25 because it's been related to either our waiver or what you



1 all left behind or whatever. So that people have the sense
2 that we're not doing all wrong. I actually think that the
3 legislation that had been passed. That legislation has been
4 what folks wanted for Colorado. But I just feel like it's
5 convoluted so that for me that shouldn't be the
6 conversation, please know what's in it, but then we need to
7 go figure out what is the right thing first. We believe
8 it's the right thing when our taxpayers support value.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: Is he ESSA included in this
11 presentation today?

12 MS. PEARSON: In this one or the other one
13 this afternoon.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: This one too, this one.

15 MS. PEARSON: This one, we -- we brought in
16 some the applicable parts of what's in the ESSA statute
17 around accountability just you all know what that says.
18 It's not totally all encompassing of all the pieces of ESSA
19 in terms of accountability. What I would say what is in the
20 ESSA and for the most part there's a few little specifics
21 that we're really -- we're going to have to do what's right
22 for Colorado. We may want to do what's right for Colorado,
23 instead of fixing the ESSA I think it's a conversation you
24 all want to have but most of ESSA is pretty broad. And
25 actually I say we give it a little bit more freedom than



1 what's in the state law. So I again, how the right
2 conversation is what is right for our state. And then let's
3 figure out what's in the way of getting there.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: How much money attained to
5 from the federal government?

6 MS. PEARSON: To ESSA.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes we get 315 million. Is
8 that the right number, Pat?

9 MS. PEARSON: About 350. There's not a lot
10 in ESSA. There's not a lot that will cause to lose the
11 money. Like the -- the options are pretty broad. And what
12 is in the ESSA compared it to what's in the requirements in
13 the waiver. And no child left behind previously. There's a
14 few points in terms of participation in opt out. We have to
15 see what that really means in terms of ESSA and it seemed to
16 me as the areas of conflict.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So this 350 ESSA what we are
18 counting Title 1 and some of the other federal funds, is
19 that correct?

20 MR. DILL: We received around 150 million
21 under Title 1 and we have a number of other programs.
22 Actually 350 is a little high. It's really more like around
23 250 but then when you start looking IDEA which has been sort
24 of attached to ESSA then you start getting around 400 or 500
25 million.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what would be the
2 total of -- of the money we get from the federal government?

3 MR. DILL: I think it's I saw a recent
4 estimate around 600 million that came from our budgeting
5 office.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Large money.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Not much more, not ten
8 percent of the total state spending in education.

9 MR. DILL: That would be I think around ten
10 percent to us.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So we had tail wagging the
12 dog.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that include any --
14 does that include any Perkins money we get from some other
15 programs.

16 MR. DILL: I don't believe we get Perkin's
17 money.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At all?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: It goes to Higher Ed.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's Higher Ed.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's all Higher Ed?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: We don't like that.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I am sorry was absent for a
24 minute did we finish?



1 MS. PEARSON: I think if you all could let us
2 know if --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: No, we still have one more
4 section.

5 MS. PEARSON: -- no this is the last one.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And so what actually is --
7 what action do you --

8 MS. PEARSON: Just to know how you all what
9 you been doing it and help you with your decision making.
10 We have our custom study session if you wanna go in more
11 depth and run April and May because in June we need -- we
12 need to decide on direction. Because we need that so that
13 you are not going to meet in July and we can get the
14 frameworks out.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Does anybody have any
16 specific request on what they'd like on this, Dr. Flores?
17 So we're done with that.

18 MS. FLORES: I think they -- I think they
19 understand we went detailed deep dive for this part for the
20 next two -- two meetings.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And anything else.

22 MS. PEARSON: And if you would like rather do
23 that in a separate sitting session from a Board meeting or
24 out of the Board meeting just to let us know what your
25 preference is?



1 MS. FLORES: What is our session next week?

2 MS. PEARSON: The next week on the
3 accountability clock that clock now.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So we've made some
5 significant things to do.

6 MS FLORES: Anywhere you want to attach this
7 other to that?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I'm sorry few hours.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: They go out telling
10 additional study sessions so we -- we will work on
11 scheduling that. All right.

12 MS. PEARSON: Thank you all so much.

13 ALL: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Pearson and
15 Ms. Huchton. Let's -- Ms. Burdsall, would you announce an
16 executive session, please?

17 MS. BURDSALL: An executive session has been
18 noticed for today's State Board Meeting in conformance with
19 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific legal
20 questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) CRS in matters
21 required to be kept confidential by Federal Law or rules or
22 State Statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III) CRS.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there a motion to
24 convene? Yes, Dr. Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I move we go into executive
2 session.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second.

5 MR. DURHAM: Is there opposition to that
6 motion. Seeing none, we will stand in recess for the
7 purpose of an executive session and away we go. So let's
8 come back at 1:40 p.m.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, give me about
10 an hour and 15 minutes.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: For the Executive Session?
12 Let's come back at 2:00 p.m.

13 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600