



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
November 13, 2014, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 13, 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: The State Board will come  
2 back to order. Staff, please call the role.

3 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz-Berman.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Here.

5 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff. Paul Lundeen.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

7 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

9 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

10 MS. NEAL: Here.

11 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

13 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The next item on the agenda  
16 is a legislative report, Mr. Commissioner.

17 MR. HAMMOND: Oh, thank you very much. I'll  
18 turn it over to Jennifer, if you're ready to make the  
19 report.

20 (Chuckling)

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

22 MS. MELLO: Good morning, all. Mr. Chair, Mr.  
23 Commissioner, everyone. Congratulations to all of us on  
24 getting through another election season.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.



1 MS. MELLO: I think one thing we can  
2 universally agree on is that it's nice to have it done  
3 with, and now we can move on.

4 So I'm starting to feel a little bit like a  
5 broken record, but I'm going to talk to you about a couple  
6 of interim task forces and what's happened with those  
7 since the last time we spoke. I'll start with the Online  
8 Task Force. Again, this was legislatively directed. They  
9 were -- the intention or one of the main goals of the  
10 Online Task Force was to look at how we certify  
11 authorizers of multi-district online schools, how that  
12 process works.

13 The group has met quite a bit. They are  
14 making a lot of progress towards having recommendations  
15 that the legislature can choose what they want to do with.  
16 They may take a vote, and they may not. But for how to  
17 improve the current system around authorizing these multi-  
18 district online schools.

19 Their report is not due till January, so we  
20 won't have anything official until then. But under the  
21 status quo, the Department reviews -- so if a district  
22 wants to create a multi-district online school, Department  
23 reviews the plans. You know, there's quality standards  
24 that are outlined by statute and by rules that those are  
25 reviewed against. And then says yes or no, essentially.



1 If the answer is yes, then that's it. And it just  
2 continues in perpetuity.

3 What the Online Task Force is contemplating.  
4 Again, no decisions have been made. None of this is done.  
5 But what they're thinking about is essentially, a district  
6 would come to the Department with the statutorily outlined  
7 criteria, and say we want to be able to authorize multi-  
8 district online schools. They would go through a process  
9 of determining whether the district has the skills,  
10 capacity, quality, all of those kinds of things to do  
11 that. Grant that authority, and then once that authority  
12 is granted, the district could -- it wouldn't be school-  
13 specific, so they could do it for more than one school if  
14 they wanted to.

15 But that -- then that would also be reviewed  
16 on some regular period, regular basis. So let's say every  
17 three years, every four years, every five years. I mean,  
18 again, they haven't decided on the number, but it's not  
19 just once you're approved, you're off, and it never comes  
20 back. There's a review process built in to make sure that  
21 those standards are that are outlined in the law and the  
22 rules are continuing to be met.

23 So that's the direction they're headed. The  
24 way the bill was structured is it said. This is the one  
25 thing we really, really care that you look at. But if you



1 have time, there's some other things you might want to  
2 look at, including some pilot programs around multi-  
3 district online schools, or online education, and how to  
4 test some different assumptions in that and how we might  
5 be able to do it better. It looks like they will actually  
6 have some time to consider that, and so they may include  
7 some language on that in their recommendations as well.

8 I'll stop there and see if there's questions  
9 about that particular task force.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Are there significantly  
12 different models, and that's what they want to look at, or  
13 -- I'm not sure I -- I understand the part that there's  
14 going to be sort of a continuous review or periodic review  
15 of the -- but what was the second part? That didn't make  
16 a lot of sense to me.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Give me an example.

19 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Dr. Schroeder, I don't  
20 have an example to give you. I think what -- so why don't  
21 I follow up instead of babbling on and --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

23 MS. MELLO: -- not really answering your  
24 question. Why don't I get a real answer to your question  
25 and provide it?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I don't know what else  
2 they're talking about looking at. Whether there are  
3 alternative models? We want to pick the best one, or we  
4 want to try some new ones, or --?

5 MS. MELLO: It's a great question, and I  
6 apologize that I can't answer it for you. But I will find  
7 something and make sure to get it to everybody.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Before you leave --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, we've got more. Pam  
10 has a question, though. Go ahead.

11 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry. Would you remind  
12 again the purpose or what brought this Online Task Force  
13 about?

14 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member Mazanec,  
15 the -- this has been a conversation for that's -- I would  
16 say going on for two, three years at the Capitol. There  
17 are a number of legislators who are very interested in  
18 this topic. The ones that were sponsors of this  
19 particular legislation. In the House, it was  
20 Representative Dave Young and Representative Jim Wilson.  
21 So a Democrat and Republican. And then in the Senate, it  
22 was Senator Andy Kerr and Senator Ellen Roberts. So  
23 again, it's also bipartisan.

24 And I think there's just a sense of, and, you  
25 know, I don't want to put words into their mouth. That



1 wouldn't be appropriate. But my observation would be  
2 based on is that, look, online education is still a  
3 relatively new thing. That there seems like it's going  
4 really well in some ways. There's some concerns, maybe  
5 about somehow some other parts of the system are working.  
6 And so they want to be kind of on top of it, paying  
7 attention to, as we continue to develop this tool, that  
8 we're doing it in a way that is responsible for kids,  
9 right? That it's a good thing for kids. So, I mean,  
10 that's a very general statement. But I think that that's  
11 what's driving that.

12 Now, there's been different bills proposed,  
13 different bills introduced, different bills that haven't  
14 been introduced. There was a kind of task force-type  
15 thing that met during the legislative session last year.  
16 So these legislators came in the session. They thought  
17 they had an idea of what to do. They realize it's pretty  
18 complicated. They got a bunch of stakeholders together  
19 who worked through a bunch of issues, kind of during the  
20 legislative session. It was April-ish, I think. So it  
21 was fairly late in session that that work concluded.

22 There was a much more kind of substantive and  
23 comprehensive piece of legislation that came out of that.  
24 I think given the timing during the legislative session,  
25 it was just considered that that was a really big thing to



1 do so late in the session. So that was scaled back to  
2 direct this online task force to continue that stakeholder  
3 engagement work and come with some recommendations. And I  
4 see my friend Rebecca has joined me here, and she may have  
5 some additional information to add.

6 MS. HOLMES: Mr. Chair, I can just add two  
7 other specifics. Everything that Jennifer said is  
8 correct. But to your two questions. The current  
9 situation is that our office, the online schools office,  
10 approves applications for multi-district online schools.  
11 And the intention of this bill is to look at would it make  
12 more sense for instead of the office to be authorizing the  
13 school level, because it's not typically a role we play in  
14 any other arena of education, instead, would we authorize  
15 authorizers?

16 And so really, the most substantive change  
17 that they're considering is what would be the positive and  
18 negative implications of that change? And if we made that  
19 change, the cycle of review on authorizers versus the  
20 cycle of review that we've had historically on the  
21 schools. So that's the biggest and substantive charge of  
22 this task force based on the legislation.

23 And Representative Schroeder, to your  
24 question. They have not specifically named any particular  
25 kind of pilot yet. It was only in the last meeting that I





1 think they agreed that there would be time to potentially  
2 take this on, and they're looking at what that might mean.  
3 Ethan Hemming from CSI is chairing the task force. And so  
4 in the next meeting, I think he'll be determining what  
5 types of pilots they might consider. I know one  
6 conversation has been about is it in the purview of this  
7 task force to also talk about blended versus 100 percent  
8 online models?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is relative --  
10 relatively important because we -- I believe we have two  
11 districts who improved their accreditation by closing  
12 their multi-district online programs. Right? So we --

13 MR. HAMMOND: From a performance standpoint.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Right, so we're kind of in  
15 flux in Colorado in figuring out what's the best thing for  
16 this medium to be successful. And so what you're talking  
17 about is a governance change, I think. And then the  
18 blended learning, that makes some sense. Okay, great.  
19 Thanks.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam?

21 MS. MAZANEC: Who are multi-district  
22 authorizes now? CSI?

23 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair? So most of the multi-  
24 district online operators currently are authorized by  
25 districts. So one district -- they have a single district



1 authorizing, and they serve a number of named districts.  
2 There is also a particular BOCES that's looking at  
3 authorizing a multi-district. Well, actually ,there are  
4 two BOCES who currently authorize multi-district online  
5 schools.

6 MS. MAZANEC: But not CSI?

7 MS. MELLO: No, not currently.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, I thought you were  
10 coming with a question.

11 (Talking over)

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Excuse me. I was going to  
13 ask what are the big areas of contention on the group, if  
14 there are any at all.

15 MS. MELLO: I'll further defer to CSI.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. We're looking for  
17 our (indiscernible).

18 (Chuckling)

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He left the room?

20 MS. MELLO: There are issues of the  
21 authorizing schedule. What that would mean, and what the  
22 quality parameters would be, and then issues of school  
23 finance, which is why I'm looking at Leanne.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Leanne.

25 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, I don't know if there's



1       been a lot of contentious issues that I would say at this  
2       point. I think there's been a lot of rich discussion  
3       about what the quality standards should look like in the  
4       online setting. And I do know that there are a few topics  
5       that are kind of on the other parked list.

6                       Probably one of them that is maybe on the  
7       contentious side would be the ability for some multi-  
8       district providers to enter into districts without the  
9       consent of maybe the geographic district. And so there  
10      seems to be a little bit of contention and discussion  
11      amongst the committee members about that. But that hasn't  
12      been a major topic at this point. That's something that's  
13      kind of in the parking lot.

14                    MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Thank you.

15                    CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel, questions? I  
16      do, and it's -- I'm asking for preliminary observations.  
17      I acknowledge that right up front. My hypothesis is this  
18      conversation. There's a creative tension arising between  
19      quality and innovation. It sounds to me like the  
20      conversation is around driving for quality. And so I  
21      would be concerned that some of the outgrowth of that  
22      might be a dampening of the opportunity for innovation.  
23      And I realized this is very preliminary. And I'm not  
24      asking you to speak officially or formally on that, but  
25      I'm just kind of curious the feedback because I've not had



1 the opportunity to attend any of the meetings.

2 MS. HOLMES: Well, let me just answer the  
3 question, if you don't mind. I'll just start, Mr. Chair,  
4 from a legislative perspective, because having had a lot  
5 of conversations with the legislators that are very  
6 passionate about this topic, I mean, I think they would be  
7 very disappointed if that were the outcome. I think they  
8 are equally committed to accountability or quality  
9 standards, acknowledging that many of these schools serve  
10 students who are coming from a whole lot of challenges,  
11 right?

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

13 MS. HOLMES: So that's part of what -- of this  
14 conversation.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Students who need  
16 innovation to be served.

17 MS. HOLMES: Absolutely. Well, certainly one  
18 way to talk about it. So I don't think that's the  
19 intention from a legislative perspective is to somehow  
20 stifle innovation for the sake of quality. I think they  
21 want both. Now, you know, how you go about doing that, of  
22 course, is challenging. So, you know, in terms of the  
23 task force itself, I haven't been at the meetings.

24 MS. MELLO: Right. I mean, I think that's --  
25 I would hesitate. I know Leanne would too, given that we



1 are not -- no one from the Department is a voting member  
2 on that committee to speak for that task force. I don't  
3 know that that's necessarily been the healthy tension that  
4 they have been discussing.

5           Given that the governance change that is  
6 primary their task -- primarily their task, in my opinion,  
7 wouldn't necessarily inhibit innovation any more or less.  
8 It might just streamline an authorizing process. There is  
9 that tension in the online space. But that hasn't really  
10 been the thrust of their conversation.

11           CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, fair enough. And,  
12 you know, obviously, I'll follow it and read through it as  
13 it gets finished down as well.

14           So I think that exhausted this subject, yes?  
15 Ms. Mello, please proceed.

16           MS. MELLO: Great. So the other entity we've  
17 been discussing quite a bit is the Standards and  
18 Assessment Task Force established by House Bill 1202. I  
19 think many of us refer to it as the 1202 Task Force. They  
20 also continue to move forward. They also have a January  
21 deadline for submission to the legislature. They've got  
22 their next meeting is coming up this -- on Monday. The  
23 agenda for that meeting just came out. It is a very  
24 substantive and packed agenda. It was one of those ones I  
25 looked at, and I thought oh, boy, this is a lot. This is



1 going to be a lot of work for people to get through in a  
2 short period of time.

3 At that meeting, they will officially receive  
4 the final report from the consultants that they hired. So  
5 they had, you know, gone through that whole process of  
6 hiring a group to go out and do some research on their  
7 behalf into some different topics. So that report is --  
8 will be formally presented on Monday. It may be publicly  
9 available before then, and if so, we'll certainly  
10 circulate that for all of you to see.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you remind us what the  
12 report (indiscernible)?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's the Augenblick  
14 Report?

15 MS. MELLO: It's the Augenblick Report, yes.  
16 I would have to be digging deep in my memory banks to  
17 think about it, Jill. Do you -- can you maybe talk a  
18 little bit to the specifics of the research questions that  
19 Augenblick was answering for the 1202 Commission?

20 MS. HUCHISON: Mr. Chair, the questions  
21 largely pertain to the cost of implementing both the state  
22 system and local systems, as well as understanding more  
23 about local assessments, and then delving deeper into the  
24 same sense -- some of the same questions that the WestEd  
25 Study looked at in terms of areas of burden and concern



1 around the assessments. But it's much more of a financial  
2 and time cost analysis. So they'll get at a big emphasis  
3 in addition to the hard financial costs are the impact on  
4 instructional time. So they're doing a variety of surveys  
5 and focus groups to get that impact on instructional time  
6 of the tests. So that's a focus of them as well. So  
7 there's quite a list in the statute of what that study has  
8 to include. And so they are trying to tick off everything  
9 that's in the study -- in the law, excuse me.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel?

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had a quick question.  
12 Just remind me who chairs that.

13 MS. EMM: Dan Snowberger, who's the  
14 superintendent of schools in Durango. Is that correct?  
15 Has been -- was elected by the task force itself to be its  
16 chair. So the appointments were made by a variety of  
17 entities, including Chairman Lundeen, and then amongst  
18 themselves they held election for chair.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do you attend all those, or  
20 who attends those meetings?

21 MS. EMM: I do attend all of those. And  
22 there's usually -- the task force has asked the Department  
23 for information on a variety of different topics. So  
24 there typically are a number of Department staff that are  
25 there as well.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

2 MS. EMM: And Mr. Chair, just to clarify, the  
3 CDE is not the staff for the task force. So it is -- they  
4 have hired a staffer who runs the meetings. So we respond  
5 essentially, if they have requests, and occasionally they  
6 ask for information. So they've asked for the same report  
7 that you all received yesterday, around different options  
8 for thinking about growth at high school. So that will be  
9 shared. They've asked the department to complete an  
10 impact grid.

11 MS. HUCHISON: Yeah, that's what I was talking  
12 about.

13 MS. EMM: So those kinds of things will  
14 present, but it's just at their request. They manage the  
15 public Augenblick, Palaich, and Associates contract and  
16 work directly with APA. So we're not involved in that  
17 study other than the work that we did to finalize the  
18 contracting.

19 MR. HAMMOND: And that's very purposeful so  
20 that we're very independent, and they operate  
21 independently.

22 MS. MELLO: Yeah, I think that was very much  
23 part of the legislative intent. And I know the folks here  
24 at the Department worked really hard to honor that. And I  
25 think the task force has been very mindful that that is





1 their charge, right? To be this independent kind of  
2 convened entity looking at this really important topic for  
3 our state.

4 MS. NEAL: I don't think you attended the one  
5 in Grand Junction, did you? (Chuckles)

6 MS. MELLO: Madam Vice, Mr. Chair, Madam Vice  
7 Chair, I did not attend all the public input hearings, you  
8 are correct about that.

9 MS. NEAL: And I did not get a chance at  
10 either. I had planned to attend it, but this arm got in  
11 the way. But from what I read and heard and had reported  
12 to me, it was very well-attended and had (chuckles) very  
13 wide-ranging discussion. I have not heard a formal report  
14 on it yet, but I will be looking forward to it.

15 MS. MELLO: Thank you. According to some of  
16 the correspondence I've gotten from the from Laura  
17 Lefkowitz, who is the person that the task force hired to  
18 kind of help them coordinate all of their work. They are  
19 working on written summaries of all those public input  
20 meetings. They haven't completed that process yet.

21 So you may recall, when I spoke to you about a  
22 month ago, they were getting ready to launch into a series  
23 of these public meetings. They were doing them around the  
24 state. And so that process is almost complete. I believe  
25 there's one meeting they still have to do. But they are



1 working on written summaries of all of those. And we can  
2 make that information available, certainly, as well.

3 The other big thing, and we've talked a little  
4 bit about this before, that they, relatively early on,  
5 decided it would be a helpful decision-making tool for  
6 them to create what they call the system impacts grid. So  
7 it was kind of a way of saying, okay, if we change this  
8 over here, what impact does that have in all these other  
9 ways? If we change something about testing, what impact  
10 does it have an accountability, for example, or you know,  
11 on all the different things. So that's another tool that  
12 they have asked the Department for help on. That will be  
13 something that gets presented on Monday as well, kind of  
14 that matrix, if you will.

15 I really view this meeting on Monday as this  
16 is when they get the big kind of information load that  
17 they have asked for, right? They'll be getting all these  
18 pieces of data. And so now -- and the -- they'll start  
19 that afternoon, and then going into their next couple of  
20 meetings really be in the decision-making process of okay,  
21 now that we have all this information. Now that we really  
22 had a chance to talk to the public, think about this  
23 issue, where do we want to go? So the next meetings will  
24 be particularly interesting to start to see how that comes  
25 together.



1 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Do you know what time and  
2 where the Monday meeting is?

3 MS. MELLO: It is at State Capitol. I don't  
4 know the room number off the top of my head. We can  
5 certainly get it for you. I believe it starts at 9:00,  
6 but let me confirm that. They typically have been doing  
7 like a 9:00 to 3:00 format.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, it's on the CDE  
9 website, as requested by this Board. All of the public  
10 input hearings are out there plus the meeting coming up.  
11 It does not -- I was just looking at a website also trying  
12 to figure out the room number. It's not on the website,  
13 but it's over at the capitol.

14 MS. MELLO: Jill just whispered to me that's  
15 in room 112.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 112. There you have it.

17 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: 112 at 9:00 a.m.?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The internet is helpful,  
19 but not as good as a live human being.

20 (Chuckling)

21 MS. MELLO: I nothing's as good as Jill. So  
22 that's in the basement. That's one of those big house  
23 committee rooms in the basement, which is how I think of  
24 it. I don't actually know any room numbers at all at the  
25 Capitol because -- so that, unless there's any other



1 questions about those interim (indiscernible) courses,  
2 kind of concludes that portion of my --

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I do have one question  
4 about that. Are there -- but I'll let others go first  
5 with their questions about the 1202 task force. Jane?

6 MS. NEAL: Oh, Jane is here. (Chuckles)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She snuck in. Well --

8 MS. GOFF: Can we get a legislative priority  
9 to give the State Board a helicopter?

10 (Laughter)

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll be happy to be  
12 (indiscernible).

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll get you a jet pack.

14 MS. MELLO: Only if I can get rides on an as-  
15 needed basis.

16 MS. GOFF: I am not meant to be in a car the  
17 last couple days.

18 (Chuckling)

19 MS. GOFF: Gosh.

20 MS. MELLO: Okay. All right. Pulling us back  
21 together here.

22 MS. GOFF: I have -- can I -- my question?

23 MS. MELLO: Oh, please. Yes.

24 MS. GOFF: Really quickly, and I'm -- tell me  
25 if you've already gone over this. The survey, there was a



1 survey put out by the task force. How widespread was  
2 that? Was that a full community participation  
3 opportunity?

4 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, for Board Member Goff,  
5 the Augenblick and Meyers, who was the consultant that  
6 they hired to do some research, did a number of different  
7 surveys. And I think they worked really hard to get those  
8 out as broadly as possible, you know, both to teachers, to  
9 school administrators, I think to parents as well. So I  
10 think that certainly was their intent.

11 They also did this series of public meetings  
12 around the state again to give the public -- I mean,  
13 they've always been soliciting written input. They wanted  
14 to give people additional, so that's as much as I kind of,  
15 I mean, that's not a very specific answer. And I'll just  
16 turn to Jill to see if you have any more detail on that.

17 MS. HUCHISON: Mr. Chair. So this was  
18 discussed quite thoroughly at the meeting with APA, that  
19 the task force had. There was a desire to get surveys  
20 that would reach parents. There wasn't a venue or a way  
21 to get out, get a survey to parent audiences. So the way  
22 that they addressed getting parent community feedback was  
23 the -- these public meetings that they're doing all across  
24 the state. But they instead focused the survey on trying  
25 to get it down to teachers. So to get teacher feedback,



1 because as you recall, when we did the WestEd Study, we  
2 didn't have a lot of time or resources.

3 So we just did one per district more at a DAC  
4 level. And they wanted to get lower, and really, because  
5 they're trying to get at impact on instructional time, how  
6 teachers are assessed. So this was really focused at  
7 trying to get at schools and in to teachers to get that  
8 kind of feedback. And then they'll get the parent and  
9 community from the public meetings.

10 MS. GOFF: Okay. So the -- so a survey with  
11 responses requested separate -- is separate from the  
12 public input through email to the email address? That's  
13 what I mean. Okay, thank you. I just --

14 MS. MELLO: Yes, they're additive ways of  
15 collecting information. And I'm sure the report, once we  
16 see it, will talk about how many responses they got and  
17 the distribution of those. I mean, I -- and that'll be an  
18 important thing, I think, to look at in terms of  
19 evaluating that information.

20 MS. GOFF: Okay. Thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Are there questions? No.  
22 Okay. So a correction on my part. The actual meeting  
23 agenda is visible on the ACD website, and it does, at the  
24 top of the agenda, have the room number.

25 (Chuckling)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So and all that information  
2 is out there.

3 Now the question I have is are they expecting  
4 more than one report out at the end of the project? Will  
5 there be a majority report, minority report? How will the  
6 information come out of this? Have they landed on their  
7 process with regard to that issue?

8 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, the legislation very  
9 specifically allows for majority and minority reports. I  
10 think they don't know yet, because I don't think they have  
11 had -- I think they've been waiting for the information.  
12 And now that they are going to be getting that  
13 information, they will really start the kind of -- the  
14 hard part of the work. Right?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

16 MS. MELLO: And I think it remains to be seen  
17 whether there will be enough consensus to just have one  
18 report coming out, or whether there'll be a majority and  
19 minority report. I don't know at this point. Both are  
20 possibilities.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Excellent. Okay, I  
22 think that exhausts this issue.

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay, I have one more  
24 question.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That does not exhaust this



1 issue. We have more energy on this issue. Please, go  
2 ahead.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Is the focus around  
4 assessments, or is the focus around PARCC?

5 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member Gantz-  
6 Berman. Both. I mean, I think they have taken a global  
7 look at assessments. I mean, particularly the way they  
8 have taken a fairly deep dive into local assessments,  
9 right? I mean, that's obviously not PARCC. But there  
10 are, of course, not ignoring PARCC either. I think it's  
11 been a very comprehensive look at how we assess students.

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: About all the assessments  
13 that are out there. So it's not just singularly focused  
14 on this PARCC for this, PARCC for that. It's about the  
15 READ Act. It's about --

16 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member Gantz-  
17 Berman. Absolutely. I mean, I think that has been -- and  
18 this is kind of my opinion to some extent, but I think  
19 most people would agree they have taken a very broad look  
20 at the assessment picture. All pieces of it and  
21 components.

22 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And it's -- I can go on the  
23 website too and look, but does the agenda -- is the agenda  
24 spelled out so you know what happens at 9, 10, 11 and 12?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You bet. And it's got nine





1 windows throughout the day, starting at 9:00, closing at  
2 3:30. And it identifies the various segments of what will  
3 be happening at what time.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay. (Indiscernible).

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, I think next issue.

6 MS. MELLO: The main thing I want to talk  
7 about is the legislative priorities and in that  
8 conversation, but what I will just say in terms of --  
9 obviously, the elections have just concluded. We still --  
10 neither the House Democrats or the House, excuse me, the  
11 House Democrats or the Senate Democrats have held their  
12 leadership elections yet. The House Dems will do that  
13 this Friday. The Senate Dems will do that this Saturday.  
14 So things are still a little bit in flux.

15 I think we all know generally the results of  
16 the elections. I don't need to be the one to describe  
17 that to you. What I will just remind you is that now that  
18 we'll be in a situation where we have one party  
19 controlling one chamber and another party controlling the  
20 other chamber. What that typically means is less --  
21 fewer bills passed, right? And the bills that do pass  
22 tend to be more things that you can get -- generate  
23 bipartisan support for.

24 So it will be a different climate than then  
25 we've operated under in the last couple of years since



1 I've been working with you all, where we had one party in  
2 control of all three branches. And there were a lot of  
3 proposals that came through, I think, as a result of that.  
4 So I think we'll see -- it will be a little bit more of a  
5 smaller, more contained conversation this year. What that  
6 conversation looks like I think is still very, very much  
7 to be determined.

8 As you know, the Governor's budget proposed  
9 some new additional increases in funding for schools.  
10 Running that through the negative factor, which I think  
11 school districts are, in general, pleased with. I think  
12 they're still trying to figure out if they're fully  
13 pleased with it, or if it's quite enough for them. But  
14 you know, the funding conversation has been a big one. It  
15 will continue to be a big one. There's no doubt about  
16 that.

17 This assessment conversation, the result of  
18 the 1202 Task Force, I think, will also certainly be a  
19 conversation at the capitol this year. Other than that,  
20 I'm not quite sure. I don't have a great -- my crystal  
21 ball is really cloudy at the moment. Maybe in December it  
22 will be a little clearer. But we're still at a somewhat  
23 unsettled time. And it's hard to say exactly what  
24 different kinds of proposals we'll see moving forward.

25 So that's my legislative preview, which is



1 very not helpful. I'm not knowledgeable.

2 MS. NEAL: No big thing out there that  
3 everybody's waiting for, right?

4 MS. MELLO: No.

5 MS. NEAL: No?

6 MS. MELLO: I mean, not that I know of. If  
7 so, they've cut -- they've kept it a really good secret  
8 from me.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So two questions on the  
10 school finance front. One is that my understanding is  
11 that in the Governor's budget, part of the increase in  
12 school funding is one time only. So if you can explain  
13 that, at least that's what I read.

14 And then the second question has to do with  
15 that the Governor is recommending returning the surplus,  
16 the Tabor surplus, and I know that Pat Stedman was saying  
17 we shouldn't be returning the state's -- the surplus, and  
18 we should be using it for public education. So my  
19 question on the second is, does the JBC and the State  
20 legislature make that decision? Does the Governor make  
21 that decision? And when will that decision be made? So  
22 two questions.

23 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member Gantz-  
24 Berman, let me take your second question first, if you  
25 don't mind, to give Leann time to come up here and help me



1 with the first part of your question.

2 The Governor, so we're at -- our budget is at  
3 a -- it's a strange time in terms of our budget, the way  
4 that it's shaping up for the 15-16 fiscal year, because  
5 they are project -- most economists are projecting. We  
6 don't know for sure. It's a projection that we will hit  
7 our Tabor cap, which means just briefly, right, Tabor said  
8 you can only keep so much money. And when your  
9 collections exceed that, you have to give it back. And  
10 most analysts think well, we will reach that cap in the  
11 upcoming fiscal year, which means you have to find a  
12 mechanism to refund the voters. That all happens unless  
13 the voters approve. So remember the Rev-C, you know, the  
14 Rev-D, you know, that we all, I think, probably remember  
15 that. You know, is it's ten years ago now?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wow. (Indiscernible).

17 MS. MELLO: My goodness. I'm feeling old. In  
18 order for the State to keep revenue in excess of the Tabor  
19 cap, you've got to go to the voters for approval.

20 That can happen through a variety of ways. It  
21 can be a referred measured by the legislature. It doesn't  
22 have to be. So we'll see how that plays out. I mean, I  
23 think we are at the very, very beginning of that  
24 conversation.

25 And I think part of what I heard the Governor



1 say yesterday in his presentation was his perspective is  
2 we need to budget conservatively in the sense that we  
3 should assume that that's going to be the case. So that  
4 we don't spend money that that we end up not being able to  
5 keep, right? I mean, if you think about it, like from  
6 your household budget perspective, right? Like if you  
7 think you might have to give a bunch of your money back,  
8 you may not want to make plans to spend that money. And  
9 if you don't have to give it back well, great, but you  
10 know, if it works out the other way around, that can be a  
11 real budgeting problem. So I think that's where the  
12 Governor is coming from in terms of presenting his budget.

13 It will be like it always is in that the  
14 Governor presents his budget. The JBC has a huge amount  
15 of authority controlling. I mean, Colorado is a very  
16 legislatively controlled state when it comes to the  
17 budget. I think it's -- most people would say the  
18 legislature has more control over the final budget than  
19 the Governor does. But it's always a negotiation. In  
20 some years, some people have more influence. In other  
21 years, others do. So, again, not a very specific answer  
22 to your question. (Chuckles)

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, no, I think the  
24 answer is it goes to the voters, and it's not up to the  
25 Governor or the legislature.



1 MS. MELLO: I think the Governor and the  
2 legislature have a lot of say in shaping the conversation,  
3 though, I would say. But yes, at the end of the day, the  
4 only people who can say you get to keep extra money and  
5 spend it, do whatever you can do with it as a voter, so.

6 And then Leanne, do you mind on the details of  
7 the school finance part?

8 MS. EMM: Sure. Mr. Chair, the Governor's  
9 proposal did propose to fund not only growth and inflation  
10 but buy down the negative factor by \$200 million. And  
11 what they are thinking is that that \$200 million, what it  
12 did is it bought down the negative factor from  
13 approximately \$900 million this year to about \$700 million  
14 next year. And then since it would be one time, there  
15 would be no guarantee that that negative factor would stay  
16 at the 700 million point. That that would be a  
17 negotiation in the following budget year as to where that  
18 should land. Does that help?

19 MS. MELLO: I'll confess. I called on Leanne  
20 because I think this is a very -- it is a strange one-time  
21 but not one-time kind of proposal. Again, this -- I'm  
22 just giving you my observation on it. It's pretty  
23 nuanced.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But it's worth talking  
25 about, because this is something that people do not



1 understand. You know, we all live in a life where it's  
2 linear. If I didn't make as much money this year as I  
3 made last year, I just adjust my life, and I move on. But  
4 the Constitution and the laws require that we forever must  
5 look backwards in the world of education towards something  
6 that once was but may not be currently reality. But  
7 somehow because there are words in the Constitution and  
8 the law, we have to pretend that it's reality. And so  
9 understanding that disconnect between reality, you know,  
10 the financial reality of what's going on today and what  
11 the law says it should be is one of the big questions I am  
12 constantly peppered with when I'm out talking with people  
13 about education. So, you know, if you want to take  
14 another crack at it, because there were some glazed eyes.

15 MS. EMM: Sure. Maybe another way to frame  
16 this, Mr. Chair, is that if the districts were to plan on  
17 this amount of money coming into their district this year,  
18 then they need to be very strategic on how they might plan  
19 for the funding. Because if, in fact, it was not  
20 available next year again, then they are going to have to  
21 be very careful about how they plan to use that one-time  
22 chunk of money that can come in this year.

23 And I believe that that's going to be a very  
24 interesting conversation this year as far as should that  
25 be one-time money coming in, or should it be an ongoing



1 fund -- funded amount that brings the total program up  
2 again on an ongoing basis. I think that'll be a very  
3 interesting conversation.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So when the Governor funds  
6 growth and inflation, are we still adding to the negative  
7 factor? Because it -- because of the years when we didn't  
8 completely fund growth and inflation? Is that roughly  
9 what you're talking about?

10 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, last year's legislation  
11 included a statement in it that said that the negative  
12 factor would not get any deeper than it was last year. So  
13 in effect, they are not allowing the negative factor to  
14 get any deeper by funding all of that growth and  
15 inflation. And again, that is a -- that is also a nuanced  
16 kind of conversation. But basically, yes.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: It's sort of -- I think I see  
18 two things going on. There's a lawsuit, I believe, that  
19 says that if the plaintiffs prevail, all the factors will  
20 be subject to the Amendment 23 inflation --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Requirements, yeah.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: -- requirements. Then there's  
23 the negative factor, which is all the money that has been  
24 lost in the past by districts that they could not provide,  
25 that the Governor is trying to make up. So I'm over here





1 on this side about annual. Are we now giving inflation to  
2 all the factors, growth and inflation, or just the ones  
3 that we were doing when we were going through the  
4 recession?

5 MS. EMM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That's a hard  
6 question to answer, and I apologize.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: But I want an answer.  
8 (Chuckles) Because I'm trying to understand how you get  
9 through all this with our voters, right?

10 MS. EMM: So the way the negative factor works  
11 is that you take your base per pupil funding, which is  
12 what Amendment 23 is applied to. That's the number that  
13 picks up the inflationary piece. And that's part of the  
14 contention of the Dwyer Lawsuit, is that it should not  
15 only be on the base. It should be against the whole pie  
16 that inflation has been applied.

17 So since base funding is only picking up the  
18 inflation, and then the factors are applied to that base,  
19 which gives every district the different funding, per  
20 pupil funding amount. You calculate the total program pie  
21 for each district, and then the negative factors apply to  
22 that pie at the same rate. So different districts will  
23 have different effects on their factors that give them  
24 their total program.

25 So I'm trying to come back to the question,



1        though, in that --

2                    MS. SCHROEDER: Are we giving inflation on the  
3 factors? Growth and inflation?

4                    MS. EMM: We're giving inflation on the base  
5 per pupil funding.

6                    MS. SCHROEDER: But not --

7                    MS. EMM: But not the factors.

8                    MS. SCHROEDER: So if the loss -- if the  
9 plaintiffs were to prevail, that would -- still wouldn't  
10 affect the negative factor, that sum of money. It would  
11 just change the annual school finance calculation because  
12 we're still under that opinion that says we don't need to  
13 give inflation for the factors.

14                   MS. EMM: Yes, Mr. Chair, it could  
15 significantly impact the amount of total program that  
16 would be available to districts. Absolutely.

17                   MS. SCHROEDER: And that lawsuit does not try  
18 to get money back from the negative factor, from what's  
19 been -- what districts have felt shorted about up till  
20 now. That lawsuit is only going forward. Is that right?

21                   MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, that's the way I  
22 understand it, is that it's not a retroactive-type fix.  
23 It's looking forward.

24                   MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry.

25                   MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So I have one --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Go ahead. Go ahead.

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: You sure?

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I've got to think a  
4 little before I -- and this is goofy

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So the \$200 million that  
6 the Governor is recommending against the negative factor  
7 does not go into the school finance formula.

8 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, it does in that it's  
9 applied at the end. So once your pie is calculated, once  
10 your district's pie is calculated, then that negative  
11 factor isn't going to be as -- it's not going to cut out  
12 as big of a chunk is it had in the past. So --

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But it doesn't go to the  
14 base.

15 MS. EMM: Exactly. Yes.

16 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay. And that's why it's  
17 one-time funding, because if it went to the base. Okay, I  
18 think I've finally got it now.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: You'd have to do it every  
20 year?

21 MR. HAMMOND: It still is a revenue source for  
22 the district that --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: For that year.

24 MR. HAMMOND: -- they -- for that year that  
25 they would have to be very careful of. If I was in a



1 district, yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It may not reappear.

3 MR. HAMMOND: I would -- it would be prudent  
4 to budget that in a different way, because we apply that  
5 the salaries. You could find yourself in a predicament  
6 real bad.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: But if you apply it to the  
8 things we've been hearing about, which is we don't have  
9 the capacity to give assessments. We don't have the  
10 textbooks that are up-to-date.

11 MR. HAMMOND: Capital --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Cap --

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Technology.

14 MR. HAMMOND: And technology.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Well capital technology, but  
16 capital, no. Capital is a different budget. But --

17 MR. HAMMOND: Well, technology.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: There are a lot of things that  
19 we could -- that are basically infrastructure needs and  
20 resource needs for kids and teachers that could make a  
21 huge difference.

22 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so this is very  
24 interesting to me. I could go on all day, but I think we  
25 should probably move on.



1 MS. NEAL: If you saw -- if you could solve  
2 the problem, we can go on all day.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I can solve the  
4 problem.

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: We can all fall asleep to -  
6 -

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But I don't have the  
8 authority so. (Chuckles) Miss Mello?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

10 MS. MELLO: It is a -- thank you, Leanne. As  
11 always. (Chuckles) My resource as well on all of these  
12 questions.

13 I will make one observation, which is the  
14 truth of the matter is any money the legislature  
15 appropriates to anybody or anything is one time, because  
16 the next legislature can always come along and change  
17 that. I think that --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. We've got to change  
19 Amendment 23.

20 MS. MELLO: That is true.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, sorry.

22 MS. MELLO: Absolutely. Right. But I, you  
23 know, in terms of the way the overall funding picture  
24 works, and so I think that part of what's challenging  
25 about school finances, that for a number of years we --



1       because it's formula-driven, I think that reality of the -  
2       - what the legislature giveth, the legislature can taketh  
3       away, became much more present when we had the most recent  
4       recession, and the negative factor was created and all of  
5       that. The other parts of the budget would say that  
6       they've -- that's been their reality for a long time.

7                        So that's just an observation. I think  
8       sometimes it's helpful. We get very focused on education.  
9       You know, there are other pieces of the budget that would  
10      say, well yeah, (chuckles) that's how it always works for  
11      us, so.

12                      CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, and then I would  
13      encourage everybody to take the next step and move from  
14      the education portion of the budget to the balance of the  
15      state budget to a family budget. The family budget  
16      doesn't have built in guaranteed increases, etcetera. And  
17      so they just adjust to reality naturally. And that's  
18      something that consistently gets left out of conversation,  
19      but it's -- I think it's a perspective builder. Please  
20      proceed.

21                      MS. MELLO: So, Mr. Chair, with your all's  
22      permission, perhaps we can take up the -- your 2015  
23      legislative priorities next. Unless anyone has any other  
24      questions about legislation or anything like that?

25                      CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sounds like a plan.



1 MS. MELLO: Okay. So I did my best to  
2 encapsulate the discussion that you all had a month ago.  
3 This document was circulated to all of you. There was one  
4 additional suggestion made by Vice Chairman Neal. I think  
5 you find that on -- it's in section seven around early  
6 childhood education. The insertion of the words,  
7 particularly at-risk children. So that was a second  
8 version of this that was then distributed to all of you in  
9 advance of this meeting.

10 I'm happy to answer any questions about this,  
11 or take your criticism and feedback if I did not  
12 adequately capture your sentiments, or help with this  
13 discussion any way I can.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair?

15 MS. NEAL: No, I was just going to ask you if  
16 I could share. I didn't bring my copy.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, you want to look on?  
18 This is not a test. You may look on with me.

19 (Chuckling)

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, that side. That side.  
21 Flip it over. I was working on the center page there.  
22 Oh, here you go. Carrie's going to give you your own  
23 personal copy.

24 MS. NEAL: Oh, thank you, Carrie.

25 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I have a question, and I



1 don't know, Marcia, whether this --

2 MS. NEAL: Go right ahead, Elaine.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: -- came -- well I -- this  
4 question may -- well, this came from you. But on number  
5 five, we added B. Provide flexibility in the way small  
6 districts of fewer than 1,000 students meet reporting  
7 requirements and implementation requirements in order to  
8 minimize the burden on small district school staff.

9 Just tell me the -- I mean, it sounds great,  
10 but I imagine every district's going to want flexibility.  
11 So where did that come from? And --

12 MS. NEAL: I don't have that.

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: You don't have that?

14 MS. MARKEL: Sure.

15 MS. NEAL: Five?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Five B.

17 MS. NEAL: Could I have another one? Well, I  
18 thought I had the latest iteration. Maybe I don't. But  
19 this was in our packet?

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: On your desk? Maybe you'd  
21 don't.

22 MS. NEAL: Maybe I don't.

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay, here comes Carrie.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Maybe it's in here. It's in  
25 red.





1 MS. NEAL: I thought I pulled it out of here  
2 yesterday, but maybe I didn't.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So Marcia, did that come  
4 from you or just does anybody remember what --

5 MS. NEAL: Well, I think what I was -- you  
6 know how we never know what we're talking about several  
7 months ago. That smaller districts frequently have to go  
8 through certain hoops that are really unnecessary because  
9 for them, it amounts to either little or no money, but  
10 they still have to follow the rules. That there should be  
11 more flexibility for small districts that kind of say this  
12 doesn't fit for us, you know? It doesn't work for us.  
13 Now, it doesn't impact any of the various things that  
14 happen.

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So I'm fine with that. But  
16 I just think -- I think every district wants this kind of  
17 flexibility. We hear this from everybody, in particular  
18 some smaller --

19 MS. NEAL: Well, they do, but not in the --

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: -- districts.

21 MS. NEAL: -- same way that all smaller  
22 districts, all rural districts, have very much the same  
23 problem.

24 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, let me ask the  
25 commissioner on this. I mean, does this present -- when



1 it says meet reporting requirements and implement in order  
2 to minimize the burden. I mean, it's almost like saying,  
3 you know, eh, yeah. We'll give you guys a pass, but  
4 everybody else has to do this stuff.

5 So I think you can write it. I just don't  
6 know if you want to write it this way. Because it seems  
7 like we're --

8 MS. NEAL: And I'm open to suggestions.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The operative -- okay, so  
10 my feedback is this. There's a rationale. The rationale  
11 is it sits on the teeter totter of 1,000. Fewer than  
12 1,000 there, it's a different world, we'll say. And there  
13 is a certain vagueness in this that allows for the  
14 commissioner and the Board to take appropriate action.  
15 And that is embedded in the word flexibility. That's all  
16 that the request is for, is to provide flexibility. So I  
17 would be supportive of it as drafted. I think it makes  
18 sense and is rationally supportable.

19 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair. I'm sorry.

20 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Commissioner. We'll let you  
21 give feedback, and then Angelika can follow in after that.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. Go ahead, Ronald.

23 MR. HAMMOND: No, in answer to your question,  
24 I'm really fine with the wording. Because what we've  
25 talked about in the rules, the rules have talked to for



1 some time, is a consideration by the legislature, because  
2 all of our reporting requirements are either in state  
3 statute or they're required by the feds. So we don't have  
4 a lot of flexibility, except what can be waived under  
5 certain statutes. We talked about that yesterday.

6 So actually the way it's written, in some  
7 cases, the legislature may consider districts less than  
8 250 students would be exempt from a particular law. It's  
9 just by our definition, we have 105 school districts in  
10 this state that are less than 1,000 students. And we have  
11 38 school districts that I'd say that are less than 200.  
12 But more importantly, those 38, you have the  
13 superintendent is also a principal at the same time. What  
14 it's really trying to get at is when you come below 1,000  
15 population, when you consider any rule, and we do that in  
16 the Department, anything. You should look at the impact  
17 to districts less than 1,000 and gauge how that's going to  
18 impact those, especially the smallest ones. So that gives  
19 a flexibility up to 1,000. So that's -- I have no problem  
20 with the way it's written.

21 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: You know, I'm going to take  
22 that --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika was next, and then  
24 I'll come to you.

25 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, I'm going to say I'm



1 going to take back what I said.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, okay.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So you can still talk, but  
4 I think I didn't focus on in the way. You know, I focused  
5 on not having them do it. So in other words, what this is  
6 basically saying they still have to meet the reporting  
7 requirements, but it's the way they report it. And I  
8 didn't read it that way.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: And it might be better to  
11 clarify that, but I -- what I want to clarify is that the  
12 outcomes for kids are there because smaller districts are  
13 much more nimble, and they can get to the same point for  
14 our kids without engaging in some of the legislation that  
15 we have for larger districts. Nonetheless, I want the  
16 assurance that the outcomes for students are going to be  
17 similar. That we have proficient students.

18 So that's the piece that makes me a little  
19 uncomfortable, you know. Oh, hell no, we just don't want  
20 to do it, as opposed to here are some different ways that  
21 we can accomplish this, ensuring that students have a  
22 quality education.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

25 MR. HAMMOND: (Indiscernible) that might help.



1 When you consider flexibility, and you always have the  
2 overriding your accountability system for schools and for  
3 districts. And that really is what the governance -- when  
4 we try anything new or different, that in the long run is  
5 the outcome. Did that actually go down because we did  
6 something?

7 And so I would say it's the same thing here.  
8 I mean, if you notice something through legislation that,  
9 you know, that we're picking up on the performance on the  
10 accountability side, that they're going down, then you  
11 start asking questions why. Now, I mean, it's -- did this  
12 really backfire in some way? I mean, there's a lot of  
13 variables to consider. You know that. But I just throw  
14 that out, because our accountability system is where  
15 anything shows up.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: But they're requesting out of  
17 the assessments, which are part of the accountability  
18 system.

19 MR. HAMMOND: Which it couldn't --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So we have to be --

21 MR. HAMMOND: -- by federal law.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, that's what I'm a little  
23 worried about. I don't know to what extent they want --  
24 we are comfortable that these kids' needs are being met.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair.



1 MS. NEAL: And I guess I would just add that  
2 if you didn't do that, you still don't have that assurance  
3 that it makes the difference. That they really will do  
4 well because of that.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: This is true. Some of the  
6 things that were, as I said, they're so much more nimble.  
7 There's so many other ways that they can get that.

8 MS. NEAL: And when you get to that small a  
9 group, you know, is it worth it? Is it worth it to make  
10 them jump through some hoops --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Through hoops.

12 MS. NEAL: -- that they didn't need to jump  
13 through --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: It's not the hoops.

15 MS. NEAL: -- because perhaps --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: It's the outcomes. It's the  
17 outcomes I want to be able to (indiscernible).

18 MS. NEAL: Yeah, I understand both of it,  
19 yeah.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not -- I don't have the  
21 desire to create hoops where they don't make any  
22 difference.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Actually, what is happening --  
24 sometimes I worry about -- not so much maybe 1,000 of  
25 those very small districts. Some of the things that we



1 required over the years, it's like just that extra added  
2 little thing that keeps them from focusing on the core  
3 important things.

4 And you know, you have some superintendents --  
5 I'll just ignore it. But you have a lot of conscientious  
6 ones that really want to try and do everything. When I  
7 wished I could tell them, don't do that. Just focus on  
8 this, but that's really not -- you want to help your kids,  
9 and they do. But if you do this, that's really defocusing  
10 you. But I must do all those, so that's why I feel kind  
11 of strong about something like this as legislative members  
12 consider future bills. And --

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I'm fine. Now that I read  
14 it again, I'm completely fine. And I'm sorry. As I said,  
15 I focused on the backend and not the frontend of the  
16 sentence.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

18 MS. MELLO: I have something else. We're done  
19 with this. This is fine.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

21 MS. MELLO: Does anybody else have their hand  
22 up? Jane?

23 MS. GOFF: I just want to real quick check in,  
24 and this may not sound like it relates to this. Yesterday  
25 -- it came up yesterday when we were talking about



1 accreditation and recognizing -- giving some, I don't know  
2 what we want to call it, off time to schools that  
3 continually do well, whatever. Changing that around a  
4 little bit. Can I? I need some clarification, Jill.  
5 Maybe today you're it, or Elliot? Do we not have  
6 something in place that's a three-year -- there's a three-  
7 year hiatus? Is that UIP planning, or what? Or was that  
8 legislation that was being considered, we were going to  
9 take a look at school districts and school districts that  
10 have had a series of years of performing or better. And  
11 then it was a three-year --

12 MR. HAMMOND: Is that out of the UIP, Elliott?

13 MS. GOFF: Is that UIP only?

14 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah, Elliott, come on up if you  
15 can.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's for the  
17 (indiscernible).

18 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah, I'm pretty sure that was  
19 it.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They'd get to only have  
21 to produce (indiscernible).

22 MR. HAMMOND: If you'd (indiscernible).

23 MR. ASP: Yeah, it's for small districts,  
24 rural districts that are performing well. They have to do  
25 a UIP every other year. So they could continue -- would





1 not have to turn in.

2 MS. GOFF: But it didn't -- so what was the  
3 impact on their accreditation status again. Just --

4 MR. ASP: I believe it's performance only.

5 MS. GOFF: Only through performance measures,  
6 okay.

7 MR. HAMMOND: And then we combine them if they  
8 were one of those 38. They didn't have to do one on every  
9 single year. They could do that as a district, I believe.

10 MR. ASP: Yeah, I believe that's the case.

11 MS. GOFF: Thanks. I'm just -- my mind's  
12 going -- this is sideways rather than up and down today  
13 about how this might relate to that flexibility mode.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, Elaine. Next issue.

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So how much time do we  
16 have?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You have exactly 32  
18 seconds.

19 (Laughter)

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: How much time do we have?

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, technically,  
22 practically, not that we have to prove Parkinson's Law --

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But you guys get longer  
24 than 30 seconds. (Chuckles)

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- through and expand to



1 fill the time available, but we have until 10:45.

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay, so I'm going to dive  
3 in on a subject that you care deeply about, Paul. Do you  
4 have your hand raised.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, no.

6 MS. NEAL: No.

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Oh. (Chuckles)

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I do.

9 MS. NEAL: You just carried my pen around.

10 (Chuckling)

11 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So you said yesterday --  
12 let's see if we can reach some consensus as a Board. This  
13 is going to be a real challenge.

14 You said yesterday that before you leave the  
15 Board, you want us to make some statement about  
16 assessments.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right sizing and  
18 assessments.

19 MS. GOFF: About what?

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Assessments.

21 MS. GOFF: Assessments?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right sizing assessments,  
23 that's correct.

24 MS. NEAL: I said that in a moment of madness?

25 (Chuckles)



1 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: No, you're not leaving the  
2 Board.

3 MS. NEAL: Oh. Oh, oh, okay. You're -- it's  
4 your fault.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She's one of them.

6 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: You're staying, Marcia.  
7 Did you forget?

8 (Chuckling)

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Which would fall under  
10 number four, right? And right now, we have very, very  
11 little under four. So I had sent the Chairs some ideas a  
12 while ago actually about what to include, and we kind of  
13 went back-and-forth. And I'm going to make some  
14 suggestions. And I'm going to include Paul, one of your  
15 suggestions as well. Okay?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you.

17 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So and this is not new  
18 stuff for us, but it's pretty straightforward. But if we  
19 look at characteristics of assessments -- so I would -- I  
20 do not want to get into the conversation of PARCC or no  
21 PARCC, but rather the characteristics of the types of  
22 assessments that the State Board could support.

23 So timely results capable of providing  
24 information on student growth over time. Limited impact  
25 on instructional time. Actionable information at the



1 student programs, school and district level. Assesses  
2 higher-order thinking skills. Relevant to students,  
3 meaning a test worth taking. And then Paul, what you  
4 asked to be included as a system of assessments. So that  
5 is my proposal. You want to --

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, in the context that  
7 you're mapping, I would change my word system to network  
8 or menu.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I think you said systems.  
10 A system of --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I did, but it was in a  
12 slightly different context, but -- so we can talk about  
13 the detail of that, but --

14 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah. And maybe we can  
15 then --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- I'm trying to provide an  
17 element of flexibility with what I was pursuing in that  
18 context of system when in a list like this, sounds as more  
19 confining than what it was in our conversation, perhaps.

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So maybe what we could do  
21 is go -- and Robert?

22 MR. HAMMOND: Well, I'm just -- if you're on  
23 that line to just continue your dialogue, I'll just throw  
24 something out. What you're really talking about is  
25 supporting a system as assessment. You may not all agree



1 that. That would include these elements or  
2 characteristics. But that's one way you could look at  
3 that.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So in other words, the  
5 system of assessments would be the lead-in sentence of  
6 who's ever going to write this.

7 MR. HAMMOND: Or you're saying timely growth,  
8 yeah.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And then we'd list within  
10 that the characteristic of the system of assessments would  
11 be timely results capable bah, bah, bah, bah.

12 MR. HAMMOND: The flexibility.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Jane?

14 MS. GOFF: An idea. About -- I can't read it,  
15 but a vast majority of what was -- the words just used,  
16 and the phrase just -- phrases just used are in our  
17 attributes document that we agreed to in 2010. And so if  
18 we're just looking for key phrasing, what we might want to  
19 do is go back and look at that and see how we -- have we  
20 changed? I don't know. I mean, I don't have it front of  
21 me, but yet, I could. Have we changed our terminology?  
22 Have we changed our vision, our definition? Our what --  
23 have we changed the list of attributes?

24 We could just restate that or put it in a  
25 legislative proposal or priority format.



1 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Where is that document?

2 MS. GOFF: It's on the assessment page, isn't  
3 it?

4 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair? Yes. And we provided  
5 it also I think at the -- I'll pull it up. I think we  
6 provided it in your materials in August when we were  
7 continuing some of these conversations. It's also on the  
8 task force website.

9 MR. HAMMOND: Was that --

10 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: 2010.

11 MR. HAMMOND: The one I have is 2010. Is that  
12 right?

13 MS. MELLO: Yeah.

14 MR. HAMMOND: I'll just send that one.

15 MS. MELLO: Do you want to send that?

16 MR. HAMMOND: Uh-huh. I'll just send that  
17 (indiscernible).

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, since we have the  
19 time now, if we could pull it up now. We've got time to  
20 discuss it all and see what we can agree on.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, let's find it then.

22 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And you could either look  
23 at that or --

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We can do that, and let me  
25 speak to some of the principles maybe, characteristics.



1 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Much of what you're  
3 offering to do here and you're trying to do here, I agree  
4 with. There's no question about it. There's elements of  
5 this that I think most everyone would be grateful for.  
6 The timeliness is something that is absent in the current  
7 system.

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And would be greatly or  
10 positively received. So we can talk about things that  
11 would -- that we agree with, but there's a kind of a  
12 fundamental difference in an approach between how I might  
13 come after this and the way you're coming after it. You  
14 proposed a phrase, I think, was actionable at the  
15 district. I'd prefer to kind of turn that around and give  
16 the district flexibility to use something that is inherent  
17 in their culture, in their process, in their values, that  
18 is then useful for accountability.

19 So I'd just kind of flip the conversation  
20 around, you know. You're kind of coming at it, I think,  
21 from the accountability first perspective. I think that's  
22 inherent in what you're doing. And I would come at it  
23 from the let's free the districts to be doing what they  
24 do, educate students, and the information that they gather  
25 the assessments, they take be useful in accountability.



1 So it's kind of just which direction you come to it.  
2 Angelika?

3 MS. SCHROEDER: And I think if you listen to  
4 the psychometricians, I think they would say there's a  
5 limit. There are different tests for different purposes.  
6 And what you're recommending is that we have a test that  
7 does everything, and that doesn't exist. So do you --

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: No, that's why it says a  
9 system of assessments. It's not one assessment.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: But I would agree with Paul in  
11 terms of the assessments, that districts should still be  
12 very free to pick what assessments, and teachers should be  
13 very free to pick the assessments. What we're responsible  
14 for are the accountability assessments, and I think what  
15 you're talking about is building a broader system.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So okay, so now let me  
17 speak to --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: That's a worry to me.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let me join into this  
20 conversation. And I think we heard from our assessments -  
21 - who is our specialist? What's the name of the company  
22 that provided --

23 MS. MELLO: Center for Assessment.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Center for Assessments came  
25 in, and for me, they gave me a little window to look into





1 something that might be a slightly different perspective  
2 on the way we've approached this. The approach seems to  
3 always be we're going to create something that is perfect,  
4 that does the whole thing that is ideal. And they gave me  
5 a word, or I maybe I gave them back a word, but they gave  
6 me the premise, the concept, of correlation. If we can  
7 get a high degree of correlation to what's useful for  
8 accountability through a test that is primarily for the  
9 purpose of improving an educational experience, I would  
10 take that if I can get 85, 90, 95 percent correlation in  
11 utility to accountability. I would say make it 100  
12 percent perfect, or, you know, perfectly designed or  
13 primarily designed. Probably primarily designed is a  
14 better way of approaching it for the learning opportunity.  
15 And if I can get 90 percent correlation into an  
16 accountability system, I'll take it.

17 Which comes back to your question Angelika,  
18 the psychometricians may say you can't do a one-size-fits-  
19 all, one thing is perfect for everything. But if I can  
20 get a high degree of correlation, I would accept that.  
21 And again, my baseline would be at the district. It would  
22 be about the educational experience first, and  
23 accountability with a high degree of correlation sic.  
24 Jane?

25 MS. GOFF: The correlation to what? To each



1 other?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, to each other, to the  
3 utility --

4 MS. GOFF: Well, okay, and then --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- and effectiveness and  
6 veracity with regard to growth or whatever it is that  
7 you're trying to have.

8 MS. GOFF: Accountable to what? I guess  
9 that's where the -- I keep going back to the word  
10 attributes. Finding results and so on. But is -- does  
11 correlation mean a central fountain of what's measured?  
12 In other words, are we all -- are we thinking a body of  
13 standards, which have been taught, which have been  
14 measured. And regardless of the tool used to measure  
15 those standards, as long as they correlate, you know, I'm  
16 good with that. And I just want to know accountable  
17 toward what end? And the idea of districts choosing, I'm  
18 not sure what's really -- what's that mean? And how do we  
19 know there's a thread of correlation --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well --

21 MS. GOFF: -- if you have a bunch of districts  
22 choosing a bunch of assessments?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, Dr. Scheffel?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So my thought would be this is  
25 a pretty complex topic, obviously, right? And we're



1       trying to find out if we have any consensus on a couple of  
2       bullets that we would put in these legislative priorities.  
3       I think your point is, what's our model of assessment,  
4       right? We know that we can have a census model, where we  
5       have long documents that capture the language of the  
6       standards. And then the items on the assessments are  
7       almost a census of those standards. So you've got many,  
8       many items, as opposed to a sampling approach where you've  
9       got much fewer items and use different psychometrics to  
10      correlate with some external benchmark. Right? So the  
11      question, what kind of model are we adopting here?

12                               And that's why we're, I think, we're a  
13      little confused about our direction. But I think it's  
14      around the language, actionable people providing  
15      information at the school and program level. That detail  
16      requires lots and lots of items. And I think it does  
17      diminish local control. So I think that we should land on  
18      a couple bullets that makes sense for our legislative  
19      priorities, which could be timely, minimal impact on  
20      instructional time, growth over time. If we're going to  
21      drill down to -- and we also want to give actionable data  
22      for districts at the program level. Woo! That's not  
23      possible (chuckles) with the kind of assessments that we  
24      have. I mean, then we're doing a census of specific items  
25      at fifth grade that are actionable for it to -- I mean, we



1 really don't want that in our system. So I think the  
2 model that we're thinking about impacts this language.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, and perhaps we  
4 acknowledge, in our framing statement, this is not a  
5 completely designed, you know, assessment program that  
6 we're talking about. But these are principles. These are  
7 characteristics that this Board would like to see in what  
8 the next assessment regime in Colorado looks like. So  
9 even if we can only get part of a loaf out of this, I  
10 would go for that.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: If we could even get the  
12 notion of timeliness in there, that would direct the  
13 legislature to spend enough money, that they come back  
14 fast enough, that would be a big piece of the criticism  
15 that we have for what we're doing here. Because the  
16 districts are using the data. Not to the level that  
17 Elaine is suggesting, but they are using the information.  
18 They're just getting it back so darn late that they're  
19 very, very frustrated

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right. So --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So even that kind of message -  
22 -

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Is that the only one you  
24 would want to put in, Angelika?

25 MS. SCHROEDER: No, but I would not go to the



1 detail that you went to. What was it, timely --

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So let's leave that one  
3 out. Okay? So timely results. Why don't we go through  
4 them one by one? See if we can --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, timely results. I  
6 think we've got a winner there.

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So anybody have a problem  
8 with timely results? Okay, the next one capable of  
9 providing information on student growth over time. Okay.  
10 Silence means acceptance.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Three, limited impact on  
13 instructional time.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Whispers) I still don't  
15 think this belongs in legislation. I'm sorry.

16 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You're winning so far.

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Jane. Are you okay?

19 MS. GOFF: I'm not. I'll get somewhere with  
20 this.

21 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: No, no, no.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So tell. What are you  
24 thinking?

25 MS. GOFF: Well, no. I agree with every --



1 all of those things. I'm just saying that all of those  
2 things have been -- they've been around for a long time.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah, I think that's  
4 (indiscernible).

5 MS. GOFF: But we have it in all of our  
6 documentation.

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But it's not in our  
8 legislative priorities and what we want to do.

9 MS. GOFF: All right. Then the next question  
10 I would have is whose role is it to do what? I guess  
11 (chuckles) the funding for and providing and allocating  
12 resources for this, that is a legislative function. But  
13 as far as saying --

14 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: (Indiscernible).

15 MS. GOFF: -- what we consider to be, perhaps  
16 -- I don't know. If this is legislative action that we  
17 are prioritizing, is that necessary? Where does the  
18 authority lie to determine and define the assessment  
19 system, or whatever we call it? And I think we've already  
20 done that.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: That's a plus. That's a good  
22 point.

23 MS. GOFF: Putting it in legislative priority  
24 means legislative action is inferred, and I'm not sure  
25 that's where we are right now. Maybe what we chatted



1 about earlier, (chuckles) a statement of or a reiteration  
2 of based on updated thinking about a statement, about what  
3 we perceived to be what we think should be the best kind  
4 of system. I'm not -- I'm just not --

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: No, I hear what you're  
6 saying. You're saying what falls in the legislative  
7 (indiscernible), and what's not?

8 MS. GOFF: I'm not comfortable putting it in a  
9 legislative priorities because I think that hands over  
10 some --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, and that's been  
12 clouded of late. I would argue.

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Exactly.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And you've heard me argue  
15 many times from this very chair that our natural authority  
16 has been taken from us. So.

17 MS. GOFF: Well, I'm kind of in the middle.

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So Jane, why don't we see  
19 what we can agree upon, and then decide whether it should  
20 go on the legislative priorities or in a separate  
21 statement. Because up until now, you're right. We  
22 haven't been able to have a really thoughtful conversation  
23 on this. And then maybe Jennifer and Jill and others can  
24 help us figure out what's within the legislative purview  
25 and what isn't. What's just within the Department of



1 Education's purview. Robert, you have any thoughts on  
2 this? Or you just want to --

3 MR. HAMMOND: No, I'm just listening to the  
4 conversation.

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: (Chuckles) I know you are.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Chuckles) Well, let's,  
7 press on and see if we can get some -- even if it's not a  
8 complete list from which you could inform the effort, if  
9 we can get a partial list. Let's at least try and get --

10 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay. So I think we've got  
11 -- we've agreed on three, and I think Jane, you're okay,  
12 even though you're not sure where it should go. The last  
13 one was limited impact on instructional time.

14 MS. GOFF: Sure.

15 MS. MELLO: Okay, so the fourth one is the one  
16 that I think people want to delete.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, I'm not comfortable  
18 with actual --

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And that's the actual  
20 information of the student programs. Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think that comes back to  
22 us.

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I think the purpose of that  
24 one is that let's not have assessments that don't result  
25 in, you know, anything being done in the classroom. Let's





1 just not have it for the sole purpose of accountability.  
2 It should help the students.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: But there are folks who say  
4 there are different assessments for different purposes.

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay, I'm willing to give  
6 up on it. I'm just trying to put that, you know --

7 (Chuckling)

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I get what you're saying, but  
9 what's your saying is what people are always asking for.  
10 And we keep being told no, you can't do it all. That's  
11 why you have to -- that's why we have different  
12 assessments.

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay, so we don't care if  
14 it's actionable information. I'm just making a point. If  
15 you're taking it out, it means we're saying --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: It's actionable to the  
17 Department. It's actionable to schools.

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay. So you don't want it  
19 actionable at the --

20 MS. GOFF: It's actionable, if it's certainly  
21 actionable at the state level.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, but see -- and I have  
23 heartburn over it, because it's the direction from which  
24 the authority flows. I think we're taking -- as the  
25 current system does, and I disagree with that -- we're



1 taking authority from the district, which is, I believe,  
2 where it should reside from.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, we're all kind of coming  
4 at this from different points.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, absolutely. Seven  
6 different perspectives.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: But just know by taking it out,  
8 we're making the opposite statement that it doesn't have  
9 to be actionable.

10 MS. NEAL: I would just add to this thought  
11 of, as Paul said, that one of the problems is the student.  
12 We don't talk about the student. And by the fact that the  
13 district does not have that account -- that  
14 accountability, they're not able to actually take action -  
15 - take actionable. Therefore, the student becomes very  
16 disengaged from the whole process. And that's one of our  
17 big problems.

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Right. Right.

19 MS. NEAL: They're not a part of the process.  
20 You know, they don't feel like they're part of the  
21 process. They should be, but they don't feel like they  
22 are. And so if it were more of a district thing I, you  
23 know, if we could do that, I certainly think that would be  
24 --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So relevant to students?



1 MS. NEAL: Relevant to students.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think we have --

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Actionable information  
4 relevant to students?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I just like to relevant to  
6 students part. (Chuckles)

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: You have to pull a bar of  
8 context in that --

9 MS. NEAL: You don't want it to be relevant to  
10 students?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, that's --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: That's not the point.

13 MS. NEAL: But it is the point.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I think that is the  
15 point. That's the significant point. We got a CMAS out  
16 there --

17 MS. NEAL: That's a significant --

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- where 60 to 70 percent  
19 of some seniors and some schools are saying, thanks, but  
20 no thanks.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, if we said it was going  
22 to be on their transcript, it would suddenly become  
23 relevant.

24 MS. NEAL: Yes, and a district could do that.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Chuckles)



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And a district can do that.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, let's work on what we  
3 can do here, because we're --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: A district can -- exactly. A  
5 district can do that.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We started down this  
7 pathway looking for half a loaf. I'll settle for a third  
8 of a loaf at this point. Let's keep moving forward.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I just -- if the staff is  
10 seeing any threads of consensus on this particular one,  
11 and you can offer any rewrites.

12 MS. NEAL: You see some bread maybe or some  
13 pizza? Just like that feeling?

14 (Chuckling)

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah, on that -- yeah,  
16 because I see what everybody's saying on this one on  
17 actionable information at the student program, school, and  
18 district level. So if anybody has any brilliance on how  
19 to reword that.

20 Okay, so while you're thinking about that, the  
21 next one is assesses higher order thinking skills.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm going to get squishy on  
23 you on that one. That one's pretty vague.

24 (Chuckling)

25 MS. NEAL: Well it is. How do you --



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, we've got two arms up  
2 over here. Jane and then Deb.

3 MS. GOFF: You know who could disagree? I  
4 mean, all of these things are -- they are absolutely --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Apple pie.

6 MS. GOFF: -- the right way to put a priority  
7 on what we want our system to look like. I just say I  
8 don't think this document is the place for that language.  
9 (Chuckles) I think that's in our work. I don't know. I  
10 mean, I don't see --

11 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So Jane, I'm going to push  
12 you here. I've been saying this for a while, and I think  
13 Paul said it yesterday. The State Board has not taken any  
14 action on assessments when the entire state of Colorado  
15 was screaming about assessments. You want us to be silent  
16 on this?

17 MS. GOFF: I didn't say that.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: She didn't say that.

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But I am not hearing what  
20 are you saying.

21 MS. GOFF: I said the legislative priorities  
22 don't seem the right place --

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Fine. Then what should be  
24 do?

25 MS. GOFF: I just mentioned it a few minutes



1 ago.

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Then let's do it. There.

3 MS. GOFF: Then let's do it.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: What do you think we should  
5 do? Forgive me for getting frustrated, but I got --

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, well, and --

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Let's see if we could put  
8 our arms around. We've got a half an hour. We're going  
9 to -- okay, I'm going to calm down. Breathe. Breathe.

10 MS. NEAL: Twenty minutes.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, thank you for joining  
12 me in my frustration. And we've got more than half an  
13 hour, Elaine. I had asked for an actionable item from  
14 this board by December. So we can work through this. And  
15 this informs perhaps a broader conversation or a narrower  
16 conversation on which we can potentially take action in  
17 December. So let's keep moving down this pathway, and I  
18 would --

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Let's keep going through  
20 it, and then we'll decide what the format is. So let's  
21 pretend it's not in the legislative priorities. But let's  
22 at least figure out what we can agree on, and then figure  
23 out what it should look like. Is that fair?

24 MS. GOFF: That's where I've always been.

25 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And I've agreed.



1 MS. GOFF: (Chuckles)

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Let's get the document --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you guys remind us of the  
4 document of (indiscernible)?

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Jill just sent it.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: She did?

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah, Jill just sent. It's  
8 in our computer. But I think we're going to have to pull  
9 it out. So is it useful for me to keep going on these  
10 characteristics, or it's not? Yes?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: As you get deeper into your  
12 list, I became more challenged by the list. And then I  
13 added a few items of my own.

14 And my first point of contention was this  
15 system, which the law uses the word system currently. My  
16 perception is in terms of defining what it's about.  
17 Really, I would prefer that it be a menu. That it provide  
18 flexibility at the district. That it grow up organically  
19 from the learning experience and feed into accountability  
20 where it can. So --

21 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah, that's a good way to  
22 deal with it.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, but that's the way I  
24 look at it. I think we've had this top-down failure, and  
25 it's part of the reason we've got some of the challenges



1 we have right now.

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So be specific with some  
3 examples.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, this is where I can  
5 only give principles. I don't, and I would look to people  
6 that actually, you know, understand assessments better  
7 than I. But this idea of my fundamental perspective is  
8 start with something that's useful in the learning  
9 experience, because that's really what I care about most.  
10 And then I do care about accountability as well. If we  
11 can pick points out of that assessment, which has utility  
12 in the learning experience, to inform accountability, with  
13 a high degree of correlation, it does not have to be  
14 perfect, I would take that. Because I think we've become  
15 all about accountability and lost our way on learning as  
16 part of that process. And lost our way is, you know,  
17 emotional language, but it points you in the direction I  
18 think we have, in fact, gone.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Some districts say that. Other  
20 districts do not follow that. So you're generalizing here  
21 (indiscernible).

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I understand, but I'm  
23 answering your question. How would I do it? And I would  
24 do it organically, growing from the ground up and  
25 informing accountability with a high degree of correlation





1 where appropriate.

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, I mean, I think we're  
3 here because a lot of things have gone on in the last 10  
4 to 15 years in assessment, and the districts are feeling  
5 it and the students are feeling it. Well, not everybody,  
6 but some are feeling like it's too much testing. It's  
7 impinging too much on instruction. And it's diminishing  
8 our ability to really focus on instruction, because so  
9 much of it.

10 So question. What can we say that would  
11 address that concern? And even if we landed on, wherever  
12 it goes, minimal impact on instructional time, which is  
13 what teachers want, we know that the best leverage point  
14 for what goes on in kid -- with -- for kids in terms of  
15 quality educations in the classroom with a great teacher.  
16 So let's have minimal impact on instructional time.  
17 Timely, so that whatever they do get make sense and means  
18 something. Growth over time, so that we don't have static  
19 data points. And maybe that's enough.

20 I mean, I think when we go to actionable -- I  
21 mean, as we said, when it's too local, then it's top-down,  
22 which is what people are upset about. When we look at  
23 systemic, we don't know how to define it. We don't know  
24 how big it gets then, so maybe we don't want to do that.  
25 And then for me, when I think about the whole critical



1 thinking piece, even though intuitively it makes total  
2 sense, it kicks in all kinds of detail. Like are we using  
3 Bloom's Taxonomy? Are we using Craft Wills' reiteration  
4 of it? Are we using depth of knowledge?

5 And that language was the reason that PARCC  
6 and Smarter Balance came up with these behemoth items  
7 where they're reading all these interdependent texts, and  
8 the stems of the questions are very complex. So I guess I  
9 don't even want that in there.

10 We want to help districts note that kids are  
11 moving and growing. And we will -- we don't want to  
12 diminish the teachers' time instructionally, and we want  
13 the data that makes sense so that it can drive change.  
14 Maybe that's enough.

15 MS. GOFF: And we want to be accountable to  
16 our taxpayers.

17 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I think those three things  
18 get us there in many ways.

19 MR. HAMMOND: I think some people are going  
20 overboard.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you, that was very  
23 helpful.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I agree with you. Great.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That was very helpful,



1       thank you. Thank you.

2                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I suggest a fourth one that  
3 I think you said earlier, Paul, and that's the relevancy  
4 to students? Because of the student -- if the test isn't  
5 relevant to students, then there's no stake in the game,  
6 and they have no motivation to take it.

7                   So you can call it whatever you want. The  
8 wording that I thought was relevant to students is a test  
9 worth taking, but we can use whatever words we want. But  
10 that would be a fourth one that I think we could probably  
11 agree with, three. And I agree with you that maybe we  
12 should just leave it at that.

13                   And I don't know, Angelika. It sounds like  
14 you were suggesting a fifth one, which would be  
15 accountable to taxpayers, or I don't know.

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: No, I think that what's being  
17 described is -- also provides that accountability.

18                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

19                   MS. SCHROEDER: The relevance to students'  
20 piece can be very dependent on the student. There are  
21 plenty of kids who take the ACT that have no buy-in,  
22 because they don't (indiscernible).

23                   So to suggest that we have a for sure --  
24 that's sort of a district effort and a school effort. And  
25 as part of whether the education is even relevant to the



1 students, quite honestly. And so I think that's another  
2 one of those that's mushy enough that we can say it. But  
3 we really can't identify with that for our students.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So what about this example  
5 that's come up about the doing the social studies test in  
6 the 12th grade? And the students are all saying this has  
7 absolutely no relevance to us. We're going to graduate.  
8 This doesn't apply to our GPA. This has absolutely no  
9 relevance to us. Get rid of it in the 12th grade. And I  
10 think we do have some control over that. Well, or just  
11 the fact that the CMAS test doesn't apply to their GPA.  
12 So why bother?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I have a feeling some of  
14 that's going to be addressed by both districts and by  
15 hiring. It's not for us to do.

16 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I don't know. It's one  
17 thing we have heard a lot. A lot.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: I know we've heard it a lot,  
19 but I think we are -- we have our first standard system  
20 that we never quite got to a competency-based standard  
21 system. And we are again in flux, and we are not there  
22 yet in the system. Ultimately, the system, as its  
23 created, will make it relevant, simply because it will be  
24 part of what students use to demonstrate that they are  
25 college and career ready.



1 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, then why? Okay.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's part of graduation  
3 requirements, etcetera.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: We could soften the language  
5 and say encourage student buy-in or something, or we could  
6 just leave it.

7 MS. MAZANEC: I think it could -- I think that  
8 we're going down that -- a road that may be difficult to  
9 stay on later when we try to make it relevant to students,  
10 because some of these students are never going to find  
11 some of these tests relevant.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Until (indiscernible).

13 MS. MAZANEC: So if you place that in there,  
14 it looks, you know, then we have to make sure that every  
15 test is relevant to every student that -- or even look  
16 like we're trying. I think it's a --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I know. But again, this is  
18 where -- a case where I think perfect is the enemy of  
19 good. And I really think we need -- because right now, I  
20 would not describe what we have as good. We need to at  
21 least pursue good. And you're gonna have outliers. I  
22 agree completely, but I think student relevance is an  
23 important concept. Because we're doing things right now  
24 that are just completely, honestly irrelevant.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: It's an important concept to



1 our whole education system. This is not just about  
2 assessments. It's whether we have an education system  
3 that's relevant to students.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's a big piece. I've got  
6 to turn this off.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so where are we at?  
8 Okay, Jane, your comment, and then I thought you did a  
9 good job of summarizing. I'll come back to you.

10 MS. GOFF: Well, quickly -- yeah, I mean, who  
11 can argue with the main concepts in those phrases? Maybe  
12 we can spend a little time thinking about the timeliness  
13 of results, because the word timely means as many things  
14 to as many people as you ask. What do you hear when you  
15 hear the word timely?

16 I mean, we've got (chuckles) -- we're in the  
17 middle of it right now. And whenever -- if and when new  
18 things get put in place, when you start a new system, as  
19 we've just gone through that you can't deliver actual  
20 results the day after.

21 I know for a fact, and I would probably be in  
22 the exact same place if I was in the classroom right now,  
23 saying I, you know, I want to know this yesterday. I want  
24 to know how -- what it looked like right away. And how  
25 are we going to do that? Nowadays that's done through the



1 miracles of technology. And when you get into the  
2 technology conversation, there's a whole other ball of  
3 wax. So I'm just saying, timeliness of results is great  
4 as long as -- and on the other hand, what we say in our  
5 statements is that's important for us.

6 I think we spend a lot of -- too much time,  
7 and I'm doing it right now. We spend a lot of time  
8 dissecting what words we choose, and we narrow -- our  
9 world is narrowed by the impact of it. But I would say  
10 that timeliness of results, yes. But if we're making a  
11 statement about it to other powers that be and other  
12 policymakers in our communities, we have to be ready to  
13 talk about what that really means. What's the  
14 expectation?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Would you accept more  
16 timely than current as a goal?

17 MS. GOFF: Well, this is where I struggle with  
18 -- yes, we -- the current today reality is it's -- doesn't  
19 happen right away.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

21 MS. GOFF: But why are we doing -- we are  
22 doing some things that are going to solve that issue. But  
23 we won't -- we (chuckles) -- it won't happen if we don't  
24 do it.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Then we're in agreement



1 that's a good thing.

2 MS. GOFF: You know, sure. But I just want to  
3 -- I'm just talking kind of fresh from hearing a lot of  
4 people talk about a lot of things out there in the world,  
5 and timeliness of results means -- it usually means  
6 tomorrow.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right. Dr. Scheffel?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, is what you're saying,  
9 Jane, that it would be better if we just had a motion or  
10 resolution or statement or a letter that would say the  
11 State Board recognizes the angst in the field regarding --  
12 around success.

13 MS. NEAL: I mean, I have no problem if it  
14 (indiscernible).

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: The State Board believes that -  
16 -

17 MS. SCHROEDER: No, no. I just put that  
18 (indiscernible).

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- future legislation and  
20 policy should address timeliness, and responsivity to  
21 student relevance.

22 MS. NEAL: I didn't mention that at all. I  
23 mean, it's a good idea, but --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Minimal impact on time, growth  
25 over time.





1 MS. SCHROEDER: We find (indiscernible).

2 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is that -- I mean, in some  
4 ways, we can talk about where does it go? But I think  
5 maybe the interest is there's a lot of angst in the field.  
6 Should we say something to acknowledge that people are  
7 concerned about this issue? And then where does it go?  
8 It could go in any one of those mechanisms.

9 MS. GOFF: Sure.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: To make a point.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So okay, new question. And  
12 that's valid. I would say for now, let's shape this.  
13 Let's stick it in our legislative priorities. We've got a  
14 place to hang it. Whether perfectly, you know,  
15 appropriate in that location, Jane, or not, but it gives  
16 us a place to hang the conversation. And then I would  
17 come back and say Dr. Scheffel, I think you're absolutely  
18 correct. What do we want to do with that to make it  
19 perhaps more appropriately lodged is a good question as  
20 well.

21 But let's get back to the subject content. I  
22 thought you did a good job of summarizing. Could you do  
23 that again, for us?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Minimal impact on instructional  
25 time seems to have consensus. Timely growth over time.



1 And then there was something about relevance, and it could  
2 be responsive to parental, responsive to student buy-in.  
3 We could add parents. Or I mean, instead of relevant,  
4 maybe it would be responsive.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd just leave it out.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I just thought we could  
7 just --

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So the fourth -- the  
9 four things I'm hearing, and just because I want to be  
10 clear what we're actually talking about, so we can make  
11 sure we've got a consensus here. Timely results. Capable  
12 of measuring student growth over time, or multiple data  
13 points is a way. Limited time, instructional time spent.  
14 Relevant to students, and I'm assuming people that are  
15 quicker with a pen than I are working on making sure we're  
16 capturing this.

17 The relevancy to students, which we have a  
18 little bit of angst on right here. Boy, I'm sure hoping  
19 that my concept (chuckles) grows from the learning  
20 experience in forming accountability. And I won't -- I  
21 wouldn't say secondarily, but it grows from the learning  
22 experience and informs account -- accountability with a  
23 useful degree of correlation gets in there as well.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, that's kind of the



1 theme I've been talking about saying --

2 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm good with three of them.

3 The rest of them, I'm not, so --

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so I'm going too far.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm going (indiscernible).

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So I'm going too  
7 far. (Chuckles) I'm overreaching here. Back to the  
8 third of the loaf.

9 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, please.

11 MS. MELLO: I don't write very fast, but let  
12 me throw something out that I think reflects at least your  
13 consensus to this point, and it's an attempt to at least  
14 be a little nuanced on the point that you're raising. And  
15 I think some of the concerns that that some of your fellow  
16 Board Members are raising on that.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 MS. MELLO: What if you phrase it as support  
19 assessment policies that emphasize, or you could say allow  
20 for, timely results capable of providing in student growth  
21 over time, minimize instructional time. And I need -- I  
22 acknowledge that I need to finesse a little bit that  
23 wording. I think the key that I'm suggesting is the  
24 phrase supporting assessment policies as a way of  
25 providing some non-defined space for different points of



1 view in terms of kind of where that may come from. It's  
2 just an idea.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And what about minimize the  
4 impact on instructional time, and not minimize  
5 instructional time.

6 MS. GOFF: It might fit in to be --

7 MS. MELLO: Yes, thank you.

8 MS. GOFF: It might actually fit into be --  
9 you might want to think about it. Fully fund the  
10 development and implementation of a comprehensive system  
11 of state line assessments that --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, Carrie's been  
13 scribing away also.

14 MS. MARKEL: On the timely results based in  
15 the governing one to verify that they would like that to  
16 be supported at both the state and district level, because  
17 in reading it, someone might assume it just is at the  
18 state level. And what I'm hearing you talk about is  
19 timely results for districts. So I just raise that as --  
20 if we're going to --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Are you saying that the state  
22 would get the data and not share it with the districts?

23 MS. MARKEL: Well, the state gets data, but  
24 the data is used for different purposes in the state  
25 level. Districts want to use it to inform their



1 instructional practices. And so I think that what we're  
2 hearing from districts is we get it so late we can't -- we  
3 aren't nimble enough to make changes for the next  
4 instructional year.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: And maybe --

6 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Is that because we're  
7 sitting on it?

8 MS. MARKEL: No.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well again, it comes back  
10 to the perspective. To me, the perspective of the  
11 ultimate individual I'm concerned about this is the  
12 student. Timely to the student frankly would be the way I  
13 look at it.

14 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But the way Carrie said it,  
15 I think, would be great if we can write it that way.  
16 Timely, so it's able to inform instructional practice.  
17 Whatever you just said. Maybe you --

18 MS. MARKEL: At the district level.

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair?

21 MS. NEAL: And I would just add timeliness and  
22 relevance go together.

23 MS. MARKEL: Yes.

24 MS. NEAL: If we want it to be relevant to  
25 students, it needs to be timely. That, you know, they're



1 not even in that class half the time, but so why should  
2 they care what they did last year? So I think there's  
3 such a connection between timeliness and relevance that we  
4 need to emphasize them.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. So do we need  
6 90 seconds to prepare a read back here?

7 MS. NEAL: Are we just doing that?

8 MS. MARKEL: Please.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

10 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I think it's probably going  
11 to take more than that. And I think, I mean, to really  
12 massage it and get it where maybe that's what we do at the  
13 next meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I've got a little  
15 secret in my pocket.

16 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: We do?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We actually don't have to  
18 be done with this until 11:00. So we got another 15  
19 minutes to finish. So is that correct?

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: A secret.

21 MS. MARKEL: That is correct.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So it's a good secret that  
23 I had in my pocket.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, it's a tactic, and  
25 there's always (indiscernible).



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's always the  
2 bathroom, too.

3 (Chuckling)

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So I want to come back to  
5 the -- both what Jane and Deb said in terms of where is  
6 the best place to make our statement? And do we have a --  
7 do we have enough to make a statement? I mean, it may or  
8 may not go on the legislative priorities. I personally  
9 liked the idea of having a Board letter, or I don't know  
10 what it would be.

11 That kind of says a lot of attention is being  
12 paid to the burden of assessments right now in the State  
13 of Colorado. There are many student protests going on  
14 around the testing time. We recognize that the burden  
15 does exist, and we recognize that actions need to be taken  
16 to address this burden. Therefore, the State Board of  
17 Education -- I don't know, something like that. I would  
18 prefer --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm with you, and I'd put a  
20 fine point on the fact that our natural responsibilities  
21 have been stolen from us. But we won't go that far. But -  
22 -

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, I think this is an  
24 opportunity we could provide a little leadership. So I  
25 think we're going to --



1 MS. MARKEL: The State Board has not given us  
2 the defacto 1202 Task Force.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: This would be a great  
4 opportunity to do that.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's probably how -- I was  
6 thinking about that.

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So a letter to the --

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think that would be a  
9 leadership.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes.

11 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: That'd be great.

12 MS. MARKEL: Now the State Board is giving its  
13 feedback.

14 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Isn't she good?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yep. So there's two things  
16 coming out of this. One, we're going to hang some  
17 principles in our legislative priorities.

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And then we're going to do  
19 a letter to (indiscernible).

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And from that, we're also  
21 going to --

22 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: That we need to have ready  
23 by Monday. Or not.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- to expand the letter  
25 that talks about the public conversation, etcetera.





1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, also go back to --

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Quickly but --

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- our criteria that we had --  
4 that we (indiscernible).

5 MR. HAMMOND: But I think Carrie brings forth  
6 a good point. And both you do, Elaine, and so does  
7 Debora. There is a great deal of angst, and you've heard  
8 me talk about that yesterday. One of our superintendents  
9 and what is happening out there in the testing in the 12th  
10 grade. And also the emails you're getting, even as the  
11 day of, kids that don't want to take the test.

12 To recognize that angst, and that may be a  
13 very appropriate opinion to do that through the 1202  
14 Committee hearing from you, that we recognize that angst.  
15 We recognize the importance of this committee, and so  
16 we're trying to solve this problem, to listening to the  
17 field, to listening to others, as they come up with a  
18 recommendation. That's different than somewhat your  
19 platform, and what you want to see as values or almost  
20 attributes, quite frankly, in the new assessment system.  
21 But things that are important, at least, to you at some  
22 level.

23 So separating this, and that may even lead,  
24 quite frankly, what Paul is trying to talk about. But I  
25 don't want to speak for you. At the next meeting, and



1 that message that you're trying to think about sending  
2 collectively to that -- would go in timeliness to the 1202  
3 Committee, because their report is not due until January.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I need a --

5 MS. NEAL: New what?

6 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I didn't understand that.

7 MS. GOFF: Are you say -- Robert, are you  
8 saying two, possibly three venues for making a --

9 MR. HAMMOND: Right. Your platform is pretty  
10 generic. Okay? What you always said. What you and  
11 Debora were really talking about is really and kind of  
12 what I agreed with Carrie on, something to the 1202  
13 Committee that really expresses and recognizes the angst  
14 and concerns that are out there. And this needs to be,  
15 you know, some -- you feel very strongly it's being  
16 resolved. And then I don't know where that ties in where  
17 Paul was thinking. At the next meeting, coming up with  
18 things that you could agree upon more. That would  
19 naturally, I think, feed in a 1202.

20 MS. MARKEK: I think the comments, as I  
21 understand it from Jennifer, the comments to the 1202 need  
22 to be -- we need to wrap that up and get it out no later  
23 than next week.

24 MR. HAMMOND: Oh, okay.

25 MS. MARKEK: But then the other statement



1 could be perhaps erected to the House and Senate education  
2 committees as a follow-on to the comments. That you agree  
3 on the comments to the 1202 Task Force.

4 MS. GOFF: They sure are.

5 MS. MELLO: Well, and I would add that in some  
6 ways, your legislative priorities are comments that you  
7 provide annually to the House and Senate education  
8 committees and the legislature as a whole.

9 So that I --from my perspective, I think  
10 inserting some language here that you've managed to come  
11 up with consensus with and the legislative priorities is  
12 helpful. And then in addition, taking this action of  
13 communicating with the 1202 Committee. And my suggestion  
14 is just to do it sooner rather than later, because you  
15 want it to be -- they're about to get into the meat of all  
16 of this. And so if you want your comments to come at a  
17 relevant time, I think now's the time to do it. Doesn't  
18 have to be Monday at 8:00 a.m. necessarily, but it  
19 shouldn't be a month from now either.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so here's my  
21 scribing, and I'm honestly trying to capture what we've  
22 had here, but Jane --

23 MS. GOFF: I mean, I don't want -- I'm sorry.  
24 I don't --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- if you have a comment,



1 go ahead and speak.

2 MS. GOFF: I don't like to interrupt trains of  
3 thought. (Chuckles)

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I don't have much of a  
5 train, so.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay. What Angelika said earlier  
7 about tying it to the funding of such, provide resources  
8 for. Were you under the B -- the 5B section when you were  
9 talking about that?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: 4B?

11 MS. GOFF: Or somewhere? 4B? I mean --

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Fully funded development and  
13 implementation. All comprehensive systems and statewide  
14 assessments should be included.

15 MS. GOFF: So that feels comfortable to me as  
16 part of a legislative relationship we have. It does  
17 require the allocations to do this. But to make that a  
18 priority.

19 MS. NEAL: I hate to add if you -- the words  
20 fully fund. I mean, it --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: They're already there. I  
22 mean, they're already here.

23 MS. NEAL: I know it, but I'm -- what I'm  
24 saying is if you're going to say you can't do this unless  
25 you fully fund it, then you are limiting us because we



1 know they're not going to fully fund it.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: We don't know that.

3 MS. NEAL: Well, (chuckles) we know it.

4 MS. GOFF: I'm just saying. I'm just -- I'm  
5 not picking words. I'm picking sections.

6 MS. NEAL: But that's just kind of a side  
7 issue.

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: We're (indiscernible)  
9 figure out. Okay, Paul, get (indiscernible). Interrupt.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, okay. So here's what  
11 -- and I'm not --

12 MS. NEAL: Where do you get it from?  
13 (Chuckles)

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm not gonna engage this  
15 because, quite frankly, this is one that, because I'm  
16 going to weigh in with all my, you know, dripping wet 185  
17 pounds on Marcia's side of this argument. So I would  
18 prefer to try and get the third of a loaf we've been  
19 working on --

20 MS. NEAL: No, I agree.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And work forward from that.  
22 And so what I've got scribed down at this point is support  
23 assessment policies that are responsive to student and  
24 parental buy-in, have a minimal impact on instructional  
25 time, are relevant and timely. And I would put to



1 students, but that's inferred, I guess, or implied.  
2 Provide achievement data reflecting growth over time. Can  
3 we live with that?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, we can't live with  
6 that?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Come on. Let's just stop.  
8 We've gone about as far as we can go.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So that -- what --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Writing parents into this --

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah, exactly.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- on an accountability  
13 system, do we want to have parents read all our -- I mean,  
14 you're coming from a philosophical point of view that --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kind of complicates it a  
16 lot.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So what would you -- okay  
18 so help me out. Edit me.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm on three things that we  
20 agreed to and then we're going to look up those other  
21 things. And let's be done with it.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the three things are?

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Timeliness.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Relevant and timely.

25 Minimal impact on instructional time. Achievement data



1 reflecting growth over time.

2 MS. MAZANEC: And I think I was the one that  
3 suggested parental input just briefly, so it made its way  
4 in there. But the only reason is, is if it's hard for it  
5 to be relevant to the -- I mean, it's a hard thing to  
6 measure, obviously. But it's hard for it so much to be  
7 relevant to the kids, unless the parents have some buy-in.  
8 And a lot of the angst from the field comes from the  
9 parents, but we may not want to comment on that. I think  
10 I was responsible for that.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, the angst is coming from  
12 the teachers. Let's be real clear about that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It's coming from  
14 everywhere.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, I hear from so many parents.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, it's coming from  
17 everywhere.

18 MS. MAZANEC: There's tons of parents.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I know, but when it started,  
20 it came from a whole different place. And it's just  
21 snowballed. But it came from the classroom to parents.

22 MS. MAZANEC: I just think that as we  
23 acknowledge the angst, we should look where does it come  
24 from, and say that we've heard it.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: We've heard it.



1 MS. MAZANEC: And we want to be responsive to  
2 it.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So that's -- I think  
4 that maybe we can address that --

5 MS. MAZANEC: I think that.

6 MS. GOFF: And it can be general.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- in this next iteration  
8 of this. So for now, the legislative priorities for  
9 assessment policies that have minimal impact on structural  
10 time are relevant and timely, provide achievement data  
11 reflecting growth over time.

12 (Chuckling)

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'll email it to if you  
14 want me to.

15 MS. MELLO: I'm sorry. I can't write that  
16 fast.

17 (Chuckling)

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, I've got it here.

19 (Talking over)

20 MS. MELLO: If you email it to me, I'm happy  
21 to incorporate it into your document and send it back to  
22 you. My apologies for my poor skills.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, that's --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are heads at the  
25 door.





1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be nice to have  
3 a quick break.

4 MS. NEAL: They can open it.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm with you. So Elaine,  
6 I appreciate you bringing this up. But fellow members of  
7 the Board, my dear colleagues, whom I sincerely -- and  
8 I'll get all mushy on you next month. Whom I will miss,  
9 thank you for working through this to the extent we were  
10 able to work through it right now. I will get to you,  
11 because I've got your email handy, and you don't have a  
12 computer in front of you, the language that we had there.  
13 We'll put that in. So I think everybody's clear enough on  
14 that. So let's take action on that. Go ahead.

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, there are two pieces  
16 of it. Were you going to address the next?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Of the specific legislate -  
18 - go ahead.

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: One piece is what you just  
20 talked about. The next piece is drafting a letter that  
21 would go to the 1202 Task Force, which talks about what  
22 Robert and Deb were talking about, which is talking about  
23 the angst in the community. We need to address the --

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And Carrie, I think, you  
25 know, lit us off on this path with some very good



1 language. So I -- yes, the answer is yes. We're kicking  
2 that one back.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And for me, I'm happy to  
4 work with you on it, and Paul. (Indiscernible).

5 MS. NEAL: Yeah, that should be completed.

6 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: (Indiscernible) reach an  
7 agreement. And then I can -- we can do our usual thing  
8 where I share it with Angelika and Jane, and you share it  
9 with the other (indiscernible).

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right, yep, and we'll work  
11 on it, and then we'll take action on that in December. Is  
12 that December for the 1202, or we're trying to do a  
13 (indiscernible) intake?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no.

15 (Talking over)

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. So let's set  
17 ourselves a deadline of one week today to have that out  
18 the door. So everybody be responsive on the emails as  
19 they come through on that second step. One week today, it  
20 goes out the door. Okay?

21 MR. HAMMOND: That's good.

22 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: That's soon enough?

23 MS. MELLO: I think so.

24 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: For the 1202?

25 MS. MELLO: Yes.



1 MS. GOFF: For the 1202?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so are we -- did we  
4 flesh out? Have we discussed enough the legislative  
5 priorities? Are there other concerns, or can I get a  
6 motion on the legislative priorities as discussed? As --

7 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: (Laughs) I move that we  
8 accept the legislative priorities.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: As --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I would suggest, Mr. Chair,  
11 that you allow us an opportunity -- allow all of us an  
12 opportunity to revise. To make sure that she has  
13 captured. That we have captured it, and then we will  
14 circulate it to. And if it's -- if there are -- and if  
15 there's any pushback, we'll take it up in December, but if  
16 there's consensus, we will have a (indiscernible).

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, and that is exactly  
18 what we will do. I will send you the language I've got  
19 here. Where we're at in the conversation is as drafted,  
20 with revisions, including this next revision, we're in  
21 general consensus. Let's check that out when people have  
22 the final document in front of them.

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So let me throw one more  
24 thing out that we never even got to. As we talk about the  
25 challenges with assessments, last year, we had legislation



1 that gave a one-year, what's the word?

2 MS. NEAL: Hiatus.

3 MS. MARKEL: Moratorium?

4 MS. MELLO: There were two pieces of  
5 legislation that kind of addressed the transition to new  
6 testing, both in the accountability system and in the --  
7 so in --

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So it was about the  
9 educator evaluation system.

10 MS. MELLO: Right. Okay, so there was another  
11 piece of legislation that did that. Yes, that provided  
12 some flexibility for districts and how they

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: (Indiscernible).

14 MS. MELLO: Yes, correct.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: And I'm not sure that was  
16 adequate.

17 MS. MAZANEC: It would be easier to  
18 (indiscernible).

19 MS. SCHROEDER: And I'd like to see some kind  
20 of wording that until such time as we are confident that  
21 we have our assessment system in place, that we have  
22 enough -- and I forgot what the wording is --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hold harmless.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: -- hold harmless, thank you.

25 Hold harmless for -- in the CMAS. And I think that's a



1 discussion we need to have. I don't think that's  
2 something we need to -- I'd be surprised if everybody  
3 agreed to that. But I think a lot of the anxiety out  
4 there is that people don't even have any idea what it's  
5 going to look like, what we're gonna end up with.

6 MS. NEAL: Are you talking about PARCC? About  
7 PARCC or just CMAS?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: CMAS. And I'm not saying that  
9 districts --

10 MS. GOFF: We're talking about teacher  
11 evaluation.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that districts don't use it  
13 for their educator evaluations 50 percent, but they have  
14 the options for that this year, whether they're ready to  
15 use that growth from the CMAS, or whether they use the  
16 growth from their own district website. I think that's an  
17 appropriate thing for us to take a position on, because I  
18 think (indiscernible) very strongly. There was so much  
19 anxiety about using PARCC this year when we -- nobody had  
20 any of it -- taken it. I think that anxiety went to use.

21 And I don't know what the trigger should be,  
22 but there probably should be some clarity on what our  
23 state assessment system is before we -- people are  
24 worrying about their jobs.

25 MS. NEAL: Not (indiscernible), but



1 (indiscernible)?

2 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Dr. Schroeder, I mean,  
3 obviously, that's your all's prerogative to discuss, and  
4 it is a significant topic. If it would be helpful,  
5 perhaps I could put together some language that I think it  
6 at least tries to express what you're saying in terms of  
7 continuing that legislation that was passed last year.  
8 And then you all could use that as a departure point for  
9 your conversation about agree or disagree.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So the Secretary of Education  
11 that sits (indiscernible) about two years. I don't think  
12 that should be the criteria. I think the criteria should  
13 be that we are comfortable we've got a system that's  
14 appropriate for accountability. And that part of that  
15 information should be part of the educator evaluation  
16 system as the district chooses.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, so something -- I think  
18 the CMAS is different, and that's why I'd like to look  
19 more deeply at the test. But when we look at PARCC, for  
20 example, one of the things the superintendent yesterday  
21 was saying was we don't have the materials aligned with  
22 common core to be able to make progress on this test. And  
23 he's exactly right. Because yeah, that -- those items on  
24 that test are -- require teaching kids how to take that  
25 test. And without materials that help them do that,



1 they're writing curriculum at night. And I don't know if  
2 CMAS is like that as well, because I haven't looked deeply  
3 at the way that items are organized and the sentence stems  
4 and things which I have looked at with PARCC. But anyway,  
5 so I think it is a good discussion.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

7 MS. MELLO: Dr. Schroeder, is that -- I mean,  
8 do you want me to try to capture that the best I can?  
9 Maybe you and I can have some dialogue to make sure I'm  
10 getting your point, and then the group obviously, as a  
11 whole, can discuss.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, let's go back in the  
13 rules and look at what that 50 percent rule said. Now, I  
14 know there's a lot of -- there's (indiscernible) within  
15 the districts and how they use it. But let's look at the  
16 language and then align that with -- do we know in  
17 Colorado what those -- where we are in those assessments?  
18 Are we comfortable? Do people feel it's fair? My concern  
19 again is there's been such a feeling it's just not fair,  
20 because we don't really know what we're asking them.

21 MS. MELLO: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, good to go. Madam  
23 Vice Chair, and then we're going take a quick break. We  
24 got a lot of students in the anteroom.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are they coming in, or



1 are we going out?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: They're coming in.

3 MS. NEAL: Angelika?

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Hang on, Madam Vice Chair.

5 MS. NEAL: Sit down. (Chuckles) I've been  
6 listening to you.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: In your seat.

8 MS. NEAL: Thank you. I wanted to add  
9 something, and we do not need to discuss it. We do not  
10 need to have time, but because Jennifer wasn't here  
11 yesterday, another area that we need to begin to talk  
12 about a little more is the whole rulemaking process.  
13 Because we ended up talking at great length about two sets  
14 of rulemaking yesterday, and I, being the legislative  
15 liaison, did not even remember the legislature. So what  
16 happens to the, you know, the legislation between there  
17 and the time it comes to us? I think we just need to be  
18 more involved in it -- in a discussion of -- and in one  
19 case, what was it?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The energy --

21 MS. NEAL: The energy one was one, and the  
22 other one was, oh, the loan program.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The loan program.

24 MS. NEAL: The loan program. By the time, you  
25 know, it was like -- well, here it is, but nobody can





1 really apply for it, because they're not going to get it,  
2 because the treasurer, you know.

3 And I thought why did we spend all this time  
4 going through this legislation? And the staff spent all  
5 this time with the rulemaking? And then when it comes to  
6 us, it's like, well, you can't really do that. So I just  
7 -- I think we need to -- that's another discussion that we  
8 need to engage in. And, you know, we do this, and then it  
9 comes to us a year later. What happens in between? Don't  
10 you think that we need to have more discussion about that?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. Absolutely.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I -- Carrie and Robert will  
13 know. Do we have rulemaking that could be sent to us as  
14 Board Members ahead of time? Here was the law that was  
15 changed, altered, passed, whatever.

16 MS. NEAL: No, that's fine. But I'm just  
17 saying we need to have more discussion.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then also the draft rules.  
19 And so we understand a little more about the intent of the  
20 changes or the law. And how that --

21 MS. NEAL: Isn't that what I said?

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: All I know is that I don't  
23 agree with all (indiscernible).

24 MS. NEAL: Isn't that what I said? (Chuckles)

25 Isn't that what I said?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I'm saying along the same  
2 lines of whatever you said.

3 MS. NEAL: Oh, okay. (Chuckles)

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I said that I --

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Did she say ask Carrie  
6 about the statutes?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, we'll take a few-  
8 minute break. Thank you very much, Ms. Mello.

9 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: A few-minutes break, and  
11 we'll come back for ACT acknowledgments.

12 (Meeting Adjourned)

13

14

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 PARCC Drive, Suite C165  
Houston, Texas 77058  
281.724.8600