



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
September 14, 2016, PM

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on September 14, 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: All right. We're going to
2 come back to order, and the first order of business is
3 14.01. Is there motion? It's the disciplinary item,
4 14.01.

5 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, sir.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. I knew we have
7 a motion.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Turn this on?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Concerning disciplinary
11 proceedings OAC Case number ED2015-0009M. I move to
12 overturn the ALJ's decision and deny the applicant's
13 license.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seconded.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved and
17 seconded. Is there objection to that motion? Seeing none,
18 the motion (inaudible) adopted by a vote of seven to
19 nothing. All right 14.02, Pam supposed to make a motion.
20 What would the proper motion be, Ms. Burdsall? Its
21 Cordial, I'm sorry, I'm relapsing. Help me here.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. You'll get used to
24 it.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, I will. Slowly but
2 surely, we'll be used to it. Okay, so I believe Pam's
3 motion would be regarding disciplinary proceedings
4 concerning a license charge number 2012EC3023, signify
5 acceptance and approval of the terms and conditions of the
6 settlement agreement by directing the commissioner to sign
7 the agreement.

8 MS. MAZANEC: That's what I just moved.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Okay, perfect.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, is there second to
11 that motion? Yes, Ms. Goff seconds. Is there objection to
12 the adoption of that motion?

13 MS. GOFF: Could -- could you just reread
14 it? I'm sorry.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Ms. Burdsall, could
16 you reread the motion, please?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Ms. Cordial.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Cordial --

19 MS. CORDIAL: Oh, yeah. Ms. Cordial --
20 thank you Board Member Schroeder.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I did that last minute.
22 I'm trying not to sleep.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Regarding disciplinary
24 proceedings concerning a license charge number 2012EC3023
25 signify acceptance and approval of the terms and conditions



1 of the settlement agreement by directing the commissioner
2 to sign the agreement.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I apologize. Thank you.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. My pleasure.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, is there objection
6 to the adoption of the motion? Seeing none. That's --
7 your motion, Ms. Mazanec.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I object.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That motion is
10 carried by a vote of seven to nothing. Our next item is,
11 let's see, 16.01 -- no, I'm sorry, 15.01 presentation of
12 awards to the national awardees for the Presidential Award
13 of Excellence in Mathematics and Science teacher. And
14 Commissioner, do we have in charge for that? Let's see,
15 hold on here.

16 MS. ANTHES: Are you doing this? I'm going
17 to turn this over to (inaudible) to present the awards.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Very good. So Ms.
19 (inaudible) go ahead.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Commissioner, Mr.
21 Chair, (inaudible) Members. It is our pleasure to present
22 the Presidential Awards 2014 and 2015. (Inaudible) The
23 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and
24 Science teaching is the highest honor bestowed by the
25 United States government in regard (inaudible) in



1 Mathematics or Science teacher may receive for outstanding
2 teaching. Established by Congress in 1983, the (inaudible)
3 program authorized by the President to bestow up to 108
4 awards each year. Awards were given to Mathematics and
5 Science teachers from each of the 50 states, the District
6 of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the
7 Department of Defense activities schools, or the US
8 territories as a group. The award recognizes those
9 teachers who develop commitment to high quality
10 instructional program, that is informed by content
11 knowledge and enhances student learning.

12 Presidential awardees receive a certificate
13 signed by the president of the United States, a trip to the
14 Washington, D.C. to attend a series of recognition events
15 and professional development opportunities, and a \$10,000
16 award from the National Science Foundation. Awardees also
17 join an active network with outstanding educators from
18 throughout the nation and serve as models for their
19 colleagues and inspiration to their communities. The
20 National Science Foundation announced the 2014 to 15 PAEMST
21 awardees on August 22nd 2016. The 2014 -- the PAEMST
22 awards were recognizing elementary teachers, 2015 were
23 recognizing secondary teachers. Today, we're recognizing
24 four Colorado educators who have been awarded this
25 prestigious honor.



1 Dawn Bauer, has been an educator for nearly
2 15 years. She taught fourth and fifth grade Science and
3 Mathematics at Pearson Elementary School for seven years.
4 She has taught eighth grade algebra in physical science as
5 well. Her current role is with the Denver Public Schools
6 as a career and technical education curriculum coordinator,
7 working with instructors from various fields integrating
8 science and mathematics content and practices with career
9 ready skills. Dawn's passionate commitment to STEM
10 education has been the catalyst for her growth as a
11 teacher, problem solver and innovator.

12 She is dedicated to deepening her
13 understanding of STEM and empowering others to do the same.
14 Dawn has presented at several state conferences and
15 provided district professional development around
16 scientific explanations using the plain evidence reasoning
17 framework. She has served as a math and science lead
18 teacher focusing on standards of communication. She is a
19 proponent of Problem Based Learning and Technology
20 Integration, and strives to model these strategies to all
21 audiences. Dawn has a bachelors degree in biological
22 sciences from Colorado State University. She received her
23 elementary teaching certificate from the University
24 Washington Bothell. She is certified in grade sixth



1 through 12th science and elementary education. Please join
2 me in honoring Dawn for this prestigious award.

3 MS. BAUER: Thank you so much for this
4 opportunity, Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. It's a
5 pleasure to be here and it was an honor to represent
6 Colorado and K6 science education in Washington, D.C. last
7 week. One of my big takeaways from our time in Washington,
8 D.C. was the importance of active learning, and we had the
9 opportunity to basically go on all day long symposium on
10 active learning. We talked about how active learning is
11 really the catalyst for both students and teachers to learn
12 the best way that they can.

13 And -- so one of my big takeaways for my new
14 role in the career and tech ed department is, really making
15 sure that our professional development that we do for all
16 of our teachers is very much aligned and connected, so that
17 students are really seeing what's happening in their core
18 academic classes is also happening maybe on that job shadow
19 that they went to and then in their engineering classes
20 they go to in the afternoon. And that's been a really
21 amazing experience to work with all of our teachers, as
22 well as all of our departments in Denver Public Schools in
23 making this alignment truly happen for our students, for
24 our teachers, and for community as a whole. Thank you so
25 much.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jessica Noffsinger has
3 been an educator for 15 years, has spent the past five
4 years teaching science and engineering at the STEM Magnet
5 School in Adams 12 Five Star school district. She
6 currently teaches eighth grade science and engineering.
7 Creating learning experiences that are engaging and thought
8 provoking is Jessica's specialty. Students in her
9 classroom have engaged in several problem-based learning
10 activities that have challenged students to use their
11 understanding of scientific concepts to solve problems,
12 ranging from replacing fluorescent lights in the classroom
13 to landing 40,000 kilograms of cargo on Mars.

14 Jessica also sponsors a variety of
15 extracurricular activities and serves on numerous school
16 and district committees. Jessica has presented sessions on
17 engineering, scientific literacy, and (inaudible) -based
18 learning at regional and national conferences. She has
19 also served as facilitator for the past five years during
20 the summer institute to train new teachers in the STEM
21 inspired model. Jessica served on the state committee
22 tasked with writing the current standards for science to
23 embed 21st century skills in various assessment teams.
24 Jessica earned her BS in chemistry from the Carter School
25 of Mines. She earned a masters in educational leadership



1 from the University of Denver. She is certified in
2 secondary science education. Please join me in honoring
3 Jessica for this prestigious award.

4 MS. NOFFSINGER: Mr. Chair and Members of
5 the Board, thank you for inviting us today. Last week, it
6 was such a great honor to represent the secondary science
7 teachers of Colorado during the presidential recognition
8 event. I was humbled to be around such amazing educators
9 and have access to current research on what's working best
10 with active learning and next generation STEM high schools.
11 After action-packed week, my greatest takeaway is the
12 importance we have as a community of educators to ensure
13 that all students, regardless of where they come from, have
14 access to high quality STEM education with a well-prepared
15 STEM teacher. I stand here today a product of the wide
16 range of STEM opportunities that are available in Colorado.
17 I grew up in rural Northeastern Colorado where science fair
18 was the only avenue they had to push me as a gifted
19 learner, and I got opportunities to meet professors around
20 the state.

21 They made me fall in love with science. I
22 got to go to the School of Mines and then I became a
23 teacher, and in my urban title one school, I saw just how
24 much science works to make things come alive as my students
25 engaged in project based science. Suddenly, rather than



1 being bored, they had high engagement and were passionate
2 about solving problems in their community. Now as a
3 science and engineering teacher at a suburban K8 magnet
4 school, I see a wide variety of students including those
5 with special needs and English language learners, thriving
6 as they interact with real world problems and propose
7 innovative solutions to problems adults haven't solved yet.

8 We need to ensure that all of our students
9 have access to these experiences. Colorado has done so
10 much of this work already, when we wrote the new standards,
11 we've done a sample of curriculum projects, and CAI has
12 worked with the STEM roadmap. As you continue your work, I
13 urge you to consider how we can make it happen for kids
14 from the eastern plains, the Front Range, and the western
15 slope. How do we make sure all of our kids learn to love
16 science and engineering, so that we have a diverse
17 workforce in the future? Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Our next awardee is
20 Carolyn Jordan. Carolyn has taught first, fifth, and sixth
21 grades at Normandy Elementary School and JeffCo public
22 schools for 22 years. She currently teaches fourth grade
23 which includes an accelerated mathematics class. Carolyn's
24 lessons include active math for students act out
25 mathematics processes, draw pictures, and use cheerleader



1 moves to show geometry. She provides manipulatives to
2 increase the depth of knowledge. Food is used to
3 illustrate fractions, sayings help her students to remember
4 mathematics operation, cards and dice are used to practice
5 facts and learning objectives.

6 As the fifth and sixth grade teacher, Ms.
7 Jordan provided a math club for struggling students. She
8 implemented an interactive civics unit by allowing students
9 to take part in a model town. Carolyn also led sixth grade
10 students in a district week long outdoor based educational
11 experience in the Rocky Mountains. Carolyn served on the
12 Parent Teacher Organization Board for nine years. She runs
13 the school science fair. She's presented her active Math
14 idea of local conferences, and has trained staff Members on
15 Intel Teach to the future. Carolyn has a BA in
16 Communications and a certificate of elementary education
17 from the State University of New York and an MA in
18 Administration Supervision Curriculum Development
19 Instructional Technology from the University of Colorado at
20 Denver. Please join me in honoring Carolyn for this
21 prestigious award.

22 MS. JORDAN: Mr. Chair and Members of the
23 Board, thank you for this opportunity. Last week was just,
24 wow! My teaching is dedicated to the continuous teaching,
25 learning, and growth of my students and for myself. To



1 that end, Colorado schools and districts can improve
2 student learning and system effectiveness by engaging in a
3 cycle of continuous improvement to manage their
4 performance. To support this purpose, the education
5 accountability act of 2009 requires each Colorado district
6 and school to create an annual improvement plan. At
7 Normandy elementary school, and my principal is here with
8 me to honor this time together, we use student data.

9 We collaborate to determine one content area
10 for our school wide focus, work, and learning for the year.
11 As teachers of younger students, we find that we need to be
12 a jack of all trades, and can easily be spread them on all
13 the required standards and learning objectives. The focus
14 of the UIP enables us to drill deeply into a professional
15 learning and the application of the learning in our
16 classrooms. Knowing that my district, my school, and my
17 fourth grade team could have the same focus is empowering.
18 Our school PLCs or Professional Learning Communities are
19 UIP driven. Therefore we participate in targeted
20 professional development, investigate relevant materials
21 and resources, and truly learn from one another's
22 strengths.

23 Working collaboratively towards an agreed
24 upon objective has proved to lead to long term successes
25 and valuable learning experience for the teachers and the



1 students at our school. To quote Abraham Lincoln whose
2 memorial we visited last week as we were recognized
3 nationally, "A house divided against itself cannot stand."
4 Each of us has won the presidential award because we are
5 innovators in the classroom, the more opportunity we have
6 to spread our knowledge, our enthusiasm, and collaborate,
7 the richer we will be, because we will have a growth
8 mindset as we work towards this UIP.

9 We will come to the table saying yes and we
10 will self advocate for what is needed in our classrooms.
11 Together, educators are stronger and together we will make
12 the changes necessary to support all of the learners in our
13 classrooms. Thank you for being our guide and support in
14 the self reflective process anchored out in the UIP
15 process. Teachers are continuous learners, and tour guides
16 for our students' future. We are looking forward to our
17 next year of learning and the adventure ahead of us. Thank
18 you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Final word
21 is Lisa Bejarano. Lisa is in her 13th year as a
22 mathematics educator, and her fourth year teaching at Aspen
23 Valley High School in the Academy 20 School District. She
24 currently teaches geometry, pre-calculus, an introduction
25 to computer programming to students in grades 9 through 12;



1 primarily using problem-based tasks, inquiry, and debate.
2 Lisa enjoys encouraging and facilitating mathematical
3 discourse in collaboration among her students. She
4 recently began teaching computer programming because it
5 supports students development to have a growth mindset,
6 building logical thinking skills ,and general confidence in
7 overcoming challenging task.

8 Lisa is a reflective blogger, who frequently
9 collaborates with other teachers to improve her teaching
10 practice. She facilitates training for other teachers
11 focused on designing and implementing personal professional
12 development, developing curricula and lesson supporting
13 state standards, and engaging and motivating students to
14 become energetic problem solvers. Lisa is nationally Board
15 certified in adolescence and young adult mathematics. She
16 earned her BS in Engineering at the University of Colorado
17 Boulder, and her MA in Curriculum and Instruction from the
18 University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. Lisa holds a
19 Master Teacher certification in 7 through 12 mathematics
20 and a career in technical education STEM certification.
21 Please join me in honoring Lisa for this prestigious award.

22 MS. BEJARANO: Mr. Chair and Members of the
23 Board, thank you very much for this opportunity. I'm
24 really excited to receive this award because it gives me an
25 opportunity to be able to share my perspective on education



1 in Colorado. I have so many issues that are important to
2 me, I couldn't decide what to speak on, and I started
3 thinking I could talk about teacher evaluation or
4 supporting professional development opportunities for
5 teachers or equity across all classes or acquiring and
6 providing timely data for a minimal comprehensive
7 standardized student testing to inform my instruction. But
8 since my time is limited, it forced me to think about
9 what's the most important to me, which right now is
10 maintaining, advancing -- maintaining and advancing the
11 teaching as a profession, and then also retaining those
12 teachers.

13 To recruit great teachers, we need to
14 maintain high expectations. If we eliminated the highly
15 qualified teacher provision, it would counteract the goal
16 of trying to recruit the great teachers. Content knowledge
17 alone is insufficient, though, to be an effective teacher.
18 We have to understand student developmental needs and
19 becoming master -- and become masters at planning and
20 sequencing and implementing content standards using
21 pedagogical knowledge. To retain great teachers, there
22 needs to be space and time for teacher reflection and
23 collaboration. No single thing has made me more effective
24 as a teacher than making time to reflect and to collaborate
25 with other motivated teachers, and I do that frequently



1 over Twitter and blogging because my school is so small, I
2 don't have teachers who teach the same thing as me in my
3 school.

4 So I connect with teachers around the
5 country, and due to the common standards that we have, I'm
6 able to connect with a teacher in Massachusetts. And
7 through online, we can make a lesson together and make it
8 better and better, and then I wake up in the morning like
9 it's Christmas morning, so excited to, like run in and try
10 it, and that's what keeps me in the classroom. So I'll ask
11 that you maintain and support high standards for both
12 teachers and students. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. On
14 behalf of the State Board, I'd like to congratulate all of
15 the -- all of you for the exceptional achievements and for
16 achieve -- for earning such a prestigious award. Please
17 join me in honoring Dawn Bauer, Jessica Noffsinger, Carolyn
18 Jordan, and Lisa Bejarano, awardees for the Presidential
19 Award for Excellence in Science Mathematics teacher. So
20 congratulations. We do have some certificates and I think
21 -- and I think -- yeah, this ones.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, yeah.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We'll just start
2 with Dawn Bauer and Dr. Flores, and we'll have to get a
3 little picture here.

4 MS. CORDIAL: And Katy, you're -- you're
5 with them, too.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Jessica Noffsinger and
7 Jane -- Jessica Noffsinger and -- I'm sorry, no. Carolyn
8 Jordan and Dr. Scheffel.

9 Overlapping)

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Once again, thank you all.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry, blocking away.
13 Okay. All right. We'll now proceed to item 16.01. Next
14 agendas are -- agenda item is the consideration of Lewis-
15 Palmer's request for a waiver from CRS 22-7-1014(2)(a)
16 school readiness assessment. Before we begin, is there a
17 motion on the take -- table or do you wanna wait until
18 we've heard the --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Maybe we can vote once
20 through there.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's correct. So go --
22 go ahead. All right.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the waiver
24 request from Lewis-Palmer School District Number 38 for CRS
25 27-7-1041(2)(a) school readiness assessments.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that
2 motion?

3 MS. FLORES: I second it.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores seconds the
5 motion. So at this point, the Commissioner and the staff,
6 prepared to proceed with an overview.

7 MS. ANTHES: I think we're actually -- this
8 is gonna turn it directly over to the district --

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

10 MS. ANTHES: -- and you have in your
11 materials the feedback. And so we're turning it directly
12 over to Ms. Beving.

13 MS. BEVING: Thank you. The Chairman, State
14 Board Members, thank you for having us today in considering
15 our waiver request. Today, I have with me Assistant
16 Superintendent, Cheryl Wangeman in place of Karen Brofft.
17 We are here on behalf of Lewis-Palmer School District
18 students and teachers asking for a waiver from the
19 assessment portion of the School Readiness Act. Last time
20 when we were here in April, we talked about the rationale
21 and the replacement plan. Once again, our teachers use
22 profiles of progress as a measurement instruments. Those
23 measurement instruments are by trimester and all of the
24 areas that TS Gold would cover. Those profiles of progress
25 then populate our standards-based report card. Our



1 standards-based report card is a vertical alignment for
2 grades K-6. It's also research-based and aligned very
3 closely with what teachers have said.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Could you pick up your mic,
5 please?

6 MS. BEVING: I'm sorry. Thank you for
7 asking me. I didn't -- I didn't recognize I wasn't. Thank
8 you, I appreciate that. Is that better?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: You still have to pull it
10 towards you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

12 MS. BEVING: Okay. Now is that better?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect.

14 MS. BEVING: Okay. Thank you for correcting
15 me. I appreciate that. Last time we were here, there were
16 questions around our -- our notification process for a
17 public hearing. After our April meeting, we -- we turned
18 to our district, and then again went ahead, and the
19 questions were around how we -- we did not advertise as
20 well as -- as what was expected to be. So therefore, we
21 went and posted the request for open comments, public
22 hearing, and the required places that CDE asked, and in
23 addition to that, we did it at Tri-Lakes the Chamber of
24 Commerce.



1 We had it on our website. Electronically,
2 all the documents were displayed. We had a means for
3 electronic feedback, as well as we also had it displayed as
4 you would instructional resources for adoption, so it's a
5 hard copy in our administration building. We also had
6 opportunities that are reported at that point in time for
7 people to share feedback. After that process, in a four-
8 week window that the newspaper had to run the announcement
9 for the -- the public hearing, we went ahead and held our
10 public hearing. Three people showed up to make public
11 comments. Of those three people, two were very supportive
12 and one -- the third one was a maybe.

13 After the public hearing, we went ahead and
14 went forward for the Board for a second resolution. The
15 Board unanimously pass a second resolution for support of
16 this waiver, as well as they did in the very first
17 resolution. And with that -- with that, we -- it's in the
18 best interest of our kids and our teachers to keep our
19 assessments as closely to the teachers as we possibly can
20 because this stated is what drives our instruction and
21 informs our parents -- parents about the -- their progress
22 and in great detail and -- and gives them specifics. And
23 so with that, we are requesting to keep the assessments in
24 local control with our teachers.



1 MS. WANGEMAN: In a nutshell -- I'm not sure
2 this one's even working.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, yeah.

4 MS. WANGEMAN: It's working. Okay. In a
5 nutshell, we do appreciate you all taking the time to meet
6 with us today. One thing that we appreciated about this
7 process is that we have a choice as a school district, as
8 parents, and as Board Members, our local Board Members to
9 say we'd like a different option here. In Lewis-Palmer
10 School Districts, we do have a standards-based report card
11 at our elementary level, and we use the standards-based
12 report card for this grade as well. We've vertically
13 articulated that report process up, so our current or our
14 traditional, and we do still use that measurement, as
15 opposed to the TS Gold as the right answer for us. We have
16 research based on what Academy School District put
17 together, which is identical to what we have.

18 From an outside consultant, the Hanover
19 Group, stating that it is the best way for districts like
20 ours to go. Many of our students, because they've had the
21 advantage of living in homes where they are affluent, many
22 of our students do come in already able to meet the -- the
23 standards set by the state, which is great. So we go ahead
24 and create our own standards, which are just -- just a bit
25 higher, because that happens to be right for our population



1 group, and then we put in additional supports for our
2 students who still need to come up and come along with us.

3 So our report card is very meaningful for
4 our parents and for teachers, not just in kinder, but all
5 the way through. A 100 percent of our kindergarten
6 teachers backed that, we have 12, they're all behind it.
7 All five Board Members have passed resolution unanimously
8 twice saying this is the right way to go, and our parents
9 backed this as well. So we appreciate your time, and we
10 would very much appreciate a vote of yes so that we can go
11 ahead and do what we think is in the best interest of our
12 particular group of kiddos in Lewis-Palmer Schools.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions from Members of
14 the Board? Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So you have seen the staff
16 response, would you please comment on the concerns that our
17 staff has expressed?

18 MS. BEVING: Yes, absolutely. So --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Let me -- let me ask you one
20 question first. When did you develop the standards-based
21 report card that year?

22 MS. BEVING: We have the standards-based
23 report card since 2009, I believe.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So in 2008, this law
2 was passed, why would you ignore that legislation and
3 create your own?

4 MS. BEVING: I -- I was not with the
5 district at that time, so I cannot tell you. I think it's
6 because the standards were released in 2009 and revised.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, go ahead.

8 MS. BEVING: So my understanding of the
9 staff's concerns is this -- our measure -- around our
10 measurement tools, and so I'd like to give you an example.
11 In a TS Gold objective, it says uses -- using alphabet
12 cards that student will identify ton. So in our profile of
13 progress, we have, for the first trimester, 26 letters, and
14 then they have actual recording sheets to accompany that.
15 As well as second trimester, it is 26 as well. And so you
16 can see that -- that as we go through, our kids are coming
17 in with -- with those skills already, and so the ton in
18 this TS Gold piece right here doesn't drive our teacher's
19 instruction.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Isn't there a --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Careful.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, thank you.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: -- sort of a graph where
24 kids that are ahead are going to be, I mean, it's not a
25 single response on a TS Gold.



1 MS. BEVING: No. But four or higher is
2 considered to be there. And so it's says --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: But it can measure it
4 higher, right?

5 MS. BEVING: Right. So --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: It has a capacity measure
7 higher. So it's doing the same thing that you are doing.

8 MS. BEVING: That -- that would be an aid to
9 identify 26 letters.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Why is that a problem?

11 MS. BEVING: Because that -- that's --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: What is -- what is wrong
13 with TS Gold compared to what you have?

14 MS. BEVING: Because this -- this does not
15 drive instruction force because our kids are coming in
16 already at the level of school readiness that TS Gold
17 measures.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: And I thought it was a
19 continuum. That's what I'm trying to find out.

20 MS. BEVING: There is a continuum. But the
21 continuum on this specific one is a eight and this is the
22 highest it goes. Identifies the names, all upper and lower
23 case letters when presented in random order. Another
24 example will be row count -- row counting, Math and I
25 believe TS Gold goes to 100 and counts 30 objectives



1 accurately. Our -- our profiles of progress require
2 students to count row count to 100, starting at the number
3 30 and we actually have specific protocol and how that
4 assessment happens written into our profiles of progress.
5 Another piece that this stuff response back was, it was
6 uncertain how often kindergarten teachers got together and
7 did (inaudible) reliability. Minimally, we do that twice a
8 year with our kindergarten teachers and revamp the profiles
9 of progress and realign them according to student need.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: How about the reporting?

11 MS. BEVING: Pardon me.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: How bout the reporting?

13 We've -- we got a real concern -- we a have a concern about
14 reporting of school readiness because we don't have -- when
15 we have districts going off of our approved plans, we're
16 not getting a (inaudible) data.

17 MS. BEVING: Correct. And my understanding
18 is, we will work hand in hand with CDE and the other school
19 districts that had received the waivers such as Cheyenne
20 Mountain and Academy 20.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: And?

22 MS. BEVING: We would draw that information
23 from our report card. And I don't believe that system has
24 been built by CDE, so I can't address your concerns
25 specifically.



1 MS. WANGEMAN: But even though -- we
2 understand your concern around the need to make sure that
3 you're getting consistent data here in the Colorado
4 Department of Education, so you can evaluate how all
5 students in the state are doing. And we would certainly
6 work with Colorado Department of Education to ensure that
7 the data that CDE needs, so they can have a comprehensive
8 look at how our district is doing as well as all districts
9 are doing would be a part of it. We're requesting this
10 waiver because of the fact that the vertical articulation
11 that works in our district works with our standard based
12 report card that we've -- we've developed.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: You know, I'm -- I'm still
14 can't figure out why you did that when in fact there was a
15 law that sort of specified something different.

16 MS. WANGEMAN: Oh, we --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: It's just a little odd.

18 MS. WANGEMAN: We did -- we did -- we do
19 currently comply with -- with TS Gold. And I know --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: In preschool?

21 MS. WANGEMAN: -- requirement set -- set
22 back in, yes.

23 MS. BEVING: And I believe in --
24 Commissioner Elliott Asp -- Interim Commissioner Elliott
25 Asp actually gave us another year of implementation for TS



1 Gold. So we had to had the standards based report card
2 according to statute and then we had another year of
3 implementation.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm sorry, help me --

5 MS. BEVING: Elliott asked (inaudible) out,
6 I believe last October, giving school districts permission
7 because a TS Gold platform was problematic in terms of
8 interface. And so Elliott Asp, Commissioner Elliot Asp at
9 that time, gave us another year for just planning and
10 implementation of that.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So you've not implemented TS
12 Gold?

13 MS. BEVING: So we started off implementing
14 that and we were doing small groups of kids in entering
15 them into TS Gold last year.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At preschool and
17 kindergarten?

18 MS. BEVING: Preschool and Kindergarten
19 level?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Preschool is --
23 preschools -- yes. Preschools is on the old platform,
24 staying on the old platform and they're in progress right
25 now.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

2 MS. GOFF: No. I --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No.

4 MS. GOFF: -- I can't formulate it quite
5 yet. No.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Let us know when
7 you are ready. Dr. Scheffel?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I just, guess I -- I
9 appreciate the plan you put together. I think it meets the
10 intent of the law. I think it meets the needs of your
11 students. I think it honors not having just a one size
12 fits all approach while still meeting the needs of the
13 state and the intent of legislation. I think you've done a
14 careful job of this across all these dimensions of
15 learning. And I guess I appreciate the opportunity to
16 review your materials. Thank you.

17 MS. WANGEMAN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: Yes. I -- I concur with what
20 Dr. Scheffel said. I -- I do appreciate all the detail you
21 have here. I also appreciate the fact that I've looked up
22 all the test scores and third grade and, all although some
23 have gone down, I understand that, for the most part, your
24 students are doing quite well --

25 MS. WANGEMAN: Yeah, yes.



1 MS. RANKIN: -- compared to the rest of the
2 state. So you're doing something good and I hope this
3 continues with that program.

4 MS. BEVING: Thank you. Our teachers are
5 wonderful teachers and we have great kids and we have
6 incredibly supportive parents.

7 MS. RANKIN: It shows.

8 MS. BEVING: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion, I have
10 a couple of questions. Part of the problem is that we when
11 we first granted the first waiver that I can recall which I
12 think was (inaudible) the -- it appeared to be kind of a
13 special case. And I think, as a general rule, I viewed
14 waivers and waiver requests as it should be the exception
15 rather than the rule. But in this area for whatever
16 reason, I think given the -- the number of pending and the
17 kinds of things we've seen, it would appear as that this is
18 becoming the rule rather than the exception. And I don't
19 think that's what the legislature intended or wouldn't have
20 used the language that it in fact used about nationally
21 recognized standards.

22 And that's why CDE, I think, approved three
23 or four different plans and I -- I don't think it was
24 contemplated that -- that everyone would develop their own
25 plans and there was supposed to be some sort of statewide



1 general standard so that the legislature could look at the
2 data and then CDE can look at the data and evaluate --
3 evaluate the outcomes kind of on a statewide basis. I'm
4 not sure that's possible with this. But I think it's --
5 it's clear at least that -- that in the present pace we're
6 on, if we grant all the waivers that start to come before
7 us, there is no going to be anybody left doing the state
8 prescribed -- the legislative prescribed program. That
9 might be good, but I -- I have a hard time believing the
10 legislature went to the trouble and did pass the statute,
11 if they were to presume everybody was to go out do their
12 own thing.

13 So -- and -- and I think the staff has found
14 a number of -- that -- a number of areas where you don't
15 meet the specific requirements of the statute and I think
16 they are outlined in the -- in the staff responses. So let
17 me ask a couple of other questions after the statement. Do
18 you -- you -- you indicated that this is going to save some
19 money and you -- you showed the implementation cost of TS
20 Gold at \$41,725. But then you -- that's a gross figure.
21 You don't -- you're not showing -- it's not a net savings
22 because I presume you have some costs in -- if you
23 calculate in the same way, in -- in implementing your own
24 program. Is that a fair statement?



1 MS. BEVING: I would respectfully disagree
2 with that because our teachers will still be using the
3 profiles of progress because they find -- because they find
4 them very -- very valuable. If we don't get the waiver,
5 they'll be doing -- doing dual reporting process with TS
6 Gold as well as the profiles of progress, the measurement
7 tools.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Why?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But that will be your
10 choice. That's not -- (inaudible) would that to do.

11 MS. BEVING: Correct. They're not going to
12 find these 51 objectives purposeful in reporting out to
13 parents, and the progress of parents, as well as
14 information to drive instruction. Not only from their
15 daily practices, but trimester by trimester through
16 curriculum mapping, unit planning, and then daily lesson
17 planning.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

19 MS. FLORES: I think one of the things the
20 state's doing is trying to really bring down the
21 profession, the area of early childhood education. I -- I
22 mean, I said it before, my guess about a year ago, that I
23 think that this TS Gold would be great at training
24 teachers. But I think that, once a teacher is trained, you
25 know, if you're going to play an instrument, either you, I



1 -- I -- let's say you're -- you're playing an arpeggio on
2 the piano or on the violin, you look at the first note, you
3 look at the last note, and you play it. And you don't
4 think about the first, second, third, fourth and fifth, no.
5 You just play it. And I think when you have trained
6 teachers, teachers know. They know the behavior. They
7 know these areas instinctively about a child that, you
8 know, is -- is playing point by point by point as opposed
9 to playing the whole arpeggio and -- and getting it right.
10 And I think it's a great training to all but I -- I really
11 think that there are teachers out there and I remember that
12 we did our own when I was teaching and I would say it's
13 superior. And there are some issues that are instinctive
14 to teachers who have been well trained and know and do not
15 need an instrument that would be -- that I would say for
16 training -- that would be used for training. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, in my senses, with
19 respect to your comment, Mr. Chair, is it not true -- I'd
20 have to go to look at the exact language in the statute but
21 it seems what the legislature wants to know is, what kids
22 are ready. And -- and they do specify categories of
23 readiness but they don't specify the number of items under
24 each and so forth. So I mean, given what they want to
25 know, I guess my sense is that, this approach fulfills that



1 need. And I -- and I guess I think it's important to honor
2 local control, local needs, as well as the state need. And
3 I think that this approach does that.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think -- I think Dr.
5 Scheffel, I think you're right. That -- that, I mean, in
6 theory and -- and going back to our earlier discussions of
7 this, it would appear there's only two possible answers,
8 ready and not ready. But the staff clearly thinks that the
9 understanding the gradations and providing teaching to
10 whatever possible shortcomings there may be to be
11 beneficial. And secondly, the statute does contain, I
12 think we would have Julie read it to us but it does contain
13 some pretty specific language about what is required for a
14 replacement plan and that you -- do you have that in front
15 of you, Ms. Thompson?

16 MS. THOMPSON: Are you talking about the one
17 regarding this specific review assessment?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

19 MS. THOMPSON: I do not.

20 MS. FLORES: Can I ask a question?

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, in -- in my review --
22 I'm sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. No, go ahead.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: It -- the -- the statute, in
25 my recollection, specifies the categories that comprise an



1 overall sense of readiness or not ready. But it does not
2 specify the specific test, it doesn't specify how many
3 indicators underneath each of those categories is necessary
4 to populate a database. And so I -- I feel that this plan
5 addresses those categories of language cognition, social,
6 emotional readiness, and motor and so forth. So I -- I
7 guess, I -- I do think it fulfills the need of the statute
8 and that's the need of the state. That's my sense.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So Superintendent Brofft ,
11 would you say then that your system is better than TS Gold?

12 MS. BROFFT: I believe our teachers would
13 say absolutely because it --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not asking what your
15 teachers would say. Is there some other evidence that your
16 system is better? Your teachers have been doing it and
17 they like it and I understand that piece. But TS Gold is -
18 -

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's TS Gold.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: -- is considered to be one
21 of the best measures out there. Can you prove that yours
22 is somehow stronger and better?

23 MS. BROFFT: I think what our -- our
24 teachers are expecting of our kindergartners are -- is
25 higher than TS Gold.



1 MS. WANGERMAN: Yeah. I -- I would add onto
2 that. For -- for our particular students in our particular
3 system, our K -- PK12 articulated curriculum, the system
4 that we're proposing to replace TS Gold with, is superior
5 for what our kids need and we'll provide informed data for
6 our teachers as those children move along. And inform
7 better, informed data of four parents.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: The -- the profile.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. (inaudible), Ms.
10 Mazanec, and then Dr. Scheffel

11 MS. MAZANEC: First of all, I would like to
12 get some clarity. But I -- I believe that the attorney
13 general's opinion told us that we have the ability to waive
14 these if we believe that their replacement plan meets the
15 intent of the law. I do not believe that we have any
16 requirement the districts have to have a better plan than
17 TS Gold and that they have to prove that it's better than
18 TS Gold. I think that all we have to determine, is whether
19 we think it meets the intent of the legislation. And once
20 again, we're talking about kindergarten readiness. Are
21 they ready or are they not? And when the child is in
22 kindergarten, are they going to be addressing whether they
23 have challenges? It's kindergarten.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.



1 MS. MAZANEC: I bet -- I bet that's
2 happening in every kindergarten classroom.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is.

4 MS. MAZANEC: To one degree or another and
5 maybe -- maybe better in some classrooms and others, I -- I
6 recognize that. But I think this is -- this is an
7 opportunity to provide some flexibility for school
8 districts and our schools. And I will be voting yes.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Yes, Ms.
10 Rankin.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. I -- I just would like
12 to add. I -- I was a kindergarten teacher --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nice.

14 MS. RANKIN: I know. Whether you -- what
15 you have and I -- I think it's very thorough whether it
16 align -- aligns with TS Gold or not, doesn't matter to me.
17 I want to know if it aligns to our standards, assuming our
18 standards are correct in the first place. And it appears
19 to me, what you have done is -- is go above and beyond that
20 because of the students that you serve which are very
21 different than the students in another school district. So
22 I -- that alignment with the standards are -- is more key
23 to what I believe is the intent of the law to us.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: And my --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Scheffel, did you have
2 comment?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: My comment reflects yours.

4 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

6 MS. FLORES: And mine.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Further
8 discussion on the issue? Okay. I think what we'll do then
9 is, I'll take this off table 'till we can receive some
10 legal advice on that point of statutory requirement. We'll
11 bring it back either later today or more likely tomorrow
12 after the executive session when we've receive some legal
13 counsel. So thank you very much.

14 MS. FLORES: Let's see what is in there. I
15 mean that --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

17 MS. FLORES: -- we have the right to do
18 this.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then --

20 MS. FLORES: I mean, I read it.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll -- we'll have some
22 comment, we'll have some conversation with the attorney and
23 we'll see where we end up. So thank you very much.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

25 MS. WANGEMAN: Thank you for your time.



1 MS. BROFFT: Thank you for your time.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Okay. The next
3 item is 16.02, a request for consideration of -- of Wray's
4 request for consideration of waiver from CRS 22-7-
5 10114(2)(a), (inaudible) assessment. Before we begin, is
6 there -- I think let's skip the motion for the moment and
7 Commissioner, if you'd like to introduce this (inaudible).

8 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Welcome
9 to the Wray School District and we'll have them present
10 their waiver request you and I'm turning it over to Andrea,
11 the principal?

12 MS. HAMMER: That's correct.

13 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you.

14 MS. HAMMER: Thank you, Katy. Thank you
15 Board for allowing us to share our experience and
16 information with you today. My name is Andrea Hammer, and
17 I am with -- I am the Wray Elementary Principal in Wray,
18 Colorado. I have been in education for 14 years, 12 as an
19 elementary teacher, and two as an elementary principal.
20 Today, I'm here to present a waiver for TS Gold which
21 hopefully you have in front of you. We know many school
22 districts have presented waiver requests for TS Gold, and
23 knowing our odds are not good due to past responses and
24 votes, we feel it is important to share first hand
25 experience as using TS Gold. Our school readiness plan



1 includes an assessment that is very valid and reliable
2 which is the (inaudible) assessment.

3 Assessments that can be used to show
4 consistent longitudinal data over several years, and allows
5 for my kindergarten teachers to continue working on skills
6 until students have them mastered. Being in education for
7 14 years, I know and understand that teachers are the ones
8 who have the first hand experience with students and
9 programs we implement in education. Currently, Wray
10 Elementary School has a system in place for our students to
11 make sure they are ready for school. I have brought with
12 me two kindergarten teachers who have experienced TS Gold
13 firsthand, and can explain the impact TS Gold has had on
14 our students, and what our current replacement plan has to
15 offer. I will now turn the presentation over to Mrs. Mary
16 Raymond, and then to Ms. Rachel Linke.

17 MS. RAYMOND: My name is Mary Raymond. I've
18 been teaching kindergarten for 11 years. It was difficult
19 to leave the classroom and sit early in the year. However,
20 we felt strongly about having teacher voices heard. We are
21 educators and want to do what's right for students, and we
22 do not believe continuing kindergarten readiness throughout
23 the kindergarten year is right for students. We want to
24 thank you for the opportunity to share with the Board some
25 experiences we have encountered using TS Gold. We piloted



1 the TS Gold with five students in each class for the three
2 benchmarks in the 2014-'15 school year. We found that the
3 data we collected from our current assessments were both
4 more valuable from an instructional standpoint, more
5 concise, and less time consuming.

6 In the 2015-'16 school year, all students
7 were assessed for the fall benchmark. Because of the
8 amount of time needed to complete the assessments, we
9 needed additional support. We took a half an hour of our
10 day, of our intensive small reading groups that we call
11 flooding, and we brought in five additional staff Members
12 which is a total of eight when you -- when you include the
13 three classroom teachers. So in place of the intensive
14 reading time, we did TS Gold assessments. Therefore, it
15 interfered with the intensive reading for all students, but
16 we felt it was most detrimental for ELLs and our MTSS
17 students. Due to our need for additional staff support to
18 reach the deadlines, classroom teachers were not always
19 able to assess each student.

20 So then you have iterator reliability, that
21 make consistency difficult, and since we, the classroom
22 teachers were unable to do the testing on each student, we
23 felt like we didn't know the student's strengths and
24 weaknesses as well as we have in the past. Since we used
25 the reading block time for TS Gold assessments, it made it



1 difficult for the students to get into a consistent
2 routine, because we were doing such a wide variety of
3 activities each day. There are also concepts on TS Gold
4 benchmarks that assess students on content that we have not
5 covered yet in the classroom. We do not feel we should be
6 assessing students on materials that have not been
7 introduced. TS Gold benchmarks do not align with our
8 kindergarten quarterly assessments.

9 One example is 3D shapes that we do not get
10 to until third quarter. The advance students get
11 enrichments on their own level, but the -- to assess the
12 whole class on specific material that has not been covered,
13 its not yet fair to the students. We have used TS Gold in
14 two previous years. TS Gold forces us to over-assess and
15 under teach. The students need time on task to master --
16 master concepts. Any time you're assessing the students,
17 they are not engaged in learning. Backtracking to see if
18 students are kindergarten ready, impede us for the job we
19 need to be doing, which is first grade readiness, and
20 school success. We feel that we have been successful with
21 our system we have in place, and that it meets the needs of
22 our students and teachers. I would now like to turn the
23 presentation over to my colleague, Rachel Linke. She will
24 give you more information about the system we currently
25 use.



1 MS. LINKE: Hello. Thank you for your time
2 today. My name is Rachel Linke as Mary said. This is my
3 fourth year that I have been teaching kindergarten, and I
4 hope to shed some light on the resources we have to
5 effectively replace TS Gold. To start, we have 50 of 56
6 students who come to us from a program that uses TS Gold to
7 assess three times during the year. The latest of which is
8 the spring benchmark. I would like to focus on the six
9 students who did not come to us with the data, and how we
10 are addressing them. Of the sticks -- of the six, one
11 student was retained from the previous year. One student
12 moved in from out of state and is well prepared for school
13 based on our assessments. One student came to us with an
14 individualized education plan, otherwise known as an IEP in
15 place and has already had a staffing on their behalf this
16 school year.

17 The remaining three students have been
18 determined to not be school ready. This was determined by
19 the beginning of the year data pulled from DIBELS NWEA
20 classroom observations and the classroom assessments such
21 as letter identification and naming, counting, name
22 writing, and fine motor skills. However, it doesn't make a
23 difference if they are ready or not. We are there to meet
24 them at their needs, and develop growth wherever they may
25 be. To do this, these students are currently receiving 30



1 minutes a day of small group instruction from our
2 interventionist, as well as 20 minutes daily of focused
3 small group work with an instructional aid. These students
4 are also in the process of being screened for interventions
5 such as speech services and occupational therapy.

6 To monitor and support students who do not
7 have previous data, or came into kindergarten not meeting
8 some of their TS Gold goals previously, we addressed
9 through various avenues. As well as rapidly providing
10 additional support for students who come in, who are not
11 kindergarten-ready. It is our opinion that our current
12 system to achieve and monitor school readiness is
13 successful. Tools we use that match the value and
14 effectiveness of TS Gold system include academic
15 assessments such as identifying letters, sounds, and
16 counting. We would like to point out that these
17 assessments -- we continue to assess and monitor our
18 students throughout the year until they have reached
19 mastery on these foundational skills. The support and
20 maintenance of close working relationships with our
21 Northeast BOCES professionals including the occupational
22 therapists, speech pathologist, psychologist, school nurse,
23 and counselor.

24 On top of that, we have a special education
25 teacher, an interventionist, and a school counselor onsite.



1 Students benefit from art, P.E., music, counseling,
2 technology, and library weekly. Our quarterly report cards
3 inform parents of students academic achievement, as well as
4 how they perform socially and emotionally. We have a
5 strong community support of parent volunteers and retired
6 teachers that come in to provide additional instruction
7 when needed. Also the head start and pre-school facilities
8 are housed in our elementary building, and we maintain
9 close working relationships with the staff of these
10 programs. For example, we work with these to have a plan
11 in place and the support needed for students we anticipate
12 will need additional support coming into our program.

13 Overall, for students who do not or do
14 previously have TS Gold, or who are struggling or not in
15 kindergarten, the data we have indicates that we are having
16 success with the growth and progress of students with our
17 preferred method of assessments and systems used. We are
18 struggling to understand how the TS Gold kindergarten
19 readiness benchmarks help us. Students that do not come in
20 as kindergarten-ready, or who are ranked as not
21 kindergarten-ready during the year, still have to be in
22 kindergarten. We do not, unfortunately, have a program in
23 our district that is the transition room, where students
24 who are not kindergarten-ready can be placed to be further
25 prepared. Regardless of how kindergarten- ready students



1 come to us, it is still our goal for all students to be
2 first grade ready by the end of the school year. It is our
3 job to educate students from day one, whether or not they
4 are ready for school.

5 The Board may wonder about data, and how we
6 might report the school readiness of our students if we do
7 not use TS Gold. The current assessments we have in place
8 that our district uses includes maps which we also refer to
9 as the NWEA. At the kindergarten level, this includes the
10 Reading and Math tests. DIBELS data is also used. We also
11 use READ plans, IEPs, RTIs otherwise known as MTSS, and 504
12 plans. Even though, NWEA and DIBELS are not CDE approved
13 assessments, they're excellent indicators of school success
14 and growth. Furthermore, we value using NWEA and DIBELS
15 testing because it provides a consistent record of student
16 achievement and progress district wide. DIBELS and NWEA
17 helped guide our instruction where we did not feel TS Gold
18 did so.

19 DIBELS and NWEA also provide clear data on
20 students used when vertically collaborating, whereas TS
21 Gold does not provide us with this opportunity. It is also
22 of value to us to use assessments such as -- such as DIBELS
23 and NWEA because parents are familiar with these reports
24 and consistently see them throughout their child's
25 educational career. If data is so strongly valued



1 especially beginning at the kindergarten level, I think we
2 should also look at the value of mandating and fully
3 funding kindergarten in the State of Colorado. If we want
4 students to be school ready, then we need to prioritize and
5 fully fund kindergarten as well as support our pre-school
6 programs.

7 In regards to the Board approved alternative
8 assessments, the DRDP and the REAL, the pre-school Head
9 Start and Learning Center in Wray all use TS Gold, and we
10 wanted to maintain a level of consistency with those
11 students. We also have the resource of staff who know the
12 system with TS Gold. If we use a different assessment
13 program, we would not have that system of support. Also
14 based on the feedback by the state directed review
15 committee, the other two assessments, the DRDP and the REAL
16 both rank lower than the TS Gold program. We did not see
17 value in assessing our students with systems that are
18 ranked lower than TS Gold.

19 It is of our strong opinion that rather than
20 meeting the specific letter of the law, we are meeting the
21 intent of the law. I would press upon the Board to please
22 consider our waiver as a case by case basis. If I could
23 leave you with a thought that if CDE stresses the
24 importance of improving and promoting school readiness,
25 then I believe a better way of doing -- doing so, then a



1 program such as TS Gold would be a way to support and guide
2 parents and guardians. Our students spend a significant
3 amount of their time learning and living outside of school.
4 To effectively build school readiness, we need to reach out
5 to those who have just as much of an impact on a child's
6 life, and educational career as educators do. Thank you.

7 MS. HAMMER: With everything that my
8 kindergartner -- kindergarten teachers have shared, I would
9 like to remind you that our preschool Head Start and
10 Learning Center, give the TS Gold three times during the
11 year, the fall, the winter and spring. Kindergarten
12 students who come in with no TS Gold are assessed in the
13 fall with all of their kindergarten students with the
14 assessments created by kindergarten teachers. We have
15 volunteers, the RTI process, the READ plans, DIBELS
16 progress monitoring, NWEA, and Math assessments in place,
17 for us to track students throughout the year, and give them
18 the help they need to be -- to catch up as well. We are
19 asking for a three year waiver, where after three years, we
20 can reevaluate and make sure our data is still showing
21 progress.

22 We believe our assessments and readiness
23 plan we have in place at Wray Elementary gives us the best
24 longitudinal data for our district. TS Gold does not give
25 us the longitudinal data we need to make our students, or



1 to make sure our students are making progress year after
2 year. TS Gold is a cookie cutter or universal system.
3 Education is currently using the key phrase differentiated
4 instruction which I'm sure you've heard of. With
5 differentiated instruction comes differentiated ways of
6 assessing and educating our students. If we expect our
7 educators to use differentiated in the classroom --
8 differentiation in the classroom, excuse me, is it not
9 reasonable to ask our State Board of Education to
10 differentiate by giving schools local control, over school
11 readiness? Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Questions from
13 Members of the Board. Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Just a quick one. When
15 you're using the TS Gold in first grade, were you using TS
16 Gold light or the full TS Gold?

17 MS. RAYMOND: We were using TS Gold in
18 kindergarten and preschool program.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: The full one, not the other
20 one that the Board has adopted which is --

21 MS. HAMMER: Last year we did the shorter
22 version.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: You did the shorter version?

24 MS. HAMMER: Yes.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And what was the effect of
2 that? I mean, how much -- how did that help?

3 MS. RAYMOND: I -- honestly, I was so
4 flustered that first quarter where we had to be doing the
5 TS Gold, and the kids were getting different -- they were
6 getting pulled out, we were assessing on the different
7 things, and I was glad when the benchmark -- when the
8 deadline was in and my numbers were in so I could go back
9 and get the classroom procedures, and the kids started on
10 the schedule and it just calmed down. I -- it just really
11 was stressful to me to do the TS Gold.

12 MS. HAMMER: Even with condensed version.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, maybe this is a
15 question for CDE. What percent of the -- of the schools
16 use TS Gold? I think it's like over 90 percent, am I
17 correct? Does anybody from CDE know the answer to that?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dr. Colzman will know
19 the answer to that.

20 MS. COLSMAN: (Inaudible) as of last year, I
21 believe we had all but three districts that were using
22 Teaching Strategies Gold.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. And so I
24 appreciate your presentation. I guess, my sense again is
25 that I understand the law, I understand what the state is



1 looking for, which is percent of students who are ready. I
2 understand the categories that they've asked for data and I
3 understand TS Gold, even in the shortened version is
4 extremely time consuming, and some might think of it as
5 best practice but when you really watch teachers give it
6 and when you talk to them about instructional time, it's
7 compromised. And you talk to parents, and you look at kids
8 taking that test or being, you know, the protocols that are
9 superimposed on their behaviors over time.

10 It's a very time intensive test, and
11 there're also a lot of subjectivity in the items. So, I
12 appreciate you as professionals thinking through this,
13 trying to come up with options that are best for your
14 district, and I just appreciate the fact that I believe we
15 have statutory authority to give waivers and to give
16 flexibility to these districts. And I appreciate the great
17 work that you've done in trying to think of something that
18 both meets the intent of the law and also meets your needs
19 as a district and as those of your students and parents.
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further, yes, Ms. Mazanec.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Is your assessment a new
23 assessment or is it something you've used for some time?

24 MS. RAYMOND: It's pretty much what we've
25 been using for the nine years I've been there.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Okay, thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any -- yes, Ms. Rankin.

3 MS. RANKIN: I -- as much as I -- how many
4 students do you have by the way in kindergarten?

5 MS. RAYMOND: We have 56 this year.

6 MS. RANKIN: 56. How many classrooms?

7 MS. RAYMOND: Three.

8 MS. RANKIN: Three. You know if I see a
9 written detail of exactly how the accountability is being
10 presented, I -- I understand what you're saying. But in
11 order to know what you're doing is aligned, and -- and have
12 a report, I mean when you talk to parents do you have some
13 kind of a report that's a checklist that these -- BOCES
14 people, the counselors, the -- all the support groups have
15 put into the program so that it is uniform throughout your
16 -- your school and that parents understand it, too?

17 MS. HAMMER: Yes. We have a portfolio for
18 each student that enters our kindergarten school year. So
19 that's where we keep in the house our data is within this
20 portfolio. The portfolio includes data from the TS Gold
21 from the previous years as well as assessments that the
22 teachers give at the beginning of the year in keeping --

23 MS. RANKIN: Kindergarten?

24 MS. HAMMER: Yes, it can be variable.



1 MS. RANKIN: Beginning of the kindergarten
2 year. And -- and if I had a child in two different
3 kindergartens, would the report be the same?

4 MS. HAMMER: Yes.

5 MS. RAYMOND: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further --

7 MS. HAMMER: (Inaudible).

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion --
9 okay. Very good. Thank you very much. It will take this
10 off the table. Pending legal advice (inaudible) tomorrow
11 afternoon. Thank you.

12 MS. RAYMOND: Thank you.

13 MS. HAMMER: Thank you.

14 Overlapping)

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry, 18.09. Next item
16 on the agenda is notice of rulemaking for the
17 administration and certification of the oversight of
18 Colorado Online Program 1 CCR 301-71. For starters, is
19 there a motion, Dr. Schroeder? Time out.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the notice
21 of rulemaking for the rules for the administration,
22 certification, and oversight of Colorado Online Program 1
23 CCR 301-71.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Ms. (inaudible),
25 you're on.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep. Thank you, Mr.
2 Chair. So this notice of rulemaking was prompted by two
3 changes. One was a recommendation from Legislative Legal
4 Services to insert a technical amendment. And the second
5 was the passage of House Bill 16-1222, this most recent
6 last legislative session, and there are two updates and
7 changes before online schools that prompted the rulemaking
8 process.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any discussion? In
10 my understanding, this is fairly perfunctory, there are no
11 -- we wouldn't have any comment since this is just notice,
12 but in -- in your judgment, this is -- doesn't add any
13 burden beyond what statute anticipated would be applied
14 into districts --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. So the
16 statutory change is that this aligns with, actually removes
17 -- to reporting elements for online schools.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Isn't there another -- is
20 this the one that also has online schools have to give
21 notice if they want to add --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If there is a great
23 change. Yeah.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Great change.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep. So it removes the
2 two -- the -- so the two elements that it removes is change
3 in authorizer and change in education provider, and then
4 it's -- I would say clarifies the need to let CDE know if
5 there is a great change.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: When there's something about
8 approval also they have to go -- will they have to go back
9 to their authorizer for approval to make a great change?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I think it's more
11 of a clarification about process.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Clarification, okay, all
13 right.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other questions on
15 this. Do we get a motion? I'm sorry.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, sir. I made a motion.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And was it seconded?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, I can't remember.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't remember. Anyone
20 who wants to second that? Yes, Ms. Goff. Okay. Is there
21 objection to the approval of the notice -- notice of
22 rulemaking?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, good question.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, (inaudible)



1 MS. RANKIN: Are we just opening rulemaking,
2 is that what we're doing?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct.

4 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This is not the rule per
6 se. Any -- any objection to that motion? Seeing none,
7 that motion's adopted by vote of seven to nothing. Thank
8 you. We'll now move on to item 20 which is the 20.01. The
9 rules for the administration of the --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 19.

11 MS. CORDIAL: No, they're --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, 19.01.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Mr. Chair, you are -- you are
14 correct. Since we're ahead of schedule we're pulling the
15 outside presenters at the (inaudible) chairs.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, okay.

17 MS. CORDIAL: And so if we could jump to
18 20.01 and 20.02 that would be wonderful.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 20.01.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not here yet.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Which is the report on the
23 PARCC contract, and then on the PARCC meeting that there
24 was attended?

25 MS. CORDIAL: No, it's the two notice of --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm on a
2 wrong -- which rulemaking am I on now?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 20.01 of rulemaking
4 (inaudible).

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. It's right
6 otherwise. Yeah. Is there a motion on that 20.01?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the notice
8 of rulemaking for the rules for the administration of
9 college entrance exam 1 CCR 301-46.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that
11 motion? Ms. Goff, seconds. The motion's now --
12 Commissioner, would you like to direct the discussion on
13 this issue?

14 MS. ANTHES: Sure, will just turn right over
15 to Ms. Zurkowski, the Executive Director for Assessment.

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So we have had
17 historically two different sets of rules that involved our
18 college entrance exam. One that dealt with administration
19 and one that dealt with the National Test State. And when
20 we got the 151323 legislation passed included and there was
21 also a requirement that we look at those rules. The rules
22 were very outdated. Going back to 2001 and dealing with
23 issues with the college entrance exam at that time. For
24 those of you who may not be -- have been attending to
25 college entrance exams that were given at a state level,



1 back in 2001, Colorado is one of the first states to do
2 that, and there were some issues and some concerns about
3 moving forward with that. So our rules were really
4 emphasizing some of the concerns that the vendor had and
5 colleges and universities had in terms of being able to
6 accept the -- the results from a state administration, and
7 there was a lot of concern from the NCAA.

8 So our students who wanted to compete for
9 athletic purposes, actually needed to test on a National
10 Test State in order for those scores to be acceptable for
11 those purposes. That is no longer an issue. So
12 referencing or needing to deal with that is irrelevant.
13 What wasn't included in the rules in terms of that National
14 Test State dealt with our online schools. So obviously, in
15 the last 15 years our online schools have significantly
16 increased in number, and they are actually our schools that
17 have the majority of our students who need to test on a
18 National Test State, because they do not have a brick and
19 mortar site from which they can set up an appropriate
20 testing site with security and provide that testing. So as
21 we are looking at aspects of who is eligible to test and a
22 National Test State, there has been some revisions to
23 reflect what's going on in 2016 as opposed to 2001.

24 In terms of administration, there were also
25 rules regarding the secure administration, standardized



1 administration of the assessment. Those rules specifically
2 identified the 2001 ACT test administrator's manual. In
3 order to make the rules clearer and more easily accessible,
4 we are suggesting not referencing any one test or a
5 specific manual and instead referencing the specific
6 principles are important in a standardized college entrance
7 examination administration that will result in college
8 reportable scores. So you will see a very clear
9 delineation in terms of what the expectations are, as
10 opposed to reference to a specific manual. We are
11 suggesting combining those two sets of rules. So
12 essentially, we would be deleting CCR 30154, and
13 incorporating the National Test State into CCR 30146.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any questions for Ms.
15 Zurkowski? Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you expect any concerns
17 with this? (Inaudible) I was trying to figure- -

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It's assessment. So I
21 always expect concerns. To put it out there bluntly, there
22 is nothing that is --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible).



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- inconsistent with current
2 practice. So really what it is, is frankly bringing the
3 rules in line with what we've been doing.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So I don't expect a
6 significant --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So nothing in here is going
8 to make it a struggle for students?

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: There is nothing in here
10 that --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Or tested -- tests --
12 administration is not the right word. Tests --

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: All of the requirements that
16 are in here have been requirements that schools and
17 districts and -- and test administrators have had to
18 fulfill in order to get those college reportable scorers
19 anyway. Again, they are just more clearly delineated in
20 rule as opposed to referencing a 2001 administration
21 manual. It also -- the administration manual encompasses a
22 lot of other things that is irrelevant, so rather than
23 having to read a 50 plus page manual, here they are much
24 more succinct.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Another question. What are
2 the odds that students will be able to take, for example,
3 the SAT online when they want to take it?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: College Board is moving into
7 an online system. This is their pilot year. Colorado is
8 not participating in that pilot. I would suggest that
9 Colorado has reached a level of tiredness in terms of
10 having to do new and different things. So for this year,
11 we intend to have the administration be via paper. We will
12 see how that pilot goes and then whether or not in 2018, we
13 want to offer both an online administration and a paper
14 administration. For this year, there's enough complexity
15 with the shift frankly from the ACT to the SAT, as well as
16 151323 made it a requirement that any student who wants to,
17 can choose to take the writing assessment. And so that is
18 going to create some new work for our schools and
19 districts. We didn't believe adding on and pilot for
20 online testing was in the state's best interest.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Will that require different
22 rules, do you think?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: The -- we wrote the rules
24 with that in mind. So I believe that we will be okay.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions for Ms.
2 Zurkowski? Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Does this have anything to do
4 with the ACT versus the SAT issue that we faced last
5 December?

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So again, the
7 rules were written about 15 years ago. They did specify
8 ACT as opposed to college entrance, as opposed to the
9 generic term. You'll notice now that we do not
10 specifically reference ACT or SAT, we just reference
11 college entrance. So regardless of which college entrance
12 test we are using, we developed rules that at least meet
13 current expectations for both of those major funders. So
14 we wouldn't have to go back into the rules should down the
15 road another change be made.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is it appropriate to say,
17 "The college entrance exams." Kind of nuance, is it, "A
18 college entrance exam?"

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it is "The college
20 entrance exam" that has been selected in accordance with
21 151323. And obviously, we can look more carefully
22 throughout the wording to see how it is phrased, but that
23 is why it's saying, "The college entrance exam."

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The college entrance exam
2 is not a reference to a specific product by a specific
3 company?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. It is not
5 referencing a specific product by a specific company. It
6 is referencing a specific requirement in 151323 that the
7 state adopt a college entrance exam as the Colorado College
8 Entrance Exam given census wide.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And I think as a practical
10 matter, this the legislature is constitutionally prohibited
11 from naming specific products or companies. And we should,
12 probably in our rules, make sure that we follow that
13 general constitutional prohibition. Yes, Ms. Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: I'm just curious because this is
15 a college entrance exam used throughout the country. Do
16 all states follow this -- do all states have some sort of
17 rulemaking process around this or are we unique in this
18 context?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Zurkowski.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I cannot speak to the
22 details of every state that happens to give a college
23 entrance exam census wide, but I would suggest that not all
24 of them are required to go through rulemaking. We need to
25 go through rulemaking 'cause it is specified in



1 legislation. And again, I would suggest that it's a
2 carryover from 2001, when it was new and different. And as
3 folks were having conversations about trying to utilize
4 this in a meaningful way and in a way to get college
5 reportable scores for folks. They believed that going
6 through the rulemaking process was the best way to ensure
7 that.

8 MS. GOFF: On a day, when nobody had
9 anything else to do. Kind of -- kind of a fun activity to
10 find out. No, because --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)

12 MS. GOFF: -- No, I'm -- I'm just talking.
13 Nebraska for example, I believe just moved to paying for
14 every student to take the ACT. So I'm just curious if
15 states rule in their -- in their decisions how are they --
16 how do we come together on some of this? If it's a
17 required exam, I don't know, just curious.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Zurkowski.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Every -- every state's
21 legislation comes to be in different ways. And so really
22 Colorado is required to do this under R151323 that other
23 states don't necessarily have.

24 MS. GOFF: So the parents pay for it?

25 Excuse me.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, no. Students -- this
2 is paid for by -- by the state. It's a state requirement,
3 state pays.

4 MS. GOFF: State pays for whatever the state
5 test --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The state test.

7 MS. GOFF: -- is determined. They're still
8 free to take others.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right, any
10 other questions? Let's see, do we have a motion on that?
11 We did, right? Did we?

12 MS. GOFF: Yes, we did.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. It's been moved and
14 seconded that we approve the notice of rulemaking for the
15 college entrance exam. Is there objection to the adoption
16 of that motion? Seeing none that motion (inaudible)
17 adopted by vote seven to nothing. See, we are now -- as
18 long you're here Ms. Zurkowski, we should probably finish
19 20.02. Correct.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: That's 20.02 just --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: ACT --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, you want the motion?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think we will need
24 another motion. Yes.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to approve the notice
3 of rulemaking to repeal the rules for the administration of
4 the ACT assessment on a National Test State. One -- to
5 repeal, yes. 1 CCR 301-54.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there objection to the
7 adoption -- or I'm sorry. Is there second to that motion?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, it's been moved and
10 seconded.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's do all of it.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: As Ms. Zurkowski, as I
13 understand that this is just conforming, because we're now
14 replacing that -- those rules with rules that we just gave
15 notice of hearing for so we'll give notice to repeal, these
16 rules need to move forward in tandem.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Again I wanted to go back to
20 what occurred in December where there was a lot of
21 confusion about who made the decision to switch from ACT to
22 SAT. So as we repeal one set of rules and open rulemaking
23 for another to replace it, is that issue included in the
24 language and what were repealing such that we should ensure
25 that it occurs in the new iteration of these rules or where



1 -- I'm not sure where that language occurred that said or
2 that implied here's the State Board's role, here's this
3 other advisory committees role, here's who makes this
4 decision as to which tests. I know it gets reviewed every
5 five year, but I just want to make sure we don't lose
6 something that we should be addressing while we repeal this
7 previously relevant set of rules.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So the rules
9 that we are suggesting repealing strictly deals with
10 students who rather than sitting on a Tuesday to take the
11 college entrance exam that has been selected, they go and
12 sit on a Saturday. All right, so that is the only piece
13 that we're looking at repealing in that CCR 301-54. And
14 again, those shifts, I would suggest we would need to make
15 regardless of which college entrance exam we would have
16 because they were not reflective of what was occurring now
17 in 2016. In terms of the decision about which exam is
18 selected that goes into procurement, right? And so we have
19 to follow all of the procurement rules and regulations and
20 laws.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: And where whereas that
22 language in this new set of rules potentially? Where is
23 that language --

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. That -- that is
25 -- so in terms of procurement, I will acknowledge that I am



1 not sure exactly where within state legislation all of the
2 procurement rules and guidance fall in terms of the
3 departments, we are obligated to follow the procurement
4 procedures. The open competitive procurement procedures.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is that in rule or statute or
6 both?

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Procurement is and, I
8 apologize for this, I'm looking at our Chair because I
9 think he knows this better than I do. It is legislative.
10 It is independent of the Department of Education. It is
11 government -- state governmental procurement expectations.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. It's fairly
13 prescriptive in statute which is followed by extensive
14 rules I think and I want to say it to Department of
15 Administration where --

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- where procurement takes
18 place. And if you do it, you do it under essentially a
19 general state rule. And I think going back to the December
20 situation, the legislature mandated in 1323 a competitive
21 bid process and the department simply carried it out. And
22 as I remember, there was a 15 Member committee, only one of
23 those Members was an employee of CDE. The rest were least
24 independent of CDE and almost all of them I think were
25 school district employees.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So that's what I'm asking
2 with respect to then how that decision got made. There
3 were 15 individuals only one of which represented CDE, is
4 that in rule? In statute? Is there -- and is there an
5 opportunity for us as we look at these rules to look at how
6 that procurement -- procurement actually works in terms of
7 who makes the decision? What feedback the State Board has
8 into the process?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, going back to that
10 decision, I don't know whether we could have had or whether
11 the department could have included more of its own staff on
12 there or not --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Or state Board Members.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah or -- probably not
15 State Board Members, I would suspect. And in -- in the
16 State Board, had we, I think, overturned that decision
17 would have created significant liability for the state
18 because I think it would have been difficult to second
19 guess, legally, second guess that procurement process. And
20 so I think when it came to us, which I remember it's
21 Christmas Eve or close to --

22 MS. FLORES: It was Christmas --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Merry Christmas.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I mean from the public
25 perception it certainly appeared that the State Board was



1 responsible for the decision. And I'm just saying, is this
2 an opportunity to clarify? To adjust the process? Maybe
3 not.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. I think -- I think it
5 -- I -- I absolutely, I agree. I think there were -- there
6 were number of -- there were number of people who thought
7 that there was a State Board decision but it was anything
8 but and I think that the problem was that there was
9 significant surprise, really in the entire education
10 community including CDE staff, that was surprised by the
11 outcome. But once -- once the outcome was done and the
12 procurement process properly followed, changing it would
13 have been -- would have created an enormous liability for
14 the state.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so that's why I'm
16 thinking going forward, is this an opportunity to put
17 anything in place that would either clarify the role of the
18 State Board, adjust the number of individuals and who's
19 represented on the 15 Member review -- maybe not. I'm just
20 asking. I just guess I'd like -- I'd like this not to
21 happen again, where we have the surprise decision and it
22 appears that the State Board's responsible when they had
23 nothing to do with it.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We didn't really do and I
25 -- I think if it's a pure procurement process directed by



1 the General Assembly, I'm going to guess that -- that we'll
2 have little control regardless of what the rules say over
3 that process. We will not be in a position to supersede
4 the -- the Department of Administration's procurement
5 rules.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

8 MS. GOFF: Dr. Scheffel, are you interested
9 in having the pure formal language where some of these is -
10 -

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just saying, I'd like to
12 avoid the situation that occurred last December because
13 there was so much confusion in the media, from parent. We
14 got flooded with e-mails that assumed one thing which
15 wasn't accurate. And so I just was wondering --

16 MS. GOFF: E-mails and phone calls.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- is this an opportunity to
18 create clarity? I don't know. But I guess I'd like to
19 bring clarity through some mechanism --

20 MS. GOFF: I was going to offer that right
21 after -- during and right after that Elliot Asp wrote a
22 very, very good explanation of how the process worked, our
23 role in it, the nature of the committee that made the final
24 decision. It was in a press release. Maybe some of --

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes, I remember.



1 MS. GOFF: -- you guys could help, whenever
2 that, December-January. We know that. But it was it was -
3 - it was a good explanation for superintendents and it was
4 district people that were up in arms about confusion at
5 that point, mostly. But as far as the general public is
6 concerned or anyone who's going to be paying attention to
7 these rule hearings, it would -- it would be a start at
8 least unless -- unless we want to wait, go -- go into a
9 legislative conversation about where -- where in the law
10 should this be effected.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Zurkowski, the rules
12 we're considering here are strictly for the administration
13 --

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- of these exams. Not
16 the procurement or choice of which exam. So if we wanted
17 to participate in that, I suspect we would have to ask the
18 Attorney General about the scope of our authority, if any,
19 and then see if there were some rulemaking that could be
20 done. I wouldn't want to second guess or straight out
21 guess the Attorney General's office but I'm going to guess
22 you're going to tell us we don't have -- there's no
23 specific statutory direction to us to manage that
24 procurement process.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And regardless, that's --
2 that's a separate process than what we're talking about
3 rules.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, these rules relate to
5 administration --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just to be clear on that.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- not procurement. All
8 right. We have a motion and a second. Is there objection
9 to the adoption of the notice of rulemaking to repeal the
10 existing rule on the National Test State? Seeing none.
11 That motion's adopted by a vote of seven to nothing. I
12 think we will take about a five minute recess so Dr.
13 Schroeder can get a cup of coffee and -- and then we'll
14 come back. We'll -- since we're still ahead of schedule,
15 we'll go to item 21.01. State Board will come back to
16 order and we're privileged to have one of the artists who
17 was able to make it here. And so let's see who's in
18 charge.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm going to have --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Elizabeth.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Elizabeth is going to
22 be in-charge.

23 MS. CORDIAL: So we're lucky to have one of
24 our student artists here today. And just to reiterate she
25 is -- she's from the -- she is -- was part of the 2016



1 Congressional Art Show competition and has graciously
2 allowed us to house her artwork here and the State Board
3 room for a year for a more visually appealing look at our
4 State Board room. And -- and so I will just go ahead and
5 turn it over to Eliza -- or no, it is Eliza.

6 MS. ELIZA: Hello.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Hi. Welcome.

8 MS. ELIZA: Hi, my name is Eliza.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hi.

10 MS. ELIZA: I go to Grandview High School
11 and I did this when I was a freshman. So I'm a sophomore
12 now. I really like art a lot. So this is my watercolor
13 that I submitted and it's called Giant Impossibility
14 because I've always thought that when you like, I don't
15 know, get out of reach and you get out of your comfort
16 zone, there's many possibilities that I don't really know
17 about. And it's very colorful and vibrant it's a lot of
18 opportunity. So I kind of relate that to the ocean cause
19 it looks very scary and mean from the top but when you go
20 in it, it's very vast and colorful and beautiful so that's
21 why I made her underwater. So thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's generally the way
23 the Board feels. Yeah, okay. All right, well
24 congratulations and we appreciate you. Thank you very
25 much.



1 MS. ELIZA: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then, Dr. Scheffel, if
3 you'd like to go out and we'll get some (inaudible) where
4 we get this picture and so I got our photographer's back.
5 We're hitting on all cylinders here. You want to do it
6 here? Yeah, right here. Okay.

7 MS. ELIZA: My mom's here, too.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, good.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, we'll come back for,
11 what was that -- item 21 the PARCC contracts. We'll start
12 with Ms. Zurkowski and then we'll ask Commissioner to fill
13 in on the meeting. You're on.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there are actually four
15 different agreements that relate to our CMAS PARCC
16 assessments. The biggest agreement is actually our Pearson
17 contract. Our Pearson contract also encompasses more than
18 just the CMAS, PARCC, ELA, and Math assessments. It also
19 incorporates our CMAS Science and Social Studies
20 assessments. Our (inaudible) Science and Social Studies
21 assessments, that contract expires September 30th of 2017.
22 Our second contract is actually with PARCC Inc. PARCC Inc.
23 provides some program management facilitation support for
24 the consortium. That contract expires June 30th of 2017.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, did you run
2 those dates starts with the Pearson contract?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Pearson contract expires
4 September 30th 2017. PARCC Inc. contract expires June 30th
5 of 2017. The third agreement is actually the PARCC
6 consortium, MOU, Memorandum of Understanding. That is the
7 cross state agreement that expires June 30th of 2017.
8 Separate from those, there is a New Mexico pricing
9 agreement. New Mexico engaged in a procurement process for
10 the consortium as a whole. States kind of bought into that
11 pricing agreement through a variety of different
12 procurement methods that New Mexico pricing agreement runs
13 through the spring 2018 administration.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Spring?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Runs through the spring 2018
16 administration. So, we have several contracts obviously
17 that are in play here. Two of those agreements/contracts
18 are ending in June 30th of 2017. Pearson contract, ending
19 September 30th of 2017. That Pearson contract again
20 encompasses more than just the CMAS PARCC assessments. It
21 also includes our Science and Social Studies assessments.
22 We are in a position where we are going to need to move
23 forward more than likely with some type some type of RFP
24 for all of our CMAS assessments. We have had some



1 conversations about how do we go about and do that and
2 obviously we need input from you as well as from the field.

3 And do we break this apart? Do we keep it
4 together? There are advantages to keeping these
5 assessments together, really from an administration point
6 of view. And it is for schools and districts, right. If
7 they're dealing with one testing system as opposed to
8 multiple testing systems, that's easier for them. Having
9 to deal with one contractor for purposes of data cleanup
10 rather than dealing with four different contractors, that
11 makes things easier for them. So remember for CMAS, PARCC
12 is one component of CMAS and then we also have the CMAS
13 Science and Social Studies. So right now, we do have a
14 single vendor for CMAS Science and Social Studies, CMAS,
15 PARCC, ELA, and Math as well as for our Colorado alternate
16 assessment for Science and Social Studies.

17 And we actually do have an additional
18 assessment the Colorado Spanish Language Arts. All of
19 those currently are with a single vendor. We have also
20 started to have some preliminary conversations about not
21 just how to potentially split those assessments by content
22 area but also should we look at some differences by grade
23 level. Right now, for our CMAS PARCC assessments, we are
24 administering those in grades three through nine. We are
25 required by state law to have a three through nine



1 assessment for both ELA and Math. The question is, do we
2 maybe want to look at having three through eight be a
3 separate procurement than grade nine? That's the status of
4 our current contracts.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Observations
6 or questions from Members of the Board. Dr. Scheffel.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when does this decision
8 have to be made and then do we have copies of the contracts
9 and when can we go deep on this issue?

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So all of our assessment
11 contracts, because they do involve individual student level
12 data are posted on our website. So all of them are right
13 there for public viewing and obviously for your access. In
14 terms of moving forward, we are still engaging in
15 conversations in terms of what we may have, in terms of
16 options from a procurement point of view. We would need to
17 release an RFP, winter of 2017. I never know what to call
18 winter of 2017/2016.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sometime in the next four
20 months.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: 2016.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you. Sometime within
23 the next four months. For those assessments that are
24 currently under the Pearson contract and are -- we cannot
25 access through the New Mexico pricing agreement.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: And the ESSA statute and the
3 rules associated with it, suggest more flexibility in terms
4 of numbers of tests and so forth than the Federal guidance
5 document. And so as we look at those documents as
6 informing the kind of assessment we choose, have we
7 unpacked that -- have you looked deeply at that? Done any
8 cross works between the guidance document and the statute
9 and the rules itself? Because I think that informs how the
10 Board thinks about this issue.

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So as you may recall, when I
14 was in front of you last month, I think it was last month,
15 under -- I said there are actually two different sets of
16 what I'll call legislation and proposed rules. There are
17 the standard ESSA requirements that require us to have in
18 grades three through eight and ELA and Math assessment.
19 There are requirements for us to have once in high school,
20 ELA and Math. There are federal requirements that cover a
21 single administration of Science, once in elementary
22 school, once in middle school, once in high school, and
23 then there are requirements that we have an English
24 Language Proficiency Assessment. Those requirements are
25 very consistent with what we had under NCLB. The major



1 shift is for our high school ELA and Math assessment that
2 used to have to occur in grades 10 through 12, they
3 extended that to grades nine through 12.

4 Then there is the -- what some folks are
5 referring to as like a pilot. It is the Innovative
6 Assessment Demonstration Authority and there are proposed
7 rules for that Innovation Assessment Demonstration
8 Authority that does allow states to apply for some
9 flexibility in terms of how they operate their state system
10 while they are implementing some new innovative
11 assessments, while maintaining their current assessment
12 system, and building up those innovative assessments to
13 eventually become the state system. That is separate from
14 our basic requirements and what is required within our
15 state plan. That Innovative Assessment Demonstration
16 Authority process will actually be separate from our State
17 Plan process.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: There's language in ESSA in
20 the rules that stipulates the nature of the assessments and
21 rigorously valid and reliable and so forth and so on. So I
22 mean is it the plan -- I can see they pulled together a
23 list of tests that would meet that threshold of a
24 psychometric rigor so that we would consider what we have



1 as well as other options or what is -- would that be a
2 reasonable next step to look at options?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. I would suggest
4 that that would actually be the procurement process itself,
5 is we would set the expectations, what are the requirements
6 for our assessment? It will very much follow what is
7 required within ESSA, right? Alignment to our standards,
8 technically rigorous, things like that. We could also
9 insert some of Colorado's priorities in terms of online
10 assessment versus paper assessment. All that's right in
11 Colorado, we must have for any online assessment also have
12 a paper assessment. We can have some priorities for, you
13 know, what our reporting will look like, things like that.
14 But essentially, we will get a list of assessments through
15 that procurement process and select one through that
16 procurement process.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: To the extent that we may
19 change our standards, next spring? That would be what
20 would drive, I would think. Any changes in the changes
21 assessments. I'm not sure. I was -- the coffee hasn't
22 started working yet. If I heard everything that Dr.
23 Scheffel said, it is possible for us to move to a testing
24 system that is more formative. In other words, there are
25 two or three tests throughout the year rather than one. It



1 was my shock that a whole lot of the people who responded
2 on the listening tour said that's what they want. And yet
3 I recall, what life was like when we had two. So this
4 conversation needs to be very, very broad in the -- in the
5 consequences of having three assessments versus one. I
6 think you really need to be fleshed out. I'm think -- I'm
7 guessing this will be part of the assessment group? Spoke
8 -- Spoke group?

9 MS. FLORES: Excuse me, would we go against
10 -- wouldn't we be going against the legislature that
11 suggested that we have less testing instead of more tests?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Maybe. It depends on what
13 those three assessments are, compared to what we have now.
14 You just made me lose my (inaudible) --.

15 MS. FLORES: That's -- that's legislature.

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- my portrait of thought.

17 Okay, coffee.

18 MS. RANKIN: May I ask --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin --

20 MS. RANKIN: Could I ask --

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- wiping your thought.

22 Ms. Rankin (inaudible) then Dr. Scheffel.

23 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. I think I came on the
24 Board a little late and when I asked to see some of the
25 tests I was told, no. That's something I really want to



1 see even if we take the -- the ones we currently have. No,
2 I don't have to see the whole test but just some of the
3 questions because I have heard -- I have heard statements
4 about some of the questions that are more content driven
5 and in Language Arts and I -- I -- I'm just not familiar
6 with them. I'm going to judge a test, I -- I want to see
7 what one test is against another, against another, and be
8 able to look out. And I won't bring a paper and pencil or
9 anything I just want to see what we're dealing with here.

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: We -- well, obviously we
13 need to work with the consortium to get you access but we
14 should be able to do that consistent with how we provided
15 the rest of the Board access.

16 MS. RANKIN: Yes, and -- and, you know, my -
17 - my thought is the sooner the better because I don't think
18 it's something you can just sit down and do in 30 minutes
19 and have an idea.

20 MS. FLORES: Wouldn't it be a practice test
21 by now?

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: There is a practice test
25 that is available. There are a lot of released items that



1 are also available, those anybody can look at, they're
2 publicly out there. I was assuming you would want to
3 actually see it in the same format.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel and then Dr.
5 Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Dr. Schroeder, what were you
7 referring to with respect to the assessment committee work
8 that's still looking at this? What committee is that?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: There's the Spoke -- of the
10 seven Spoke --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: The Spoke of the -- of the
12 ESSA.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. I think --

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: And they're just looking at
15 this assessment?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, and I think they'll be
17 -- I hope they'll be looking at the feedback because that's
18 part of their job, is look at the feedback, to look at the
19 law, et cetera. To be looking at assessments.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: And does -- do any Board
21 Members attend that meeting? That -- that Spoke committee?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible)

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, the listening tour
24 will be a part of what we discuss.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't think we go to
2 Spoke.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can't.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: We don't go to Spoke.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I go to Hub.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We could, I mean but we --
7 we haven't.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I just wonder what the
9 preliminary discussion is.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So we are on a big long
11 schedule from Bizy? All the different meetings?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: God forbid.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. Just for
15 complete transparency. The assessment Spoke is not moving
16 quite as quickly as some of the others Spokes. We've been
17 doing some other things.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Getting out all of the
20 assessment results and making sure that folks had access to
21 what they needed. So right now, the dates are not set but
22 we'll obviously get those to you when they're available.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Click before I forget. So
2 one of the questions has been answered. They have released
3 some more questions, right? So there are a number of
4 questions that have been released either from the -- from
5 the practice tests or from the items that have been
6 released to get an idea what's on this assessments. But
7 what I -- what I would like to know is, what process is
8 there now for feedback in order to meet the goal, or maybe
9 it's just my goal, that the test be as short as is
10 practicable to achieve what we want to achieve and that the
11 results can come back in May?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there are definitely
15 conversations that are occurring within the consortium
16 about test to length, test to time, things like that. We
17 have contributed to those conversations, I would suggest
18 advocating for a deep look in terms of how long the
19 assessments are and do they need to be that long in order
20 to give the information that is valued by schools and
21 districts? I think those conversations will be ongoing for
22 the 2017 school year. The decision was made (inaudible)
23 consistency for two years in a row, right? And when we had
24 the 2015 assessment, there were some adjustments that were



1 made for 2016 but let's have a couple of years that are
2 consistent.

3 It is a conversation for us to have in terms
4 of 2018 and where Colorado is going. We may have some
5 conversation about whether or not Colorado would choose to
6 shorten the assessment that they are giving. In terms of
7 getting the results back and we've talked about this I
8 think a couple of different times, part of our challenge is
9 that schools and districts want to have the results, sorry,
10 they want to have the testing experience as close to the
11 end of the school year as possible because the assessments
12 are intended to be end of the year tests, right? So they
13 want them as close to the end as possible but then we also
14 want to make sure that we're getting results back as
15 quickly as possible.

16 Given that our assessment, not only based on
17 what has historically been Colorado value, but also what is
18 in legislation we need to include our constructive response
19 items which always takes longer to score. That's just a
20 fact. So we cannot give a test at the end of April and
21 then have results back at the beginning of May. Now we
22 have consistently been working on, how can we shorten that
23 timeline? What types of additional information could we
24 give to folks even if they weren't final results that they
25 might be able to utilize in classrooms? We have heard loud



1 and clear that folks want more information more quickly and
2 I think that would be a priority for any RFP that we would
3 put out there. And sorry, Mr. Chair. I -- I think I may
4 know in part where you were going when you lost your train
5 of thought. So is it okay if I try to --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- poke a little bit here?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Help him.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is this the mind reading
10 portion --

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You were, I think, we're
12 talking about the standards and -- standards as of July
13 1st, 2018 and the relationship between new standards and
14 new assessments. So, if I'm right about that -- so right
15 now, that schedule is for July 1st, 2018 that there will --

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: '17 -- '18, okay. Good.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: I feel better. Okay.

19 MS. MAZANEC: She's not here.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah, I'm -- I'm pretty
21 confident in that. We're looking for our standards, person
22 behind me. So July 1st, 2018 is when new standards are
23 supposed to be adopted by the State Board and essentially
24 there would be about a two year period before schools and
25 districts would be expected to be implementing those



1 revised standards so you're looking at July 1st 2020. I
2 would agree with you that depending on the level of
3 shifting and the level of change in those standards, that
4 will influence how much we may need to revise our
5 assessments. So there may very well be -- say in spring
6 2021, an assessment that needs to be very closely aligned
7 to the new standards and again depending on how much those
8 vary that may require us to vary our assessments
9 significantly or not.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

12 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question. I don't
13 know. You should probably know this but I don't. The --
14 the Smarter Balanced, do they have the same issue with --
15 why is it taking too long to get results or would -- is it
16 unique to Colorado? And we -- would we have the same
17 problem, if we were using Smarter Balanced?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Zurkowski?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So there -- for
20 the Smarter Balanced assessments, there are a couple of
21 differences. One is that each state has their own
22 administration contractor and so the timing of the release
23 of the results varies by that contractor, and I will admit
24 to you that off the top of my head I don't know what those
25 schedules are. I can find out for you.



1 MS. MAZANEC: So the problem is Pearson?

2 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I didn't --

3 MS. MAZANEC: You know when we talk about
4 getting the results back so late -- I mean too late to
5 really drive instruction, right?

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So again this is intended to
9 be an end of the year assessment, right. This is -- you
10 have instructed, you've assessed locally, you've
11 instructed, you've assessed locally, you've instructed,
12 you've assessed locally, it is now the end of the year and
13 the state is asking, has the student mastered what the
14 student was supposed to master within that year? Not
15 intended to provide immediate information in terms of what
16 we should be doing and structurally because it's the end of
17 the year, right? And that's -- it's done under our current
18 structure with a summative end of year assessment. I
19 think, in part, that is why there is interest in
20 potentially going to kind of this interim model where the
21 state system and the local systems could merge a little bit
22 and then they would be getting some information throughout
23 the school year that they could be utilizing along the way.
24 I agree with you that I think there are some
25 interesting conversations that are occurring and there are



1 a lot of different variables that need to be taken into
2 consideration and we're going to need to have a thorough
3 understanding, kind of -- of -- what I'll call longer term
4 in terms of where Colorado wants to go. I think there are
5 some schools and districts who are believing that that
6 flexibility means that they can utilize any interim
7 assessment that they want. So one district will use NWEA
8 map and another district might use Aspire, at another
9 district may utilize Galileo. That is not allowed under
10 the ESSA regulations. It is -- there would be a state
11 interim assessment system that would be utilized.

12 I think for Colorado, we would need to have
13 a lot of conversation to make sure that all of our local
14 districts would be okay with there being a single state
15 interim assessment or whether that would be perceived as
16 overly intrusive to just put it out there. I also think,
17 you know, we reflect on what happened last year when we had
18 two assessment windows, expand that to three, and make sure
19 that folks fully understand what the implications are.
20 Again, having it be more closely tied to instruction might
21 make that okay, but I think there's a lot of conversation
22 that's gonna need to occur.

23 MS. ANTHES: Can I just add --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Anthes.



1 MS. ANTHES: Can I just add one thing to --
2 and so you have talked about it, Ms. Mazanec, as -- like
3 the problem that I think Ms. Zurkowski talked a little bit
4 about because it's a summative and because Colorado has in
5 our laws, that constructed response that takes longer to
6 score, and you know, there is some reasonableness to, you
7 know, when the scores get back, because of the way our
8 system is set up and the way our lives are set up in
9 addition to Colorado law allowing for paper based
10 assessment, that also takes longer to deliver the papers
11 in, get them graded, and come back. So some of this is
12 around sort of state law and things --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So some of these things
14 you need to --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think -- and do you
16 wanna give a quick report on the -- before we close on this
17 on the PARCC meeting you attended on Monday, I guess it was
18 --

19 MS. ANTHES: Sure, sure.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So I think it was fun
21 filled, no doubt.

22 MS. ANTHES: Yes, it -- it wasn't as
23 exciting as we may have thought. But, yes I -- I missed
24 the ESSA Hub meeting in order to do the PARCC Governing
25 Board Meeting. It -- it was some more detailed



1 administration questions and -- and that sort of thing. So
2 we talked about the ESSA requirements, and how the ESSA
3 requirements do give some states. Again, it doesn't
4 necessarily reflect ours because every state has different
5 laws, but how it gives them more flexibility with state
6 assessments. We -- we walked through the work plan for the
7 PARCC Inc., sort of, management around, how the next
8 administration was going to look and what decisions, and
9 what materials they need from states in order to meet that
10 timeline.

11 So it was really quite nitty-gritty working
12 group meeting. We talked about sort of how we make sure
13 in, as a consortium, that items are being replenished and
14 that they're being researched and those sorts of things.
15 So it was really pretty nitty-gritty on that front. In
16 terms of update, there were not major decisions made in
17 terms of governing. I think the only piece, you know, I
18 sized that -- you know, we will -- it comes back to that
19 RFP decision in the next four months. We have, Colorado
20 has a contract that expires a little bit earlier than some
21 of the other states. So our decisions on this RFP are
22 critical and that's -- we have to move forward on those,
23 you know, here in this fall period. I think Joyce was
24 there so she can add anything that I missed.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. I agree that
2 there were some pretty nitty-gritty details that we were
3 going through. We were looking at numbers of items that we
4 have in our item bank, what where feature development need
5 to look like. Looking at '17-'18 scope which is obviously
6 relevant for the rest of the states who will be continuing
7 under the New Mexico pricing agreement. Again, Colorado's
8 role in that unknown at this time, looking at student
9 number projections that sort of thing.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Any -- any discussions about
12 any lessons learned -- new lessons learned with this second
13 iteration?

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I think there were some
15 discussions about lessons learned, both in terms of
16 administration, communicating with the field, but also how
17 to minimize in some ways the cross state dependencies or
18 making sure that we all understand the cross state
19 dependencies, so that one state's results are not held up
20 because another state has not completed whatever their
21 process is. And I think there was recognition by all of
22 the chiefs there to say we have to make that a priority.
23 That our internal process -- we need to make sure that
24 we're meeting our deadlines because we're not only



1 impacting our state but we're potentially impacting other
2 states.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Was that really significant?

4 MS. ANTHES: Yeah. I mean, I think that
5 there's always -- the lessons learned across this couple
6 years of being in a state consortium, I think everyone sort
7 of starting to say to themselves how much is -- is the
8 benefits of being in a consortium worth the costs of
9 independent state flexibility. And so those discussions do
10 continue to happen and I think, and -- and Ms. Zurkowski
11 can talk more to this but this actually happened before I
12 was in the mix of all this. A request for information was
13 -- was given out from -- give me the right name or else
14 I'll say it wrong.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah. You have it. So the
16 PARCC of Governing Board, which is the group of chiefs from
17 the PARCC states, issued a request for information last
18 February requiring a response, I believe, by March 11th.
19 And one of the main points of that RFI was to ask for some
20 proposals that would look at the management of the
21 consortium, perhaps in a different way.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, I remember that.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So I think there are --
24 there are some implications in terms of Governing Board
25 structure and function, item management, and things like



1 that. But that obviously also is going to potentially
2 influence how these states work together. Again, I think
3 there's been some interest, and again the consortium
4 started off with a high level of respect and desire for
5 cross state to comparability, and we think we have achieved
6 that with the states that are participating. And we gonna
7 have a side conversation about some more details because,
8 there are some differences across the states.

9 But I think what's happening now is, really,
10 folks are trying to engage in conversations that says, how
11 much flexibility can we have and how much independence
12 state decision making can we have while still preserving
13 enough of this comparability? But I think the emphasis has
14 shifted from making sure that we have this to how do we
15 prioritize this? And as an example for Colorado, the
16 consortium had the intent of phasing out paper based
17 testing. That was a consortium goal. Initially, it was a
18 Colorado goal but legislation was passed last year that
19 says, that's no longer a goal for us. We will always have
20 a paper option for any online tests that we give. That
21 shifts what happens within our development of our
22 assessment and where we're going. And we've had to figure
23 that out across state as well as within our own state.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Are there issues with
25 (inaudible)?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, yes go ahead.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Like to finish it.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Are there concerns about
5 the, let's say, 15 percent that's different in Colorado
6 from, perhaps, other states? The personal finance? Are
7 they -- are they assessed in their -- are there differences
8 between the states?

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So Mr. Chair, the way that
10 we have approached that issue up to this point, is we did
11 do a thorough review of what I'll refer to as unique to
12 Colorado standards. For English Language Arts, frankly
13 there's an awful lot of redundancy between what was in --
14 the unique to Colorado versus what is shared across the
15 states. There is some more specificity but a lot of
16 overlap. So there wasn't a lot of concern in terms of
17 English Language Arts. In terms of Math, you've identified
18 where the biggest difference is and that's with the
19 personal financial literacy. At this point, we have not
20 incorporated assessment items into the PARCC assessment
21 just for Colorado. So as part of that state assessment,
22 those are not incorporated. But what we have done is we
23 have developed assessment tools that get out both -- sorry,
24 personal financial literacy as well as some of these ELA
25 pieces that schools and districts can choose to use to



1 cover those standards. But at this point the decision was
2 that we would not increase the length of the PARCC
3 assessments by adding in personal financial literacy
4 specific to Colorado.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. We should be
6 transparent about that considering the very strong interest
7 at the time that we were working on our standards. To be
8 sure to incorporate those standards and ensure that they
9 are being covered in schools.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Remind me how many states are
12 now in the private?

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Seven.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Seven.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That include District of
16 Columbia?

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It doesn't.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: They're not a state.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I know.

20 MS. ANTHES: Six and a half.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Six and a half.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Six and a half.

23 MS. ANTHES: And the Department of defense
24 has also joined.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Who joined?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Six and three quarters.

2 MS. ANTHES: The Department of Defense.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Six and three quarters.

4 What -- Pam, do you have any other --

5 MS. MAZANEC: No, but I mean, it was
6 supposed to consist of 15 or was there 15 to begin with and
7 did anyone drop -- did anyone drop out in the last year to
8 the PARCC?

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. So back when the
10 original Race to the Top grants and the proposals were due,
11 there was a requirement that 15 states sign on saying,
12 "We're interested in sharing an assessment." There is
13 nothing within those requirements that said 15 states had
14 to remain in the end. It was an order to start the
15 process, you need to have 15 and I think that's where the
16 magical 15 number comes from.

17 MS. FLORES: And there's nothing to cost
18 effectiveness?

19 MS. MAZANEC: Was there any -- was there 15
20 to begin with though?

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I believe when we were
24 looking at both governing and participating states, there
25 were actually 24.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. And how -- where we at
2 now?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: We're at -- we're at the six
4 and three quarter.

5 MS. MAZANEC: -- six and three quarter
6 participated in the -- that governing.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So we had the six states
8 plus the District of Columbia that -- I need to break down
9 my state because I might have this slightly wrong, sorry.
10 I will confirm this after because I'm not jotting as
11 quickly as I need to. But the -- it is fair to say like
12 the Department of Defense is not a full governing Member.
13 They are not sitting at the table that, that Dr. Anthes was
14 sitting at earlier this week. They're utilizing the
15 assessment and obviously they have, you know, some interest
16 in having an assessment that is consistent, you know,
17 across all of their schools.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It doesn't have to be a
19 big table though. It fits in a small room.

20 MS. FLORES: May I?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

22 MS. FLORES: So what happened to the other
23 states? What -- what did they do? Why -- why did they
24 leave?

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

2 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So some states -- were
3 states frankly like Colorado, initially when these two
4 consortia started, we were in both -- both of those
5 consortia. We were participating states in both ASPAC and
6 in PARCC. Colorado made the decision to go to a PARCC,
7 some other states made a decision to go over to ASPAC.
8 Other states made the decision to go forward with their own
9 assessment system. Other states made the decision to
10 incorporate aspects of the PARCC assessment into their own
11 assessment systems. So there's a variety of directions
12 that states have gone.

13 MS. FLORES: And just one question. What
14 about Indiana and the ITBA? The Iowa Test --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, just go on.

16 MS. FLORES: ITBA -- ITBS excuse. So
17 Indiana was given the right to -- to do an achievement
18 tests. (Inaudible) achievement test?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. I, again, will
20 acknowledge that I don't -- do not know the intricacies of
21 all 50 states and all their processes. What I do know is
22 that Indiana was initially a PARCC state, and they made a
23 decision that they wanted to go back into their standards,
24 and they did that. They also then went into a process of
25 looking at their assessments. I know initially -- I'm



1 pretty confident that initially it was not the Iowa Test of
2 Basic Skills. It may be now at this point. They will go
3 through the same process that we have to go through with
4 our assessments which that -- is that -- that --

5 MS. FLORES: It was approved by (inaudible).

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- that it will -- at this
7 point, no state's assessment has been approved.

8 MS. FLORES: Okay. But at the time --

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So no state's assessment at
10 this point in time is approved. And that's --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So some of them are doing
12 it?

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So just right now, even --
14 even with Colorado, right, we submitted our assessments to
15 the Department of Education for peer review, we have not
16 heard back. We do not have a stamp of Department of
17 Education approval. Dr. Scheffel, I know, is engaged in
18 reviewing some of the peer review documentation, but at
19 this point no state has officially heard back from the
20 Department of Education saying you are approved.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: To -- yes, Ms. Goff.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: On what? What are you
23 talking about? (Inaudible).

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sorry. So obviously with
25 our assessment system meets our state requirements. It



1 also needs to meet federal requirements. That process to
2 go through approval is referred to as peer review. It is a
3 technical review of the assessments of the reporting,
4 things like that. All states submitted -- with some give
5 here, their assessments this past spring for that peer
6 review process. At this point, Colorado has not heard
7 back, no state has heard back in terms of whether or not
8 they are fully approved, partially approved, strong
9 suggestion to revise, or it appears that your assessment is
10 not aligned, you have a problem. Again, so I just wanna
11 make clear that at this point no state has an approved
12 assessment.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Last question.

14 MS. FLORES: Well, May I finish?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead and finish, Jane.

16 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible)

18 MS. GOFF: I get -- I -- we can talk about
19 that. I'm -- I'm just kind of a bit loss for -- we've got
20 peer review going on with upcoming plans, we've got -- we
21 have a state assessment system right now, I'm curious as to
22 how this fits in with this. My other -- let me make a real
23 quick comment. The state of Indiana withdrew from the
24 Common Core per se a while back. They took a couple of
25 years, ended up redoing their standards only to find that



1 they were so similar to what they had before the common
2 core that they adopted a new old set. That required them
3 to redo their assessment system, which they have done in
4 their own, so state choice -- state project.

5 That's -- I'm not sure what the status of
6 that. I -- I don't want to say, well, as I know for sure
7 where they -- where they are with that test. Iowa itself
8 did away with the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. So they --
9 they realized -- they're after a lot of conversations on
10 looking at their own standards and their own expectations
11 and aspirations for the kids and the alignment up there.
12 How that had to align assessment to standards. They --
13 they decided that the Iowa test was not meeting their needs
14 anymore. So as of this point, ITBS, I guess -- I can't say
15 it's not being given anywhere, but not in Iowa. And that
16 was --

17 MS. FLORES: Well, it being given -- it's
18 given in Indiana.

19 MS. GOFF: It's -- okay. It's the Iowa test
20 not being given in Iowa. My other statement would be that
21 (inaudible)

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And I'll -- I will be happy
25 to go and connect with my Indiana counterpart. I -- I do



1 have to suggest that this is not consistent with at least
2 some of my prior information in terms of who they were
3 working with for their assessment system and in creation
4 of, I believe what is called, thank you for reminding me,
5 ISTEP. Again, I don't know if the Iowa Test of Basic
6 Skills is incorporated into that, but we can look into it.
7 At this point, it is true that the Iowa Test of Basic
8 Skills is no longer being utilized by Iowa. Iowa did a
9 full, actually did a very full report in terms of looking
10 at what their options were and where they were going to
11 land. And that's publicly available.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Further
13 questions? I have a couple, if nobody else does. Is it
14 still -- does (inaudible) law still require we belong to a
15 multi-state consortium? Or is that particular provision
16 expired?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman, thanks to
18 staff -- that issue was flagged for me during the break and
19 absolute that in terms of statute, that obligation has
20 expired.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No obligations. So the
22 reason -- the reason this is on the agenda is -- is, we've
23 all taken a lot of heat and public comment and
24 consternation are really about two things. Standards
25 commonly known as Common Core and assessments commonly



1 known as PARCC. And I believe this is about the last
2 chance we're going to have to deal with it because if you
3 look at the time frame that's been laid out, we have in
4 place all the contracts and agreements necessary for
5 testing in the 2016-'17 school year. If changes are to be
6 made for the 2017-'18 school year, as a practical matter,
7 they probably have to be made before March which be the end
8 of winter, roughly. And as everyone knows, with the
9 accountability issues that we have on our plate, these are
10 two very significant issues that would take a lot of time
11 and a lot of a -- a lot of careful treatment by this Board
12 if we were going to make any changes.

13 And I would submit that the mere appearance
14 of a innocuous item on the agenda called CMAS PARCC
15 contracts has already triggered the first display of the
16 greatest force in the universe, which is inertia. And you
17 saw two people testify today under public, comment that,
18 "My god, don't change PARCC, it's just wonderful," although
19 that would appear to be a minority view but nonetheless I
20 suspect you'll hear a lot of. So if -- if we're going to -
21 - if we're going change and I would -- I would say that
22 this Board has the authority, I don't think we have to go
23 through procurement to decide if we're gonna join Smarter
24 Balanced as opposed to PARCC. We can make that decisions
25 next meeting, instruct staff to start making those changes.



1 I'm going to guess that will not make us particularly
2 popular with staff and probably with a number of people in
3 the field who are now used -- used to PARCC.

4 However, I think -- I think we have an
5 obligation to make those decisions. The decisions are now
6 -- it was 2010 that we adopted Common Core. Question is,
7 do we want to stay with standards that are not content-
8 oriented but rather are, and I always have a hard time
9 defining exactly what they are. Whatever higher learning
10 is, which I keep waiting for an explanation, but I haven't
11 yet seen one. That whether we could revert and move toward
12 a content-based set of standards and whether we ought to do
13 that and ought to instruct staff to start moving in that
14 direction so that whatever we do with the assessments,
15 we're aligned. And I think we ought not to enter any more
16 long-term agreements with anyone because our assessments
17 are clearly going to be up for evaluation in 2018.

18 So this item and the next item on the
19 agenda, the standards review discussion, are really here
20 because I believe this is your last chance as a Board. And
21 if you want input into these, these are hard decisions,
22 hard decisions that will have to be made in a relatively
23 short period of time and also be made while you're dealing
24 with probably the other. The single most important issue
25 that we have to do, which is accountability and



1 accreditation, which is going to keep us all very busy. So
2 the question I wanted to pose to the Board is, you want --
3 you want these contracts, the assessment issues on the
4 agenda for the October meeting?

5 If you don't, then I won't say any more
6 about it. If you do, then we'll put it on and we'll move
7 towards some decisions that I suspect that will fill up
8 your e-mail and your phone calls, more than you ever wanted
9 to. But I am to believe that given all the issues that
10 I've heard the most about in the two years ago, nearly two
11 years of on the Board, these are yet. And if we don't do
12 anything now, then we won't do anything because we will be
13 completely victimized by inertia. So just on a show of
14 hands basis, how many want to see this on the agenda for
15 some decision making in the October, November, December
16 time? Pam?

17 MS. MAZANEC: I'm not sure. Because it's
18 4:00 in the afternoon, but --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm brain dead, too, so --

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. Coffee is not working,
21 but I'm not sure I'm clear on what you mean by, do we have
22 to do this in October or the train leaves the station and
23 we'll never get the opportunity again?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You could -- you could
25 wait probably as late as, I think is, Ms. Zurkowski said



1 you could late, until late winter. So in theory, you could
2 put this on the agenda in March and -- and have some
3 decisions made. But I think if you don't spend some time
4 with it starting very soon, then you will face -- then we
5 will all be faced with the standard answer we get if we
6 can't change because we just don't have time to adequately
7 consider other options. So I'm trying to avoid -- I'm
8 trying to avoid a result dictated by inertia.

9 I -- I think we ought to have an opportunity
10 to discuss it and if the majority of the Board wants to
11 stick with PARCC, great. If the majority of Board wants to
12 go in another direction, that's great, too. Some of those
13 options are closed because if we develop our own test, it's
14 probably, I've told it's a many multi-million dollar
15 proposition. I don't think the legislature is going to
16 give us that money. So our option may very quickly be
17 limited to PARCC or Smarter Balanced. And you already
18 heard the people this morning, telling you, don't change
19 and you're going to hear a lot more of that.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I said (inaudible).

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Why are you saying we're
23 limited to PARCC or Smarter Balanced? Do we have to go
24 through procurement if we go outside those two options and
25 if we do so, what?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, if -- if there were
2 -- yeah. That's a good correction. Thank you. We could,
3 if there's another test out there that would pass the
4 Department of Ed, sort of, you know, prove standard, then
5 we could probably go that route. I don't know if there
6 are. And I've asked that question and if none have been
7 approved by anyone, then the answer is that's kind of a
8 shot in the dark.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Now, my sense is it's up to
10 us to make the case and I'm quite sure that there are but
11 we would have to look -- begin looking at them and look at
12 the language in ESSA that stipulates the nature of the test
13 and then cross walk it to the characteristics of the
14 assessments that we want to consider.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But I wouldn't
16 underestimate the enormity of this process because it will
17 be controversial and resource intensive and I would submit
18 that staff is pretty busy at the moment.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: The good news is there's been
20 a fair amount of work on this from professional
21 organizations that have anticipated this issue. So I mean,
22 it's not like we'd be starting from nothing. There are
23 some good technical reports and white papers on this issue.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So how many people
25 -- yes, Dr. Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I guess, I'll repeat
2 what I said a little while ago. Our assessments need to be
3 aligned with our standards. And for us to spend an
4 inordinate amount of time now before we review and possibly
5 revise our standards, seems to me, we're going to be
6 doubling up. We're going to do something now to make some
7 kind of a decision and then, after we have a process in
8 2018, and I swear I thought it was 2017, so now I'm -- I
9 might have agreed with you more, sooner. But now -- now
10 you've lost me because that doesn't really make sense. I
11 don't want to do this twice. I've already done it once.
12 One more time, it's just fine but under ESSA it clearly
13 states that the assessment must be aligned with your
14 standards. Your standards must be high. They need to be
15 approved by Higher Ed. I don't remember it all but --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Since I missed all the fun
17 before, I'd like to have the opportunity to go through it,
18 so -- no reason why you should have all the fun.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: I just --

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Zurkowski.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay. So I do have to share
24 just a little bit of my own little ulcer that's going on
25 and of course I always follow your direction. But if we



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let me throw one thing
3 out. I think if -- if there's a kind of a consensus on the
4 Board (inaudible) that we ought to be somewhat more
5 content-oriented in standards, then I'm sure there's a test
6 out there someplace that we could gravitate toward that
7 might be more content-oriented. But I -- I would simply --
8 I would simply say, I think the public is entitled to a
9 review of this question by this book.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. And the other
11 thing is that, you know, I tried to think about buying
12 stock from Pearson. And Pearson is just like almost --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You will disqualify
14 yourself on voting, if you do.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But Pearson -- no, I
16 didn't. But Pearson is almost dead. I mean, they're just
17 their stockist, which is the best time to buy. But --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Can we please talk about
19 real stuff?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I'm serious. I
21 mean it's --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I guess, I've got.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) I'm sorry.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I guess I've got some
2 confusion about what you mean by more content. (Inaudible)
3 I -- I don't know what you call scientific concepts. I
4 don't know what more content you can have in the standards
5 language, in my opinion. I also think that a lot of the
6 content is determined by the way we do things in this
7 state. If content means curriculum, which means resources,
8 which means teacher strategies and practices, that's
9 content.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. That's not
11 strategies.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: In a certain topic or
13 subject area.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's not.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: I understand the word
16 content. I'm just having a hard time putting on how our
17 standards need to be more content-filled. Maybe we --
18 maybe one of the teachers can help out here someday.
19 That's -- that's one thing. I am not going to be restful
20 on this decision whichever way it ends up going without
21 some acknowledgment of Angelika's repeated question. What
22 standards are we basing this on? We have -- we know we
23 have a strong suggestion. It's not a requirement to
24 include computer science standards. We have had -- it's in
25 the law. This passed this last session.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, it's in the law
2 and we can fulfill that.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: We can. We're not required
4 to. It's just another set of new standards that impact
5 schools and how they measure their standards. There are
6 some other requests that we were approached with around new
7 standards in addition to computer. I don't remember
8 exactly. Maybe deadwood. What happened with those bills
9 that it dealt with? Well, they died. I know they did.
10 But it's still an idea that's out there that people will
11 submit around different things, around retirement planning
12 and some other financial literacy stuff not important to
13 hear.

14 But really, I don't know how we can align a
15 sensible, logical aligned system of test without knowing
16 exactly what standards you were asking for to be measured.
17 I think they have to be aligned. In my view, that takes
18 more than a bubbling test. So we're looking at a certain
19 nature of exam that we should -- I think we should be
20 looking at. And if you want performance at all. Then my
21 last topic -- question for Joyce, when the PARCC was
22 condensed into one session, the one session includes both
23 the multiple choice type items and performance tasks?

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So. Okay. Well, I don't
2 know. Earlier when the three assessment possibilities were
3 being discussed (inaudible) whether it's part or not --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel and then Dr.
5 Anthes.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: -- expanded to that.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just thinking when you
8 were mentioning the RFP, I guess I don't want us to assume
9 that we want more testing and that we're moving in the
10 direction of formative and summative assessment sound like
11 if the -- has the Spoke Assessment Committee convened yet?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It has not convened yet.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when some people are --
17 when you say some people want formative --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Deb, Deb. I just -- I just
19 sort of, got heartburn as I was reading the -- the answers
20 to the questions from the Listening Tour. That's when I
21 just panicked. I'm not suggesting at all that I know what
22 the Spoke group will come up with. But they were -- they
23 were -- I want to say, almost unanimous. There's just this
24 -- I mean, I -- I keep channeling Dr. Shepherd who keeps
25 trying to explain to us that you cannot -- you should not



1 try to use the same assessment for teaching kids which is a
2 formative assessment and accountability on a statewide
3 basis which was the summary of assessment.

4 She's lectured a number of times on that.
5 But we're not getting there with the folks who were
6 attending the Listening Tour. They were all talking about,
7 we want these assessments to be both formative and
8 summative simultaneously. So we have to be really careful
9 in our discussions about this so that we -- those folks get
10 the feedback. This is what this would mean which is a heck
11 of a lot of testing.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So anyway, it's getting to
13 close. The -- the question really in it's item, I think
14 we've discussed for all intents and purposes, items 21 and
15 22. So I think the question really is, do you want to
16 discuss these two additional items in a -- in a timely
17 enough fashion to actually do something and for the Board
18 to be -- have -- which some impact on the decision? That's
19 really the question. So how many people would like to see
20 it on the next agenda? Okay. All right. We'll -- we'll -
21 - we'll continue to at least to explore our options and if
22 any of the doors closed on us as a result of anything we
23 learned, we'll -- we'll work from there. All right. Thank
24 you. Thank you very much, Ms. Zurkowski. Okay. I think
25 then the last item on the agenda is --



1 UNIDENTIFIED

2 VOICE: (Inaudible).

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- that's the report.

5 Yeah. It's the Colorado Special Education Advisory Report.

6 Let's see here.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we just have three

8 minutes?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, go ahead. It will

10 take us a while to get warmed up. So let's see here.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where was I?

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Commissioner, you want to

13 reintroduce this one?

14 MS. ANTHES: What numbers --

15 MS. CORDIAL: 19.01.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. This is item 19.01.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 19. Oh, I lost --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 19.01.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hi.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hello.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You've been waiting a

24 long time, haven't you?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, we were on at 3:30
2 and we were ahead of schedule.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know -- I know.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We hurried up to wait.
5 It's okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair,
8 Board Members, I would like to take the honor and introduce
9 a couple of very wonderful ladies who are our Colorado
10 Special Education Advisory Committee, Co-Chairwomen. They
11 are here to report to you on their 2015-2016 annual report
12 that is due to the Board every year. And I would like to
13 introduce Katherine Rains, Co-Chairwoman, and Deborah Paul.
14 Commissioner, would you like to say anything?

15 MS. ANTHERS: No. I'll just -- you may not
16 have met Angela Denning, either who is the executive
17 director of our exceptional student services unit. And I
18 mean, with that we'll turn it over to -- I'm not sure who's
19 gonna go first, Katherine or Deborah. Deborah, thank you
20 for being here and thank you for your patience, we're
21 interested in your report.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Before you start
23 Deborah, can I just recognize that Member Scheffel is -- is
24 on our committee and attends frequently and we appreciate
25 her support.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I just like to say thank
2 you too for the great work. I love serving on this
3 committee and just really appreciate all the work you do.

4 MS. PAUL: Thank you Mr. Chair, Vice Chair,
5 and all of you Board Members for allowing us to come today
6 and share some highlights of what we've accomplished this
7 past year. And moving forward what we hope to accomplish
8 as the Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee. You
9 should have all previously gotten our full report. So
10 we're just going to provide you today with some highlights
11 from that report. In terms of subcommittees that are part
12 of our Colorado Special Education Advisory Committee, we
13 have a communications subcommittee, a membership
14 subcommittee, a public policy and legislation subcommittee,
15 as well as student outcomes. We also have, based on
16 parental concerns or committee input, we will develop and
17 start ad hoc committees which we've done in the past, one
18 being a mental health ad hoc committee and we've developed
19 work on a position paper around that.

20 We typically do our work during or through
21 those subcommittees, as well as working with internal
22 working committees with the Colorado Department of
23 Education. Some of those internal CDE committees that we
24 partner with, are the Cedar Grant Leadership team, the
25 Preschool Special Education Committee, as well as the Early



1 Dispute Resolution committee. Some highlights for our
2 various subcommittees this past year, on specific to our
3 communications subcommittee, we created a list of contact
4 information for the at the state level for the local SEAC's
5 including individual districts. We planned and held a
6 local SEAC forum last fall that was really well attended.
7 We received very positive feedback regarding that local
8 SEAC forum and we're gonna be holding another one in the
9 next month, in November.

10 We also are continuing to support the use of
11 the people first language in Colorado through the
12 distribution of information that our committee -- our
13 communications committee helped do and we've begun updating
14 the power of partnership, which is a resource for local
15 special education committees in Colorado that has been
16 posted on the Colorado Department of Education website and
17 we're in the process of revising and updating that
18 document. Our membership subcommittee works on a continual
19 basis in terms of recruiting new Members and interviewing
20 numerous applicants.

21 This past year, we've -- this committee has
22 received nominations, a number of nominations, and are
23 charged with going through all of those nominations,
24 interviewing applicants and then presenting all of you as
25 the State Board of Education, with prospective candidates



1 for appointment to -- from their respective congressional
2 districts. They also piloted a new mentorship program for
3 our new Members that are coming in to be a part of SEAC and
4 that was well received and we're going to continue with
5 that mentoring program. The next committee and highlights
6 of what they've done this past year is our public policy
7 and legislation committee. They've maintained ongoing
8 communication with Dr. Scheffel, who is our State Board of
9 Education Liaison. Thank you so much for your ongoing
10 support of our committee work, your participation and we
11 just so appreciate it.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Great. I really appreciate
13 the opportunity to just do a wonderful job.

14 MS. PAUL: This subcommittee also tracks
15 legislation and reports out to our greater committee. If
16 there's anything that would impact the work and our
17 advisement on meeting those unmet needs of children and
18 youth with disabilities. And they work, have worked,
19 continue to work diligently with the Colorado Department of
20 Education around leadership changes that we've experienced
21 this past year. The last subcommittee I wanted to mention
22 in terms of what they have worked on this year is the
23 student (inaudible) subcommittee and they maintain ongoing
24 connection and partner with the state systemic improvement
25 plan and results-driven accountability development.



1 They've also provided input to the CDE and liaison on an
2 ongoing basis and have also reviewed documents and
3 processes related to outcomes for students with
4 disabilities.

5 MS. RAINS: In addition to the subcommittee
6 work, we do work as a community as a whole, we meet four
7 times a year, as well as a two-day planning retreat in the
8 summer and a variety of CDE committees have requested our
9 input and come see us throughout the year. Last year, that
10 included the multi-tiered system of support school
11 community partnership implementation guide that was
12 developed within the ESSU and along with SACPIE which is
13 the student and parent engagement version sort (inaudible)
14 us. As well as the state summit improvement plan and the
15 new data management system that's being used by the
16 exceptional student services unit. Another way that we
17 gather information is sort of through our constituents when
18 they raise issues with us. We choose to bring in speakers
19 to our group so that we can learn more and decide if that's
20 a need that we need to address as a committee.

21 This year, the people that we brought in to
22 address our committee included such topics as ESY which is
23 Extended School Year services, inclusive education
24 opportunities in this state, how turnaround schools work
25 with regards to children with disabilities. The



1 unfortunate occurrence of children with disabilities being
2 bullied. Data privacy with regards to the new management
3 system the ESSU is being -- is using, as well as, how to
4 engage peers and supporting kids with disabilities within
5 the schools. This is -- helps us sort of guide the work
6 that we're doing in this coming year, as the 215- 217
7 chair, I'm actually co-chairing this coming year as well.
8 And we basically identified three main issues that we're
9 going to work out through the course of the year with CDE
10 and the ESSU and it's how these topics align with work
11 which can affect kids with IEPs and their mental health,
12 access to school choice and charter schools across the
13 state, and the use of Section 504 plans as an alternative
14 to the use of IEPs within the schools.

15 We work with the ESSU on these issues. We
16 also reach out to our constituents to gather input from
17 them. And as the way this day is set up we try to identify
18 areas of practice that we can then help share with other
19 parts of the state, that may be facing similar issues. We
20 are streamlining and revamping a constituent input process
21 this year and are developing a tracking system, sort of
22 measure our impact around the state through this process.
23 Going forward, we will continue to develop and sort of
24 revise this constituent input process based on how
25 effective it is throughout this course of this year and we



1 will produce papers, regarding these three identified
2 topics, mental health, charter schools, and choice and the
3 Section 504s.

4 Hopefully, by the end of the year we do have
5 to go through an improved processes, the committee and then
6 we'll bring them to CDE to post on our website and we'll
7 distribute them across our network as well. That's
8 basically it for the report. I want again, want to thank
9 Dr. Scheffel for her work with us and we look forward to
10 talking to you tomorrow, as well as the State Board. Our
11 work with ESSU and CDE has been fantastic. So thank you
12 very much.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Questions or
14 comments from the Members of the Board. Yes, Dr.
15 Schroeder.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: I have a very specific
17 challenge and that is that I've been contacted by some
18 families and I don't know how many there are. Sounds like,
19 I'm told it's 200. We have concerns about dyslexia and of
20 course, I think you probably know about it Deborah, cause
21 it's in our community. Some of this is probably from the
22 READ acts, some of this is Special Ed. How can you help
23 these folks? How can you help these folks? Are there best
24 practices that we should be talking about statewide, so
25 that parents know what to expect in the school -- from



1 their school district? I'm a little flummoxed and I'm
2 trying to learn. But I -- I look to you, I mean, I think I
3 should be looking to you, to help with this, cause I
4 certainly am not the expert on this.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, thank you
6 for that question. And -- and -- and we realize that
7 dyslexia is coming up in a number of states. A number of
8 states have clear laws, rules, and regulations around
9 dyslexia.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we? Does Colorado?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I do not believe
14 so.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: We do have one.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do have one. Yes --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Very light. But it talks
18 about teachers being trained such they can address it but
19 there's not really teeth in it.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Trained -- dyslexia.
21 So it's not -- yeah. It's more towards the training around
22 what a teacher would need to know about a student with
23 dyslexia versus dyslexia. That's right.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. This is
25 identification?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, yes.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So yeah. And this is
4 something, you know, that I would definitely want to sit
5 down with you and talk with you about and I know that
6 you've talked with --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: No. I don't wanna be the
8 one to talk to.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would be happy to
10 talk with her.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean, I'm happy to listen
12 --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: -- but I'm not the one who
15 can -- who has the credentials to come back to this
16 community to talk, to help them ask the right questions, et
17 cetera.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Cause that's not my skill
20 set.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this is, you know,
22 it is -- it is something that -- that parents are talking
23 about. I mean, it is something that they want to know more
24 information about. It's -- it's like any other parent,
25 what's best for my child. And they're asking some really



1 good questions. I think that, you know, one of the things
2 that would be interesting is -- because I know Katherine
3 and Deborah both have very good relationships and -- and
4 can speak with other parents about these types of things.
5 And we need -- we need-

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So has -- has this group --
7 has this group interacted with --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not yet. Not to our
9 knowledge, no.

10 MS. PAUL: We had previous -- Mr. Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

12 MS. PAUL: We had a previous SEAC committee
13 Member, who was a parent representative and was heavily
14 involved in her county because had a child that had
15 dyslexia. So it's a topic that has come up previously from
16 her own personal experience as well as those families that
17 she works with in her local school district.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, considering this group
19 has gone to their congressman. I would say that it's
20 probably time to have this broader conversation. And I
21 mean, I'm happy to listen but I'm not sure -- I don't know
22 enough about dyslexia, is there a mild dyslexia and severe
23 one? Do our -- does our READ act actually identify kids
24 with it and then guide teachers on what to do next? These
25 are the kinds of answers that I think these folks --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're looking for.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: -- are looking for and if we
3 can help them I think that would be -- I don't -- I don't
4 feel good about offering you one more charge for the year.
5 But there is -- I sense in my -- in our community, Deborah,
6 a sense of urgency and frustration that we probably
7 shouldn't ignore, if we can avoid it.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, it's -- I've been
9 pretty involved with that group in our state and also
10 groups that touch on their work nationally. And it's such
11 an important issue and there's a lot of misinformation.
12 For example, recently, I was speaking to a teacher who said
13 as part of his evaluation, his school administrator
14 required that there be a 50/50 split between teacher talk
15 and student talk during instruction. And when we look at
16 students with dyslexia who are -- who evidences dyslexia
17 are trying to develop the skill of reading. If you have
18 that 50/50 instructional split, then you're not really
19 doing direct explicit systematic instruction, which has the
20 highest likelihood of successful students who have
21 dyslexia. So I mean here we have a kind of one size fits
22 all again evaluation plan for teachers, where you've got a
23 teacher that isn't really aware that well for these
24 students and that's the highest percentage of students in



1 special education, have reading issues and a percentage of
2 those evidence dyslexia.

3 I mean it's a great way to close the
4 achievement gap and turn things around. But if people
5 don't understand the nature of the instruction that can
6 address it, then -- then we're really not touching the
7 problem. So I think that initial law that was passed
8 several years ago to say, "Hey at least can teachers be
9 well schooled in how to address this," in teacher prep
10 programs was as a start. But I think parents just see
11 their students moving through the system and their needs
12 are just not addressed. So I would love to be part of that
13 conversation and this group is a great advocacy group for
14 that. So I just think it's important that --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Some specifics to the
16 greater population, I think, would be huge. I would like
17 to understand -- what I understand is that kids aren't
18 being diagnosed, unless the parents actually send their
19 kids to a private evaluator.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: The goodness is they're just
21 really robust research on what works and that should be
22 available.

23 MS. RAINS: Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am.



1 MS. RAINS: If you wanna hook them up to our
2 group via our liaison through CDE, we'd be happy to set
3 something up and talk to them and figure out what --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I'd be thrilled too because
5 I --

6 MS. RAINS: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: And as I said, I'm happy
8 they want me to listen, but I -- I'm just the wrong person
9 to respond in any way other than to listen. I -- it takes
10 the kind of expertise that you have access to that I --
11 that I really don't as a representative of that community.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We would be happy to
15 follow up and to get them connected.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: We will forward that e-mail
17 to you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. Thank you
19 very much, yes, yes.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion or
21 questions. Ms. Goff.

22 MS. GOFF: Very quickly, the topic of
23 dyslexia has also come up in the Gifted Education Committee
24 work. The whole idea of twice exceptional encompasses a
25 lot of areas a child's learning life. So yeah, I



1 appreciate that too and if this expands among us even, I'd
2 be appreciative of that. But I -- I've always placed a lot
3 of faith in -- in that committee as well as yours. To know
4 -- have a really good broad understanding of some of these
5 different issues and challenges for kids. But appreciate
6 that. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: As we look forward to looking
9 at our standards and the assessments that are high stakes,
10 I really look forward to input from this committee because
11 a lot of times these assessments have a disproportionate
12 negative impact on really capturing what students are
13 learning and achievement and growth. So really getting
14 your voices there with the nature of the language and the
15 tests, and what it's actually measuring. (Inaudible)
16 really valuable so I look forward to helping carry that
17 message and having you come speak at our meetings.

18 MS. RAINS: Thank you.

19 MS. PAUL: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further from the Board?
21 On behalf of the Board, I want to thank you for what you
22 do. I'm sure the high pay incentivizes you to work harder
23 but we -- we do appreciate your efforts on behalf of
24 Colorado's children. Thank you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, I think we're now
2 down to one item for Members to report on previous or
3 upcoming activities, and just want to start with Ms.
4 Mazanec and we'll just get right down the road here.

5 MS. MAZANEC: I don't think I have anything
6 to report.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

8 MS. MAZANEC: We should --

9 MS. RANKIN: That's okay. I have a bunch.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin?

11 MS. MAZANEC: We should do this first thing
12 the second day maybe (inaudible) fresher.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Want to do this tomorrow?

14 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes?

16 MS. RANKIN: Fine by me.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead, Joyce.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Go ahead, Joyce.

19 MS. RANKIN: Okay. I put 1,700 miles on my
20 car this past month. Besides going to the Pueblo State
21 Fair and Parade, I toured the district went to Gunnison,
22 met with the Tredway superintendent. Went to Hinsdale
23 County and met with Leslie Nichols, the superintendent
24 there. We thought they would have 97 students this year,
25 they have 110. They're just bursting at the seams. New



1 superintendent, Rob Stein in Glenwood Springs and another
2 new one in Moffat County, David Orrick, I met with him.
3 I've met with him a couple of times. An update on Sirocco,
4 remember the last meeting we had, where in July, Peabody
5 filed Chapter 11 and Darcy Moore from Southern Route County
6 School District put in a grant for a million dollars so
7 that she could make payroll in July and August. She's very
8 grateful for that. She expressed that to me when I was
9 visiting her. The problem is that Peabody has made --
10 trying to pay off that, so that we can get our million
11 dollars back in case this comes up again, us meaning state,
12 and there has been some difficulty with the payment and
13 between the treasurer and Peabody that is in the process of
14 getting ironed out, but we do not have the money back yet.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: That's one (inaudible)
16 treasurer, actually.

17 MS. MAZANEC: At this point --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Dr.
19 Schroeder.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: It's been fascinating.

21 MS. RANKIN: It's been a fascinating story,
22 yes. Good. Thank you. Ouray had an opening of a school
23 and I was called by, you probably all got the invitation
24 too, and I decided to go and I drove three hours and
25 stopped by a school in Ridgway on the way and they said,



1 "Oh, didn't you know they just canceled that." So I drove
2 three hours back, so that's how I got the mileage.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

4 MS. RANKIN: I know. It's really pretty, it
5 was a nice day. Club 20 had their forum meeting on
6 Saturday, it was a candidate forum, I attended that. And
7 the superintendent's -- (inaudible) superintendents meeting
8 last Friday in Rifle West Slope, I went to that and also
9 the ESSA Hub meeting. So I've been pretty busy but it's
10 been extremely interesting, and I'm enjoying getting some
11 tours of the schools. I have 58 districts, it's huge, I
12 won't get all of them but I'm sure learning a lot and I
13 appreciate that.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Ms. Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Well, not exactly the same types
16 of activities. Not nearly as much driving, which is always
17 fine with me, because mine's in rush hour here. The Adams
18 County Districts, all of them are pretty heavily involved
19 in common and similar work. I have been through their
20 summer -- there is a group called the Adams County, there
21 are several groups. One that I've been involved with on a
22 newer level is the Adams County Youth Initiative. So when
23 you take into account several districts in Adams County are
24 in challenging situations and working real hard to overcome
25 them as much as possible and adapt to some of the things



1 that are going on particularly Adams 12, Adams 14,
2 Mapleton, and Brighton, just to some extent, Adams 50 in
3 Westminster, not quite as heavily involved.

4 Our Cradle to Career initiative which is a
5 community wide push effort lots of collaboration to put
6 together county agencies of early childhood health, the
7 small businesses, larger industries that are in Adams
8 County and growing and coming together on plans for
9 continuous improvement which I heard teachers talking about
10 here today, and other types of activities where they
11 literally, as a full community, make plans and measure to
12 keep data. They're teaching and learning themselves about
13 the deep data in the sense of what did we really learn?
14 Depending on what we're looking at, we need, what are we
15 learning?

16 The -- my other big activity has been our
17 teacher force and some of the connected activities around
18 maintaining, promoting the profession, growing the
19 professions so I have had usual summertime pleasure of
20 working with Colorado Teacher of the Year groups and
21 affiliations as well as the Milken award winners. Family -
22 - family foundation for Milken and that's -- all of those
23 great announcement and news bites will come out very soon.
24 I'm not even sure when exactly, but if we look forward to
25 honoring our teachers and in another chance to just



1 recognize what incredible accomplishments happen every day,
2 even in the summertime, in the relationship between
3 teachers and kids in communities. So that's -- that's my
4 highlights of (inaudible)

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Two items. First of all, at
7 least Jane and I will be attending the (inaudible)
8 conference in kind of mid to late October, and the Board
9 needs to appoint a Member to be the delegate to vote at the
10 business meeting. I would like to nominate Jane, and I
11 would appreciate either someone else step up or let's all
12 please have Jane be our delegate since I'm on the Board of
13 (inaudible) I would rather not be the one to take that
14 task. Any feedback?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think out of the bylaws,
16 we, I think as a Board, required to -- in order for anyone
17 to be able to vote for Colorado, they have to designate
18 somebody. And so this might be a good time to do that. Is
19 that a motion to designate?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Something like that, yeah.
21 It's a 435 motion.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect. Is there a
23 second to that motion? (Inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's now moved and
2 seconded. Is there objection to that motion to officially
3 appoint Jane as our voting delegate to (inaudible) meeting?
4 Seeing none. Motion's call adopted and so was that on the
5 agenda for tomorrow?

6 MS. CORDIAL: No, that was on the agenda for
7 just right now.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect. All right.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

10 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So one more item is that I
12 was invited to attend a presentation at Skyline High School
13 in Longmont for the new P-Tech school. This is the first
14 year Colorado has two P-Tech schools and I've now forgotten
15 where the other one is, somebody can help them with that.
16 No, I forgot. Anyway, it's going strong, the students
17 actually came and presented. They've been working hard.
18 They came back to school early and they had some sessions
19 over the summer in preparation. These are kids who most
20 likely, who come from families where most likely no one has
21 gotten any kind of a degree and they will graduate with an
22 associate degree.

23 IBM is one of the participants but it is not
24 limited to IBM and so they are still looking for other
25 businesses to join in. It's really a terrific program.



1 The kids were incredibly impressive, articulate, well
2 prepared. They know their technology, they're freshmen at
3 Skyline. They had PowerPoints and different degrees of
4 sophistication in their presentations but they were all
5 really with it, and I was very, very impressed. I'm
6 looking forward to kind of following how this first cohort
7 of students goes through. I think they'll make it.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: I've done a couple of things.
10 One is, I have been doing, as probably the rest of the
11 Board has, the people with CDE a deep -- a deep dive on
12 ESSA. So I've been kind of reading everything I can get my
13 hands on -- on that. I've been following some interactive
14 computer programs that NALEO, the National Association of
15 Latinos in Education -- well, but I've been following those
16 as well. I've done a couple one on early childhood and
17 another just in general. I attended the Legislative
18 Interim Committee meeting which was again on ESSA. They
19 brought some very interesting folk from -- from around the
20 country, from (inaudible), who have been looking at ESSA
21 requirements for the state and was -- I thought a very good
22 group of people that they brought. Also I've attended the
23 Hub committees.

24 One of the areas I guess that's been taking
25 a lot of my time has been the (inaudible). The (inaudible)



1 Denver Public Schools, the A and B. And I guess I'm
2 supposed to know a lot about it so I talk to -- I had
3 meetings with their public relations people and also a lot
4 of people of course turn to me to have information about
5 what this means. So I've read the -- I don't know. I
6 guess it's this thick on that and I guess I can answer some
7 questions as to what schools are going to get monies. I
8 guess the biggest question asked is, is it being spent
9 really on schools and kids and teachers and not on
10 administrators? So that's a big question I get asked. I
11 met with Mike Johnson who is a Board Member. Talked to
12 some other Board Members about it and had a lot of meetings
13 with people who are in the know on that area. And I would
14 say that that's -- the biggest thing right now in Denver
15 Public Schools is, because it is 675 million dollars, they
16 want to know that the money is being spent well, the public
17 does.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Inaudible) You know I've
20 really just been meeting with parents and teachers and
21 others who care about education in Colorado and I always
22 appreciate hearing from those doing the hard work of
23 teachers in our classrooms. I also attended the 9/11
24 remembrance on Sunday downtown. Found that very moving and
25 honoring our first responders and military and those we



1 lost 15 years ago. So it's been a good couple of weeks.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. So I
4 visited was the superintendent of a small rural district in
5 El Paso County Grant Schmidt. The school building was
6 about 45 minutes maybe a little longer from downtown
7 Colorado Springs on roads that are improved or need some
8 more improvement perhaps, but it really does -- it really
9 did highlight the challenges that these small districts
10 face, and had a good chance to meet with staff and some of
11 the students. And it was very -- such a very uplifting
12 kind of renewed your faith and what people can get done
13 when they put their mind to it. So it was a very positive
14 meeting and thoroughly enjoyed the opportunity. All right.
15 Apparently, we do have one individual who wanted -- give
16 us three minutes, Cheryl -- this looks like Mosher?

17 MS. MOSHER: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Cheryl, you have three
19 minutes for public comment. I'm sorry, we skipped that.
20 Thank you for waiting around.

21 MS. MOSHER: No worries. There wasn't a
22 sign up sheet out there, so.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We -- we used it this
24 morning.



1 MS. MOSHER: Mr. Chair and Members of the
2 Board, good afternoon. My name is Cheryl Mosher and I
3 teach Earth Science in Jefferson County. Thank you all for
4 honoring the amazing Presidential Award Youth earlier
5 today, one of whom was my son's fourth grade teacher Kerry
6 Jordan. I would like to personally thank Dr. Scheffel for
7 taking, I'm sorry, for talking with me in person last
8 spring after the May meeting. I appreciate that very much.
9 Thank you also to Dr. Schroeder for attending the America
10 Achieves Colorado Educator Voice Convening on Saturday.
11 Very long name, and for listening to the teacher voices
12 that were in the room. As you reflect upon agenda items in
13 the coming month, there are a few things from a teacher
14 perspective that might be helpful to consider and you may
15 have heard them already.

16 This perspective is not solely my own, as it
17 was echoed loudly and clearly throughout the weekend
18 convening by teachers from all over the state representing
19 urban, suburban, and rural districts. Their message is
20 that, we cannot leave the PARCC consortium. We have
21 finally received actionable data for all of the assessed
22 content areas. Schools are beginning the process of
23 intensive data analysis to implement curricular changes and
24 develop plans for individual students and subgroups to work
25 towards closing achievement gaps. We are now beginning the



1 process of getting these results into the hands of parents
2 who appreciate the comprehensive reports and the data for
3 their child.

4 Keep in mind that the test is not just the
5 content tests and it does test content. It is purposely
6 designed to attempt to assess the 21st century skills that
7 employers rightfully insist we instill in our students. If
8 the State Board decides to cancel the contract with PARCC
9 or change it, it will mean that there will be another time
10 out period in our data and accountability measures,
11 regardless of the test that's chosen. As I shared with you
12 in May, developing a quality research based assessment is a
13 lengthy and very costly process. If Colorado removes
14 themselves from this consortium we will be forced to
15 contract with the testing company and start from scratch,
16 for all math and all reading, writing, and communicating
17 test.

18 The chaos that we experienced last year with
19 a brand new test, will be repeated once again, and
20 students, teachers, and parents will be left to wonder why
21 testing is even happening when the data is no longer
22 usable. In spite of the opinions of my husband, who is
23 also a teacher, literally next door to me, I have always
24 had my son participate in testing. If Colorado was forced
25 to start over, I will seriously consider opting him out of



1 the new test and waiting until the high school SAT series.
2 As always, I thank you for your time and work on behalf of
3 all of Colorado students. Thank you Mr. Chair and Members
4 of the Board for your time and consideration. I really
5 appreciate it.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. All right, any
7 other business come before the Board? If not, we will
8 stand adjourned until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, and thank
9 you all.

10 (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