



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
May 14, 2014, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 14, 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: Is everybody okay? Well,
2 we're back here at WSBE.

3 (Chuckling)

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Live fan broadcasting to
5 the millions and thousands across the globe.

6 We are going to move the budget item, which
7 you'll see is next on our agenda, to after our lunch
8 break, and come back at this point to a conversation on
9 educator preparation and licensing rules and content
10 assessment. Mr. Commissioner.

11 MR. HAMMOND: You're going to try and cover
12 both items though, right?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And then we're going to
14 do, immediately following that, take a look at the PRAXIS
15 II content again.

16 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. Well, the first
17 item really did -- has to do with how aligned are we when
18 it comes to our assessments in this area? And Dr. Colleen
19 O'Neil is going to go through that with you. What we want
20 to do in a comprehensive study, it's long overdue, and
21 explain that process, as well as the next generation of
22 PRAXIS II. It's a process you go through periodically.
23 That's always a delight for you to review and approve,
24 okay? Okay. So with that in mind, I'll turn it over to
25 you.



1 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 MS. O'NEIL: Good afternoon, morning. I
4 think it's still morning. Somewhere in there.

5 MS. NEAL: Somewhere in there.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Barely.

7 MS. O'NEIL: Thank you. Barely still in the
8 morning, so thank you. I do have two items to go through.

9 MR. HAMMOND: When do you want to do that?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right after lunch.

11 MR. HAMMOND: Okay.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We may need to come back
13 early from lunch. We've got 30 minutes for lunch.

14 MS. O'NEIL: I do have two items to go
15 through this morning. So the first one is really an
16 information item that I'm bringing forward. So in the
17 last year, educator licensing has had an opportunity to
18 really take a look at. (Indiscernible) as well as our
19 present PRAXIS assessments, content assessments. We have
20 discovered that there are some misalignments associated
21 with that. As an example, some of our place assessments
22 that we were contracted with in 1994 to really write in
23 accordance with our standards and our rules, are still the
24 same assessments as 1994.

25 So we actually are embarking on a



1 comprehensive study to take a look at our rule alignment,
2 our place in our PRAXIS assessments, and our content
3 assessments throughout the entire state with our
4 stakeholders.

5 So that work has already started with putting
6 together a document in quotation. So we will be engaged
7 with a third party to really help us with this work,
8 because it involves our stakeholders coming together to
9 really talk about where our rules are in alignment with
10 our Colorado academic standards, with our principal and
11 teacher quality standards as identified in (indiscernible)
12 191. And we will be working with them to pull together
13 stakeholder groups across the state.

14 MR. HAMMOND: (Indiscernible). (Chuckles)

15 MS. O'NEIL: (Indiscernible) to an 18-month
16 period of time. That work is set to begin in June. The
17 ultimate intention there.

18 Oh, Bizy.

19 (Laughter)

20 MS. O'NEIL: We had to push the push button.
21 Yeah.

22 (Laughter)

23 MS. O'NEIL: I'm gonna move it away this
24 time. I don't have to repeat that do I? No.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

2 MS. O'NEIL: Okay, just checking. So the
3 concluding or the culmination of this work will actually
4 be a report to the Board of Education for recommendations
5 for you to vote on, to identify where our place in PRAXIS
6 can align, as well as our rule alignment.

7 This is again work that started about last
8 year this time. And it's culminating now into actually a
9 documented quote that we'll look for a third party to
10 begin and engage all of our stakeholders across the state.
11 Okay?

12 The next item -- are there any questions? I
13 should stop.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, I don't have the
15 benefit of incurred balance. It's kind of hard to see
16 what's going on.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: So we have to push this. No
18 wonder.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, there we go.

20 MS. O'NEIL: It explains so much. I thought
21 the green light was on. (Chuckles)

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you just unpack that a
23 little more for clarity? You said we're going to be
24 getting the beginning of process to align the rules, the
25 Colorado academic standards, and the licensure standards



1 to begin in June with stakeholders. What does that mean?

2 MS. O'NEIL: And what does that --

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Are you going to have a
4 listening tour? You're going to ask people to come in
5 during the summer and actually do a crosswalk between
6 those documents. You're hiring a vendor to do it. What's
7 actually happening this summer?

8 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

10 MS. O'NEIL: Absolutely. So this summer, we
11 will be doing a lot of that alignment work. So the
12 documented quote, as it went out for response for
13 proposal, essentially for a bid on that is for a third
14 party to come in and work strategically with us. Right
15 now, we have ten stakeholder meetings that will be
16 scheduled in conjunction with several of our meetings that
17 are happening already, such as our Colorado Deans
18 Associations has meetings together. So we will be looking
19 at trying to identify strategically how we can bring
20 together those stakeholders to do the crosswalks first,
21 and then individual meetings. A lot of that has not been
22 fully articulated at this point in time, depending on who
23 the vendor will be. So you're --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you are -- are we going to
25 bring the deans together then?



1 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

3 MS. O'NEIL: Absolutely. We will bring
4 deans, educators, our parents. We would like students on
5 those panels. We will be talking with all of our CDE
6 representatives in our content areas, as well as really
7 intricately taking a look at the crosswalk documents, as
8 you identified, with regard to where our rules are today,
9 as well as where our Colorado academic standards and
10 teacher principal quality standards are.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do you have any dates yet?
12 Just because we're -- the summer is upon us, and schedules
13 are tightening. And --

14 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

16 MS. O'NEIL: I do not have any dates yet. We
17 are trying very hard to actually articulate that with any
18 other sessions that are already happening across the
19 state. So we're not piling on meetings across that. So
20 as soon as we get them together. The documented quote
21 will close at the end of May. And we will be able to
22 identify who that successful individual will be at the
23 other end of that to help us with the stakeholder
24 alignment work.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: And to learn of those dates,



1 it would come through code?

2 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair? I think it will come
3 through a bunch of different channels right now. We're
4 strategically identifying several of the mechanisms, which
5 would include our scoop, the code, our websites, as well
6 as other educator newsletters that go about.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Great, thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Angelika?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is standard area by
10 standard area?

11 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair? Right now, yes, it's
12 going to be standard area by standard area. We will
13 actually be looking at every single rule as its aligned
14 with our standards and our endorsements.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: And when you say ten
16 meetings, you're not talking about ten standard areas.
17 You're talking about ten different groups of folks. I'm a
18 little confused as to the map of how you're doing it
19 standard by standard and who provides the input.

20 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair, I'll be really
21 honest. We want to develop that in conjunction with
22 whoever the successful individual is on the other side of
23 the offer to make sure that our vendor partners are in
24 alignment with that. Right now, what we have identified
25 is crosswalk documents that have actually been in place



1 since about 2011 with regard to where our current Colorado
2 academic standards are as adopted in 2010-2011 timeframe,
3 in addition to our principal quality standards. So we
4 already have cross walked documents that we've talked
5 about. And those documents will begin to be vetted. And
6 then as we identify the priority areas with our deans of
7 education or our educator preparation programs, as well as
8 our school leaders, as to what areas those will be. So
9 those will be strategically identified and then
10 prioritized based off of that. Does that help?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And Mr. Chair, by the --
12 just to sort of solidify the problem that we're trying to
13 solve, it's kind of twofold. One is we have incoming
14 teachers coming into our classrooms who are taking these
15 tests, and saying they reflect nothing of what either my
16 program had, because it's advanced beyond, and what is
17 going to be expected of me to be effective in the
18 classroom, because they're just outdated tests.

19 And from the Ed prep programs themselves that
20 have said, the processes don't align anymore. We've moved
21 ahead. We're meeting the needs of our districts in this --
22 -- our teachers who are going into those districts. We've
23 already revamped. We're already aligned. In our
24 policies, the rule alignment is behind.

25 So this is a chance to get that caught up.



1 And it's really been at the request of our Ed prep
2 institutions and candidates, teacher candidates, saying
3 this really needs to be done.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Onward.

5 MS. O'NEIL: Onward. Okay, so the next item
6 that we have on our agenda is the --

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: PRAXIS II.

8 MS. O'NEIL: -- PRAXIS. Yep, the PRAXIS II
9 content exams. And we did -- Educational Testing Services
10 conducts an extensive review every single year of the
11 PRAXIS assessments, which result in regenerated
12 assessments for us. Those assessments actually identify -
13 - have to come before the Board, of course, for approval,
14 with regard to the content as well as the cut scores.

15 This month, we are having an education or an
16 information session only. Next month, it will be an
17 actual vote on whether to adopt these regenerated
18 assessments or not. So we will start with just kind of an
19 overview of our system as it stands today.

20 So to help identify some context for this,
21 you're responsible for establishing the methods in which
22 our candidates are approved from an educational content
23 perspective, with regard to educator licensure and how
24 they demonstrate that level of content knowledge within
25 that association, or within that approval that is



1 currently used in the state of Colorado, or, of course,
2 the PLACE assessments, which are offered by Pearson. And
3 those are Colorado-specific assessments.

4 And those second ones are the PRAXIS
5 assessments that are actually developed by Educational
6 Testing Services and have interstate reciprocity, I
7 suppose, is a good way to say it. So many states offer
8 the PRAXIS II exams.

9 As the tests are updated, the Board must
10 review and take action on those individual assessments.

11 The annual change for Colorado comes about
12 every single year as a regeneration process in which ETS
13 really takes a look at, these actual standards. They
14 really strategically align that with a review of the
15 standards and the assessment to make sure those are still
16 meeting the needs. We will talk today about the process
17 for that practice regeneration. We will also talk about
18 the Colorado's regenerated PRAXIS tests, the three that
19 are coming before you in an information session this month
20 and decision next month. We'll also talk about the score
21 recommendations.

22 The ETS regeneration process, just as a
23 reminder, why do we do it? Why do we look at it? And
24 PLACE again, we have not gone through that process, which
25 is what the previous item was talking about.



1 MR. HAMMOND: Colleen, can you define ETS for
2 the Board Members about that --

3 MS. O'NEIL: ETS?

4 MR. HAMMOND: ETS, yes. They might not
5 understand.

6 MS. O'NEIL: Absolutely. Absolutely. ETS is
7 Educational Testing Service. They are equivalent to a
8 Pearson on the other side. So they provide us with the
9 services for the educational tests and content assessments
10 that we use.

11 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

12 MS. O'NEIL: From that perspective, from the
13 regeneration perspective, in the process, we absolutely
14 keep our content fresh. We want to be able to ensure that
15 we have alignment with that. It aligns to the most
16 current standards. We, of course, want reliability and
17 validity. And it reduces the candidate burden and cost to
18 make sure that we have some alignment across the
19 interstate agencies. And your confirmation of the
20 specifications by committees and experts is conducted.
21 And I'll talk a little bit about that process for the
22 regeneration of the assessments.

23 This particular slide talks about the actual
24 test development process that Educational Testing Services
25 actually uses when they bring the PRAXIS forward to us in



1 regenerated assessments. The first one is, is that the
2 first step is that they do amass a National Advisory
3 Council to bring together, to talk about the standards
4 alignments, and as well as the analyses of the content as
5 it goes together.

6 They then then conduct a job analysis survey.
7 And then they have a National Advisory Committee that
8 reviews that again, and it's about cross-walking those
9 documents to say these are the standards. And these are
10 the assessment pieces that we're using between those two
11 things.

12 They then identify the test specifications,
13 which we're actually testing on. Develop the test form.
14 Then they do standard setting as needed across the states.
15 And then of course, they administer the test multiple
16 times in a beta environment or in a test environment to
17 ensure that they are getting the reliability and validity
18 that they expect from that. They then make the
19 recommendations to the states as to how those regenerated
20 assessments will align and when we need to adopt them.

21 There are two models that we use very
22 specifically or that ETS also uses very specifically in
23 identifying their regenerated PRAXIS assessments. Those
24 two models are, of course, the state model. And for tests
25 that a state is adding to the existing requirements, they



1 need about a 10 to 20-person panel. We did not engage in
2 that panel for these assessments that are coming forward
3 today for the three regenerated assessments. We did not
4 send a representative, nor did we amass them at the state
5 level for these three assessments that are coming forward
6 today.

7 However, what we did do, or where they did
8 go, I should say, ETS, with the multi-state model is they
9 actually amassed different states and individuals in their
10 committee to identify what the validation and standard-
11 setting process will be. I will be bringing forward those
12 recommendations to you today for consideration and vote
13 tomorrow -- or tomorrow. How about next month?

14 (Chuckling)

15 MS. O'NEIL: Not tomorrow. We won't move it
16 right along that quickly. The process of the multi-state
17 standards setting, so that you are very well aware of how
18 this actually functions for us, is that panelists
19 absolutely take the test from -- for familiarity. They
20 ensure that they know what those tests look like. And
21 then they retake and retake as they go through the
22 process.

23 The panelists then define the knowledge and
24 skills so they can take the current tests. They then
25 ensure that they identify the knowledge and skills that



1 are needed for candidates who should just barely pass the
2 test. And I think that's important to know, is that this
3 is the minimum bar, not the maximum bar. So when we make
4 score recommendations, they are very, very much at the
5 just-qualified candidate level, or what they're referring
6 to is the JQC, another wonderful acronym for us in
7 education. But they just-qualified candidate level,
8 meaning I just graduated from an educator preparation
9 program, and I'm ready to enter into the classroom. What
10 do I need to know at the very lowest-minimum bar in order
11 to identify in order to teach the content in which I am
12 being endorsed?

13 So in order to do that from a multi-state
14 standard perspective, they have two rounds of judgments
15 with feedback as well as discussion. So they absolutely
16 go through the process, those two committees. So
17 committee one and committee two, they go through the
18 process of taking the assessments once they have re-
19 standardized them or regenerated those assessments to
20 ensure that there's the validity and reliability on the
21 other side of it, and it is meeting the expectations. And
22 then they produce a report with recommended score value in
23 the validity information. That's what we use to make
24 recommendations moving forward.

25 During this process, they identify what they



1 believe to be. Again, this is the committee at a more
2 interstate level. They identify what the standards say or
3 what the cut scores should be. So they engage in a
4 standard-setting study, which involves experts for each
5 assessment, as well as teachers, administrators, college
6 faculty, individuals who are very well aware of the
7 content and the standards as they're implemented at the
8 educational level. The recommended cut scores from each
9 panel, as well as the average cut scores across the two
10 panels are provided to the State Departments of Education.
11 So we have all of those documents, as well as the
12 recommended cut scores. We will go through those bit
13 later.

14 Then the final cut score is set at the
15 discretion and the control of each individual state. So
16 it is absolutely our discretion, your discretion to set
17 those cuts scores for us on an individual state level. So
18 they make a recommended from a committee of multi-state
19 individuals. They make a recommended cut score, which we
20 will usually in the past traditionally, especially last
21 year. We said we will adopt those recommended cut scores.
22 However, we want to conduct an analysis over the next
23 course of the year to identify if those are the right cut
24 scores for the state of Colorado. So that is more
25 conversation that can certainly happen as we get to the



1 end of the presentation as well.

2 For this year, the regenerated Educational
3 Testing Services PRAXIS II assessments that we would like
4 to bring before you are there are three. It is the
5 elementary education, so the content knowledge assessment,
6 for our elementary educators. It is also the school
7 psychologist and our speech language pathology regenerated
8 assessments. I'll talk about each one individually. And
9 then we can absolutely bring together a more comprehensive
10 view of that.

11 For our elementary education content
12 knowledge assessments, there was a multi-standard setting
13 study that was held in Princeton, New Jersey. It was held
14 in January of 2014. So it was held this January. Seven
15 states and Guam were represented by 16 panelists. Those
16 participating jurisdictions and the number of panelists
17 from each jurisdiction are included here. So we had
18 Delaware, Guam, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana,
19 Nevada, and South Dakota. Again, Colorado was not
20 represented on that panel.

21 The recommended score coming from that panel
22 for the PRAXIS elementary education content knowledge
23 assessment is 83 out of a possible 120 raw score points.
24 That's the recommended cut score that they're bringing
25 forward to us. That translates to a scaled score that's



1 associated with a raw score of 83. So that is 163 is what
2 the recommended cut score is on a 100 to 200 point scale.

3 To give you just a little bit of comparison
4 for that, right now, the elementary education cut score is
5 147 on our current elementary education tests, so the cut
6 score would actually raise someone on a new regenerated
7 assessment as recommended.

8 The next one we'll talk about is the school
9 psychologist practice regenerated assessment. This again
10 was a multi-state standard setting study. It was held in
11 Princeton again. This was held in November of last year.
12 So last fall, there were 17 panelists from 16 different
13 states represented with our school psychologist. You can
14 see the list there of the number of panelists in the
15 states represented. Again, I just want to note that
16 Colorado was not part of that study.

17 The recommended cut score for this is the
18 practice school psychologist test. It's again a 64 out of
19 possible 110 raw score points. Scaled score associated
20 with that is that -- with that 64 is 147 on a 100 to 200
21 point scale. Again, for comparison purposes, our school
22 psychologist test right now is 165. So those cut score
23 points would come down somewhat. Again, completely
24 regenerated test, with some differences in our standard
25 setting.



1 This was endorsed by the National Association
2 of School Psychologists as well. So I think it's just
3 important to note that they were part of this process on a
4 -- as a specialized service professional perspective.

5 Our next one that we will talk about, and I
6 just skipped right through it, is our speech language
7 pathology assessment. Our speech language pathology was
8 held -- our standard-setting study was held in Princeton.
9 Again, that was held in January of this year. The
10 American Speech Language Hearing Association, or ASHA, was
11 part of that. And it was recommended by panelists of 16
12 states. Here are states that are included, including
13 Arkansas, Georgia, Hawaii, Iowa, Indiana, Massachusetts.
14 You can read the rest of them, but there was a fairly
15 large, nice diversity of panel there as well.

16 The recommended score for the PRAXIS speech
17 language pathology test is a raw score of 74 out of a
18 possible 108. For the scaled score associated with that,
19 it would be 162 out of a 100 to 200 point scale. The
20 current school language -- speech, I'm sorry -- speech
21 language pathology test is not comparable, because right
22 now, it is a 600-point score on a very large, very
23 different scale. So they scaled it back, took a look at
24 the standards-based setting there, and identified a very
25 different scale score that was associated with speech



1 language pathology.

2 Again, ASHA has established a passing score
3 as part of its certification to clinical competence. So
4 these national or specialized service providers also
5 belong to a national association of some type, depending
6 on where they are. They are also regulated by the
7 Department of Regulation Authority, so DORA regulates many
8 of those from a statewide as well as national perspective.
9 All of those individuals were part of the standard
10 setting, this program, for ETS.

11 I will go ahead and stop there and identify
12 any questions that you may have for -- with regard to
13 where we are as far as recommendations and other
14 information that I can answer for you.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The first question is
16 (indiscernible). Dr. Scheffel, you get to go first.
17 We're going left to right.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: We're going left to right.
19 Thank you. I appreciate the detail. Can you say how many
20 times an individual can take one of the assessments is?
21 Has that changed in these new iterations?

22 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

24 MS. O'NEIL: No, it has not changed in this
25 iteration. So for the PRAXIS assessment, they can still



1 take it three -- actually, they can take it an unlimited
2 number of times. But they do pay. It's now all online.
3 So everything for PRAXIS will be transitioned to online in
4 September of this year, where there will be no more paper
5 and pencil tests for the PRAXIS II assessments. And so
6 they can take it as many times as they want. There is a
7 reduced fee, depending on the test associated with it, but
8 they can continue to take them.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: And is there a waiting period
10 between administrations that they have to observe?

11 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

13 MS. O'NEIL: Right now, there is not, because
14 they can schedule it individually, rather than what it
15 used to be where there was a, you know, specific period of
16 time in which you can take it.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

18 MS. O'NEIL: You're welcome.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm trying to understand
21 the process. And what I'm focusing on elementary
22 education, because that's more our responsibility than the
23 other two areas. So we have eight states and territories.
24 How many of those have recently updated their standard,
25 their own elementary standards?



1 MS. MARKEL: Oh, so sorry.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. How many of those
3 particular states have actually recently updated their
4 state standards? I'm a little flummoxed by the lack of
5 representation. It seems to me to be a narrow, very
6 narrow pool. And our focus is -- certainly is on having
7 very high performance in our elementary schools and an
8 adequate preparation for our teachers. And so if they
9 take a test that's been directed by members of a state
10 that haven't recently updated their standards? Is that
11 correct? Am I completely off on that observation? Or?

12 MS. O'NEIL: No, I -- absolutely not. And I
13 think that's a good question. I'll be very honest. I do
14 not know the answer to when they updated their standards.
15 I do know that our standards actually have not been
16 updated with regard to elementary education since I think
17 it was 2010.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

19 MS. O'NEIL: That's the last time we looked
20 at our rules. So I would -- I can absolutely do research
21 on that and get back.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) the
23 content.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm talking about the content

25 --



1 MS. O'NEIL: The content standards.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm talking about the content
3 standards. I'm sorry. Yeah.

4 MS. MARKEL: She's talking about the
5 professional standards.

6 MS. O'NEIL: Oh.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: The professional standards.

8 MS. O'NEIL: Oh, okay.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: But I'm talking about the
10 content standards.

11 MS. O'NEIL: (Indiscernible).

12 MS. SCHROEDER: So that if these folks have
13 not even been looking at their content standards, whether
14 they're Common Core at English and math, or I mean, all
15 our ten standards, how am I convinced that, based on the
16 input from these states, teachers prepared to teach in
17 Colorado -- elementary teachers to teach -- prepared to
18 teach and Colorado have the appropriate content?

19 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

21 MS. O'NEIL: Jill was kind enough to tell me
22 that she thinks everybody has updated those standards
23 recently in alignment with Race to the Top funding, I
24 would assume, as well as other nationalized associations.
25 But I also have to say that I can do research on it to



1 identify exactly when those standards were updated for
2 each one of those individual states and what their
3 contribution was to that level.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Yeah, thank you.

5 MS. O'NEIL: I can do that.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So Race to the Top is just a
7 couple of areas and --

8 MS. O'NEIL: Right.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: -- Common Core, those were
10 just -- those are just two areas where Common Core was
11 adopted without actually going through a State process, in
12 fact. But it's a -- it's -- I think elementary education
13 is a much broader area in science and etcetera.

14 MS. O'NEIL: Certainly, Mr. Chair.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm surprised that we have
16 only eight. And none of them are considered the leading
17 standards in terms of -- the leading states in terms of
18 the standards process. I'm thinking Massachusetts, for
19 example, and Kentucky, etcetera. And yet, in the other
20 two areas, you had 17 states. Is this because people are
21 so busy, they can't provide participants?

22 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair? I don't know. I
23 will absolutely ask ETS exactly what, you know, how did
24 they solicit individuals to come to the elementary
25 education specifically? How did they specifically --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: That most specifically.

2 MS. O'NEIL: Yeah, how did they solicit
3 those? And what was the response? And how has that been
4 articulated? I think that will better inform.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: And this, my second one, is
6 that once the -- we adopt the new practice, what's the
7 process for feedback from folks who are taking the test?
8 Does it really seem to align with what's being -- what
9 their perception of our standards are? Similar to the
10 responses we're getting right now to the old test. Is
11 there a good process for feedback?

12 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair, that processes is --
13 I would have to say -- I'm going to just be really honest.
14 Traditionally, that has not been a good process. No. We
15 have not had a solid process for it. Moving forward, will
16 we have a process? Absolutely. That should be a yearly
17 process in which we engage with stakeholders, as well as
18 go through our data and identify analyses on the other
19 side as to how we were really looking at our standards
20 alignment, as well as the outcomes of the PLACE and PRAXIS
21 assessments.

22 So ETS does actually have a very nice
23 database of -- that we can get in and manipulate ourselves
24 to answer questions, data-engaged questions, on the other
25 side. I don't think that we've used it as strongly as we



1 could. So moving forward, we will absolutely have that.
2 And that'll be part of our roles, that previous
3 conversation. How do we do that on an annual basis so
4 that we're coming forward with the most current
5 information for you?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just a comment. Just knowing
9 a little bit about the work ETS does, I think they have a
10 very structured, incredible process. And I think Terry
11 Owen is our contact. So if we -- to Angelika's point, if
12 we want to detail and how they chose those individuals,
13 and how they structured their work, I think they'd be
14 quite detailed in providing that.

15 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

17 MS. O'NEIL: I need to apologize in advance
18 because Terry Owens was scheduled to be here.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Chuckles)

20 MS. O'NEIL: She was trying to be here
21 tomorrow, because she was in Nevada today for their State
22 Board of Education meeting.

23 (Chuckling)

24 MS. O'NEIL: And so when we -- when I was --
25 I was like, Terry, we can't do it tomorrow. We have to do



1 it today. And so she is not here. She is meeting with me
2 tomorrow, however, in Denver. I'll be happy to ask her
3 those questions. And I think we can get feedback back
4 very quickly.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

6 MS. O'NEIL: Just systematic decision.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions.

8 MS. GOFF: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, go ahead.

10 MS. GOFF: Colleen, thank you very much for
11 this. I know we had started to chat about it before. Is
12 there a set schedule? Is there -- oh, I'm sorry. Is
13 there a set forward-thinking plan about which content
14 areas come up in the in the cycle? PLACE, was one part --
15 is a part of the conversation PRAXIS? Definitely, at some
16 point, I look forward to us talking about where are we
17 going? What is -- what are our aspirations around
18 developing this whole thing? So that it really is more in
19 tuned with what we're asking new license folks to be doing
20 and ready for.

21 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair, thank you very much
22 for the response. On that, we -- I have started to go
23 through with our Educator Preparation teams, as well as
24 all of the data to identify where are some of our largest
25 areas of assessment taking. We have some very large



1 areas. And I mean, just off of the top of my head here,
2 Japanese, we have exactly one person who is taken it in
3 the last year. However, when we look at our elementary
4 education content, they have 241 that have taken the PLACE
5 in addition to the PRAXIS. So I think we can use that as
6 our starting point, in addition to our educator
7 preparation programs, as a prioritization level, to make
8 sure that cycle comes back around on a more consistent
9 basis. So thank you.

10 MS. GOFF: Well, but yes, thank you. But I
11 also think it probably has a lot to do with school just in
12 demand. So as district capacities and their own goal
13 setting and changes over time, according -- whether it
14 matches up a standards, our whole improvement drive in the
15 state is going to, I would think, dictate a lot of what
16 district decision-making turns out to be. So if that's
17 development or not a particular content areas, which then
18 impacts staff needs and money available, all those things.

19 But yes, as you know, we have had a
20 longstanding (chuckles) conversation about the movement of
21 world language instruction. And as the fluctuations
22 happen of demand and yet other content areas, every --
23 everything playing its role within the big picture, it
24 does make things a little hard to predict. But there are
25 some educators who are most interested in having as good



1 of measurements for everything (chuckles) we do as
2 possible. And that's one area.

3 MS. O'NEIL: Thanks.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions? Thank
5 you very much.

6 MS. O'NEIL: Thank you for your time.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So with that, I believe we
8 will take a break, grab a bite of lunch. And when we come
9 back from our lunch break, we'll dive into the budget.

10 MR. HAMMOND: Ten-minute break?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So eat lightly. Thirty-
12 minute break.

13 MR. HAMMOND: (Chuckles)

14 (Meeting adjourned)

15

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 30th day of May, 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