



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 11, 2016, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 11, 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: Okay. Well, we proceed
2 then to item 9.01 state panel, or state review panel 2016
3 nominations. Welcome back.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So members of the
5 Board. This is an annual process, every year we bring
6 names to you. Usually, it's on the consent agenda for
7 state review panelist. State review panelist, as we just
8 talked about, are one part of the recommendation process
9 for schools, and districts on the accountability clock.
10 They provide a recommendation to you. Again, like we
11 talked about, you can determine how that recommendation is
12 used in making your final decision. Now, I'll turn it over
13 to Samantha now, and let her talk through the process a
14 little bit more detail.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you received a memo
16 that outlines the recruitment, and essentially that the
17 hiring process, and essentially work is done all fall to
18 try, and recruit folks that meet the statutory obligation
19 of certain categories to be filled. So essentially,
20 superintendents, administrators, teachers, what have you.
21 We also have identified some other key areas that -- that
22 need some representation, so a particular emphasis on
23 meeting folks that have a background with English language
24 learners, online programs in rural areas.



1 So we've really tried to recruit a little
2 bit more specifically that way as well. We've mentioned
3 before that -- the department has contracted with school
4 works to coordinate that work, so that it is at least
5 overseen by an independent body, so that it's not confused,
6 or appears that the State Department is managing that
7 recommendation process, the state review panel process. At
8 the same time, it is supporting the commissioner, and his
9 recommendation process, so we really try to draw some lines
10 but know that we also are -- are involved, and help, and
11 support that -- that works so. Panelists, turn in, or
12 applicants turn in an application, school works reviews
13 those applications, look for in particular those areas that
14 are of need on the panel.

15 They also then invite them to a training.
16 They are not told that they are hired panelists, it's
17 really a way to get some more background on the seat review
18 panel, so that is someone to be unique approach, so that
19 they can learn more about it. But then it's also a way for
20 them to do engage in some work, so that that school works
21 can look at their written products to make sure that they
22 actually understand what is expected of them, and that they
23 have some of the skills that are really necessary. Some of
24 those analytical skills, interviewing skills, writing
25 skills, things like that. And then based on that, and



1 their interactions with them, and we are at those trainings
2 as well so can they give input.

3 Ultimately, they then put forward that list.
4 So the list that you have of the panels in front of you
5 include both returning panelists as well as some new ones.
6 I will say that not all returning panelists were asked to
7 come back, some it just was not a good fit, and then not
8 all applicants that were new this year were accepted
9 either. So really it was just a matter of where were the
10 need areas, and if it wasn't, if somebody came in not
11 helping the panel get stronger, then -- then really they
12 were not brought on.

13 The other thing I wanna point out is when
14 the state review panel was first started six years ago now,
15 they were all volunteers. A few years ago the State
16 Department was able to do a decision item to get some
17 funds. These guys now do get a small stipend, not very
18 big. It's still does a little bit like volunteer work. So
19 know that there is some monetary compensation involved,
20 both for their travel but then also for their time, okay?
21 They -- and then the panelists engage in both document
22 reviews, and then those site visits, and they have to
23 adhere to a pretty tight protocol process, but they are
24 doing reports on that document review as well as a site



1 visit, and then do that final recommendation based on the
2 list that Brenda walked through with you earlier.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores?

4 MS. FLORES: Again, it's about parents, and
5 teachers. Certainly we know that there are probably
6 teachers out there, and parents that could be added to the
7 -- to the list. And I was thinking about teachers,
8 especially teachers who teach, and who might not wanna
9 miss, but you know, there's weekends, and then there's
10 summers, and then there's other times that the groups could
11 can be, so to accommodate their schedules. I know people
12 don't wanna miss in their room. I would -- I -- when I was
13 teaching, I did kind of a little low level of this because
14 it's not right to leave your kids in your class for long
15 periods of time, but there are I think ways that to be
16 included.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We would greatly
18 appreciate you all recommendations for any possible
19 candidates in the future. We'll make sure when we do the
20 recruitment next year that we send that request to you all,
21 and if you have anybody that you think would make a great
22 panelist, we would really appreciate that.

23 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: Just as a matter of organization,
2 I guess, you know? I look -- I look on the list, and I see
3 people who are connected to are part of an organization of
4 the online community, for example. So it is generally true
5 that -- that -- that area of expertise will then be -- they
6 will be involved with any, if ever, online schools that are
7 on -- in a group that's being reviewed, or looked at, and
8 vice versa. Does it -- does it matter? Is this more of a
9 general practitioner look at schools? So is it an area of
10 expertise germane to the choice of where they're -- what
11 kind of school they're reviewing, or not? I'm just
12 curious.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks, Mr. Chair. So
14 yes, absolutely. We really do school works. Sorry, I'm
15 still trying to change my vocabulary. School works really
16 works hard to assign panelists that have at least some
17 context for that particular school, or for that district.
18 So but we also do take things to --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can I interrupt for just
20 one second? I thought we were told earlier that the
21 commissioner made these assignments. So these assignments
22 are not made by the commissioner to review, to go to
23 particular districts, or made by the contractor?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that is correct.
25 So the commissioner is putting forward that the panel list,



1 but then the contractor, in consultation with CDE, is
2 making assignments based on expertise. When I am -- as I
3 mentioned earlier and in context with the districts, and
4 this -- and that contractor is not on the phone, I do
5 ensure with the district that if there are any panelist
6 that would be a concern, or if like they feel like there
7 would be a conflict of interest, then they are able to let
8 us know at that time that there's a concern.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I speak about that
10 for a second?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, commissioner.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Going back to Brenda's
13 slide where she showed three reports, there's the
14 commissioner's recommendation, then the panelists, and then
15 the district options. I appreciate a little -- I
16 appreciate the independence of the contractors sign those
17 panelists because it is -- I'm going with a simple
18 recommendation from my staff here. And if I'm -- if I'm
19 kind of guiding both the panelist, and my employees, it may
20 not be quite as objective.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's all good.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I like that -- that
23 independence with the consultations. I know what you did,
24 that means I appreciate it that you mentioned that
25 recently. It's just for what it's worth.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anybody else have any
2 question?

3 MS. GOFF: Just one more.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

5 MS. GOFF: Is there -- and I could look at
6 the statute, or the documents around this, is there a
7 number limit to your recommended limit to the size of this
8 group?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, there's no --
14 there's no limits.

15 MS. GOFF: Is there a limit to the size of
16 this group?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's -- there's not.
18 So it can -- it can be as many people as we want. I do
19 wanna point out that there is this financial component to
20 it, not that all panelist are paid just because they are on
21 the list, it's really based on the hours that they're
22 putting in. So really depends on our -- our capacity, and
23 how many document reviews need to happen, how many site
24 visits, locations, things like that. So there is that
25 consideration.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Mazanec, and
3 then Dr. Flores.

4 MS. MAZANEC: And there's -- and there's no
5 term limits, right?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, there's not.
7 Again, it really goes back to, is it the right fit
8 depending on the schools, and the districts that are going
9 through a site visit, and also based on past performance.
10 Like I said, there are some panelist --

11 MS. MAZANEC: I'm just wondering how other
12 members feel about that? Wondering whether -- not to say
13 that any member of this panel should be turned down. I'm
14 just thinking of the possibility of having a fairly stable
15 state review panel that, you know, may never change as long
16 as those members want to stay on. And does that -- does
17 that limit us to having new people on it who might also be
18 a great contributor, but so long as that spot is taken.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me -- let me
20 clarify, though. Is it an annual appointment approval
21 process? There is no -- we just play once you're on
22 forever, if you want? Unless somebody sits --

23 MS. MAZANEC: No. But as long as they're --
24 they're performing, they don't have to leave.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I mean, they
2 were -- they're reviewed for performance, or any other
3 input that's come in about that.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. And as I said, I'm not
5 saying that they should be kicked off. I'm just wondering
6 if we -- just something to consider, we maybe limiting
7 ourselves.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've never been in
9 that situation. We've never had.

10 MS. MAZANEC: You've never had the area?
11 You've never had people banging down on the door?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we've always
13 needed to recruit members. I think you're right.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, again, because
15 they're -- the change -- the needs of the schools, and
16 districts change, and so we're really intentional about the
17 recruitment process, and the types of needs to match again
18 what's going on in those schools.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

20 MS. FLORES: I did notice, and documented,
21 you know, all the people that are kind of nonprofits in
22 here, and there are a lot of nonprofits in here, and I just
23 kind of wonder, you know, whether --

24 MS. MAZANEC: We need more capitalist.



1 MS. FLORES: -- nonprofits -- yes. As I
2 said before, we need teachers, and we need parents. So I
3 just wondered why it was waiver in that way, and my other
4 question, and I'll close it, how much do they get paid?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have to go back.

6 MS. FLORES: And is it per hour, per
7 documents that they're looking at?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I can get you the
9 actual numbers, so just know I'm going off the top my head.
10 So you know, be careful with this. But they are -- I can
11 answer that they are definitely paid per activity, and for
12 things like site visits, it really depends on how far away
13 that site is. So it's really -- if they're writing a
14 report, they're getting paid for that activity, not the
15 number of hours it takes. So I wanna say they are -- you
16 know what? I'm not gonna say. I'm gonna give you the
17 specific number.

18 MS. FLORES: Well, not a specific number,
19 but let's look at a trip that somebody made. What was the
20 last trip that somebody made, and how much would that cost?
21 Meaning travel, just on average.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Maybe just give Dr. Flores
23 an estimate. Maybe actual necessary expense that are
24 occurring.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For a day, for doing a
2 site visit --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a per diem for
4 doing a site visit?

5 MS. FLORES: Per diem report.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it'd be -- it would
7 be equivalent to, or close to what the state per you know,
8 per diem would be in terms of travel, and things like that.
9 But as far as for their time, it would be about -- for like
10 a full day of a site visit, it'd be about \$700 for the
11 entire -- for two -- for two days of visiting. And then --
12 yeah, and for traveling.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Per day?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the entire visit.
15 They are not getting -- again, they're -- this is -- these
16 are sometimes consultants that are used to making quite a
17 bit more. So this is -- this is not a huge amount of
18 money. They're not getting rich.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: In other states, you know,
20 this Board, other states paid this Board \$300, or \$400 a
21 day. So that's exactly what it is, \$300 to \$400 a day.
22 Yeah. Well, I'm sorry.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Try to accept.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will continue. I'll
25 give you a specific number, though.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other questions?
2 Going once, going twice. Well, let me just make one
3 comment. I -- will you -- it's been -- it was stated that
4 earlier that the bulk of these recommendations are just to
5 create an innovation school, which is the least intrusive
6 recommendation, which, if I don't miss my guess, has
7 resulted in significant improvements in most districts.
8 And I guess some question I have to ask, are these people
9 really equipped to make hard-nosed, hard tough decisions
10 knowing that their peers are likely to be very unhappy with
11 anything beyond pabulum?

12 And how do we remedy that problem because
13 when their expert recommendations come to us as X, they
14 carry -- they carry weight, and as volunteers up here,
15 overturning them gets to be pretty difficult. And so I
16 need, well, there needs to be, and the contractor needs to
17 be seriously advised that these people have to be
18 independent of peer pressure, or they ought not to be sent
19 on these visits. That they have to come back with cold-
20 blooded suggestions, keeping in mind that the objective of
21 this is not to serve the school Board, school
22 administrators, it's to serve the children. And if they
23 don't understand that mission, then we agreed to revamp the
24 system, and while I appreciate the Commissioner's desire
25 for some independent body, the reality is that these



1 schools are in turnaround, and didn't get there in one
2 year. They failed to make progress for a long period of
3 time. And so if you really don't care about kids, we're
4 gonna have more than pabulum brought before this Board.

5 Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I appreciate what you're
7 saying. I think that underneath that kind of a comment
8 though, is that the system is great, and that it works, and
9 it really calls out districts, and schools that aren't
10 working. And we really need to intervene at the state
11 level. And I think that we have to pull back the curtain,
12 and look very detailed about these data. And I think that
13 that premise needs to be carefully examined. And I haven't
14 tried to look at it deeply myself. I have issues with the
15 way these buckets work. You know, and the trend data, and
16 all that. So anyway, I just think that's --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Point well-taken.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: You just have to look deeply
19 at what we're doing here.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you very
21 much.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's vote.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We got -- we got to
25 approve this guys.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We have the -- is there a
2 motion?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move we approved the
4 list of members.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved, and
6 seconded that the --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: State Review Panel.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: State Review Panel
9 nominations be approved. Is there objection to the
10 adoption?

11 MS. RANKIN: I second.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, just a second.
13 Yeah, yeah. I'm sorry, Ms. Rankin, second. Is there
14 objection to the adoption of that motion? Seeing none,
15 that motion's good adopted unanimously. Okay. Now, we're
16 at 10.01, Seal of Biliteracy. Two of us just make a few
17 opening comments, as witnesses before us last time, I think
18 the concerns were that it was difficult, at least for me,
19 and I think for other members of the Board to appreciate
20 what this seal meant.

21 And the resolution that we were being asked
22 to adopt at the time was, really kind of left it up to
23 local districts, which putting -- putting a good -- good
24 seal on, good housekeeping seal of approval on something
25 that was without standards was concerning. And



1 subsequently, I learned that there is an effort even though
2 at the legislature, and there's going to be the legislation
3 to codify some of these standards, and put them in
4 practice.

5 So Ms. Goff, this is your proposal. You
6 have every right to have it brought to a vote. I would
7 just hope that you might lay it over until we knew more
8 about the -- knew more about the legislation, and see if we
9 get to make sure that this other list isn't in conflict,
10 and that we're not giving approval to something that the
11 legislature may preempt in kind of short order. So Ms.
12 Goff?

13 MS. GOFF: Well. Okay. I'm gonna respond
14 on actually two fronts here. First of all, I think it's
15 very encouraging, and I can't think of anything that this
16 effort. I can't think why this effort that's been going on
17 for several years anyway on the part of school districts,
18 and the world language profession, as well as many of
19 families, and students in the communities.

20 That if there's going to be some
21 legislation, I find that very gratifying, and that makes me
22 as a former teacher but also a member of the professional
23 organization, very happy to hear that we have an interest
24 in our state of moving this forward on a truly a statewide
25 level. The resolution's original intent was to do two



1 things. One of those things is to honor that this is a
2 district's decision to participate, and you know, I can --
3 perhaps, it wasn't clear enough in the original resolution
4 that the criteria for this is -- is absolutely based on a
5 set of guidelines that are also in line with the national
6 standards for world language.

7 We have national standards which Colorado
8 has developed into our own, much in the same way as our
9 Colorado State standards our -- our State standards adopted
10 by districts. But this is -- this is giving districts an
11 opportunity to honor their kids who achieve, and they --
12 they maintain a literally, a school year career length term
13 of study in one, or more languages. One of them has to be
14 English. The other is a bonus of the multilingual benefits
15 that come from the study of English, and at least one other
16 language.

17 We have a student demographic that is
18 actually changing in a huge way the picture of our student
19 population. Which also means it's changing the picture of
20 communities, and what communities are looking for, and
21 needing in the future. And that can be in the way of the -
22 - the educate -- the education of communities. It's
23 absolutely very impacting on the workforce that's
24 available. It's creating lots of their new jobs are going



1 to be needed that require more, and more communication
2 skills in various languages.

3 So this -- this, you know, I'm sorry if that
4 didn't come through. This is really a statement of support
5 from the Board that we support literacy, the expansion of
6 literacy, so that's in all the linguistic skills. It means
7 cultural awareness. It's recognition of the diversity of
8 our various communities. It is a voluntary participation
9 activity on the part of districts. There is a network.

10 We remember meeting team Colorado who came
11 here, and presented the basic structure, and all of the
12 resources, and collaborative resources that are available
13 out there to various districts who want to get involved.
14 Within the districts, there are individual schools that
15 have taken it up under the mantle of their district. There
16 is nothing new in the way of content standards -- standards
17 attached to this. The programs, the language programs,
18 whether they are in the world language, or they're in the
19 English language curriculum, districts carry on their own
20 curriculum.

21 It's follow through on the curriculum, so
22 there -- there -- there's nothing new that -- that's added
23 as far as standards assessments mechanism. It works in
24 (inaudible). It's an honor. It's a recognition. It's a
25 way for many, many students to literally go at double speed



1 to develop literacy skills. And that's something that we
2 care about in all languages, and beginning at the early
3 grades if possible. 13 states including Arizona. Just
4 recently, Iowa, most recently.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, if I can
6 speak to you for just for one minute? I'm -- I'm
7 interested to learn a little bit more (inaudible). I'll
8 just tell you about the background. About three years ago,
9 I sat down, and built what I thought was the ultimate
10 dashboard for a high school. And when the metrics on there
11 was the percentage of students who speak one, two, three,
12 or more languages, everybody knows that all the
13 industrialized nations, nobody trails further in this
14 category than the United States, as far as biliteracy,
15 bilingual languages. It is critical to our long term view
16 for competition.

17 Now, I apologize, being little bit new not
18 knowing exactly. I do love the idea of endorsements, but
19 it's not my vote to take but anything that we can do to
20 move toward (inaudible) not I'll be stuck in that mentality
21 that if you want to do business with me, you will speak my
22 language, or I'm not going to (inaudible).

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec?

24 MS. MAZANEC: I certainly support
25 bilingualism. I certainly support biliteracy. I think



1 this -- I think the Seal of Biliteracy probably has good
2 intentions. But in looking at, online at the Seal of
3 Biliteracy, while I support biliteracy, and bilingualism,
4 I'm not sure I support this particular movement. I don't
5 feel comfortable with it, and I think that it should be
6 done at a district, and school level at least so far.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was (inaudible).

8 MS. MAZANEC: Well, you're asking the State
9 Board to support it, and you said that we would be
10 supporting literacy by doing this. I certainly support
11 literacy. I don't want to support this program at this
12 time, so I would oppose it.

13 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

15 MS. FLORES: I don't mean to be contentious,
16 but I mean, why would you oppose this?

17 MS. MAZANEC: Because I don't know enough
18 about this particular movement. We've known about this
19 movement. I've known about this movement for two mo -- two
20 months. And what I'm reading here online is a blueprint of
21 how to promote the Seal of Biliteracy in your area, and I'm
22 just reluctant. It may be a good thing. I'm reluctant to
23 say yes right now.

24 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff?



1 MS. GOFF: Do you want to respond?

2 MS. FLORES: Well, I just think it would be
3 a wonderful thing if -- if we would biliterate, or
4 trilliterate, or bilingual. I think it really helps to I
5 mean, one of the research that I -- I went to a conference
6 a couple of months ago, and there was a psychologist who
7 was very impressive in showing her research, and her
8 research dealt with bilinguals, and how they were better at
9 solving problems. They were faster, quicker, and they
10 solved problems that multi -- that people who just spoke
11 one language could not. And it showed even little children
12 solving these problems who were bilingual. I was so
13 impressed. And I wish we could bring that psychologist to.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Dr. Flores, just so you know.
15 I want it to be clear that I am in no way saying that I
16 oppose bilingualism, or biliteracy --

17 MS. FLORES: Oh, I know -- I know.

18 MS. MAZANEC: -- so there is no reason for
19 you to not tell the benefits to me.

20 MS. FLORES: No, no. I'm not.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. I just want to make
22 sure that's clear.

23 MS. FLORES: But I just wanted to -- to say
24 just openly about the -- you know, the benefits of
25 bilingualism. And now, well here is research showing that



1 bilingual individuals are able to solve problems, and even
2 young children. I -- I was just amazed by this
3 presentation, and being shown this. It's just a little
4 kind of citing.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin?

6 MS. RANKIN: Do we have the brighter quicker
7 STEM students seal that we put on diplomas? Or does it, or
8 do -- do we have any seals that we put on high school
9 diplomas? I'm -- I'm serious about this question. I don't
10 know the answer.

11 MS. MAZANEC: At the State level.

12 MS. FLORES: National Honor Society.

13 MS. RANKIN: So that's a seal that goes on
14 the diplomas, is that correct?

15 MS. FLORES: But -- but -- but it went on
16 mine.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It didn't go on mine.

18 MS. RANKIN: That's simply my question.

19 MS. FLORES: And I think it's important to
20 keep this -- keep this in front, this fact in front of us,
21 anything like that. And I -- I do believe that some
22 districts have certain insignia, or add-ons that they
23 choose to put on diplomas, or enter on transcripts. That
24 is a district decision, Pam. You know, I want to make sure
25 you're at peace with that.



1 MS. MAZANEC: And nothing stops the
2 districts who want to from doing this, right?

3 MS. FLORES: Correct. Which is true for
4 this, and is true for STEM. They choose to go that way.
5 It's true for arts, other arts programs. I -- I think this
6 -- this is a good time. The timing is right. Considering
7 all of our discussion, and our -- our goals, and our
8 missions, and our work together with many other people of
9 interest that are interested about developing literacy
10 skills. So that's the real point. It's that we are saying
11 to school districts, "Thank you for jumping in there, and
12 doing whatever you can to build literacy skills in your
13 kids." One way -- one great way to do that is to promote
14 districts, and schools, communities.

15 Frankly, this is a community effort just as
16 much as anything, that -- that the opportunities that all
17 kids should have regardless of language to build up their
18 skills, to be good communicators, and members of their
19 communities. So this -- this is, and I purposely avoided
20 trying to suggest use of the word "The State Board
21 Supports," because that can take on different conclusions.
22 That can add different conclusions. Support could possibly
23 mean to someone if they weren't, if they were reading it in
24 their own way, that we are offering money for that. That's



1 not what this is about. This is strictly a program that we
2 are saying to districts, "This is a great thing.

3 You will find great support in your
4 community, meaning encouragement, and cheerleading for any
5 opportunity that gives these kids a chance to show how
6 they're learning, and recognize this. It's a -- it's a
7 feat, and you have young students who can do two, or more
8 languages, and -- and they have to be proficient. They
9 have to meet standards in both English, their English
10 standards, and their language standards. This is not a,
11 you know, sign up, and get it. This is -- this is
12 schooling."

13 So we're -- we're just asking for a
14 statement by the Board that, yes, we are in favor of
15 developing literacy. We encourage school districts to
16 continue doing whatever they can to develop their students'
17 literacy. It's important to our society, it's important to
18 the economy, and it's important to those children, and
19 what's happening to them. So that's all I have to say
20 about it. It's not a -- it's not a call for any mandatory
21 activity, it's not putting any orders on school districts,
22 or schools.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll take a five-minute
24 break. All right. The Board will come back to order. Is
25 there a motion?



1 MS. FLORES: Jane.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Jane?

3 MS. GOFF: (Inaudible). I moved that we --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Will you adopt the
5 resolution motion you just --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I picked the wrong
7 one. I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I'm on the wrong number.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

9 MS. GOFF: Can I just do it?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Yes. Ms. Goff.

11 MS. GOFF: I move that the -- that the State
12 Board adopt the proposed resolution entitled, "In Support
13 of the Seal of Biliteracy in Colorado."

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And second in discussion
16 on the motion? Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd just like to say that
18 biliteracy is a wonderful thing, having done some research
19 on this. Apparently, the seal was developed by
20 Californians together in 2008, and there have been
21 legislation following in California in 2011, and there's a
22 couple of a number of other states that have accepted this,
23 or passed it. My concern is that it actually lowers the
24 bar because it uses the term functional literacy. And when
25 we talk about the biliteracy, and bilingualism in Europe



1 it's not functional literacy. It goes far beyond that.
2 I'm also concerned about the data issues associated with
3 LinguaFolio. I don't know if we would be associated with
4 that, or not but their data issues.

5 And I'm also concerned about the definition
6 of biliteracy. Community service is one way to show
7 biliteracy, how are we even defining it? And it a -- I
8 don't know if it does, it would do this here, but it
9 certainly entangles the State with PARCC as one way to show
10 proficiency in English, which I would object to, not a good
11 measure of literacy, having looked at the test deeply. So
12 I won't be able to vote for it, though I fully support
13 bilingualism.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further do.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're in discussion
18 now?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of the major
21 aspects of it, if it is a -- if it's adopted, or supported
22 -- or supported by a state is that the state then has, we
23 would have the prerogative to set the criteria. In a -- by
24 mean -- by that I mean to say that any district, or any
25 school who chose to take the biliteracy route, we would



1 have a -- we'd already do -- we have a framework in place
2 that has criteria outlined. So the three districts
3 presented to us, Denver, Adams 14, and Eagle County, did
4 collaborate, and came up with the criteria that those three
5 are based on.

6 Each of those districts has slight
7 variations in what they -- what they consider that the ex -
8 - the minimum expectations, how they define the assessment
9 pool tool box that is available, so on. So Debora, I
10 appreciate that line, when we read about it, when I first
11 read about it from California, and that was what, five
12 years ago now, almost, when that conversation happened.
13 But each state that has gotten involved with it, and then
14 within those states, every district that has adopted it has
15 developed. They've taken a framework, and they've built
16 their own criteria. In most cases, PARCC, for example.
17 Not all states are involved in PARCC.

18 So it's one example that's given. But the
19 overall general state assessment for English, some states
20 are using that. AP, IB. Interesting that in many states,
21 the AP for worldwide, or the AP World Language, and English
22 language, their minimums criteria scores higher than in
23 other -- other types of criteria. Even admissions is
24 higher than our own graduation guidelines are.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would just say, I
2 just see no reason to just -- not to just leave it at the
3 district level. They're doing it with districts end of
4 term.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

6 MS. FLORES: And -- and seriously, I worked
7 on, and did research on language exams, oral, and written.
8 And it -- it's -- it's not -- it takes a lot of work. I
9 mean, an -- and the standard, the gold standard is the
10 Foreign Service language exam. So if you have that, and
11 that's -- that's really not easy. You'd have to train
12 teachers. I mean, teachers have to be trained to be able
13 to hear it, and be able to analyze documents, and such, by
14 documents I mean reading, and give such a test, or
15 something like a test. I know that on the teacher exam for
16 bilingual teachers in Texas, and that was Spanish, and
17 English. It's not an easy task.

18 So if it's left to the district to put, you
19 know, a National Honor Society seal on that, that's fine.
20 But I think we have to be -- we have to worry about the
21 state going into such an endeavor when, you know, we don't
22 see the scale. We don't see, you know, what it's like. If
23 it's left to the districts, let the districts do that work.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I guess I'm just still
2 unclear as to where you're not seeing that's what this is
3 saying.

4 MS. FLORES: Well, no, no. You're asking us
5 --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is an
7 encouragement to local districts from this -- from us --
8 from us, as representatives of districts all across the
9 state of Colorado. Encouraging them to consider, as a
10 district --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, it actually says
12 establishment. Encouraging them through the establishment
13 of a Seal of Biliteracy on the high school diploma, or
14 transcript.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Encourage.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion. I
17 would just simply observe two things. One is that there's
18 really -- we're being asked to support, as a Board,
19 something that is without standards to be put on a diploma.
20 And it's quite clear that the passage of this puts the
21 Board on record as somehow -- somehow in a position of
22 something that, which we have absolutely no idea what it
23 is, but we're on record of being for it.

24 And if this had specific standards that we
25 were going to recommend, I would be in favor. Also --



1 that's the reason. I certainly might reconsider my
2 position once the, I do think, and I'm not at all adverse
3 to ignoring the legislature when appropriate or -- or but
4 in this case, I'd least like to see what they have in mind
5 if they're willing to set standards over there. I think it
6 would certainly improve the quality of -- of a -- of a seal
7 that would mean something kind of universally. And if it's
8 a message to employers, then actually stands for something
9 specific.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I think we're
11 saying the same thing. In fact, it's -- it's two routes to
12 what hopefully will be the same outcome. The ideal goal is
13 to have at the legislative level, to have a statement. I
14 think we are entitled to ask that we be involved in the --
15 in the development of that legislation, because there is
16 ample examples, and sets of standards that this entire
17 program will be based on, and that fit with what Colorado
18 considers high -- high enough standards for our state to
19 support.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, further discussion?
21 Seeing none. Ms. Burdsall, if you'll call the role.

22 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

23 MS. FLORES: No.

24 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff?

25 MS. GOFF: No.



1 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec?
2 MS. MAZANEC: No.
3 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin?
4 MS. RANKIN: No.
5 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel?
6 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.
7 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder?
8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.
9 MS. BURDSALL: And Chairman Durham?
10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. Motions loss, five to
11 two. Last item on the agenda, if I can find my agenda.
12 Last item on the agenda is a (inaudible). My request on a
13 notice of intent to reconsider the action taken by the
14 relay graduate -- on the relay graduate school of
15 education. Initial authorization. Mr. Dill would -- let's
16 have a motion.
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move that we
18 reconsider.
19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, let me --
20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, maybe --
21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let me start. I'm sorry.
22 I apologize. Let me just ask the indulgence of the Board,
23 since I was absent. As a courtesy, if you would provide
24 unanimous consent for reconsideration of this particular
25 issue, so that we might then proceed forward for a second



1 vote. Is there objection to reconsideration? Thank you
2 very much. Seeing none of the Board has authorized
3 reconsideration of ---

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The passage?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Of 11.0.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was Relay Graduate
7 School of Education. Our initial authorization of the
8 Institution of high state of Colorado to offer a post-
9 baccalaureate teacher preparation programs in elementary
10 education, and the secondary education endorsements of
11 English Language, Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social
12 Studies.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Proper motions are second.
14 It has been seconded by Ms. Rankin. Discussion further --
15 Oh, Mr. Dill, you had some commentary, I believe, for us.

16 MR. DILL: Yes. This was before the Board
17 pursuant to 22-2-109(5)(a) , which obligates the Board to
18 review the content of a teacher preparation program, and
19 make recommendations as to the content to the Colorado
20 Commission of Higher Education. The statute says the State
21 Board shall recommend that Commission not approve a program
22 if it determines that the program content does not meet the
23 requirements specified in subsection 3 of this section, or
24 the endorsement requirements. I just wanted to mention
25 that, you know, the statute therefore puts this in a fairly



1 restrictive con -- context that you're looking at certain
2 aspects of the content of the program itself. And I wanted
3 to make sure that was clear.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, Mr.
5 Dill. Questions to Mr. Dill? Seeing none. Any other
6 commentary? Yes, Dr. Flores?

7 MS. FLORES: And Dr. O'Neill, you found this
8 program to be within the con -- that admit that the needs
9 of the curricula and the standards?

10 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you Dr. Flores. We did.
11 There is actually a committee that is made up of reviewers,
12 both internal CD, and external institutes of higher
13 education, as well as designated agencies that conduct a
14 review. I'm using matrices to identify whether these
15 standards are in alignment with the Colorado Educator
16 Preparation rules, as well as our Colorado academic
17 standards. Yes, that committee did indeed find that there
18 is alignment within that per the state statutes as
19 identified.

20 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Ms. O'Neill.
22 Any other questions, or comments? If not, Ms. Burdsall,
23 would you please call roll?

24 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

25 MS. FLORES: Aye.



1 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff?
2 MS. GOFF: Aye.
3 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec?
4 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.
5 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin?
6 MS. RANKIN: Aye.
7 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel?
8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.
9 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder?
10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.
11 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham?
12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. The motion's adopted
13 on a vote of seven to nothing.
14 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.
15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. O'Neill.
16 Now, I think the last item is the. Does anyone have any
17 reports, or comments on future business? Anything else to
18 come before the Board, or any comments you'd like to make
19 or future plans?
20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd just like to make -
21 -
22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Schroeder?
23 MS. SCHROEDER: I would just like to report
24 that I enjoyed participating in the School Choice Week
25 rally at the Capitol on the 28th, and Commissioner Crandall



1 spoke. It was inspiring, as always, and I'm looking
2 forward to more school choice in Colorado.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Flores?

4 MS. FLORES: I just wanted to report that
5 teachers, and parents are getting together in Denver, and
6 there was a meeting, a seminar, last week, where parents,
7 and teachers met on the topic of the schools that Denver
8 students deserve. And it was a really exciting seminar
9 with teachers, and parents coming together, and discussing
10 that issue.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any other? Yes,
12 Ms. Goff?

13 MS. GOFF: In the coming -- coming near --
14 near coming time --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Soon.

16 MS. GOFF: -- we will -- I will have for
17 you, from the NASBE perspective, but in relation to what
18 our chatting is around several issues. And especially, one
19 thing right now is the ESSA, and the timeline, and
20 guidelines, and what's a -- what's in the -- in the picture
21 for state boards, how are roles can be impacted, what kinds
22 of new things we'll get to talk about. Good things? And
23 how we might go about that within our state, within the
24 policy making.



1 Our flexibilities that we will have, as well
2 as what's called state flexibilities. But Boards are going
3 to have some things to really think about too. So I'll be
4 attending a couple of things, and then monthly phone
5 conference calls with NASBE Governmental Affairs Committee,
6 affectionately known as GAC. So I'll let you know what that
7 entails. I believe a couple of us, I'm still trying to
8 make arrangements to attend the Hunt Institute, which is an
9 annual gathering of some sort that, for state board.
10 NASBE, CC, SSO, a couple of other organizations partner up,
11 are partnering up this year to start discussing that whole
12 thing. Our life with the ESSA in the next year, or two.
13 Hoping that the Chair is able to go. They're trying to
14 work it out.

15 MR. ASP: That's the one in Atlanta?

16 MS. GOFF: Yes.

17 MR. ASP: The whole cabinet is in San
18 Francisco, with (inaudible) doing PSA briefing that day,
19 ESSA. But we've asked -- we've got one person going from
20 CDE.

21 MS. GOFF: So we'll all have chances over
22 the next several months to be lots of places.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right, okay. Any other
24 comments? Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Joyce, and I share
2 Eagle School District, but I was really happy to read
3 recently that they put in the funds to have ACT prep
4 classes for all their students. I believe Aspen, there are
5 a couple of your districts. Aspen is another one. I can't
6 remember the third one. I thought it was just terrific
7 because there's a huge difference with a huge cost
8 associated with ACT prep. I think they're training some of
9 the training some of their teachers. That will be easier
10 anyway with a free program for the SAT, but I really
11 appreciate district. But they really do a great job trying
12 to provide opportunities for all kids.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anything else? We'll
14 stand adjourned until the --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: March 9.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- March meeting. Thank
17 you.

18 (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