



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
April 9, 2014, Part 4

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 9, 2014, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: State Board will come
2 back to order. Colorado State Board of Education will
3 now convene a panel discussion regarding the future of
4 PARCC in Colorado. Today, the Partnership for Assessment
5 of Readiness for College and Career's testing regime is,
6 despite the Board's best effort in 2012 to maintain
7 control over designing the Colorado statewide assessment,
8 being piloted in classrooms throughout Colorado as we
9 speak.

10 Instead of allowing Colorado to design its
11 own statewide assessments, through the passage of SB-12-
12 172, the Colorado General Assembly directed this Board to
13 join as a governing member, one of the two federally
14 financed testing consortia. Following the passage of
15 that law, this Board, the Commissioner and the Governor
16 became signatories to a three party agreement known as a
17 memorandum of understanding, or MOU, with PARCC.

18 Since that time, many and vigorous
19 questions have been raised as to the appropriateness of
20 PARCC for Colorado. Broadly stated, they may all be
21 rolled up into one. Is PARCC and all that is inherent
22 within this massive undertaking, the single best choice
23 for the students of Colorado?

24 We are delighted to welcome Senator Keith
25 King; former Superintendent of Public Schools, Louis



1 Palmer; Ted Bowman, principal of James Irwin Charter
2 School; Cindy Will, Denver Public Schools Chief Academic
3 Officer; Susannah Cordova (ph), Bruce Hoyt of St. Charles
4 Capital and Board Member of Colorado Succeeds, and Dr.
5 Steve Jordan, President of Metropolitan State University.

6 First we will hear from those panelists
7 who support PARCC, followed by those who oppose PARCC.
8 Each panel will have 20 minutes to present their
9 position. Following the panel presentations, the
10 panelists who support PARCC will have the -- ten minutes
11 in which to question the panelists who oppose PARCC, and
12 following their questioning, the panelists who oppose
13 PARCC will have ten minutes in which to question the
14 panelists who support PARCC. Trying to get a dialogue
15 going, is what we're working on here.

16 Following the panel discussion, the Board
17 will have 30 minutes for dialogue, questions and
18 discussion. So with that, I will hand the floor to the
19 folks who are speaking in favor of PARCC.

20 MR. HOYT: Do you want me to go? Okay.
21 And make sure the microphone is working. Can everybody
22 hear me fine?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You're live. You're
24 very good.

25 MR. HOYT: All right, thank you. Well,



1 thank you for having me today. My name is Bruce Hoyt,
2 I'm a founding partner of St. Charles Capital, which is
3 an investment bank doing primarily merger and acquisition
4 work in Denver. I'm a member of Colorado Succeeds, I'm
5 also a Colorado native. I am a product of Colorado
6 Public Schools and a parent of two children who went K-12
7 through Colorado Public Schools.

8 First of all, I'd like to start by
9 congratulating the State Board, and thanking you for your
10 service, the great work you've done over the last many
11 years, especially the incredibly hard work you've done on
12 updating the Colorado Academic Standards. Having served
13 on the Board with Elaine Berman, I know how taxing public
14 service can be. So --

15 MS. BERMAN: You had to get that in.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Does that make us
17 kindred spirits?

18 MR. HOYT: Yes, it does in many, many
19 ways. As an employer, the work towards higher standards
20 in aligned assessments is absolutely critical to
21 maintaining a healthy Colorado economy. Our current
22 trajectory, though improved from where it was, will not
23 get us there. For example, by 2020, 74 percent of
24 Colorado jobs will require some post-secondary education.
25 Currently, only 22 of every 100 high school students end



1 up with that credential. As a result, Colorado schools
2 currently produce less than half the workers needed to
3 fill the top 30 occupations with the largest projected
4 openings going forward.

5 I've been in conversation with numerous
6 CEOs and the complaint is -- is consistent about the lack
7 of ability to find the highly qualified workers within
8 this state that we need to fulfill the high job openings
9 that we have. There are numerous economic benefits to
10 getting there, and to better preparing students in
11 Colorado. For example, the recent study that showed that
12 if we can increase our graduation rate from just 76
13 percent to 90 percent, that would \$100 million in
14 increased annual earnings by Colorado citizens. 850 new
15 jobs coming to this state annually. \$80 million increase
16 in annual spending, and \$4.5 million in increased tax
17 space. This is why business cares so much about
18 education in Colorado.

19 I encourage you to please stay on the path
20 towards these more rigorous assessments, and in
21 particular, the PARCC assessment. I understand the
22 legitimate concerns that exist about privacy, and about
23 over testing. These need to be addressed, however, I
24 would argue that these solvable concerns are overwhelmed
25 by the public good of the PARCC assessments. In



1 education, we know that setting high expectations is a
2 key driver towards student's success. In business, we
3 know that it is true that you get what you measure.

4 The work you've already done, developing
5 the Colorado Academic Standards and PARCC, does just that
6 -- it sets those high expectations, and then it allows us
7 to measure what we get. It's critical that we can
8 continue on this path to improve the outcome for our
9 students. It's critical to create the kind of
10 accountability and transparency that these public
11 institutions should be held to, and it's critical to
12 support autonomy, choice, and innovation, which will
13 improve with the PARCC assessment.

14 As an employer, taxpayer, parent, and
15 education policy student, PARCC represents a superior
16 assessment tool. The multiple types of questions can
17 better assess conceptual thinking and critical thinking;
18 those skills highly valued by employers. The ability to
19 include formative assessments are great to -- for parents
20 and for teachers, to improve outcomes. The more timely
21 release of data from PARCC assessment will allow school
22 level, all the way up to state policy level people to
23 rack faster to strategy and policy decisions.

24 And most importantly, for the first time,
25 the ability to compare the performance of Colorado



1 students against other states, would be a huge benefit.
2 Wow, what could we do better? What are we doing worse?
3 How can we learn from other states? Districts with
4 similar demographics to our school districts that would
5 allow us to become better districts, to have better
6 policies. What incredibly value data to have. What a
7 flashlight to shine on the performance, to help us
8 continuously improve Colorado schools. What a valuable
9 benchmark for parents, for teachers, and for school
10 administrators, and what great information to continue
11 the implementation of Senate Bill 191, and the READ Act.
12 Having all this more data to be able to do a great job on
13 implementation.

14 PARCC also strikes me as the perfect
15 balance between our desire for local control, and our
16 need to develop a better, more robust comparable
17 assessment. Over 50 Colorado educators were involved in
18 the development of PARCC. Commissioner Hammond is
19 playing a critical on the executive committee on PARCC.
20 This is great Colorado participation in PARCC, but on top
21 of that, we get the benefit of some of the best education
22 minds around the country from over 600 universities
23 who've added to PARCC, and some of the best K-12 minds in
24 the other states with PARCC, adding to the quality of
25 this assessment.



1 I'm a Colorado native, I'm very proud of
2 Colorado, but it seems arrogant to think that we will not
3 have a better assessment when we benefit from brilliant
4 minds around the country, and millions of dollars to
5 supplement the work that we're doing to build the park
6 assessment. By creating more rigorous standards and
7 implementing an aligned assessment that can be compared
8 with many other states, Colorado will boost their economy
9 and improve student achievement.

10 Ten years ago, at our company, 75 percent
11 of the transactions we worked on were Colorado based --
12 today, less than half the transactions we work on are
13 from Colorado. Ten years ago, almost everybody we would
14 hire to join St. Charles Capital was Colorado based.
15 Now, we're getting inundated from applications from
16 around the country of other highly qualified potential
17 employees. State and even national borders mean less and
18 less in mobile society, and we need an assessment that
19 also reflects that kind of mobility, that kind of -- of -
20 - of reach outside of the state of Colorado.

21 I've heard a concern that some want to
22 exceed the standards that we're setting. If this is
23 indeed true, then I would argue that it makes even more
24 sense for Colorado to adapt PARCC, and to go with PARCC.
25 Why is that? I will say because if we do indeed exceed



1 the standards, PARCC will show on a comparable basis that
2 Colorado is one of the leading education states in the
3 country. What will this do for us? This will allow us a
4 valuable tool in being able to attract companies, more
5 employers, more jobs for Colorado, and to attract
6 students in various districts that are exceeding these
7 results.

8 If, as I suspect, however, that the
9 results of PARCC show that Colorado is less than
10 exceeding the standards of this more rigorous standard,
11 it will be an aid by shining a flashlight on those
12 issues, and helping us provide a roadmap of where we need
13 to improve, what areas we can improve in, and how we
14 should attack improving Colorado education. It is only
15 by deluding ourselves that we are superior, when we are
16 indeed struggling, that we can lose. PARCC will prevent
17 this from happening, because the comparability with other
18 states will not allow us to have this delusion.

19 Standard based education has helped us
20 improve educational outcomes, especially for
21 disadvantaged students. Chester Finn has recently
22 written very eloquently on how standards have moved us
23 forward, and how assessments are critical for that. The
24 current move towards more rigorous standards and a
25 superior assessment will set those higher expectations,



1 and with good data results, we know it will make a
2 business a better business, and a school a better school.
3 Good data is timely, contextual and actionable. PARCC
4 will help us move down that continuum on all three of
5 those elements.

6 We know that change is hard; we know that
7 people react against change, but the fact of the matter
8 is, PARCC has superior data and the irony is, when you
9 have great data, it gives you the courage to make those
10 difficult changes. Getting education right is critical
11 to the economic vitality of the state. I'm very proud of
12 the work that Colorado has done in education over the
13 last ten years to improve the education system. Experts
14 from around the country believe that Colorado can be one
15 of those states that proves that broad-based public
16 education achievement gains are possible. We have a
17 state legislature that has put partisan differences aside
18 to pass key reform legislation.

19 You as the State Board have done
20 incredible work on policy and standards, and the business
21 community has come together to make education reform a
22 top priority. Please have the courage to adapt these
23 standards on the PARCC assessment so that we can continue
24 to improve student outcomes, increase the transparency
25 and accountability of our K-12 system, continue to foster



1 more choice and more innovation in our schools, and
2 maintain the economic vitality of our beautiful state.
3 Thank you for your time today.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Hoyt.

5 MS. CORDOVA: Well, good afternoon, my
6 name is Susannah Cordova, and unlike my colleague here,
7 I'm not an elected official. I'm an educator. I'm the
8 Chief Academic Officer in the Denver Public Schools. I'm
9 a DPS grad myself and have had two children in the Denver
10 Public Schools as well. And I very much appreciate this
11 opportunity to share with you my perspective, and the
12 perspective of the Denver Public Schools about the
13 benefits of participating in PARCC.

14 If you'll indulge me for just a moment,
15 I'd like to share the experience that I just came from
16 prior to coming to this panel. I was at a community
17 meeting at Kepner Middle School. Kepner is a school
18 located in Southwest Denver that serves a highly English
19 learner population of about 800 students in grades six
20 through eight. Many of whom are very behind in their
21 academic levels in a school that we're currently looking
22 at implementing new programs for.

23 And the reason that I think that this is
24 an important perspective is, in this community meeting we
25 had parents who were at the table looking at the



1 potential opportunities to have new programming coming
2 into the building. And by far, what parents are asking
3 for, and for the most part, this was a group of mono-
4 lingual Spanish parents, is school programs that have
5 higher standards, higher expectations, and give us the
6 information about how our students are performing to meet
7 those expectations. And I thought it was very nice way
8 to open up this conversation about why believe PARCC
9 gives us that information that our parents, our students
10 and our teachers are requesting.

11 When we looked at the standards in PARCC,
12 in the Common Core that would be assessed by PARCC, we
13 recognize that an aligned standards and assessment system
14 is really critical, we believe, to our success. In
15 Denver we've seen very high growth, but we also know that
16 we have a long way to go to ensure that all students are
17 truly prepared for a rigorous post-secondary experience,
18 be the college or career. And as Bruce says, we know
19 that virtually all employment opportunities will require
20 some kind of post-secondary educational experience.

21 We believe that having the information
22 that PARCC gives us, will really spur the kind of
23 innovation and dedication to high expectations that we
24 need in our schools currently. The idea of assessing
25 knowledge of content-rich non-fiction text, informational



1 text, using technology to be able to assess students, we
2 believe truly will help us both design our teaching and
3 learning experiences, as well as understanding how our
4 students are performing with those learning experiences.

5 For many of our students, the only
6 opportunities that they have to access technology is in
7 our schools, and so having an assessment that is aligned
8 to instructional practices that get at that, are very
9 critical for us. As my colleague Bruce mentioned, we
10 believe it is very important to have the highest quality
11 assessments. The idea that PARCC is being developed with
12 the input of educators from around the country, we
13 believe gives us that opportunity for the highest quality
14 assessments. The comparability across states, we also
15 believe, is very important. Denver is in a somewhat
16 unique position in the state of Colorado in terms of the
17 students that we serve, the demographics that we serve,
18 and the intensity of urban need in our state.

19 It's very difficult at times to find a
20 benchmark within our state, and so having benchmarks
21 across the country of similar districts, we believe will
22 be incredibly helpful for us. We also believe that the
23 college ready focus of PARCC will be an important factor
24 for us. We know that we've improved our graduation
25 rates, we know that we've improved our state assessment



1 rates, and yet we also know that many -- far too many of
2 our students are graduating from our schools in need of
3 remediation.

4 PARCC will give us the information real
5 time along way, that will help us ensure that we are
6 setting our standards and aligning our instructional
7 systems in a way that ensures that more kids meet the
8 requirements for college entrance.

9 We think it's also very important for
10 teachers to be able to have that real time access to
11 data. And the idea that the information is available
12 much more quickly, we believe is an important aspect of
13 that. As I said, it's not just our parents at Kepner,
14 but really parents across the city are very interested in
15 having clear and timely information about the progress of
16 their students, and the progress of the students in
17 Denver, across the state -- in comparison to across the
18 state, and across the country as well. I think that's
19 one of the very large benefits of that.

20 We also believe that its important to be
21 able to have the opportunity to learn from other places
22 that are doing a better job than we are with similar
23 demographics, as well as places that are struggling and
24 seeking out new and innovative ways to improve their
25 data. We also believe that the idea that these are



1 internationally benchmarked, really does give our
2 students an opportunity to enter into a global 21st
3 century workforce.

4 One of the things that I wanted to share
5 was just a little bit of information about the people
6 within our district who have participated in
7 opportunities to give feedback into the PARCC assessment.
8 Our Director of Math and Science, Dr. Kathy Martin, is a
9 member of the Colorado Educator Cadre, and meets
10 regularly to give advice and feedback on PARCC. We have
11 been members of the Council of Great City Schools as well
12 as the Aspen Institute, and have been able to give input
13 at each phase of development into the PARCC assessment,
14 including from the very inception of the frameworks, the
15 blueprints, the items.

16 We also have members who are part of the
17 WEDA National Consortia Board, to be able to have
18 conversations across assessments as well, so that as
19 we're looking at assessments like the English Language
20 Acquisition assessment, and thinking about how it relates
21 to PARCC, that we're looking at, how do we ensure that we
22 have the appropriate technology, the appropriate
23 approaches, and the right input into those systems as
24 they are being developed.

25 And within the next four weeks, in fact,



1 we have coordinators from our Teaching and Learning
2 Department, who will be heading to help develop the range
3 finding around PARCC items, where they'll actually be
4 scoring PARCC items against the rubric to give input into
5 our ability to understand how the items and our
6 perspective on how the items align to grade level
7 expectations.

8 And so it's -- it's been a great
9 opportunity for our educators to be directly involved in
10 informing, advising, and providing feedback in -- into
11 the development of the assessment.

12 The final thing that I'd like to say is;
13 one of our shared core values in the Denver Public
14 Schools is equity, and other one is accountability. And
15 it strikes me that this is a very important opportunity
16 for us in our district, as well as all of us in our state
17 to live out those values of equity and accountability.
18 And when we talk about equity, we really do look at how
19 do we ensure that we provide the resources that are
20 necessary for all students to be able to meet high
21 expectations. When we talk about accountability, we
22 really think about what does it mean as a community to be
23 co-accountable to the outcomes that we expect to see.

24 I believe that participation in PARCC
25 truly gives us the opportunity to live out those values



1 of equity and accountability. It gives us an opportunity
2 to have the window into not just at our state level, but
3 across our nation. What are the expectations? And how
4 do we ensure that we are aligning our resources to make
5 sure that all students, regardless of where they live,
6 have educational experiences that give them the platform
7 to meet those high expectations. And it lives the value
8 of accountability in terms of our ability to say, when
9 something meets an expectation, that it's not simply an
10 expectation in Colorado, but it's an expectation that's
11 benchmarked to both national and international standards.

12 And so those are the benefits that we
13 believe are very important, and a large part of the
14 rationale for why we think it's important to participate
15 in PARCC. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Dr. Jordan?

17 MR. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
18 Members of the Committee. For the record, my name is
19 Stephen Jordan, I'm President of Metropolitan State
20 University of Denver. And let me apologize at the
21 beginning; I'm from higher education and we have a whole
22 different set of language than you do, even though we are
23 all in the same business. So if I use some terms that
24 conflict with your terms, I -- I apologize at the front
25 end.



1 And because I don't know the audience, I
2 just would be interested: How many of the people in this
3 room actually got your high school diploma in Colorado?
4 Less than half.

5 MS. NEAL: Am I the only one on the Board?

6 MR. JORDAN: Which I think speaks to
7 Bruce's point about this question about net importation.
8 So I'd like to begin by saying, first of all, I applaud
9 you, Mr. Chairman, for putting this issue on the table.
10 I don't know that there's a more important question that
11 is facing the nation today, than our ability to compete
12 with -- through the educational attainment of our
13 children. And I think the question that you put on the
14 table, puts front and center the issue of what is a
15 state's responsibility when you are a member of union of
16 republics? We are republic in this state, that's what we
17 are. All of our states are republics. But we have
18 coalesced as a union, and the question is, in order to
19 solve the nation's single most pressing question: What
20 is our responsibility as a state to assist in helping to
21 do that? And I think this conversation is an important
22 part of how we begin to understand that responsibility.

23 You know, as a college president, I
24 actually have to deal with the question of comparing the
25 ability of student's performance who matriculate into our



1 university from other states. And while 97 percent of
2 the students at my university are "residents" of the
3 state of Colorado, almost half of them actually have come
4 from other states, and have gotten their residency --
5 have brought their high school diploma from another
6 place.

7 So in this country, for years, the way we
8 made decisions about -- about higher education admission
9 was on the basis of the Carnegie unit, which created the
10 most portable system of assessment of what students know,
11 and ACT and SAT scores. And ever since K-12 throughout
12 the country has begun this conversation, way ahead of
13 higher ed, about outcomes, about trying to understand
14 what it is that students should know and be able to
15 demonstrate as they leave their schools.

16 We at higher education have been pressed
17 to rethink the basis upon which we choose to admit
18 students not only in our states, but from other states.
19 And what we have essentially been asked, on a national
20 basis, is to say that we should accept the standards that
21 are established by states on an outcomes basis as the --
22 as saying that that student is capable of doing college
23 level work. Because let's be clear, all the ACT measures
24 -- it doesn't actually measure what students know, it
25 measures a belief of what the student -- whether the



1 student will be successful in their first freshman year
2 of college. That's all it measures. It doesn't measure
3 their knowledge base, it measures whether they will be
4 successful or not in their first year.

5 So we have been pressed to -- to think
6 about moving to -- to what you're doing. And the
7 question is; how difficult will it be for us in higher
8 education -- and not only for us, but for students in
9 Colorado, who choose to go to other states, to be in a
10 position of saying, that University is going to make a
11 decision, hopefully in my favor, on the basis of whether
12 our state assessment matches up with the state assessment
13 in Indiana, matches up with Massachusetts, matches up
14 with California, matches up with the state of Washington.
15 Because our students are applying to all of those states.

16 One of the single biggest things going on
17 in Colorado today is the net exportation of our brightest
18 students to other states. And they are competing. And
19 the question is how -- will they be able to compete based
20 upon what we will choose to participate in for the
21 assessment process, for students in Colorado?

22 So I think -- I believe that we're in a
23 better position if we share the goals of higher -- of
24 higher standards with other states. That we have the
25 opportunity to be even more influential leader in the



1 development of rigorous assessment standards, but quite
2 frankly, we have to be at the table. And for me, and it
3 goes back to this question about what does it mean to be
4 a state in a union of republics? It's about leadership.
5 It's about, what are we prepared to do in our union to
6 help to assure that our country has the strongest
7 standards, and the most highly educated students in the
8 world today.

9 Let me move to another area. Ms. Goff was
10 a participant with me this past year in a -- in a --
11 about a seven month study session on -- on licenses for
12 teachers. Some good days, and bad days in some of those
13 meetings. But one of the things that is very important;
14 we need to remember that 50 percent of the teachers who
15 are licensed in teaching in the State of Colorado today,
16 did not get their degree in Colorado. Either their high
17 school diploma, or their college degree. Now, we at
18 Metro are spending a lot of time in our curriculum, as
19 our sister institutions in Colorado, making sure that our
20 teacher preparation students understand what the
21 standards are in Colorado, how to do individualized
22 instructions for students to prepare them to meet the
23 outcomes that you are setting, and to demonstrate those
24 outcomes in the tests that Colorado uses for
25 demonstration of that.



1 One of the issues that we raised, and I
2 think President Norton and I were united in this, is that
3 the truth of it is, that we admit all of those other 50
4 percent on the basis of an interstate compact agreement,
5 without a real knowledge about what are they teaching to?
6 What standards have they chosen? And are they really
7 capable of entering our classrooms today, and
8 demonstrating the ability to accomplish the outcomes that
9 you are asking them to do, and the measures that they
10 will have to be able to have their students demonstrate.
11 I think this is a critical issue that this board needs to
12 take into consideration. And my view is participation in
13 the PARCC assures that not only teacher education
14 programs of Colorado, but teacher education programs
15 throughout the nation, will be teaching to the same set
16 of expected outcomes and will be prepared to enter the
17 classrooms. And we have a vested interest in that
18 outcome in a very, very significant way.

19 I think it was well covered in terms of
20 this notion about our being a net importer of -- of
21 talent. We've seen it here in this room, that clearly a
22 majority of the people in this room did not get their
23 education, their primary education, in the state of
24 Colorado. And yet, that sets the pattern for their
25 ability to be life-long learners, because there's no



1 question that your expectation, when they leave and with
2 a high school diploma, is that they will have a set of
3 skills that will allow them to continue pursuing learning
4 throughout their lives. And I believe that participation
5 in a national nationally-based program will help to
6 assure that our students will be competing to the highest
7 standards, and will recognize that they are capable of
8 competing against kids from Massachusetts and California
9 and Washington, and all the other states.

10 And finally, you know, it strikes me that
11 there is also -- it was mentioned actually earlier, that
12 I spend a lot of time at the capital. And it's a little
13 bit about the money. And it's my understanding that we
14 anticipate that it will cost \$10 to 12 million for us as
15 a state to do these assessments. Without a clear
16 understanding of where that \$10 to 12 million will
17 actually accomplish the job or not. I don't know how we
18 think we can be assured that we will have a standard that
19 will meet those expectations in the timelines required
20 with that expensure -- expenditure, when we're competing
21 against two large national pools which have \$350 million
22 available to them to develop assessment tools. Why
23 wouldn't Colorado want to spend that \$10 million in the
24 classroom on teachers? On the experience that students
25 are having, rather than on the assessments, when we can



1 take advantage of a much larger pool of funds, along with
2 our colleagues from other states. Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. So we'll
4 move at this point to this panel. And you've organized
5 yourself, and please proceed.

6 MS. WILL: Thank you, thank you so much.
7 Can you hear me?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely.

9 MS. WILL: Okay, great. Good afternoon,
10 my name is Cindy Will, I'm the principal of James Irwin
11 Charter Academy, and I too want to join the echo of
12 thanking you for this wonderful opportunity to talk about
13 such a critical issue. It's transformative; it's going
14 to last the -- decisions here will affect Colorado for
15 generations.

16 I will be talking about my reasons for why
17 PARCC has got to go. One of our education Presidents,
18 Thomas Jefferson said, "If it is believed that these
19 elementary schools will be better managed by the governor
20 and council, or any other general authority of the
21 government, then by parents within each ward, it is a
22 belief against all experience." We have had more than
23 200 years of experience to confirm Jefferson's wisdom.
24 That parents do know better than Uncle Sam, about their
25 children's education. And I daresay that the founders



1 were not as interested in preparing students for an 18th
2 century global economy, and yet, we have documentation
3 that in the early years of our country, the literacy
4 rates were close to 100 percent.

5 We don't fear assessments. We don't fear
6 accountability. In fact, strong voices of opposition
7 from school leaders to the PARCC tests, are among the
8 state's top performers. Our schools consistently meet or
9 exceed the state requirements for a proficient
10 performance school ratings, and it cuts across both
11 political parties. This is not a Republican issue. It
12 is not a Democrat issue. It is a kid issue.

13 Here are my top ten reasons for why PARCC
14 has got to go: Number ten; PARCC and the new series of
15 tests require students to lose tons of instructional
16 time. TCAP tests for grades three through five are
17 completed February/March -- a total of three to four
18 weeks. The new series of tests for grades three to five
19 will occur January, March, April and May. We're talking
20 a total of eight to four weeks. Therefore, we have about
21 doubled our testing requirement with this new series of
22 tests.

23 Number nine reason why PARCC has got to
24 go: PARCC's harmful screen time. A screen -- S-C-R-E-E-
25 N. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, the



1 use of technology for children ages six to twelve is
2 detrimental to child development and learning. There are
3 studies that are showing that children and teens between
4 the age of six to twelve should engage in no more than
5 one to two hours a day, or it can lead to attention
6 problems. Children who can't pay attention, can't learn.
7 Children also will have school difficulties when they
8 exceed screen time. There is also studies that are
9 showing sleep and eating disorders, and even
10 contributions to obesity, with extensive screen time. In
11 fact, children who engage more than one to two hours a
12 day of technology have a 60 percent increase in
13 psychological disorders, according to a Bristol
14 University 2010 study. Children are presently using four
15 to five times that amount, of technology, recommended by
16 pediatric experts, according to (indiscernible) 2010
17 study. Does PARCC want to contribute to this?

18 Number eight reason why PARCC has got to
19 go: The PARCC test lack growth data. Colorado's hard
20 earned TCAP growth data is void. We lose the
21 continuation of our growth charts due the PARCC test.
22 The growth charts won't coordinate with our PARCC data.

23 Number seven: PARCC's myth of rigor.
24 Tests are not rigorous; they are vague. They are
25 confusing. They are not coherent. The tests lack



1 logical sequencing, and they promote guessing. All under
2 the guise of critical thinking skills. In fact, we've
3 all been warned to expect significant drops in our
4 scores. Don't be fooled. It's not because of rigor,
5 it's because of confusion.

6 Number six why PARCC has got to go: The
7 PARCC tests lack reliability. The reliable tests are
8 closely aligned to instruction. For instance, if a
9 student is taught with paper and pencil, they need to be
10 tested with paper and pencil. If they are taught paper
11 and pencil, and tested with a computer, we won't have
12 reliable data. We have not evolved as a society that
13 each child yet can afford their own computer. Therefore,
14 most students are still -- they are still taught with
15 paper and pencil. When teaching and testing are in the
16 same method, the test results are more highly reliable.
17 What good is a fast turnaround in data, if the data is
18 not reliable?

19 Number five, PARCC's got to go: The
20 PARCC's flaws follow all stakeholders. The tests have
21 huge impacts on schools, teachers, and students. The
22 school's accreditation is determined from PARCC scores.
23 The teachers evaluation rubrics link 50 percent of
24 student achievement, including the PARCC unreliable data.
25 The student's PARCC scores live on and on in a data



1 pipeline for years to come.

2 Number four, why PARCC has to go: The
3 PARCC tests promote cursive illiteracy. This requires --
4 the PARCC test require curriculum switches. Schools are
5 pressured to switch instruction from cursive lessons to
6 keyboard lessons. Schools don't have time to teach both.
7 Cursive and keyboarding -- keyboarding wins. It's the
8 test. As featured on an NPR Wisconsin radio program and
9 they were talking about, for cursive, the elimination.
10 It's an important topic for me, and they were
11 highlighting that 40 out of 50 states in July 2010, at
12 the time of this program, 40 out of 50 states were
13 eliminating cursive and handwriting. They didn't have
14 time for it. Because of a new testing emphasis on
15 keyboarding proficiency. The impact on our citizenry,
16 when students become cursive illiterate, they can't read
17 and I'm hearing from professors, they can't write or read
18 the professor's writing. Guess what? They can't read
19 historical documents, like the Declaration of
20 Independence. It's in cursive. Remember, a slow
21 handwriting results from an adequate teaching of letter
22 formation, and this has an impact in every subject, and
23 is the leading cause of illiteracy. That's from a
24 (indiscernible) study, 2010. So when we eliminate
25 cursive lessons, and we promote a new form of illiteracy



1 -- cursive illiteracy -- we are spelling trouble.

2 Number three, why PARCC has got to: PARCC
3 eliminates school choice. The PARCC tests and curriculum
4 demand a one size fits all approach. There is no need
5 for charter schools. Charter schools are charged to be
6 incubators of innovation. The national tests in
7 curriculum extinguish innovation. And they abolish
8 distinctions of schools. Gone are the innovative models.
9 Gone, language immersion. Gone, early colleges -- sorry
10 Keith. Gone, direct instruction. Gone, Montessori,
11 STEM, IB, Classical, Core Knowledge -- and the list goes
12 on.

13 Number two why PARCC has got to go: PARCC
14 tests drive instruction. The CSAP/TCAP test did not do
15 this. If the schools and students want to do well on the
16 national tests, they must use an aligned national
17 curriculum.

18 And my number one reason why PARCC has got
19 to go -- drumroll...is the PARCC test -- thank you -- the
20 PARCC test minimized local control and parental
21 empowerment. Parents lose their voice in what their
22 child is being taught and tested. Children enrolled in
23 public education are not children of the state. They are
24 children of their parents who fund the educational
25 system. Education needs to be accountable to the



1 parents, not parents accountable to the state.

2 Let's follow Jefferson's advice and
3 withdraw from the PARCC test in exchange for our own
4 Colorado homegrown state tests. Colorado deserves
5 better. PARCC has got to go. It's as simple as A, B, C
6 -- achieving the best for Colorado's children. Thank
7 you.

8 (Applause)

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

10 MR. BOWMAN: Thank Cindy. I was
11 (indiscernible) something as dramatic as you.

12 MS. WILL: You'll do great.

13 MR. BOWMAN: My name is Ted Bowman, and
14 I'm from Louis Palmer School District 38. I don't know
15 if you know about Louis Palmer School District 38, and I
16 won't bore you with the details, but (indiscernible) top
17 performing school districts in the state of Colorado.
18 And we have been since I started in that district in
19 1988. I (indiscernible) 2003 as Superintendent of Louis
20 Palmer. (indiscernible) this year starting in January to
21 the end of the school year as an interim.

22 And so I want to give you my perspective
23 of how PARCC has changed the dynamics of our school
24 district. I really -- it bothers me that this PARCC --
25 this partnership. I don't see where the word



1 "partnership" fits into our school district. There is a
2 partnership for assessment for readiness for college and
3 careers. PARCC is a huge (indiscernible), they have
4 subcontracted with Pearson, who has subcontracted with
5 Educational Testing Services, who have subcontracted to
6 others to develop these online assessments.

7 (indiscernible) way too big, they are too
8 (indiscernible), especially from District 38. I feel
9 like we're a small fish in a big pond, and they don't
10 know our district.

11 I don't believe they've taken the time to
12 get to know us as individual school districts in
13 Colorado. We are unique. We were (indiscernible) as
14 non-existent. I watch by -- our district volunteered to
15 pilot PARCC because that's -- that's what we are. We
16 want to do the best we can for our kids. It makes sense.
17 They shouldn't be at a disadvantage. And every time we
18 call, (indiscernible) we get no response. The response
19 is (indiscernible). They don't really care about
20 District 38. I think (indiscernible) they've gotten to
21 be a part of this consortium (indiscernible) to get this
22 done, and that bothers me, because (indiscernible) into
23 our school system.

24 Our system is designed (indiscernible)
25 assessment company experts, (indiscernible) student or



1 user friendly. Either one. (indiscernible) but don't
2 think as school kids. I believe that this consortium
3 should (indiscernible) of the state of Colorado. Not the
4 other way around, and it seems like they are driving us,
5 instead of us tell them what they need to be doing for
6 us. (indiscernible) ramifications, can't and should not
7 be rushed. (indiscernible) for speed, and I think in my
8 estimation, (indiscernible) in education for 41 years,
9 that's what has been happening in the last couple of
10 years.

11 As the superintendent in this last school
12 district, I used to feel I could be an educational
13 leader. I used to feel I could be an instructional
14 leader for the district. That's what I signed up for as
15 a superintendent. (indiscernible) feel like I'm a
16 manager. That bothers me. When I'm trying to
17 (indiscernible) systems in place, so that (indiscernible)
18 kids can do as well as (indiscernible) PARCC assessments.

19 I think we've lost instruction time for
20 testing time. We've lost instructional focus for testing
21 focus. We've lost teaching time for testing time.
22 (indiscernible) instruction professional development.
23 Who has time to do that anymore? Not me.

24 It used to be that Colorado trusted us as
25 professional superintendents and administrators to be the



1 (indiscernible) for our kids. I don't know what has
2 happened to that. (indiscernible) Colorado Department of
3 Education. They trusted us to make those big decisions
4 for kids. I feel like they don't trust me anymore, and
5 that's why I'm (indiscernible) actually, to be quite
6 honest with you. (indiscernible) with this, because I
7 don't like to be a manager (indiscernible) listens to me.
8 I might not be the smartest person in the room, but I
9 have a lot of good sense and wisdom when it comes to
10 instructing kids. PARCC doesn't do that for me.

11 I would like to see PARCC discontinued.
12 We as a district have a lot of other assessments that we
13 use. We don't use one measure. I don't need PARCC to
14 tell me how our kids are doing. I don't need PARCC to
15 tell me (indiscernible). I understood that
16 (indiscernible) our kids do very well on the ACT. It's a
17 national comparison. Colorado doesn't (indiscernible)
18 acronyms. But those (indiscernible) comparison. We
19 don't read anymore. I can only speak for our district,
20 but I bet there are a lot of superintendents who feel
21 just like I do. (indiscernible) this job.

22 I'll tell you what really bugs me about
23 PARCC. (indiscernible) student testing, it has really
24 interrupted our instructional time. As I talk to
25 teachers, as I talk to students who understand what I'm



1 talking about, as I talk to parents, they feel like we
2 have lost that creativity and innovation that used to be
3 (indiscernible) School District 38. Teachers feel like
4 they (indiscernible), and I'm trying to tell the
5 teachers, (indiscernible) PARCC. (indiscernible) let's
6 teach (indiscernible) teach.

7 If PARCC were gone, we wouldn't miss it
8 all. No, the only thing (indiscernible) PARCC.
9 (indiscernible) different way. (Indiscernible) suggested
10 some of (indiscernible). Actually for us, it's only
11 three weeks, because one of those weeks is spring break.
12 We have a (indiscernible) Superintendent (indiscernible),
13 we all agreed to a spring break. So we've cut down to
14 three weeks, total (indiscernible) instructional
15 schedule. Just bugs to me death that that happens.
16 (indiscernible) school employees to make PARCC work.
17 Just (indiscernible) two pilot schools this year.
18 (indiscernible) two additional people who weren't school
19 employees, who want technology, who can come and help us
20 go from school to school. We don't have the technology
21 to handle this. We don't have anything (indiscernible)
22 because of the cuts and revisions we've had. I don't --
23 I don't have the money to (indiscernible) technology
24 (indiscernible). Teacher training is just incredible. We
25 have to train (indiscernible) that testing coordinator



1 needs to go back to the teachers, take teachers out of
2 the classroom, get subs for those teachers,
3 (indiscernible) to do this -- this testing assessment.
4 And that's (indiscernible). That just (indiscernible)
5 school district operates. (indiscernible) try to resist
6 this as much as I can.

7 PARCC is -- here is another thing that
8 bugs me about it. They are run by Pearson --
9 (indiscernible) Pearson. (indiscernible), I don't know
10 if you know what Java is. It's sort of the security part
11 of this. And (indiscernible) Pearson. So
12 (indiscernible) continuous updates that don't -- it's
13 just -- it's just ridiculous what happens with -- with
14 some of those kinds of things. (indiscernible).

15 Interactions on PARCC -- I don't know if
16 any of you have ever (indiscernible) PARCC pilot? I
17 would suggest you do that. It would be good for you to
18 see what kids and teachers and proctors are struggling
19 with. Some of the instructions (indiscernible) are
20 really too high for particularly younger kids. Do I have
21 time to give them an example?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely.

23 MR. BOWMAN: This is off of a
24 (indiscernible) grade test. The instructions say,
25 (indiscernible) their teachers. (indiscernible) These



1 tests are not written for regular kids. They are written
2 by adults who think kids understand adult language.
3 There is no way some of those kids are going to do that.
4 Many of our kids (indiscernible) used to the texting and
5 the touch buttons, and know how that works. When we test
6 online, we can't test that way. You have to use a mouse.
7 Kids sometimes have to scroll (indiscernible) to be able
8 to answer some of the questions. So they are continually
9 having to go back and forth between screens.

10 (indiscernible) going to fix the touch thing, and you can
11 do that. It just costs more to do it. We can't do that.

12 Please understand, I'm not a complainer,
13 I'm really not. And I'm not a griper. (indiscernible)
14 We've always complied with what the Colorado Department
15 of Education has asked to -- asked us to do. We will do
16 so if PARCC continues. I (indiscernible) of the fact
17 that -- I don't like the fact that our kids are suffering
18 from adult decisions. So I guess to some of us, I'm
19 concerned about the testing time, the amount of people it
20 takes, the amount of technology (indiscernible) it takes.
21 And the sacrifice that we need to make to participate in
22 this PARCC assessment.

23 Just -- here's my (indiscernible) speaking
24 from (indiscernible) district, just leave us alone.

25 (indiscernible) I appreciate your time today, and I won't



1 take anymore of your time.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Senator King.

3 MR. KING: Thank you. Well, I've had two
4 great speakers in front of me, and so I'll try to be a
5 little more to the point and maybe just talk about some
6 of the interest that I have at the school level, and also
7 when I was in the legislature.

8 Education to me is a lot about balance and
9 finding the appropriate balance to how we create academic
10 excellence and achievement, and how we create
11 accountability, and how we create checks and balances in
12 a system to get what we need to get out of the system for
13 our kids. And to me, what is happening with PARCC, and
14 all the assessments that are especially coming into the
15 high schools of this state, we are absolutely going
16 backwards. And the reason I think we're going backwards,
17 is because my efforts that I've had the last seven years
18 with Colorado Springs early colleges.

19 And if you saw the Gazette had an article
20 about the most recent announcements about how concurrent
21 enrollment is going up in Colorado, and how that is
22 increasing, and it's increasing across both charter
23 schools and district schools across the state of
24 Colorado. That to me talks about innovation. That talks
25 to me about giving students opportunity to accomplish



1 what they want to accomplish, as opposed to benchmarking
2 them against some national standard that is low, and
3 frankly, incomplete in what it takes to be successful in
4 college.

5 So I think what we have lost in the
6 balance between a system analysis and giving students
7 opportunity, is we are tying down students to a process
8 that is absolutely taking away the innovation that we can
9 do with them in schools. So let me -- let me tell you
10 why I think the balances of -- on the process is hurting
11 our outcomes. We have students -- in fact, I don't know
12 if you -- if you are living in the metro area of Denver
13 last night, and watched Fox 31, you saw a student by --
14 that was going to Colorado Springs early college, Noah
15 Dome (ph), we are opening a new school in Parker, and he
16 was talking about the fact that he is graduating from
17 high school this year with a bachelor's degree. And he
18 has accomplished something that has now been accomplished
19 twice at our schools.

20 We have a standard that says the kids can
21 go as far as they want to go. And what happens to --
22 when you start creating all the so-called standards in
23 the areas of testing those standards, you start letting
24 the focus come down on very specific issues that are
25 actually something that they've accomplished years ago.



1 And so just think about it in yourself. If I went back
2 and took an Algebra 2 test without studying up and doing
3 some work and trying to do better on it, and think about
4 it a little bit, I -- I'd -- I'd bomb it.

5 And so what happens to these kids? A lot
6 of the kids -- and we have seen it happen, they are into
7 Calculus and different things that they go on, and they
8 go back and they are taking tests that they have taken
9 years ago, and they don't feel invested in it. They
10 don't feel like it makes any difference in their lives.
11 They don't see any reason to do it, and so they don't
12 work at it. And I have had this comment come to me many
13 times from the parents of the kids at our school, because
14 they say: Our kids are already beyond this. Our kids
15 are already into college level work. They are proving
16 they can do it. They are proving that they can
17 accomplish it. And we are going backwards to have them
18 test, and why do they see a reason to test? In fact, one
19 mother was in my office the other week, and she says: I
20 guess if we're going to go backwards and take these
21 tests, I've got to go back and go back to almost like
22 elementary work and try to refresh them, because these
23 kids have gone beyond that.

24 So I think we have lost the -- the --
25 really, the prize of what we were trying to do with K-12



1 education, and that is prepare kids for college and for
2 post-secondary, and workforce readiness. And I think
3 that is one thing that these tests at the high school
4 level especially do not accomplish. So for me, the
5 reality of the diagnostic aspect, the aspect that we're
6 supposed to test them on certain areas that are going to
7 measure their success in being ready to go on to a
8 career, is absolutely backwards. We guarantee that every
9 one of our kids will graduate from a high school without
10 remediation. And we allow them to take the ACCUPLACER
11 test to prove that they can do that. And they understand
12 that, they buy into that. They have a reason to do that.

13 So let's talk just a -- I will just talk a
14 little bit about the system. And what I did with Senator
15 Hoodack (ph) in trying to (indiscernible) the system, and
16 create some legitimate (indiscernible) with 163, with our
17 school improvement plans. We -- we basically looked at
18 four categories. We looked at student achievement,
19 growth, achievement gaps, and post-secondary and
20 workforce readiness. And I think what we were trying to
21 accomplish with that bill, was give some degree of system
22 analysis about how well we were preparing kids to go on
23 to what would happen to them after high school. I think
24 -- and now, having been away from that legislation for
25 several years, we need to go back and totally redo the



1 post-secondary and workforce readiness indicators of that
2 act. It's -- it's insignificant, I think.

3 What we would be much better off to do, is
4 talk more about outcomes. Endorse diplomas, for example.
5 How many kids are getting an endorsed diploma out of the
6 school? How many kids are actually accomplishing
7 concurrent enrollment and proving academically that they
8 can go on to something more than what PARCC even asked
9 for them. And so I think the post-secondary workforce
10 readiness needs to be changed. I think when I was -- I
11 worked so hard to try and do academic growth, and give us
12 an opportunity to measure that opportunity for growth in
13 the -- in the system. And I think the continuity that is
14 lost by going to PARCC, is going to damage the ability to
15 do that, and will also make it tough.

16 And I think the other issue that I think
17 the PARCC assessment will hurt, is the kids that are the
18 low achievers, and especially the thing that I wanted to
19 work a lot on when I was in this legislature, was
20 minorities, and especially boys and how that impacts
21 their ability to find an assessment that works for them,
22 and motivates them to accomplish something that would be
23 meaningful. So I don't see PARCC as good assessment at
24 all for getting ready for going on to post-secondary
25 college and careers. I think that we have a lot of



1 opportunity to do better.

2 And I would just talk about one final
3 thing that Ted talked about also, and that's the
4 allocation of resources. We are being required at our
5 schools, really, to almost hire a testing coordinator to
6 -- we are spending thousands, literally thousands of
7 dollars, trying to have enough computers to do this
8 assessment so it doesn't absolutely destroy our school
9 year. And with the testing that we're doing. And we are
10 -- we taking away valuable dollars for an assessment tool
11 that frankly I don't think is talking enough about
12 outcomes, but talking about process and inputs. And so I
13 think this for me is taking our students backwards.

14 And I will just close with this: We have
15 decided not to disrupt our kids' college education at our
16 school by deciding to bring PARCC in during their week of
17 finals that they are taking at the college level. So we
18 are going to let them take it on Saturday, because the
19 kids care more about doing well on their finals at their
20 school than they care about the PARCC assessment, and I
21 think that we will definitely see terrible scores as a
22 result of the efforts that we are doing, because the kids
23 have already -- many of them exceeded, and excel beyond
24 what they will be tested for in that. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So now we'll watch the



1 time a little more closely on this. Approximately ten --
2 yeah, we were very generous. Both of you ran over, but
3 the comments were valuable, so we are letting you go.
4 Ten minutes for you folks to ask questions of this panel.
5 The idea is to kind of get a dialogue. It's not
6 necessarily a cross examination. And then we'll take ten
7 minutes following that for them to ask questions of you.
8 So if you have questions that -- and if this goes
9 nowhere, if this lays an egg, that's fine. We can always
10 jump in, because I know we have plenty of questions.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do they get to start,
12 or do we?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: They get to start with
14 questions, and you'll be responding. That's kind of the
15 way we'd structured it.

16 MS. CORDOVA: So I -- I'm very interested
17 in this concept that PARCC in some way will curb
18 innovation. And let me give a little context for my
19 question. In the Denver Public Schools, we very much
20 believe in choice and innovation. We have a varied
21 portfolio of schools. All of our schools have been truly
22 digging into the Colorado academic standards, including
23 in ELA and mathematics, as manifested through the Common
24 Core. Schools as diverse as the Denver Green School,
25 Grant Beacon, which is a personalized learning school



1 using lots of technology to help students master the
2 standards. Traditional schools. And we're not hearing
3 from our school partners that in any way are the
4 standards, or the approaches to the assessments, limiting
5 their ability to be innovative. And so I'm curious to
6 hear a little bit more -- the manner in which you feel
7 like it -- you know, our Montessori -- we have Montessori
8 schools, we have all of the kinds of schools that you
9 mentioned, we have in our district. And we are not
10 hearing that -- with exceptions around the amount of
11 testing time -- concerns that the standards, or the
12 assessments are going to limit their ability to be
13 innovative.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So the effect of PARCC
15 in limitation of innovation within schools? Good
16 question.

17 MR. BOWMAN: Well, (indiscernible) in our
18 district is, anytime (indiscernible) to do the testing,
19 (indiscernible) is shut down. And I don't
20 (indiscernible) what your -- what your capability is in
21 the area of technology or (indiscernible) but
22 (indiscernible. We have some schools that (indiscernible)
23 technology lab. So when we put together these
24 (indiscernible) to take to each school, (indiscernible)
25 these are old things that we refurbish, because we don't



1 have the money to buy new stuff. Because (indiscernible)
2 anytime we do anything in any of our schools, it shuts
3 everyone down in terms of (indiscernible) technology.

4 MS. WILL: I think it's a really good
5 question, and I can see where there might a little bit
6 of: Why, that's a wild statement. We've had state
7 assessments for a long time and we're not hearing that
8 before. And it's true, we're in a new world. TCAP, as I
9 mentioned, did not drive instruction. That's the
10 difference, and that's why those of us who don't normally
11 complain, are here, because this is different. It's a
12 total game changer. This -- if you want to do well on
13 these national tests, you've got to play the game, and
14 you've got to have the curriculum that is aligned.
15 That's why Saxon is now aligned. That's why Core
16 Knowledge all got that stamp and seal that they are
17 aligned. So people will still use them.

18 The curriculum is all changed in order so
19 kids will be set up to do well on the national tests.
20 Before, it was not that case, and it was not that way.
21 And Keith hit it when he said: This is not an outcome
22 based assessment. It's process oriented. A lot of those
23 innovative models I told you, when I listed in my list,
24 when I was going through them, they are not so necessary
25 involved in process. Some of those are great books. You



1 know the rule, we don't get to read the whole book now.
2 We get to read informational text. We get to read
3 manuals. We only get to read an excerpt of a novel. We
4 don't get to read the whole novel. This has big
5 curricular changes up and down the board.

6 MR. KING: I'll just tell you one way it's
7 hurting innovation over at Colorado Springs at the
8 colleges, and it's hurting it this year because we are
9 taking -- we give the kids a \$4200 voucher towards their
10 college education, and we wanted to take that up this
11 year, to keep it at the same ratio that the PPR is going
12 up. It's gone up a couple hundred bucks. And so we
13 wanted to take that up and let the kids -- because
14 college tuition -- sorry, Dr. Jordan -- is just outpacing
15 inflation, and so we're having a hard time keeping up.
16 We're instead having to keep the voucher the same this
17 year, because we have extra investment required for the
18 testing, the computers, the extra bandwidth, all of the
19 issues that are associated with this testing that is
20 being put on us.

21 And so it's not -- it's not driving
22 innovation at all in our school. It's actually taking us
23 backwards, and not able to -- we are not able to enhance
24 our kids' opportunities for what we're trying to do with
25 them at all, because of this.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And how are we doing on
2 time?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just so you know,
4 you're investing more in your college education than the
5 State of Colorado is, since they only give me \$2300, so -
6 -

7 MR. KING: We have some kids at your
8 school.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, other questions?
10 Feel free.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well I -- Can I -- we
12 would be interested in their thoughts about where they
13 see higher education going in terms of the ability to
14 make this kind of -- these kind of portable, across
15 nation decisions about preparation of individuals for
16 admission to do college level work, if we're going to
17 have 50 different assessment tools?

18 MS. WILL: I need clarification -- maybe
19 they understand. I -- I don't understand "50
20 assessments". I think we're doing fine with what we
21 have. We've got the --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I'm saying -- if
23 each state -- if each state was to say, eh, sorry I'm not
24 interesting in partnering for the greater good, we're
25 going to have our own assessment tool. So on what basis



1 then will we create the kind of portability that we think
2 is so critical for higher education in our country? The
3 ability for Colorado kids to go to California. Wisconsin
4 kids to come here.

5 MR. BOWMAN: (indiscernible) and I'm only
6 speaking for (indiscernible) School District 38, and
7 (indiscernible) go to college. And I would say probably
8 at least a quarter to a third of those students go out of
9 state. (indiscernible) problem with a student going to
10 Duke, Harvard, (indiscernible) Stanford, Northwestern,
11 (indiscernible) where they have worried about assessment.
12 Of course, all of the assessment data (indiscernible) in
13 the transcript. The ACT does. If they take the SAT, it
14 does. Our kids do very well on those, and I don't
15 understand what you're saying (indiscernible) but we are
16 doing a lot with that, and that is a (indiscernible) for
17 us that really works for us in terms of our students
18 being able to go to (indiscernible) actually.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: First of all, I
20 applaud the panelists, because there is a little bit of
21 what I would call Colorado exceptionalism on that end of
22 the table, in terms of their commitment to their young
23 people going to post-secondary. But the truth of it is,
24 Colorado leads the nation in -- in the educational
25 attainment gap of it's largest majority, and it's largest



1 minority. We've ranked something like 43rd in the country
2 in -- in educational attainment of students of color. We
3 rank something like 36th in the nation in terms of our own
4 kids actually going and getting a college degree across
5 all -- all populations. So that exceptionalism exists in
6 your schools, but it clearly doesn't exist in the state
7 of Colorado.

8 MR. BOWMAN: And you think PARCC is going
9 to fix that?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I think at
11 least it helps to begin to set a standard in expectation
12 for all students about their -- what it needs to be --
13 takes to be successful.

14 MR. BOWMAN: Let me ask you a question:
15 (indiscernible) PARCC --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what I was
17 told is the estimate for it.

18 MR. BOWMAN: I'm not sure (indiscernible)
19 --

20 MS. NEAL: He's hiding.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where is it? Where's
22 Elliot.

23 MS. NEAL: Oh, he was there, maybe he
24 left.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He heard you were
2 going to call him a genius.

3 MR. BOWMAN: And he works for the Colorado
4 Department of Education. I think (indiscernible) in the
5 district, Dr. (indiscernible). We've got -- we've got
6 folks in this state who can (indiscernible) those things
7 to our standards, to our kids, regardless of whether they
8 are an exceptional school district, or a low performing
9 school district. I think we have the capability of doing
10 that on our own.

11 MS. WILL: Dr. Jordan, I'd like to say,
12 thank you for the compliment about Colorado
13 exceptionalism and I would like to take that a little
14 further. That yes, we're talking today on behalf of
15 Colorado, but I do believe that these principals are so
16 sterling, that they belong to our whole country. I
17 believe in American exceptionalism also. And the same
18 things that are true for America, or for Colorado, are
19 also true for our whole country.

20 (Applause)

21 MR. JORDAN: And -- and I --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Dr. Jordan.

23 MR. JORDAN: I -- I -- I -- I accept that
24 premise. I worry greatly that the data shows that
25 American exceptionalism is declining. The reality is,



1 our students don't compete on an international basis, and
2 keep falling farther and farther behind. And -- and I at
3 least would make the premise, whether we like it or not,
4 that they are falling farther and farther behind in --
5 against systems in which there is a national perspective
6 about what the outcomes ought to be for children in those
7 countries.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So at this juncture,
9 we're going to offer an option for you folks to ask
10 questions of this panel. This panel gets kind of the
11 final word, if you will, and then we actually -- since
12 we're the elected panel -- we get the final, final word.

13 MR. KING: Well, just one question that I
14 would like to ask of all of our kids, regardless of
15 whether they are minorities or whether they are not
16 minorities, are guaranteed the same opportunity; and that
17 is to graduate from high school without remediation and
18 take college level courses. And I think what we have
19 done, and especially to our minority kids, and Dr. Jordan
20 maybe you can respond to this: I don't think we've held
21 enough opportunity for them to have -- to see what they
22 can accomplish. And we -- the expectations with PARCC
23 don't really inspire them to try and go on to college,
24 because the system is not challenging them and
25 individualizing them enough, and we're becoming way too



1 much oriented on the -- how the system compares
2 nationally, as opposed to trying to life every individual
3 kid and every student. So I -- I would just be
4 interested in how you think we can get individual
5 students to be excited -- especially the minority
6 students -- in the system that we have with this?

7 MR. JORDAN: Thank you. You know, I don't
8 know of any test that the test itself is going to excite
9 kids about learning. And I will tell you from my own
10 experience at my university and what I'm hearing from all
11 of you say, to me, kids get excited because they have the
12 rights kinds of teachers and they have the right kinds of
13 support services in there. And -- and my concern about -
14 - about -- in general, about students of color and
15 certainly the students in my institution, is that they
16 have much less access to those services, and to those
17 quality teachers because of the funding levels of their
18 districts, or in my case, my kids don't have the access
19 to the levels of -- of support services, because we have
20 one half of the funding that every other institution has.

21 I think -- I think that's what excites
22 them. What happens in the classroom, the support
23 services they get, the kind of environment that is
24 created. The test is a measure of what comes out of
25 that. The test itself isn't going to create the



1 excitement.

2 MS. CORDOVA: And if I can just add on to
3 that. Certainly this is a perspective for my district
4 and I'm in no way trying to claim that this is a
5 perspective that everyone shares. With our work,
6 currently with the EPATs, the opportunities to look at
7 the online and testing environment, our early PARCC pilot
8 work, definitely there have been glitches with many of
9 the things that you've shared around the job updating and
10 our ability to implement on large scale, the set-up
11 conditions. Lots of those aspects have been challenging.
12 I will tell you they have been more challenging to the
13 adults than they have been to our students.

14 In fact, the reaction from our students
15 has been very positive to the online environment. Many
16 of our students find the opportunity to engage with
17 technology to be exciting, interactive -- the idea that
18 it's not simply replacing multiple online with radial
19 buttons, but actually the drag and drop. Kids are much
20 more engaged. We are seeing that that's the feedback
21 that we're getting from our early piloting, from our
22 students, in our district.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that -- oh, I'm
24 sorry.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, that's alright.



1 I was just going to throw in that the data does show for
2 -- for poor minority kids that under standard based
3 reforms, they've advanced one to two grade levels
4 further. So this -- and -- and moving forward, showing
5 that standard based reform does work for these kids, and
6 then setting even higher expectations and an assessment
7 aligned to those expectations, is only going to
8 accelerate that growth and help close the achievement
9 gap.

10 MR. BOWMAN: (indiscernible) I guess it's
11 not so much a question, as a comment. You -- you talked
12 about how the state legislatures have been bipartisan in
13 all of this, but (indiscernible) state representative
14 (indiscernible) School District 38 to see what the impact
15 of PARCC could be on our school district. I think that's
16 a disservice to the whole state if those state
17 legislatures have not gone out to see, or even tried to
18 take the test. (indiscernible) has come to our district
19 on (indiscernible) I appreciate that, because he's said,
20 tell me about PARCC, how does it affect you, what are the
21 advantages and what are the disadvantages? I don't see
22 the state legislatures doing that and (indiscernible) I
23 think we have adults making decisions that are going to
24 impact kids, and we really don't have a sense for what
25 that impact is going to look like.



1 MS. WILL: I have a question for you.

2 Okay, are any of you aware of Amanda Ripley's best
3 selling book about the smartest kids in the world?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)

5 MS. WILL: Okay, she's been on this tour,
6 public speaking around the nation, and most recently was
7 here in February in Denver. And she has a book titled
8 The Smartest Kids in the World. And she's been to the
9 country, she's interviewed kids who have been there and
10 been educated there, and the -- the outcome that she's
11 come up with is that the best performing countries have
12 two things in common: They have low tech classrooms and
13 they have much less testing. They can't believe what we
14 have here in America, if they are exchange students.
15 They just can't believe it. And I'm wondering -- and she
16 has this really well-documented -- she's a journalist by
17 trade, and so she's really dotted her "I" and crossed her
18 "T", and she was actually seeing this as an experiment.
19 She didn't really see what the outcomes were. But she
20 wanted to know, you know, education is a big deal in
21 America. What are they doing in these other countries?

22 So my question is; with that type of
23 research and that type of anecdotal information and hard
24 studies that she has done, it makes me wonder; how do we
25 justify such a burdensome system with this new series of



1 test, as a key to improving American education, and yet
2 we've never seen it demonstrated anywhere in the world.

3 MR. JORDAN: So first of all, I guess I
4 would say, I think there is a fair question about the
5 technology component, okay? But what I did not hear you
6 say, is you did not say that she said they didn't have a
7 national set of outcome standards.

8 MS. WILL: Well, we're --

9 MR. JORDAN: She did not say that. She
10 said that it may have been administered differently, and
11 it may not be as burdensome, but she didn't say that they
12 didn't have an expectation about a national set of
13 outcomes. And I think -- that's why I think it's so
14 important to be at the table. It may be that Colorado
15 feels vehemently about the question about how they are
16 moving to administer it. And I think that's a fair
17 question to talk about. But do you want to really walk
18 away from the question about what it is our students
19 ought to know not just in Colorado, but throughout the
20 whole country, since we -- since from this room alone, we
21 see how many people are going to come here?

22 MS. WILL: Well, you have just found the
23 answer that I think everybody in this room, wherever
24 we're sitting, we all have in common. We like standards.
25 That is not the controversial issue today. The -- the



1 issue today is the PARCC assessment that is a
2 computerized assessment for young kids. And so I agree
3 with you, Dr. Jordan, we need to know what we're teaching
4 and why we're teaching it for standards. And this is
5 what her outcome was. And if you haven't -- and if you
6 think the title sounds interesting, it's called The
7 Smartest Kids in the World, and the best performing
8 countries -- two things they have in common: Low tech
9 classrooms and significantly less testing than what we do
10 in America.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So we have about 90
12 seconds left if you'd like to ask another question. It
13 had better be a yes or no question. With that, we will
14 move to the panel, because I'm sure we have all sorts of
15 questions. I'd -- I'd like to limit it this. We are
16 already over on time and I don't know how the panelists
17 are doing on their time. We're -- we're pushing up
18 against the timeframe we've given you. Do we -- let me
19 as forbearance, are we okay to run another 30 minutes?
20 Are we okay? Okay. So let's try and limit. We're going
21 to go down the -- the Board here. One a piece.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just want a
23 protocol; I thought this whole thing was an hour and a
24 half? Is it two hours? I thought it was going to end at
25 3:00?



1 MS. NEAL: Do you want it to end right
2 now?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I -- I just
4 know I informed these three panelist --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what he just
6 asked. That's what he just asked.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He just asked, and we
8 said it was okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Guess I was hoping it
10 would end at 3:00.

11 (indiscernible - multiple speakers)

12 MS. NEAL: Questions, comments, whatever.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: If you folks have a
14 question -- let's just start with questions and we can
15 move to comments before -- you know, in the next section.
16 So if you have questions of the panelists -- I know I've
17 got dozens. I could spend a couple hours here. This is
18 very enriching to me. But I will let my colleagues go
19 first. Marcia?

20 MS. NEAL: Oh, I thought -- actually, I
21 don't have very many questions. I have some comments.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Hold your comments, if
23 you could.

24 MS. NEAL: If other people have questions,
25 let's get those out of the way first.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, do you have
2 questions?

3 MS. BERMAN: Well, I must have that
4 expectant look in my eye.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You do.

6 MS. NEAL: We always expect you to have a
7 question.

8 MS. BERMAN: I guess I would like to
9 address this to Suzannah Cordova, because she's kind of
10 on the ground and working in classrooms and in a very
11 large urban district. There were a number of statements
12 made particularly by, I think, Cindy, but also by Ted as
13 a superintendent pertaining to the implementation of
14 PARCC, screen time, a whole bunch of things. Can you
15 respond to any of that? I mean, you did comment on the
16 fact that the students seem to -- you are getting good
17 feedback from the students, and some of the issues are
18 more adult-oriented. But if you can comment on some of
19 these. The growth data? That this doesn't allow for
20 growth data?

21 MS. CORDOVA: Sure, yeah. And let me --
22 let me put a little bit of context that I think is
23 helpful. So in the Denver Public Schools, obviously we
24 have a very diverse demographic. We have students who
25 are going home, where every person in the house has a



1 mobile device and Wi-fi connectivity. And then we have
2 lots of kids who maybe the only kind of opportunity for
3 technology in the home is some sort of mobile telephone,
4 perhaps with data, but frequently not. And so it -- it
5 really does -- and children who go into home where there
6 is no technology whatsoever, and the only access they
7 have to technology will be in a public library or at
8 school.

9 So we have a very, very wide spectrum of
10 the kinds of experiences that our students come into our
11 schools with. We have been very fortunate to have
12 support from our voters in terms of providing us with
13 funding to purchase both ongoing software, as well as
14 hardware, to make sure that we can bridge that digital
15 divide. We actually have more concerns about lack of
16 access to quality experiences with technology for our
17 students, than too much screen time, in all transparency.
18 We recognize that there's no one -- any place in the
19 United States who is going to go into a workforce where
20 there is not some need for a technology.

21 A very good friend of mine is a mechanic
22 for the City of Westminster, working in the Fire
23 Department. Everything is computerized. All work on
24 fire trucks is through computers, through manuals,
25 through that kind of work. And so we feel like it's very



1 important. It's an obligation that we have in our
2 commitment to equity, to make sure that students have
3 opportunities both in their learning experiences, as well
4 as in these assessment experiences, to be able to have
5 hands-on time with technology.

6 I will tell you, our teachers -- I was on
7 a panel just a few weeks ago -- our teachers have a lot
8 of concerns around -- we have had this big investment.
9 It's not nearly enough. And in terms of thinking about
10 the amount of technology that's available both for
11 instructional purposes, as well as assessment purposes.
12 I think as a -- as a district, it's a place where we're
13 going to continue to invest, because we understand the
14 importance of that.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Did you have a follow-up?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Was there a follow-up,
18 Elaine? Didn't mean to cut you off. No? Okay, go
19 ahead, Deb.

20 MS. BERMAN: Yeah, you know, in terms of -
21 - I think there was also a question -- Bruce was just --
22 was bringing my ear around our ability to look at growth
23 data with PARCC. You know, one of the things I think is
24 incredibly commendable about our state, is -- is our
25 growth model. We have been very fortunate for example



1 when we changed from the CELA test to the ACCESS test;
2 two completely different tests, measuring similar things,
3 but not the exact same things. To be able to get a
4 growth measure. And so we're very, I think, hopeful,
5 that we will be able to see what growth looks like across
6 different assessments, because we understand that that's
7 such a critical component of what we need.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, now Dr. Scheffel?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. I wonder if
10 Keith and Suzannah could respond to this question -- and
11 anybody else. It seems like there's a premise out there
12 that common standards and common assessments are
13 necessary to even the playing field. That some of the
14 high-achieving districts and students may not need that,
15 but certainly the low-achieving students and districts
16 do. Can you speak to that assumption and how it plays
17 out in your experience? I know that's kind of an
18 underlying assumption that's rarely really addressed
19 head-on, and I wonder if you could speak to that both --
20 both panels.

21 MS. CORDOVA: We absolutely believe in the
22 value of common standards and common assessments. And
23 truthfully, it's because I think as a nation we have a
24 very poor track record of ensuring that our students of
25 color, our students from poor families, our students with



1 limited opportunities in their home life, have access to
2 high quality experiences and those same standards.

3 Part of the reason why we are so committed
4 to the idea of common assessments and this -- common
5 standards, and the assessments that are built around
6 those standards, is because it really is important that
7 we have valid information about how our students are
8 doing, and not students who are getting grades that look
9 like an "A" in one part of town, and an "A" in another
10 part of town, or a score in one state compared to a score
11 in another state. We believe it's very important. The
12 research is very clear that increasing standards for
13 students who are at-risk, is the right thing to do. That
14 -- that students rise to the expectations, and the idea
15 of having higher standards, through these standards, we
16 believe is very important.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you -- in your
18 experience you've seen that to work?

19 MS. CORDOVA: We absolutely have. And in
20 fact, when you look at the progress that we've been able
21 to make in the Denver Public Schools, it's very much
22 based on the idea that we are deeply committed to
23 understanding the standards, to creating learning
24 environments, and teaching opportunities for students to
25 meet those. Have -- have we solved everything?



1 Certainly not. And it's one part of it, along with -- as
2 we've said before -- innovation, making sure we've got
3 excellent leaders and teachers in our buildings.

4 I think another benefit with the Common
5 Core is it -- we just are in the process of doing reviews
6 of materials, mostly from publishers, many of them with
7 the stamp that says: "Aligned to the Common Core". And
8 what I would say is, like, buyer beware. And frankly, I
9 think that it actually will give us an opportunity to
10 have more teacher developed, both across the state and
11 across the nation, resources to meet the expectations of
12 the standards. I don't think that the publishers have
13 caught up to the expectations, quite frankly, and so I
14 don't see this turning into a national curriculum
15 movement, by any stretch.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Senator King?

17 MR. KING: I would just say, it depends on
18 whether you view the standards as aspirational, or
19 whether you view them as minimal. And I think the
20 reality is that human behavior, when given opportunities
21 to actualize potential, far exceed what is ever asked of
22 them. And I will give you a good example: I remember
23 when Jim Ryan ran a four minute mile, and we thought,
24 wow, what an accomplishment. That's the first time it's
25 every been. Today, it's -- it's nothing. The standard



1 is -- is so low, that everybody -- you don't go anywhere
2 with that standard today.

3 And I'm afraid what we have, even though
4 we have some schools that are struggling to meet those
5 standards, that that is not aspirational for so many
6 kids, that it might be benchmarking, but it puts us at a
7 level that we say, all kids are at this level and can
8 achieve. And I think what we -- what we sacrifice is
9 human excellence and human aspiration to do better than
10 what the standards are. And I know the idea of some
11 schools is to be a year or two ahead of the standards,
12 just to try and give the kids who can do better, an
13 opportunity to do much more than what they're doing. And
14 so I -- I worry that the -- for just preparing kids for
15 Dr. Jordan's college, a university now is -- is going to
16 be some -- some that we will help. But I think in
17 general, I think the aspirations are too low.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is this an appropriate time
19 to make a statement, or are we still questioning?

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let's run through
21 questions and then we'll come back to statements.

22 MR. HOYT: And if I could just add on to
23 that quickly. The reason, I think, PARCC is so critical
24 towards that equity issue is, what we saw under No Child
25 Left Behind, when we had this -- these states with 50



1 different standards, is that states magically started to
2 close the achievement gap and look like they were really
3 making great accomplishments for -- for those children.
4 And in fact, what was happening, is they were dumbing
5 down the test and they were weakening the assessment.
6 And it was later exposed that they had not made those
7 achievement gains, the test had just gotten easier.

8 That will not be possible under PARCC,
9 because the state will not have the flexibility to do
10 that, and we'll know. And so that's where that
11 comparability across multiple states will become very
12 valuable.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Questions down
14 this way? Angelika? No? Pam, go ahead.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Taking off of what you just
16 said. Mr. Hoyt. My concern is that it also takes away
17 our ability -- if we don't like PARCC, or if we find it
18 doesn't work, it's not adequate, we are so far away from
19 where the standards are being devised. Where what's
20 being (indiscernible) -- we want have any power to change
21 them. That's my greatest concern right now. Is that we
22 are too far removed. I know I'm talking to parents
23 daily, even school board members, who are outraged at
24 what they see coming into their schools as curriculum.
25 And who do they talk to? Who do they complain to? They



1 can't go to their school board and complain because PARCC
2 is too far away, too removed from them. What do you say
3 to that? What happens if we don't like what happens with
4 PARCC? How do we affect change?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I'll let other
6 panelists weight in. Again, PARCC is the assessment
7 tool. I think the -- the concern is to the standards.
8 Right? What if we don't like the standards? And my
9 understanding is that you have done some marvelous work
10 on -- on developing those standards, and all PARCC is
11 doing, is that's the tool that's going to align the
12 assessment to those very standards. So I think the
13 question is -- am I wrong -- that you're worried about
14 curriculum and the standard? What if these are not the
15 right standards that we're -- we're -- we're being held
16 to? And I'll let others weigh in on what they think
17 about that.

18 MS. MAZANEC: How about you, Mr. Bowman,
19 do you believe that standards drive -- drive curriculum?

20 MR. BOWMAN: Yes, I do, and I note the
21 fact that in the past we had the standards and teachers
22 and principals and schools that could address those
23 standards (indiscernible) depending on the clientele of
24 the student body. Typically what gets tested, gets
25 taught. I don't like that. And so that bothers me to



1 some degree. And I try to -- I try to encourage my
2 teachers, don't pay attention to the test, pay attention
3 to the standards and address the standards in your
4 creative and unique ways. (indiscernible) testing,
5 driving instructions, versus the other way around. And
6 so I don't if that answers your question, but that's kind
7 of how I feel about it.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Can I have a follow-up?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I just make one
10 more comment on that -- on that -- just from a higher
11 education perspective? Let me just give you an example,
12 within our curriculum in our departments, the faculty
13 create a set of learning outcomes for every course. It's
14 a standard set of learning outcomes, regardless of who's
15 teaching the course. That's the outcomes for those --
16 for that course.

17 But we will see faculty absolutely vary
18 how they go about doing it. So I've got some faculty who
19 will say: I'm going to teach it strictly with
20 (indiscernible) classrooms, and we're going to spend --
21 we're going to spend the time, you're going to take all
22 of this stuff home and it's going to be delivered by
23 technology, and you're going to learn that theory there,
24 and then we're going to spend time in the classroom doing
25 it this way. Talking about the issues.



1 Other faculty are much more on the lecture
2 vote. The issue is, did they come to the same outcome
3 with respect to the student when they were able to
4 demonstrate the outcome that was expected? And I think
5 that's a great way of looking at -- that there's a
6 standard, but you can deliver that, achieve that, a lot
7 of different ways. And I don't think you're limited in
8 your creativity about how you deliver that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Senator King?

10 MR. KING: I would -- I would just like to
11 agree with that. I think the -- the assessment can be
12 totally different than the outcome. And I will give you
13 a good example: It was legislation that Dr. Jordan
14 probably really likes, GT Pathways, which standardized
15 the 31 semester hours of college curriculum across the
16 state of Colorado. It has a common syllabus, it has a
17 common theme, but it has -- you can individualize your
18 assessments, you can do whatever you want to, to measure
19 the outcomes that you have and those are comparable and
20 they have proven to be extremely successful. I carried
21 that legislation in 2001 and it's worked out extremely
22 well. That is a framework of a standard, but it gives an
23 opportunity for tremendous amount of individualization
24 and opportunities at all the different institutions, to
25 accomplish what they want to accomplish.



1 MR. JORDAN: Well, where I would slightly
2 differ with you, is that there is -- there is a statewide
3 group that goes and looks and sees, that makes the
4 assessment about whether the courses are equivalent or
5 not.

6 MR. KING: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (indiscernible)

8 MR. KING: But they don't have a common
9 assessment.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane?

11 MS. GOFF: Yes, a couple of -- it could be
12 a yes or no answer. Across the range of you, the word
13 "pilot" was used, and the word "pilot" -- "P" words --
14 "pilot", "PARCC" -- I'm wondering if when -- Mr. Bowman,
15 when you talked about the pilot, if you could see the
16 pilot going on now, are you talking about literally a
17 pilot of the standards? Because we've had several
18 districts piloting the implementation through several
19 means. One of them has been our integration pilot. But
20 we also, right now, are wrapping up phase one of, at
21 least, practice tests for the PARCC segment of our state
22 assessment system. So we're talking only about math and
23 language arts practice tests. It's not a -- only because
24 we're using both words in really kind of two parallel
25 parts of our lives here. That -- and you can talk about



1 that.

2 And I -- I guess I would ask -- any
3 reference to the PARCC test and a claim here, and a claim
4 there, or a descriptor -- descriptive statement of
5 something -- and relationship. The PARCC test. It's
6 coming to me as though you are talking about the actual
7 exam, which is not out there yet. But could be referring
8 to sample items that are single -- single or a series of
9 single items that kids are (indiscernible). Because the
10 PARCC test itself, and what I really -- not to avoid any
11 use of the word, but it is really our state assessment
12 system, our exams, in math and language arts. Is what -
13 -what we're talking about here. It's not for another
14 year. Another -- and then a statement, and then I'll let
15 them respond to that.

16 When we talk about what's going on in
17 other states and results from such -- and we've all heard
18 -- kept up on the current events and the current public -
19 - public activity around all of these things -- New York,
20 Kentucky, Tennessee; Utah was mentioned. Recently,
21 Kansas. I -- those folks -- none of those states have
22 given PARCC tests. Those are states that -- that chose
23 to -- they may or may not be members of either consortia,
24 but they have decided that they would develop their own
25 state exams in those two content areas for -- not to use



1 the consortia's exams, they are developing their own. In
2 all but one, there have been reports of glitches mostly
3 related to technology. There have been reports of delays
4 being necessary in order to analyze, to -- to take the
5 time and have the expertise and the tools you need just
6 to use the tools.

7 So it's -- I think we all would do
8 ourselves a favor, if we really help each other
9 understand that when the other states are talking about
10 "the test", it's not the consortia developed test. The
11 pilot or practice test part of our lives right now is
12 what is going to -- and there is big feedback available,
13 coming in, from all of the states. Fifteen million
14 students have been involved in this practice session.
15 But there is good feedback coming in about the -- the
16 technology and the glitches and the -- literally how the
17 questions appear on the screen, and -- and what kids have
18 suggested. All grade levels have been given a chance to
19 have live interviews with folks after the test session is
20 over. So they -- the kids are giving great feedback
21 about the physical part, the physical qualities of the
22 test, the on-screen appearance, the arrangement, the --
23 how it works for them, and if it does work.

24 So I'm just saying, I -- those are -- that
25 would be -- what I feel would be helpful to me, and with



1 everybody, if we were square on what exactly we're
2 talking about when we use certain terms in a context.
3 And I -- Senator King, I cannot disagree with you on
4 everything you said around opening up the opportunity for
5 -- if we're talking true standards-based education, we're
6 talking about the ability to move when ready, to step
7 back when necessary, to adjust the whole methodology and
8 the approach to what kids learn.

9 I spend quite a bit of time with the GT
10 parent community and students, but as long as I've been
11 involved with them, it's been -- that's been a plea. And
12 I -- I find it to be a very valid point. I think it's
13 something that we all need to be reminded of all the
14 time. That one of the -- one of the really beauties of
15 standards-based learning, if it's being applied as it --
16 for that purpose -- is to allow movement without as many
17 -- with as few restrictions and limitation as possible.
18 It's our whole thing around competency versus
19 (indiscernible) time. And (indiscernible) and being able
20 to show that.

21 So I'm -- I think through our studies and
22 our continued research and I'm looking at how things
23 work, and it develops, I believe we have to give a lot of
24 consideration to how can we use whatever system we have
25 to be able to open the doors for those kinds of things.



1 And -- and -- and interventions as well to make it as
2 flexible as possible.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What was your
4 question?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Restate the question.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, you know, I don't
8 --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The subject
10 (indiscernible) --

11 MS. GOFF: Thank you for listening, and
12 that is my --

13 (indiscernible - multiple speakers)

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She snuck a statement
15 in earlier. Angelika, question?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, actually, that was
17 helpful, because you just laid the groundwork for my
18 question.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There we go, that was
20 context for this question.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So that was context.
22 Which is -- I believe you had the benefit of an
23 assessment conversation that we had here either last
24 month or the month before about the fact that our
25 assessments don't work in a standards-based kind of a



1 system. You see that for your students. Adams 50 is a
2 standards-based -- completely standards-based system.

3 So my question to you is: Are you
4 thinking that we should be having end of course
5 assessments at the high school level? What are the kinds
6 of ways to do this differently? I think we've talked
7 before a lot about the fact that, first of all, maybe the
8 balance is off. But also the structure, especially when
9 we get to the high school level, perhaps needs to be
10 looked at in order to make it meet -- in order to get the
11 information, but also to make it very, very meaningful
12 and timely. I think that's what I heard you say.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. And I think
14 the last year I was in the legislature, I tried to get
15 the ACCUPLACER test to be something that we make
16 available. I hope it's still ongoing across every school
17 district in the state of Colorado, because that actually
18 is an assessment that gives kids -- we should -- they
19 should be taking that if they're not -- once they get
20 into ninth grade, they should be saying: What do I need
21 to work on to be ready to go on to college and be
22 successful at college? They need to take that every year
23 until they are college ready and can demonstrate that
24 they have the abilities to do that. It's a benchmarking
25 to help them understand what is necessary for some



1 success at the college level.

2 I think if we can do those types of
3 things, if they can buy into the ACT test and see that it
4 makes a difference when they go to -- onto college, to
5 get a good grade on that, they -- they will put meaning
6 into it. But the problem with PARCC that's going to be -
7 - the way we're adding PARCC at the high school level,
8 where we're going to be sorely disappointed with the
9 amount of effort that these kids put into this test.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Right, but -- but I don't
11 think we're on the same page here.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I thought I heard you say
14 that your kids just kind of go ahead. The ACCUPLACER is
15 kind of a different thing, and it's not a Colorado-based
16 -- Colorado standards-based assessment. I'm talking
17 about, how do we ensure that we're assessing kids in the
18 various subject areas when they have learned the material
19 in that area?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, what we do is -
21 -

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And then move on to
23 advanced calculus or something like that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we build a
25 framework that we build for as in English and math, to go



1 onto college. And we really concentrate on that. And
2 then as they test into the ability to do college work, we
3 put them into college courses.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So you have separate
5 assessments for courses?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we have the
7 separate -- we use the ACCUPLACER to assess them
8 immediately when they come into the school.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. But as they
10 progress throughout --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are taking the -
12 - they are taking the college-level assessments, because
13 they are taking college-level courses.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Do you see those as
15 being a substitute for -- or -- we talk about flexibility
16 in assessments, do you see those as being appropriate
17 accountability assessments instead of 11th grade --

18 (indiscernible -- multiple speakers)

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I think what
20 we're trying to -- well, our goal with high school is to
21 prepare them for college so that they can be successful
22 in college. And if we have them being successful in
23 college, I think they are demonstrating that they have
24 the ability to do college-level work, and they can be
25 successful in doing that work. And so they really are



1 making that transition from being a high school student
2 to a college student and doing their college-level
3 curriculum and the work that's necessary to be successful
4 in college. So that's what we're trying to accomplish
5 and achieve, and the kids can do it if they are given an
6 opportunity.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So final question. And
8 the way it's timing out, we're probably going to move not
9 through follow-up questions, but to a conversation among
10 the Board, and -- and tie it off with that. So point of
11 personal privilege. I am never disappointed when people
12 of good will step into a room to talk about how we can
13 improve education and what we need to be doing for the
14 students of Colorado. I'm so grateful that you all took
15 the time to be here. This has been a very interesting
16 and helpful conversation.

17 Because I don't have time to get into the
18 53 questions I have here with details, I'm going to come
19 back to a very high level conversation about principle.
20 And Dr. Jordan, you raised it, and this conversation
21 about responsibility to the country -- is essentially the
22 way you characterized it. Justice Louis Brandice (ph)
23 said that he -- I forgot the exact quote, but I'm going
24 to say he loved the fact that we had 50 laboratories for
25 democracy around this country.



1 And I think to some extent -- and this is
2 not a conversation -- I don't want to speak about
3 standards. I want to speak -- I'm speaking specifically
4 to assessments here. This conversation of 50
5 laboratories not only for democracy, but for education.
6 You seek to improve the situation for all students across
7 the country by virtue of driving into consensus in a room
8 around a collective conversation. I would argue, the
9 best way to get where we truly, both of us --

10 MS. NEAL: Another question?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It is a question. It
12 would be to --

13 MS. NEAL: You would argue?

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Would be -- yeah,
15 exactly. It would -- to be -- to lead by example. To
16 say, you know what? We're going to take and build
17 something that is -- in fact, others will be drawn to, as
18 opposed to everyone is forced -- forced into. The
19 question is: Why would you choose to lead by consensus,
20 as opposed to lead by example? In your original
21 statement?

22 MS. NEAL: I'm waiting for this answer.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I -- you know,
24 I mean, it's -- it's just the age-old question about how
25 a country moves itself forward, right? I mean, it's --



1 it's -- and people can have reasonable differences of
2 opinion. I -- I think it is -- for me, it's because this
3 to me is the number one national priority. If our
4 country is going to compete successfully, we have to
5 change what we're doing. And -- and I think that what --
6 what you're proposing is what in the literature of public
7 policy is called, "successive limited comparisons". That
8 you put together a whole series of opportunities and you
9 compare them, and then you make some change relative to
10 that.

11 And what I'm proposing is this -- what
12 they would call the rational comprehensive model. That -
13 - that a group of people get together and -- and create
14 what they think is the most rationale system, and -- and
15 in a wholesale way, try to -- to move that forward in
16 order to get the maximum gain, as quickly as you possibly
17 can. I think what you propose has on the short term,
18 less risk about disruption because it does have -- again,
19 it's limited to -- the disruption is limited to those who
20 choose to go out there.

21 I think what I propose has the greatest
22 opportunity for significant gain in a short period of
23 time. The question I think that we're facing is: How
24 much time do we really have in order to solve this
25 problem? Given that at least how quickly we see the



1 world not only catching up, but surpassing us in
2 educational attainment. I think that's really the -- the
3 crux of the argument that -- or the debate that we're
4 having here today. And I would sort of put them in those
5 two models.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough. Very
7 responsive answer, thank you for that. So with that,
8 we'll tie off questions, and I will open the floor to
9 comments from the Board Members.

10 MS. NEAL: Thank you, I have been waiting
11 very patiently.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Patiently, thank you.

13 MS. NEAL: There is a reason that I sit in
14 the middle of this group. I chose it purposely. To the
15 three of you: Dr. Jordan and Mr. Hoyt, and I greatly
16 admire Colorado Succeeds, they are one of my favorite
17 groups. I agreed with everything you said, but I -- I
18 kept thinking, but why does this have to be PARCC?
19 You're talking about measurement. You know, I agree with
20 all of those things, but I'm going -- you know, but you
21 never gave us a good reason why PARCC would be the one to
22 do that.

23 And -- and to you three people, I -- I
24 totally agree that probably -- and I know your schools do
25 very well, but I'm sorry, Ted, I don't buy "leave us



1 alone" because we have left so many schools alone and
2 gotten very bad results. And -- and of course Keith, you
3 were responsibility for the accountability legislation
4 193, so we have to hold our -- we have to hold kids
5 accountable. I'm a -- I'm a retired teacher, and I came
6 out of a high school that had a lot of wonderful, great
7 kids, and a lot of those who were perfectly happy to
8 graduate with a D. You know, that's all they were
9 looking for. I got a grade point.

10 So that is my big question is -- is why
11 does it have to be PARCC? And I did, as I mentioned to a
12 couple of you -- I spent quite a bit of time last week
13 talk to Utah, who has -- who is in the process of
14 designing their own assessment. They have -- and of
15 course, she's not -- you know, they are probably not
16 going to go, "This isn't working well," they are trying
17 to tell you the things that are working well. But they
18 have at the present time three 90 minute tests, and they
19 have with -- plus two writing prompts, one long and one
20 short -- at a cost, she tells me, of \$19.50 per student.
21 And computer adaptive assessment. So it adapts to the
22 students.

23 So that -- that's sort of where I am, is I
24 -- I'm -- I'm just -- you know, PARCC is so big, and so
25 huge, and so -- do we really need something that big? I



1 understand what you say about measuring against other
2 states, but then all of them are not, you know, we've got
3 this. We got Utah, and we have people who are doing
4 Smarter Balance. So -- and I'm sure many others will do
5 their own thing. So I -- it's -- it's impossible really
6 to say, well, Colorado is here and so -- you know.

7 I -- I -- I'm very much in favor in
8 assessing our students, and I -- and for growth, and we
9 need to know that. I'm just not at all convinced that it
10 has to be PARCC. I think it could be something else that
11 would be our own, that hopefully would be a little less
12 expensive. And you know, Utah did the same thing, and
13 they've -- they've been in this process for several
14 years, so it wasn't like they said, "Oh, throw that one
15 out and get a new one." They took what they already had
16 and they -- they wrote the assessment, they hired a
17 company to do all of the other stuff, and they -- they
18 took the -- when did they withdraw? They withdrew in --?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Utah? '12.

20 MS. NEAL: '12? So they -- you know, they
21 -- they withdrew from PARCC for political reasons.

22 (indiscernible - multiple speakers)

23 MS. NEAL: Smarter Balance. And it's just
24 been two years and -- and I mean, I'm not saying they're
25 perfect, because you know, everybody kind of pitches



1 that. But it surely sounded like a good process to me.
2 Thank you. Thank you for coming, and doing -- this has
3 been a great conversation, I really appreciate it.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think I may have made
5 an administrative mistake. It's probably appropriate for
6 us to consider -- because we've got two agenda items
7 here. To consider the panel session concluded. I would
8 ask if you're willing to stay, we won't be talking for
9 more than four or five hours, I promise. Feel free to
10 stay, but the -- the panel discussion portion of our
11 agenda, as published for today, is concluded. And we're
12 actually moving to a Board action item. So with that, I
13 would reopen the floor for -- for comments.

14 MS. NEAL: I thought you did ask for
15 comments.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I did, but I didn't
17 make it clear that I had moved to another agenda item, so
18 --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You may go if you need
21 to go, please.

22 MS. NEAL: Thank you very much.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for the
24 opportunity, we really appreciate it.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.



1 (Indiscernible - multiple speakers)

2 (Applause)

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So -- other comments?
4 Angelika?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I'll try some, but I'm not
6 sure I'll finish the first time around. Why PARCC should
7 be the assessment is one. I think the question that
8 Marcia raises. I've got four pages of names of Colorado
9 people who have participated in the development of PARCC.
10 I think this is -- I admit that when I voted to develop
11 our own four years ago, that was one of my concerns.
12 That we would not have a voice.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Two years ago.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Two years ago? That we
15 would not have a voice --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It was '12. Go ahead.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: -- in the development, and
18 of course, I was wrong. Completely wrong. We have
19 teachers from Mesa School District, from Mesa University,
20 Fort Lewis College. Nobody from Lewis Palmer, I'll
21 admit, in looking at the list. But we've had tremendous
22 participation. I'm very uncomfortable saying this was a
23 worthless effort for those people. I do believe -- and
24 particularly based on some of the questions that I've
25 been shown, that this really is -- has had a lot of



1 Colorado input.

2 The example that I have is that what's
3 unique to Colorado math standards, is that we
4 incorporated the personal finance. That's a -- that was
5 a portion that -- that was a piece that was our own --
6 there were our own. And by golly, if there aren't
7 personal finance questions in the math section of PARCC.
8 So I believe we've been heard, and there's been a certain
9 amount of tailoring. And in fact, we have permission --
10 if we find that there are pieces of our standards that
11 are not being covered, we have permission to ultimately
12 add those as we go forward.

13 Another problem that's been discussed --
14 we heard it here today -- and it is a huge problem, and
15 that is the adequacy of technology in our schools. But
16 you know what? That's just a bleeping crime that we have
17 inadequate technology. I think this board should be
18 taking a leadership in that issue, because our kids, when
19 they leave school, most of them are using technology. We
20 have the tail wagging the dog right now by saying that we
21 need better technology in order to do the assessments,
22 when the reality is our kids should be spending some of
23 their time learning, being connected to kids in other --
24 to opportunities in other states, in other countries,
25 etc. We've done a very poor job of the broadband, and



1 with the resources for the technology.

2 This is where we should be leaders in
3 pushing the legislature, if they have one time money, for
4 example, clearly identifying what kind of technology is
5 really good, how much time really is appropriate? To
6 suggest that our kids should be taking paper and pencil
7 tests, I've got to ask myself -- do I have a pencil in my
8 purse that I carry around with me? I don't even have a
9 pencil in my desk anymore. No one in the business
10 community uses a pencil. We're talking about preparing
11 our kids for the 21st century, with 19th century tools.
12 And that's just criminal.

13 MS. NEAL: But who is asking us to take
14 paper and pencil --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Lots of people are asking
16 us to take pencil and paper tests, and we're actually
17 talking about it because we don't have the technology.
18 It's just a huge problem and I will acknowledge it. Never
19 the less, it isn't a reason to get out of PARCC. In
20 fact, if we had developed our own assessments, they were
21 also going to be online assessments. So that's not a
22 problem that's solved at all, in other way.

23 Data privacy has been a real concern that
24 I've heard from a lot of folks, and I think it should be.
25 We have -- not "we" -- the Board Members of PARCC have a



1 written agreement that PARCC will not own any student
2 data. That the testing data, the student information,
3 will all be held in Colorado and it will not be shared.
4 I want you to know that that's completely different than
5 the ACT. The ACT, ASPIRE, all of those folks do college
6 data on our kids when they use -- when they take the
7 assessments. They keep that data and they are free to do
8 with it whatever they wish. So this is actually a more
9 private data -- testing system -- then what we are doing
10 for our kids today.

11 I am in total agreement that we have a
12 problem with too much testing, the wrong structure of
13 testing. We've talked about this. We need to get
14 smarter about how much we assess. We need to try to keep
15 it closer to the classroom. Again, technology is a huge
16 piece of this. We're undermining our desire to have a
17 standards-based system where kids can move at their own
18 rate, by not -- by developing the kinds of assessments we
19 have. I recognize that. That's not a reason to leave
20 PARCC, it's a reason to help, to work with other states.
21 To change PARCC. To change our overall assessment
22 system. To figure out what accountability do we really
23 need? Haven't we gone overboard? How can we pull that
24 back? It's a challenge; I recognize that.

25 But I want to point out one piece of PARCC



1 that I find very compelling. For the last umpteen years,
2 I've heard teachers say the kinds of assessments that we
3 should be giving our students are performance
4 assessments. That's how we know if they've really
5 learned it. It's not about the bubble. It's about
6 demonstrating what you know and are able to do. PARCC
7 actually has performance assessments. This is what
8 everybody's been asking for all these years. And it's
9 kind of strange that we should suddenly be talking about
10 no longer having that, or dismissing that. And they are
11 very difficult to develop and they are pretty expensive
12 as well.

13 Some people worry incorrectly the private
14 money has been a part of the development. I believe Paul
15 had that in his monologue last time. There's been no
16 private money in the development of PARCC. It's a
17 federal grant. And I know that bothers people, but I've
18 got to tell you, next week, I'm sending a bunch of money
19 to the IRS, to the feds, and I don't feel bad if for the
20 greater good some of that money serves Colorado's
21 teachers and kids. This is public money. It's not about
22 some federal odd thing; this is public money that I
23 really think should go to the benefit and betterment for
24 our kids.

25 I think it's already been pointed out; I



1 really appreciated the entire panel. This side was the
2 tough implement -- implementation, the real and hard
3 challenges. This was the vision over here. And I know
4 that some of that is pretty hard, but one of the things
5 that Dr. Jordan pointed out, that we simply don't have
6 time or resources to be developing new assessments next
7 year. Which is why this really doesn't make a whole lot
8 of sense.

9 I have to say, I have been watching this
10 weird commercial, since I watch TV again now that
11 ballgames are on. There is a commercial, a car
12 commercial, where everybody goes backwards. Right?
13 Everybody runs backwards, the cars drive backwards. You
14 know what I'm talking about, because you're watching the
15 games. That's what this feels like. We're going
16 backwards. Some of us started in 2009 -- 2009/2010 we
17 did a ton of things -- 163, 191, content (indiscernible),
18 everything. Since 2011, there's been this push to go
19 back and to go back. And maybe that's how progress
20 happens, but it's really, really hard.

21 What I learned this month, after Paul's
22 presentation, is that our districts are really, really
23 upset with us. They are thankful for the work that
24 happens at CDE, but they are really ticked off that we
25 are not just moving forward. That they have been working



1 like crazy. I've had superintendents actually bring me
2 in -- they've been working like crazy to implement the
3 new assessments -- I mean, to implement the new
4 standards, to prepare for the assessments. Now they want
5 to know, Angelika, what are doing? What is going to be
6 there? That's my final comment.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Comments from this
8 side? Elaine, you want to go next?

9 MS. BERMAN: No, let's mix it up.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mix it up?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel? Yeah, go
12 ahead?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: You know, I really
14 appreciated the discussion; I thought the panelists were
15 very helpful in helping us think through the various
16 facets of this issue, and I know the Board has some good
17 robust discussion as well. And I guess from my
18 perspective, I would just say as a long time educator,
19 and a person that's been involved in education from the
20 macro level to the macro level to the micro level in the
21 classrooms, but when we have a federally funded entity
22 like PARCC or Smarter Balanced or any other entity,
23 writing items that define language and standards, we just
24 legitimize a tremendous federal influence over what
25 students are taught, and how learning is assessed.



1 And based both on research and experience
2 in public education classrooms, I think that's the wrong
3 approach to influencing increases in student achievement
4 for all students in Colorado, as for the nation as a
5 whole. So I just think that we all are interested in
6 raising student achievement, we are all interested in
7 closing achievement gaps; question, is this the right
8 approach to doing that? And I think when we look at
9 experience and research, I don't think it is.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

11 MS. BERMAN: Well, I will reiterate that I
12 thought all six panelists were excellent, so I thought
13 this was a very good way to hear a number of different
14 perspectives. I also agreed with Angelika's description
15 of the side of the room focused on implementation, this
16 looked more at the bigger picture.

17 And I'm -- I'm really thinking about where
18 we agree and where we don't agree, and I think -- I think
19 where we don't agree the most is this notion of -- that
20 Colorado should develop its own assessments, that we're
21 closer to the schools, and that we know best. That's
22 what I heard from you, Paul, and I heard from Marcia, and
23 I think I heard from Deb. Is that correct, Deb? And
24 I'll assume you feel the same way?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a piece of the



1 argument.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Personally, I
3 wouldn't mind if we did -- did the Iowa basics.

4 (indiscernible -- multiple speakers)

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, some -- some
6 national assessment is fine with me.

7 MS. BERMAN: And I guess I better keep
8 going, I better keep going. And I guess I'm really,
9 really struggling with that and I'm struggling with it
10 not because I in any way agree, because I don't. Because
11 it's like, how can we be so arrogant to think that we
12 have the best minds in Colorado and there are no good
13 minds outside of Colorado that can help develop a really
14 strong assessment?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a false
16 premise.

17 MS. BERMAN: well --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not arrogance.

19 MS. BERMAN: What is it?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not that we
21 don't appreciate what other states might have to offer,
22 it's just that we don't want to hand over all of the
23 control to the feds.

24 (indiscernible - multiple speakers)

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No demonstrations



1 please. Please. Please, don't.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is not your part
3 of the meeting, this is our part of the meeting.

4 MS. NEAL: This is not "who claps the
5 most".

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, so -- so, this
7 is great.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't hit me.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I love you, you
10 sit next to me.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You get a little
12 (indiscernible).

13 MS. BERMAN: No, I want to point out that
14 we are not giving up control. That our commissioner who
15 all seven of us I believe highly respect. We -- at least
16 we keep renewing his contracts, so I will assume we keep
17 -- we highly respect him.

18 MR. HAMMOND: I didn't know I had a
19 contract.

20 MS. BERMAN: Well, you're still here from
21 year to year. The commissioner is a member of the
22 Executive Committee. I don't think he is a pushover. I
23 have tried several times unsuccessfully. So I think he
24 is a strong voice at the table. So I in no way truly
25 believe that we have given up our control or a seat at



1 the table.

2 We've heard a number of times that there
3 have been 50 different -- at least 50 different educators
4 from Colorado that have participated in the development
5 of PARCC. So on that notion, I -- I -- just plain
6 disagree. And I have spoken many times in the past that
7 I truly believe that we need to be looking at the whole
8 United States, and not be so parochial just to think
9 about Colorado. And I don't want to say anything bad
10 about the past, but I'm going to, because I can't make my
11 case without doing it. Colorado was not known in the
12 past for having the strongest standards, and we developed
13 our test, our CSAPs and TCAPs to measure against those
14 standards, which the Fordham Institute always rated
15 pretty average. There were always states that had higher
16 -- that had more rigorous standards than ours -- like
17 Massachusetts.

18 So I have no reason to believe, with all
19 the brilliant people we have here, that we're going to do
20 a better job now than we did in the past. And that is no
21 diss to the members of the -- of the Department of
22 Education, or the teachers; the educators of Colorado. I
23 think all tides rise when you put heads together and you
24 are able to work together. So that's one point.

25 We've talked a lot, and I heard this from



1 the former superintendent, and I think he made some
2 really good points, and I'm really sorry he's not here to
3 --

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: See his accolades.

5 MS. BERMAN: Well, to hear my thoughts on
6 this. We do have too -- we have too much testing and
7 there is a burden of testing we have in the state of
8 Colorado. And I know there is a bill before the
9 legislature to form a task force to look at it. I think
10 as leaders of public education in this state, Mr. Chair,
11 if you were to agree, I think we should ask the
12 Commissioner to come back to us in the next month or two,
13 take the (indiscernible) information. You've got great
14 staff, you heard from -- from Mr. Bowman, you've got
15 Elliot Asp, you know, we've got Jill. We've got a lot of
16 great people. Could you please come back to us and make
17 some recommendations about how we can decrease the burden
18 of testing and perhaps even decrease the amount of
19 testing? I think PARCC is getting the blame for a lot of
20 that, which is completely outside of our control, because
21 all of the testing that we're doing now is required by
22 state statute. It's by the READ Act. It's by -- it's by
23 -- it's by the Accountability Act. It's by -- it's by --
24 all of those. It's not coming from the State Board of
25 Education. There's not one test that is coming from the



1 State Board of Education.

2 So even though we will not be able to
3 unilaterally make those decisions, if it's okay with you,
4 I'd like the commissioner to come back and make some
5 specific recommendations. Can you respond to that,
6 before I finish my comments?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely. The
8 testing burden is one of the problems. We are losing a
9 greater control, or we're losing control over an entire
10 aspect of upcoming testing burden as we -- as we accede
11 to PARCC. So I -- I don't think -- I would completely
12 agree with that, yes, we should do that. But it's a
13 separate issue in terms of PARCC in my mind.

14 MS. BERMAN: I agree it's a separate -- I
15 agree it's a separate issue, however I think sometimes
16 other people meld them together. Okay, that's -- so --
17 so -- there you got that one.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, you have a
19 friendly voice -- or a friendly ear on that.

20 MS. BERMAN: The last point -- or the last
21 point I have to make, which is less important, but I need
22 to get it on the record and Cindy is gone. And it was
23 something that Cindy said.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Cindy is right here.

25 Front row.



1 MS. BERMAN: Oh good. Thank you. I'm
2 only looking this far. I have to say that she -- please
3 don't respond, I'm just going to make a comment -- you
4 did refer to the American Academy of Pediatrics, which
5 always gets me alive, because my husband is a
6 pediatrician and is a former president of the American
7 Academy of Pediatrics. So I know all of their policies,
8 and it's a very highly respected group, and I concur with
9 their policy about screen time. I will also say that it
10 is the role of the parent to make sure that their
11 student, their child, is not spending too much time in
12 front of a computer. And that -- so that's one piece.

13 And on the other side of that -- and
14 Angelika talked about this as well -- we need to be
15 graduating students that are -- are computer literate. I
16 know that my sons do everything on the computer. They
17 look up research projects, they read law journals, they -
18 - they -- every single thing they do is on the computer.
19 And we would be failing our students if they were not
20 completely computer literate and were not able to take
21 tests on the computer. So -- the end.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough. Jane?
23 And Pam and then I guess I'll wrap this up. We're
24 getting close.

25 MS. GOFF: Well, I said a lot of it



1 earlier, so thank you for indulging me then. A few
2 things now. I think I -- if Dr. Jordan were here, I
3 would probably ask him to elaborate a little bit on his
4 views around the connection between whatever state
5 assessment we have and the fact that -- and the -- and
6 student's outlook on it. Especially high school students
7 who by all justification over the last several years have
8 been able to say, what good is this doing me? Why should
9 I be looking at my -- my senior year springtime -- or my
10 junior year. Lots of other things to do. And I'm
11 sitting in a two or three hour multiple session for no
12 reason. You can't blame them for -- for being a little
13 teenager-y during those times.

14 But I -- I do think that along with these
15 really important discussions and conversations and
16 decisions, there are some other things that are happening
17 concurrently, and I -- I mean no pun when I use that
18 word, but the idea of concurrent activity that is a
19 supplement and support to other activities. There is --
20 coming up -- it's -- it's public now, but it's not ready
21 to go into full effect for a while, so it's not on our
22 top radar. Pretty significant major changes in our
23 remediation policies, higher ed remediation, post-
24 secondary, and in the admissions process. And all of
25 that is -- is work that is part of the overall alignment



1 of the 20 or early childhood through post-secondary
2 graduate level.

3 And I know for me as a former teacher in -
4 - in high school, that went through the -- the original
5 period when we were saying: What in the heck is higher
6 ed doing? Why is it so hard to communicate? To
7 understand what it is they are looking for in helping
8 high school students transition with some -- and the
9 university, or wherever they went, some appreciation for
10 what they knew how to do. There was no connect. So when
11 this all transpired and came into our auto life, I was
12 very happy, and I know a lot of my colleagues were. The
13 remediation changes will actually be factors in making
14 individualized customized to student situation and
15 experience and background, credit that will allow them to
16 be place in appropriate ways that will not only catch
17 them up -- whatever that may mean -- but also allow them
18 to take things at the same time. Still keep moving
19 ahead. It's a money saver, it's a spirit saver, it's a
20 lot of -- there's a lot of advantages to that.

21 Admissions policies, tied in with what is
22 going to become our new graduation guidelines, which also
23 includes some great work by this board with -- in
24 cooperation and conversation with the Higher Ed
25 Commission, where we have -- we now -- Colorado now has



1 what's called an endorsed diploma, which allows for
2 various other activities in other content -- in content
3 areas -- in addition to the fact that the list of
4 assessments or placement exams, college ready exams, is
5 going to be expanded. This past season, PARCC and
6 Smarter Balanced specifically were added to the list of
7 considerations for admission. So when -- when I get a
8 chance to tell parents this -- and students -- that this
9 is all going to be included now, there will be -- it will
10 be more of a point obvious to you and your family about
11 the importance of this test. Or others that you choose,
12 or that your district is -- is using.

13 So I -- I see no reason to stop PARCC,
14 because I'm -- I'm of the mind too that this is not the
15 real -- this is not the crux of our problem. We are
16 working hard, thanks to many of you who have spent lots
17 of really great time talking with us and coming here and
18 giving comments. We've learned a lot, I think we're
19 going to be able to do a lot of things more -- in a more
20 refined manner, for better advantage to kids, because of
21 our conversations. I do think our administration of it,
22 our implementation, the mechanics, the logistics, is
23 something we have to figure out. We've got to do
24 something about it.

25 The content of these exams -- we've got



1 people that have worked on this for years. In fact, I've
2 got the list Angelika has; I don't have it with me. It's
3 four pages long of Colorado classroom teachers higher ed
4 individuals. Our experts here at the Department, in the
5 institutions, folks on the ground who do live Colorado
6 education. Who have been working on this -- they've also
7 done bias checks and trained. So we do have control over
8 the future of our state test, which is what PARCC is. It
9 is our state test. And we are -- we're looking at it
10 that way.

11 If you -- I -- I -- if we all -- I think
12 if we let our study proceed, we really talk to schools
13 after the practice test periods are complete -- actually
14 I -- I intend to talk to kids, students, and I know
15 that's part of the feedback for PARCC as well. And we --
16 we proceed. We don't have the time, we don't have the
17 money to do all the processes that are involved in
18 creating our own test. It takes a lot longer than a
19 year. We can look at that after -- after we have given
20 the great work going on now a chance to -- to get to a
21 point where it's fair, to really stop and look at it
22 again. So -- thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, Jane. Pam?

24 MS. MAZANEC: I think I speak for many
25 parents and taxpayers in my district when I say that I



1 agree with George Will, I think that the Federal
2 Government is not supposed to be involved in our
3 education systems in the states, and I think this is the
4 -- as George Will said, the thin edge of a giant wedge.
5 There may be parts of this that are good. I am opposed
6 to this, because it opens the door to more federal
7 intrusion and I don't think that's a good thing.

8 MS. NEAL: Can I say, Pam and I -- we had
9 some rather long statements -- could I had something on
10 here?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Brief statement.

12 MS. NEAL: Just a couple of comments from,
13 you know, the earlier -- I know, Angelika, that some --
14 some districts are not happy with us, but I also know
15 that some districts are expressing big concerns about
16 doing this. We've gotten the email of how many hours,
17 how many -- how much time -- they are going to have to
18 close their labs and there are a lot of districts out
19 there that are really hesitating going -- do we really
20 want to do this? So I think we need to remember that.

21 And then -- and -- and -- Pam, you know,
22 we know that we are a political board. And that some
23 people have more faith in Federal Government and they are
24 in -- then some others do. I was -- I particularly think
25 back when you -- special ed. Special ed was in 1973, and



1 the Federal Government promised to pay 40 percent of the
2 cost if we would -- you know, special ed is a good thing,
3 but they are going to pay 40 percent of the cost, they
4 have never paid 40 percent. At the present time -- I --
5 and I had -- I checked this this year -- at the present
6 time they are paying 10 percent. So the national
7 committee, the -- you know, the education, they came up
8 with this proposal that they should give them more money.
9 And I'm thinking, no, you should say we're going to do 30
10 percent less because you're not paying your bill.

11 And -- and that's -- you -- you go into
12 something like this and I -- I totally agree, I mean, I -
13 - I am all for assessment, and I think we have to assess
14 our kids, we have to know where they are. But I just
15 don't have any faith in the Federal Government that they
16 won't expand it, that there won't be something out there
17 that they want us to do that next year, or two years from
18 now -- or that they ever will pay their share. So I just
19 had to add that little bit because of the comments
20 before.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, quick comments.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just let me clarify
23 this, and I can't believe you said, you just said that we
24 would do 30 percent less for our at-risk kids.

25 MS. NEAL: I didn't say that. The



1 committee in Washington said that.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You just said 30
3 percent less. The \$186 million went to the PARCC
4 consortium. The Feds have nothing to do with the
5 development of the test. All they asked for was the
6 acknowledgement or a reckoning of the money that was
7 being spent.

8 MS. NEAL: I understand that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, but I think
10 people are saying that the feds created this test, the
11 feds funded this test.

12 (indiscernible - multiple speakers)

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough. So let me
14 respond to a couple of the issues that have been raised
15 with regard to Colorado participation and the four sheets
16 of paper. You know, it's good that we have had
17 participation in this, and the more vigorous that
18 participation has been to this point, I think is more
19 condemning to the situation in which we find ourselves.
20 It says clearly that the inertia of federal, regional and
21 other states has not been able to get us where we
22 potentially want to be, to a more concise, more
23 productive test. So that would be -- that's my argument.

24 Then to the question of -- to say Colorado
25 controlled, designed and developed -- in my mind, when I



1 say: Colorado controlled, designed, that's not to say
2 that you have to pass a residency test in order to
3 participate in the development of this. I'm talking
4 about the ownership. The -- the people of Colorado, the
5 governing bodies of Colorado, the elected officials of
6 Colorado, have authority over it. And I believe that the
7 way this is structured, it's slipping. We don't have the
8 control that I would prefer we have.

9 So on to a few points that -- that I would
10 -- since I -- I mean, you were so -- all of you so
11 gracious in listening to my droning statement last month,
12 I will try to limit my comments today. But there are a
13 few key -- key points. And they can be summarized in:
14 There is a cost problem associated with PARCC, there is a
15 time problem associated with PARCC, there is a loss of
16 instructional focus, and I would say a corollary issue to
17 that. There's a loss of -- I want to call it policy
18 focus, associated with PARCC. And there -- in my mind --
19 there clearly is federal overreach. Today we heard there
20 is a significant service problem associated with PARCC.
21 And so let me go back and just kind of give you the high
22 levels. And I promise no ten minute droning speech
23 today.

24 But with regard to cost, PARCC creates for
25 us -- for the state of Colorado, a forward-looking



1 financial burden that cannot get the estimated or
2 controlled. And here is the problem: There's a business
3 reality associated with what is going on. The
4 participation in PARCC has continued state by state by
5 state to fall. It's gone from 22, if my numbers are
6 correct, to 15. The estimated cost of delivery of the
7 test today is \$35, meanwhile, the AIR test in Utah is
8 coming in at \$19.50. As the number of participating
9 states in the consortia declines, the marginal cost of
10 delivering the test is going to increase. What that
11 means, we don't know. But that is a bogey that is huge,
12 and it's a financial burden we probably shouldn't be
13 taking on.

14 With regard to time: PARCC consumes an
15 unprecedented amount of student time. And I realize we
16 already have a burden, Elaine, to your point, but this
17 burden is going to expand. I don't want to say
18 exponentially, because that might be an overstatement,
19 but clearly PARCC is going to bring another nine and a
20 half hours into the test. And we potentially have
21 crossed -- depending on which superintendent you talk to,
22 they will say we have crossed the tipping point, or we're
23 at the tipping point for various districts, as we build
24 out these testing windows for this expanded test. When
25 do we cross that point? When -- when is their not enough



1 time in the day, not enough time left in the school year
2 to do the instructional things you want to do, as you
3 build out these testing windows? And it's not just as
4 simple as it takes nine and a half hours, we'll do that
5 on one of our nine and half hour days. It's these
6 enormous windows that the districts are having to build
7 in order to achieve it.

8 Probably more important is, in my mind,
9 what I would describe as the loss of instructional focus
10 that this is driving. PARCC is causing a re-direction of
11 focus and thought -- of educational leadership away from
12 instruction, and -- and toward assessment. I mean, we're
13 moving from the most important thing we know in the
14 classroom, is a great teacher providing, you know, a
15 great interactive experience for the student. And when
16 we're moving from -- let's focus on that, to moving to
17 this -- we've got this management metric driving system -
18 - device. We'll create all sorts of information for us.
19 We need to focus on making sure that system functions
20 properly and gives us the feedback we want so we can more
21 properly manage this educational system that we have.

22 To the point of federal overreach -- and I
23 do tend to agree with Marcia -- the creation of a
24 ponderous highly centralized testing regime that is
25 controlled outside the state of Colorado, already I



1 believe is beginning to distort our ability to promote
2 Colorado initiatives. And this comes back to the point
3 that I was making earlier, this loss of -- of policy
4 focus.

5 Service is an issue that I really hadn't
6 even picked up on until today, and I was quite frankly
7 aghast as I was listening to Superintendent Bowman talk
8 about the fact that they can't get calls back; that they
9 are not being responded to, and that was separate in his
10 comments -- not to misrepresent his comments -- were
11 separate and distinct from CDE. Very positive praise for
12 what's happening within the state, but he was condemning,
13 I think, in fairly round terms, the response coming back
14 from the testing organization itself. As the controlling
15 apparatus over anything, but specifically this
16 assessment, gets further from the service user,
17 especially when it's a governmentally driven
18 organization, it becomes less and less responsive. And I
19 think it's very important that we keep control of the key
20 points of education as close to the students as possible,
21 because that's where we're going to give a higher level
22 of service.

23 So it's for those reasons, others that
24 we've talked about -- I talked about at length, that I --
25 I bring to a motion at this point. And I would call for



1 a question -- or call for this motion.

2 MS. NEAL: (indiscernible) I move to
3 request that the second regular session of the 69th
4 General Assembly, restore the authority to the State
5 Board of Education over statewide assessments by
6 repealing, during this legislative session, 22-7-1006
7 1.5. And so repealing --

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: In so doing --

9 MS. NEAL: No, in so doing, allow Colorado
10 to withdraw as a governing member of PARCC with the
11 Colorado signatories to the MOU, rescinding that
12 agreement with PARCC, thereby allowing the Board to
13 direct the Commissioner to develop an assessment aligned
14 with Colorado academic standards for implementation in
15 spring 2015.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Proper motion -- is
17 there a second? Second down here, Dr. Scheffel. Staff,
18 please call the roll.

19 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman?

20 MS. BERMAN: No.

21 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff?

22 MS. GOFF: No.

23 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen?

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes.

25 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

2 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal?

3 MS. NEAL: Yes.

4 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

6 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the motion carries.

9 (Applause)

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So thank you -- please, no

11 demonstration.

12 MS. NEAL: No, no, no.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Break. Quick break and

14 then we'll come back to public comment, I believe.

15 (Meeting adjourned)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600