



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO

June 14, 2017 Meeting Transcript -- PART 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 14, 2017, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

Angelika Schroeder (D), Chairman
Joyce Rankin (R), Vice Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Rebecca McClellan (D)



1 MADAM CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like
2 to call the meeting back to order. Ms. Cordial, would you
3 please call the roll?

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

5 MR. DURHAM: Here.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

7 MS. FLORES: Here.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

9 MS. GOFF: Here. Thanks. Here.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

13 MS. MCCLELLAN: Here.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

15 MS. RANKIN: Here.

16 MS. CORDIAL: And Board Member Schroeder.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Here. Thank you. Mr. Dill,
18 would you please lead us in the pledge this morning?

19 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the
20 United States of America and to the Republic for which it
21 stands. One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty
22 and justice for all.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Do you want to sing
24 for us? Do I have a motion please to approve the agenda?



1 MS. FLORES: I motion to approve approve the
2 agenda.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Flores. Second?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Any discussion?

6 MR. DURHAM: Yes. Thank you.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham.

8 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, I don't know of the
9 speech they added to the agenda, but sometime after 10:00,
10 I'd like the opportunity just to make few press remarks
11 about the press release that will be related -- released at
12 that time, if that's appropriate. I don't think we need to
13 add it to the agenda. MADAM CHAIR: Okay. We

14 can probably squeeze that in.

15 MR. DURHAM: So not to surprise anybody.

16 MADAM CHAIR: All right.

17 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Please remind me.

19 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, with my memory, that's
20 50/50.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Well, with mine it's going
22 down. Anyone else? Anybody opposed, or all in favor?

23 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

24 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Next will be the
25 consent agenda. May I have a motion, Ms. McClellan?



1 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to place the following
2 matters on the consent agenda: 15.01, regarding
3 disciplinary proceedings concerning a license charge, number
4 2012EC260, signify its acceptance and approval of the
5 stipulation for the suspension of the credential holder's
6 license and adopt the order by directing the chair of the
7 State Board to assign the final agency order.

8 Item 15.02 regarding disciplinary proceedings
9 concerning an application charge, number 2014EC1184, direct
10 department staff to issue a notice of denial and appeal
11 rights to the applicant.

12 Item 15.03 regarding disciplinary proceedings
13 concerning an application, charge number 2014EC14509/ED2016-
14 0006, signify its acceptance and approval of the stipulation
15 and adopt the order by directing the chair of the State
16 Board to sign the final agency order.

17 Item 15.04 regarding disciplinary proceedings
18 concerning a license, charge number 2015EC774, direct
19 department staff and the State Attorney General's office to
20 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing
21 for the revocation of the credential holder's Colorado
22 Professional Teacher License Pursuant to Section 24-4-
23 104CRS.

24 Section 15.05 regarding disciplinary
25 proceedings concerning license, charge number 2015EC868,



1 signifies acceptance and approval of the stipulation for the
2 revocation of the credential holder's license and adopt the
3 order directing the chair of the State Board to sign the
4 final agency order.

5 Item 15.06 regarding disciplinary proceedings
6 concerning a license, charge number 2015EC1155, direct
7 department staff and the State Attorney General's office to
8 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing,
9 for the revocation of the credential holder's Colorado
10 National Teacher License Pursuant to Section 24-4-104CRS.

11 Item 15.07 regarding disciplinary proceedings
12 concerning a license, charge number 2016EC152, signifies
13 acceptance and approval of the stipulation for the
14 suspension of the credential holder's license, and adopt the
15 order by directing the chair of the State Board to sign the
16 final agency order.

17 Item 15.08 regarding disciplinary proceedings
18 concerning a license, charge number 2016EC800, signifies
19 acceptance and approval of the stipulation for the
20 revocation of the credential holder's license, and adopt the
21 order by directing the chair of the State Board to sign the
22 final agency order.

23 Item 15.09 regarding disciplinary proceedings
24 concerning an application, charge number 2016EC1027, direct



1 department staff to issue a notice of denial and appeal
2 rights to the applicant.

3 Item 15.10 regarding disciplinary proceedings
4 concerning a license and authorization, case number
5 2016ES1774, issue an order of summary suspension of the
6 credential holder's Colorado Professional Teaching License
7 and Colorado Career and Technical Education Authorization,
8 by directing the chair of the State Board to sign an order
9 and direct department staff and the state Attorney General's
10 office to prepare the documents necessary to request a
11 formal hearing for the revocation or suspension of the
12 credential holder's license and authorization pursuant to
13 Section 24-4-104CRS.

14 Item 15.11 regarding disciplinary proceedings
15 concerning a license, charge number 2017EC230, issue an
16 order of summary suspension to the credential holder's
17 Colorado Initial Teacher License by directing the chair of
18 the State Board to sign the order.

19 Item 15.12, approve three initial emergency
20 authorization requests as set forth in the published agenda.

21 Item 15.13, approve deny Denver Teacher
22 Residencies authorization request of its special education
23 generalist, ages 5 through 12 endorsement program as set
24 forth in the published agenda.



1 Item 15.14, approve University of Denver's
2 request for reauthorization of its educator preparedness
3 programs is set forth in the published agenda.

4 Item 15.15, approve Fremont RE-1 School
5 District's request for its proposed alternative principal
6 preparation plan for William Carleton Summers, as set forth
7 in the published agenda.

8 Item 16.03, affirm the Innovation School
9 application from Greeley Evans School District 6, on behalf
10 of Martinez Elementary School.

11 Item 16.04, affirm the Innovation School
12 application from Westminster Public Schools on behalf of
13 Westminster Academy for International Studies.

14 Item 16.06-16.10, approve the waiver request
15 action items 16.06 through 16.10 inclusive, as set forth in
16 the published agenda.

17 Item 16.11, approve Denver Public School's
18 request for early college designation for Manuel High School
19 Early College, as set forth in the published agenda.

20 Item 16.12, approve Colorado Early College's
21 designation request for the Colorado Early Colleges Aurora,
22 as set forth in the published agenda.

23 Item 16.13, approve Lake County School
24 District's request for Early College designation for Lake



1 County High School Early College, as set forth in the
2 published agenda.

3 Item 16.14, approve Weld County School
4 District's request for early college designation for Early
5 College Academy, as set forth in the published Agenda.

6 Item 16.15, approve Hanover School District's
7 application for certification of a multi-district Online
8 School on behalf of Hanover Online Academy as set forth in
9 the published agenda.

10 Item 16.16, approve the 2017/2018 expelled
11 and at-risk student services grant recipients and amount of
12 grant awards, as set forth in the published agenda.

13 Item 18.02, approve the 2017/2018 funding
14 assistance allocations to the Board of Cooperative Education
15 Services (BOCES), as set forth in the published agenda.

16 Item 19.02, appoint Kathy Yates, Kaye
17 Wergedal, Mury Sutherlin, Michael King, Heather Carson,
18 Connolly Sherwood, Amy Masching, and Sarah Holdeman to serve
19 on the Gifted Education State Advisory Committee in the
20 2017/2020 term.

21 Item 20.01, appoint Tammy Johnson as
22 replacement with BOCES issues and rural schools expertise
23 and John McKay as the replacement with federal program
24 expertise for the vacancies left by terms ending from the



1 Education Data Advisory Committee. This is the end of the
2 consent agenda.

3 MADAM CHAIR: That's a proper motion, and a
4 long one. DoI have a second? Dr. Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: I second.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Flores, thank you. Are
7 there any items that you would like to pull?

8 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. 15.13.

9 MADAM CHAIR: 15.13.

10 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

11 MADAM CHAIR: I would like to pull 16.10.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Which ones
13 have been pulled?

14 MADAM CHAIR: 15.03.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the only one?

16 MADAM CHAIR: And 16.10.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to pull 15.01.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And may I make a --

20 MADAM CHAIR: Sure. A comment? Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, on those
22 applications for people on that committee -- I'm trying to
23 think which committee it was.

24 MADAM CHAIR: There were a couple.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Gifted and talented.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was a committee on
2 the gifted and talented. I just would like to suggest that
3 we think about minority groups. That would be Hispanic,
4 Latino, and I don't know by the names whether they're black
5 or not, but I'd like to consider committees kind of a little
6 more multicultural. And that also goes for the Committee on
7 Data. There was also a committee, and I saw Japanese names
8 and such, but I didn't see any Hispanic names. And I hope
9 there would be some black members and some - well, just kind
10 of a diverse group of people that represent the state of
11 Colorado.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: This is based on application
14 however. Am I right, Ms. Goff?

15 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

16 MADAM CHAIR: So I would certainly encourage
17 you to encourage folks that you know that might be
18 interested, because it's not that we go out and assign
19 membership.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I -- and I
21 understand that.

22 MADAM CHAIR: So that would be helpful if you
23 know some folks who might be interested.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if there was a call
25 for people, you know, just general call for...



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which there is.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the purpose of
3 diversity.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff?

5 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I can only speak for
6 the GT Advisory Committee. That was advertised. It was put
7 out on a call. It's on CDE's announcements and pages. It
8 goes through the Exceptional Student Services Unit as well.
9 I made a call. I publicized it on my media pages.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And maybe if each one of
11 us, if you could tell, you know, like each member on this
12 committee I'm sure we know members.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I don't necessarily have
14 in my head the exact timeline for announcements and openings
15 and applications. It is on a cyclical basis. They are
16 termed, so to speak. I just do know -- and there are some
17 nominations either by others or self-nominations that come
18 in. And like all of our committees, the goal is to have
19 geographic distribution as well within congressional
20 districts. That is primarily a congressional district
21 nomination process. So I understand. I know that that's a
22 concern on everybody's part on every committee that we have.
23 So well, thank you for that note. I'll take note of it as
24 well, but we all try, and hopefully we do. And there are
25 representatives particularly from out the metro area that do



1 bring to this table within their community member parent or
2 educator position that that committee is filled with. So
3 it's coming. Thank you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

6 MS. RANKIN: I'd like to commend Board Member
7 McClellan for reading this so well, and I would like to add
8 that by reading the names, I personally could not tell what
9 nationality they were, so I would take issue with some of
10 the comments. Thank you.

11 MADAM CHAIR: So I want to remind folks that
12 we do have a packed agenda today so the items that we've
13 pulled will probably come forth tomorrow afternoon. Thank
14 you. Board Member --

15 MR. DURHAM: Do we vote on the motion?

16 MADAM CHAIR: We're not there yet.

17 MR. DURHAM: Oh, not there yet.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry.

19 MS. MAZANEC: I pulled it just because I have
20 a short comment.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, go ahead. I think I can do
22 that without --

23 MS. MAZANEC: And I don't have it in front of
24 me. I apologize. It's printed right there but -- so
25 several of these disciplinary proceedings result in a



1 suspension of a license for one year. And I would just like
2 someone to be able to comment on that, that that's all we
3 can do, correct, within the law. Usually, they're -- if
4 they're suspended, they can apply again in a year. Is that
5 right?

6 MADAM CHAIR: Counselor, would you help us
7 out please, before we muddle this one up?

8 MR. DILL: I do believe that is true. I
9 don't know if you're talking about a suspension or
10 revocation.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Suspension.

12 MR. DILL: A suspension. Well, it'll be
13 under the term -- the terms of the -- if it's a settlement
14 agreement, it would be governed by the terms of the
15 settlement agreement or whatever the term of the suspension
16 is.

17 MS. MAZANEC: But I was under the impression
18 that Julie Tolleson -- I always pronounce it wrong and then
19 ask myself which way it was. But that she told us but --
20 that by law, most of these suspensions are for a year, and
21 these teachers are then able to apply again for their
22 license after a year. But it's not an agreement so to
23 speak. It's by law.

24 MR. DILL: Well, if it's a --

25 MS. MAZANEC: That's the maximum.



1 MR. DILL: If it's the - if is this a final
2 determination? You'll have to forgive me. I haven't -- I'm
3 not familiar with it.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sometimes, it's not a
5 final determination.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is. It's for the --

7 MS. FLORES: Well, this is stipulation for
8 the suspension.

9 MR. DILL: Okay.

10 MS. MAZANEC: And a final agency order.

11 MR. DILL: Yeah.

12 MS. MAZANEC: But it's my understanding that
13 when we suspend a teacher's license as opposed to revoking,
14 that normally, they can still reapply after a year.

15 MR. DILL: Well, normally I think that would
16 be the case. But I do think that the term is probably
17 included in the stipulation for suspension. Interestingly
18 enough, if you revoke somebody, there's nothing in the law
19 that says they cannot reapply.

20 MS. MAZANEC: And that was my next question.

21 MR. DILL: Yeah.

22 MS. MAZANEC: But if it's revoked, they can
23 also reapply.

24 MR. DILL: They can. They can reapply.



1 MS. MAZANEC: So I just wanted to make that
2 comment and have it on the record.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you can.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Are we ready for
6 vote?

7 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah, I have on clarification
8 or a question.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please Ms. Cordial.

10 MS. CORDIAL: So is that item no longer
11 pulled, or would you still like it?

12 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, that's all I wanted to
13 say about it.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. Then we'll...

15 MADAM CHAIR: So then we just have two items

16 -

17 MS. CORDIAL: That's correct.

18 MADAM CHAIR: -- 15.03 and 16 --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 10.

20 MADAM CHAIR: 10.

21 MS. FLORES: If it's 15...

22 MS. CORDIAL: 15.13 and 16.10.

23 MR. DURHAM: 13.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, pardon me.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What? 15.13?



1 MR. DURHAM: 13.

2 MADAM CHAIR: I did not hear that properly

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And 16.10 and 10.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sixteen...

6 MADAM CHAIR: Ten. It's a charter

7 application. Other than these items that were pulled, is

8 everyone agreement with the consent agenda. Any objections?

9 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. We're on it.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I object to pulling the
11 entire location.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just this -- it's just
15 this one I want to talk about. Just that one - just one I -
16 -

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just -- does it say
18 one through ten?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. It's says -- I only
20 pulled one.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 16.10.

22 MS. MAZANEC: They're just grouped together
23 on the consent.

24 MADAM CHAIR: They're just grouped together
25 on the consent.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Okay, got it.

2 MADAM CHAIR: And my concern there is the
3 kindergarten waiver on that one. I just want to have a
4 discussion about that.

5 All right. Next item is the report from the
6 director of State Board Relations. Are you ready, Ms.
7 Cordial?

8 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, I am. Thank you, Madam
9 Chair. Good morning, Madam Chair, members of The Board, and
10 Commissioner Anthes. As always, please just remember to
11 speak clearly into to your microphones and turn them back
12 on, if you turn them off.

13 For those of you needing to connect to CDEs
14 guest wireless, please locate the CDE hotspot. And the
15 password is Silver, capital S.

16 In your Board packets, you have the following
17 materials: the quick glance expense report, and the events
18 calendar, a few upcoming events, and other things I'd like
19 to highlight for you all include the National Forum of
20 Education Policy Conference June 28 through the 30th; the
21 CASE Summer Conference, which is July 24th through 28th.
22 And just to let you all know, we are in the works of
23 scheduling the September Board Meeting at an offsite
24 location in the Fourth Congressional District. That



1 location will be determined soon, but we're just working out
2 the nuances of that.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Mazanec? I wanted to make
4 sure you heard that considering your planning challenges in
5 September.

6 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry, I did not hear.

7 MADAM CHAIR: I know. That's why -- do you
8 want to run that by us again?

9 MS. MAZANEC: It's all Jane's fault?

10 MADAM CHAIR: It's okay. I just want to make
11 sure that you - that you know we're trying to schedule a
12 retreat.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Oh, this is for the regular
14 State Board Meeting that will -- in September that will be
15 offsite.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Oh.

17 MS. CORDIAL: We will also be working on
18 scheduling a retreat in September.

19 MADAM CHAIR: So Burlington or --

20 MS. CORDIAL: Likely Burlington.

21 MADAM CHAIR: -- a meet -- meeting in
22 September, and an offsite retreat the following week?

23 MS. CORDIAL: Or around there.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So both -- the thought
2 is both offsite?

3 MS. CORDIAL: Just for the retreat, we
4 normally don't hold it here in the Board room, so it'll be -
5 - I think we're looking into locations in Denver for the
6 retreat but not necessarily here at the department.

7 MR. DURHAM: (inaudible). That one.

8 MS. CORDIAL: So also in your Board packets,
9 and/or available on Board docs, are the following materials:
10 for Wednesday, June 14th, item 8.01, you have the 2017 end
11 of legislative session report. 10.01, memo regarding the
12 waiver request from Colorado Schools -- Colorado Springs
13 School District 11, their accompanying PowerPoint,
14 supporting materials for their request; CDE staff response
15 for document; kindergarten school readiness assessment
16 information chart; and the summary of the school readiness
17 initiatives with INCAP 4K.

18 Item 11.01, you have a memo regarding the
19 continued fiscal -- departments fiscal year '18-'19 budget
20 discussion and accompanying PowerPoint.

21 For item 13.01, you have a memo regarding the
22 2017 high achieving schools.

23 Item 14.01, a memo regarding the proposed
24 written final determination for Peak View School, Peak



1 View's updated plan, and the proposed written final
2 determination.

3 Item 14.02, a memo regarding the proposed
4 written final determinations for Bessemer Elementary, Heroes
5 Middle School, and Risley International Academy of
6 Innovation, the proposed written determinations for each
7 school from the Department, the proposed written
8 determinations for each school from the District, and the
9 District's proposed pathway plan for each of its three
10 schools.

11 For item 12 -- I'm sorry, 15.12, a memo
12 regarding the three initial emergency authorization
13 requests.

14 Item 15.13, a memo regarding Denver Teacher
15 Residency's request for authorization of special education
16 generalists endorsement program.

17 Item 15.14, a memo regarding the University
18 of Denver's request for reauthorization of its Educator
19 Preparation Programs.

20 Item 15.15, a memo regarding Fremont RE-1
21 School District's request for approval of its proposed
22 alternative principal of preparation plan for William
23 Carleton Summers.

24 Item 16.01, a memo regarding Thompson School
25 District's request for designation as a District of



1 Innovation, and the Innovation application on behalf of
2 Wynonna Elementary and Monroe Elementary, as well as their
3 supporting materials.

4 Item 16.02, a memo regarding the Denver
5 Public School's amended Innovation application request on
6 behalf of Valdez Elementary and their supporting documents.

7 Item 16.03, a memo regarding Greely Evans
8 District 6 Innovation application request on behalf of
9 Martinez Elementary and their supporting materials.

10 Item 16.04, a memo regarding Westminster
11 Public Schools Innovation application request on behalf of
12 Westminster Academy for International Studies and their
13 supporting materials.

14 Item 16.05, a memo regarding the waiver
15 request from Strasburg 31-J School District, their
16 supporting materials, CDE staff response document, the
17 kindergarten school readiness assessment information chart,
18 and a summary of school readiness initiative with INCAP 4K.

19 Item 16.06 through 16.10, are memos and
20 supporting materials pertaining to Charter School waiver
21 requests.

22 Items 16.11 through 16.14, are memos and
23 supporting materials pertaining to Early College designation
24 requests.



1 Item 16.15, memo regarding Hanover School
2 District's application for certification of a multi-district
3 online school on behalf of Hanover Online Academy and their
4 supporting materials.

5 Item 16.16, a memo regarding recommendations
6 for '17-'18 expelled and at-risk student services grant
7 recipients, and amount -- and amounts of grant awards, as
8 well as their accompanying list.

9 Item 17.01, a memo regarding the
10 recommendations for the School Turnaround Leaders
11 Development Grant Program, and accompanying PowerPoint.

12 Item 18.01, a memo regarding the notice of
13 rule making for the rules for the operation, maintenance,
14 and inspection of school transportation vehicles, 1CCR301-
15 26, a redline copy of the rules, and the rules to statute
16 crosswalk.

17 Item 18.02, a memo regarding the '17-'18
18 funding assistance allocations to the Boards of Cooperative
19 Services and the final allocations list.

20 Item 19.01, a memo regarding the notice of
21 rulemaking for the rules for the Colorado reading to ensure
22 academic excellence act, 1CCR301-29, their accompanying
23 PowerPoint, a redline copy of the rules and rules to statute
24 crosswalk.



1 Item 19.02, a memo regarding the recommended
2 candidates for the Gifted Education State Advisory Committee
3 membership.

4 For item 20.01, a memo regarding the
5 recommended replacements for the Education Data Advisory
6 Committee, the current membership list, and the proposed
7 2017 membership list.

8 Then for materials for Thursday June, 15th.
9 Item 3.01, a memo regarding the proposed written final
10 determination for Aguilar School District and Aguilar Junior
11 and Senior High School, as well as the proposed written
12 final determination.

13 Item 3.02, a memo regarding the proposed
14 written final determination for Adams 14 School District and
15 Adams City High School, the district's revised plan, the
16 district's response to CDEs evaluation of their plan, and
17 the proposed final -- written final determination.

18 For item 4.01, a memo regarding Capital
19 Construction's program update and accompanying PowerPoint.

20 For item 5.01, a memo regarding Building
21 Excellent Schools today best projects for award and
22 supporting materials for their recommendations.

23 Item 7.01, a memo regarding the 2017
24 Prudential Spirit Award -- Spirit Community Award winners
25 and finalists.



1 Item 8.01, a resolution in recognition of
2 Tony Dell.

3 Item 9.01, a memo regarding the PSAT and SAT
4 school and district performance frameworks and their
5 accompanying PowerPoint.

6 Item 10.1, a memo regarding Title 1
7 allocation pilot project for multi-district online schools
8 and the accompanying PowerPoint.

9 Item 11.01, a memo regarding the standards
10 review of the revision process and accompanying PowerPoint.

11 Item 12.01, a memo regarding student PII
12 research request for secure detention for truancy and
13 accompanying PowerPoint and their fact sheet.

14 And lastly, for item 3.01, a memo regarding
15 the financial transparency website and subcommittee
16 recommendation. And that concludes my report.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. We didn't have
18 anything to do this morning. Next item on our agenda is a
19 report from the commissioner.

20 MS. ANTHES: Thank you Madam Chair, Members
21 of the Board, good to see you all. Yeah, you didn't have
22 much to do with that. Those two reports were long, and I do
23 want to thank you. I know you got your Board materials a
24 little later than normal, and that actually allowed a few
25 staff members to take a teeny bit of time after the Memorial



1 Day holiday to sort of regroup. So really appreciate that,
2 and I know you had so much to read and digest this month.
3 So thank you.

4 So the first item on my report is the
5 assessment announcement that's going to be going out just
6 about now. And so Mr. Durham, we are -- we did move it up a
7 teeny bit. So if you want to make your comments after my
8 report, we've moved the press release up from 10:00 a.m. So
9 it's probably going out as we speak.

10 But we will be announcing an assessment
11 contractor for our state assessment. The process, the RFP
12 and procurement process officially ended at 5:00 p.m.
13 yesterday, and the press release will be going out right
14 about now. And that's just as a reminder. As you know, our
15 -- several of our CMAS assessment contracts were up, and we
16 needed to issue a new RFP to secure a new assessment
17 contract. And in December of 2016, you all directed us to
18 include several things in the RFP. And that was to shorten
19 the math and English language assessment operational testing
20 times, and require the contractor to return the test results
21 back sooner. The Board also required the Department to
22 maintain decision-making authority over the math and ELA
23 test design, form development, and test administration
24 policies.



1 So we did that in the RFP, and we received
2 two proposals from vendors that could meet those and other
3 requirements. The proposals that were submitted to us were
4 by Pearson and Questar. Based on the evaluation committee's
5 recommendation and the ability to meet all of those
6 requirements, including data privacy requirements, the
7 evaluation committee posted an intent to award to Pearson.
8 This was posted on Friday, June 2nd as required by law, with
9 a protest period ending yesterday at 5:00 p.m. We have not
10 received -- we did not receive a protest by the end of 5:00
11 p.m. So we are now -- we will now begin the process of
12 implementing the Board directives with the vendor, and work
13 from the upcoming cycle for CMAS assessments.

14 Moving on, you -- a few of you had questions
15 for staff and myself about a graduation report that came
16 out. This was based on a GradNation Report that sort of
17 grades all the states of my country on how we're doing with
18 graduation rates. That is from the America's Promise.
19 That's who issues the report. And we issued, based on some
20 comments, it said that Colorado's four-year graduation rate
21 was in the lower part of the country. And we issued -- we
22 looked into the report, and indeed, that four-year rate is
23 correct. But we issued some additional responses in the
24 media to give some more context to that, which is the
25 Colorado graduation story, which is that we are really



1 committed to keeping school -- students in school, even if
2 they fall short of the graduation requirements right at the
3 four-year mark. So we are one of 29 states that has a four-
4 year, a five-year, and a six-year rate, because we want to
5 encourage kids to not dropout, stay in school, get those
6 final requirements. And so our more accurate picture of
7 high school completion can be seen when you looked at that
8 four-year, five-year, and six-year rate.

9 In addition, we're not saying that we don't
10 need to improve our four-year rate. We do, and we're
11 working on that. And we have made steady progress over the
12 past six years on that. We've seen - actually, the past
13 seven years. Our four-year rate has moved up 6.5 percent
14 over the last six years. We still have a ways to go, but
15 when you add in that five-year and six-year rate, we get up
16 to 83.3 percent graduation rate, which does move Colorado a
17 bit further up in the rankings.

18 I also just wanted to say that Colorado has a
19 robust Concurrent Enrollment Program, which gives students
20 extra time to take college courses while in high school.
21 And about 30 percent of Colorado's 11th and 12th graders do
22 participate in that program. So that also has an impact on
23 how we look at our graduation rates. So I just wanted to
24 provide that additional context to you all. We did -- my



1 sort of letter to the editor did go out in the Denver Post
2 that sort of suggested that.

3 So moving on, we are already -- I know, Ms.
4 Mello will talk to you about our full report. But we're
5 already kneedeep in implementing some of the legislation
6 that occurred in the last leg session. The main one we're
7 focused on right now is House Bill 1003, which is related to
8 the teacher shortage. That one has a pretty short timeline.
9 So we needed to get on the ball very quickly. This is in
10 partnership with the Department of Higher Education, and
11 asks the Department of Higher Education, in collaboration
12 with us, to issue a strategic plan on how to address the
13 teacher shortage in Colorado. And it requires us to go
14 around and get feedback and input from communities. That
15 report is due to the House and Senate Ed Committees on
16 December 1st. So in order to get feedback, process that
17 feedback, and have a strategic plan by December 1st, we
18 really have to be doing that entire listening tour over the
19 summer. And so we do have a list of the first set of town
20 halls that we're doing across the state, and we'll make sure
21 that you get those. Those are all around the state. And
22 then we will be adding meetings -- similar to the ESSA
23 process. We will be adding meetings with other stakeholder
24 groups, with rural counsel, to get their feedback in that
25 plan. So we'll make sure you see the list of tours spots



1 that was sort of just solidified in the last couple of days.
2 And we are also happy to gather your feedback and ideas for
3 that report in any way you would like.

4 And then lastly, I just wanted to let you
5 know that CDE is working on our performance plan. So we're
6 required each year to submit a performance plan to the
7 legislature, and we have to do that on November 1st of each
8 year or right around there. And then that's what we present
9 to the Smart Committee on. And we have had a good strategic
10 plan and performance plan in place for the last five or six
11 years. But we thought it was time to relook at that in new
12 context, new light, and context of your new -- your State
13 Board priorities in context of me being onBoard and all of
14 those pieces. So our staff are working on creating that.
15 And when we have some -- something concrete for you to have
16 respond to and react to, we will start sharing those pieces
17 with you. And so with that, I will conclude my report.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Board Member
19 Durham?

20 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think
21 I actually want to come in on two items. One, I appreciate
22 the clarification on the graduation rates. I'm not an
23 apologist for the performance in -- of schools in Colorado.
24 But I don't think in this issue -- instance when I looked at
25 the -- at that article, you know, there was a very tight



1 range between, as I recall, five percentage points between
2 77 and 82 percent. Statistically, you know, I say it's in -
3 - not of any significance, but it -- it's certainly, at that
4 tight of range, the results that put Colorado seventh from
5 the bottoms -- bottom would be subject to significant change
6 in ranking. If you could ensure that every state calculated
7 the four-year graduation rate the same way, then I don't
8 think there's any possible way to ensure that if -- that
9 every state calculates it that way.

10 So I think those kinds of reports, while we
11 get a lot of press, unfortunately are not particularly
12 helpful unless you can absolutely guarantee that you to have
13 the same standard of measure. And I think it's unfortunate
14 that that report got to kind of press it did because I think
15 it probably put Colorado, particularly given, our very large
16 participation in the early college program an unfair -- it
17 really gives the public a misleading view of our graduation
18 rates relative to other states. So I thought the
19 clarification was helpful, and I think I would like to call
20 attention to the fact that it's -- I sincerely doubt that if
21 you were comparing apples and apples, that's where we'd be.

22 Secondly, I -- the press release regarding
23 the selection of Pearson as the contractor for state
24 assessments. I think I have been critical of Pearson in the
25 past and remain so. And I think their approach and



1 arrogance in the way they have conducted their testing
2 windows, and the amount of time these tests have taken,
3 probably did more to damage public -- the credibility of the
4 accountability system in the eyes of the public than any
5 other single thing. And I think Pearson as a company, was
6 frankly responsible, or should we say irresponsible on this
7 instance, in failing to try to correct any of the obvious
8 problems that existed in their testing module. And I think
9 two things -- that two other things that are not mentioned,
10 and I think it's in the fourth paragraph, where the Board
11 required CDE to have a decision-making authority. And the
12 Board also required that the time of the test be reduced,
13 and I don't see any reference to that. And I presume that
14 the commissioner will be fully cognizant of that Board
15 request, and will not approve any contracts that don't
16 contain a significant reduction in the test time.

17 And secondly, and I think even perhaps more
18 important than the amount of test time, is that getting this
19 information for a test given in May, in October, and
20 November, and December, is simply unacceptable. And I think
21 the Board tried to put a -- I don't know we ever actually
22 officially voted on a 40-day window. But I know there was
23 discussion of 40-day window. And I would hope that the
24 commissioner would not sign a contract that did not suit --
25 really did not guarantee and subject Pearson to significant



1 penalties if they did not meet a significantly faster
2 delivery date. I think both of -- I think both of those are
3 very important to the credibility really of the test. You
4 know, it simply can't run on for days as -- and weeks, as it
5 did, where the testing window was unreasonably large. And
6 there is absolutely no excuse in today's world for not being
7 able to produce results in, shall we say, less than six
8 months?

9 MS. ANTHES: Yes.

10 MR. DURHAM: So I hope that both of those two
11 items, that the commissioner will be cognizant of. Thank
12 you.

13 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Mr. Durham.
14 Absolutely. We actually did put a day window in there. So
15 it's -- it is absolutely in there. And we did just mention
16 the reduced operational time in this news release. It may
17 have gotten a little buried there. But it is -- that is one
18 of our biggest cognizant items.

19 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Other questions? Board Member
21 Goff?

22 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I think it's related.
23 We did hold off our -- this coming August Board meeting for
24 a week. And how was that decision related to the release of



1 test scores? And what all of the tests -- which ones of the
2 test package are we looking at in August?

3 MS. ANTHERS: I might need your help. Thank
4 you, Board Member Goff. We did ask that we, just for staff
5 purposes, once we get the test results back from the vendor,
6 that we have a little time to make it make sense for you, so
7 that we can put the charts and graphs together. And last
8 year, that was a little tight for us, and so we couldn't put
9 it all together for you by your Board meeting. So we are
10 expecting to be able to do that. I might ask Ms. Pearson.
11 She may know all of the different reports we will have for
12 you by October. That gets a little muddled for me.

13 MS. PEARSON: So the August Board meeting --
14 I'm making sure. We just mapped it out last week. We're
15 planning to have state level, all the CMS 3 through 9, PSAT
16 and SAT, overall and for disaggregated groups, along with
17 school and district level two, overall. We don't know that
18 we'll have all the disgregations, all that validated at
19 that point, to release at that exact time, but that will
20 follow if it's not ready.

21 We're also working really hard -- keep your
22 fingers crossed for us -- that we'll be able to have growth
23 released at the state level and school and district by the
24 disaggregated groups the same time, because that's been
25 something that's been really important to us, to be able to



1 release both the achievement results and the growth results
2 at the same time, because together they really give us that
3 full picture. So that extra week this year will really help
4 us be able to get growth in there.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think for
6 clarification with constituents and others, especially in
7 districts, what what we learn in August -- well, let me take
8 a pre-question, to give you a pre-question first. Which
9 tests? Is that only social studies and science part of CMAS,
10 or does it include the English languages?

11 MS. ANTHES: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So in other words, we're
13 getting -- we actually have part results in August.

14 MS. ANTHES: You'll have the English
15 language, arts, math, science, and social studies, three
16 through nine. For the, you know, science and social studies
17 are not in every single grade, but other grades that it's
18 given, you'll have that, and then you'll have that. And
19 then you'll tenth grade PSAT and eleventh grade SAT.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So is that any different
21 that we -- from the last couple of years, that we received
22 those the part -- I'm thinking parts specifically, because I
23 think that's the major topic here. We have results from
24 part in August, but they are not results that are available
25 at that time to districts, and to parents, and so forth. So



1 the clarification is, on the one hand we do have results
2 earlier than November, December, but it's -- what needs to
3 be clear for everyone, us included, is that what we get in
4 August, which is a lot earlier than hear -- people hearing
5 October, November, December, then what is available to the
6 public, so in the schools. So if -- I just want to be sure
7 we're clear on that. It's, not you know, there's an an
8 earlier than projected what's publicly known date, but it's
9 -- but the purpose of that time, why those dates, is very
10 important for people to understand.

11 MS. ANTHES: So what you'll get in August
12 will be public, and the public will have access to it at the
13 August Board meeting.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

15 MS. ANTHES: So that will all be public.
16 Schools and districts at the student level -- I'm trying not
17 to make this too complicated -- but student-level data is
18 easier to get to schools and districts. The aggregates are
19 where we need to make sure we're validating and getting the
20 numbers all right. But the student level starts going to
21 Districts now. Districts actually have like gap, and this
22 is where I'm nervous with that choice here.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 MS. ANTHES: But I believe the districts
25 already have their science and social studies student-level



1 data. I'm not a hundred percent sure. Joyce is on her way
2 back to Colorado. But so those results are starting to come
3 back sooner. You know, the first year of the assessments,
4 we had to do on the standard setting and that's what led to
5 some of those really long delays. Now that we are not in
6 that cycle, the results are coming back quicker. So then
7 districts will have those results they can choose when they
8 give it to parents. Does that help?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 MS. ANTHES: I make it (inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually, it's a little
12 bit encouraging to me when I hear that, because, I'm -- I --
13 I'm not -- I don't rest easy with any kind of disillusion
14 about what happens when out there. And I think there's
15 still to -- it's expected, but it's time to start moving off
16 of some of these standard arguments and misconceptions, that
17 we are not holding off until November and December of every
18 year to learn anything about how kids did on the tests.
19 It's a matter of just clarity. So you know, any
20 conversation about decreasing the amount of time between the
21 actual administration and when people find out the results,
22 I think that needs to be clear -- as clearer as we go along,
23 about when that actually happens. And that's one of those
24 things. I don't know. I wouldn't know how many people
25 understand it as it is, and/or if we're, you know, in a lot



1 of quarters, we're operating off of three-year-old beliefs
2 that are not necessarily lined up with the facts.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. I appreciate
4 knowing that very much. So in the interest of clarity, I
5 guess, I would like to ask Ms. Pearson if she owns the
6 Pearson testing company.

7 MS. PEARSON: I have nothing to do with them.

8 MADAM CHAIR: I think we need to be --

9 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think she be sitting
11 here.

12 MS. PEARSON: Right. It wouldn't be a good
13 time to discuss it.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry, I needed to --

15 MS. PEARSON: No, thank you.

16 MADAM CHAIR: -- define that moment. I do
17 have a couple of things. One, there's -- I just have this
18 funny feeling that we're supposed to be doing a commission
19 or evaluation, and I can't remember what the schedule is,
20 it's in the law, I need help.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair, so that's -- that
22 is well, I'll start working with you on that after this
23 meeting.

24 MADAM CHAIR: I'm on vacation tomorrow.

25 MS. ANTHES: I'm confident of that.



1 MS. CORDIAL: It's usually over the summer is
2 when we make sure that, you know, questions reflect the
3 characteristics in why you hired Commissioner Anthes, and
4 then that will get distributed. We go through month --
5 SurveyMonkey and distribute those questions to all of the
6 superintendents. So that process kind of starts over the
7 summer, and we'll give them -- so that's my next project.
8 And so we'll have that. I think we have it out there for
9 about a month for them to respond.

10 MADAM CHAIR: We have some kind of a
11 deadline. I just want to make sure that we're -- as a Board
12 are prepared to meet that deadline.

13 MS. CORDIAL: And September is when we
14 typically have the Board do the evaluation based on the
15 responses from the survey from superintendents and then --

16 MADAM CHAIR: And then we send it over to the
17 legislature.

18 MS. CORDIAL: That's correct.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you very much. The
20 second item that I'd like to have more information about is
21 basically what Mr. Durham was talking about, which is the
22 concurrent enrollment, the early college, the kind of work
23 that Colorado kids, high school kids are doing today. And
24 if you recall, as much as maybe five years ago, everybody
25 was talking about the wasted senior year, etc. And I think



1 it's really time for us to share with our public what high
2 school is looking like across the state. I'm not sure what
3 the structure of that report should be. I think the
4 information that we get is just different pieces of the
5 effort, and I'd like us to be able to say in a broader way,
6 "Here's what high school is looking like. What are the
7 opportunities?" And I would appreciate if you would include
8 in their the career efforts that are under way.

9 MS. ANTHES: Absolutely.

10 MADAM CHAIR: The reality is this is an
11 ongoing effort, and there'll be more each year, I believe.
12 The districts are -- once they started facing -- looking at
13 graduation requirements, they started looking at more
14 options for their students. But I think we need sort of a
15 touch point as to where we are in Colorado. I don't know
16 what that deadline should be, but I'll leave that up to you.

17 MS. FLORES: And could we --

18 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

19 MS. FLORES: Could we also add kind of
20 Congressional District by Congressional District, or maybe
21 area West, and East, North, and South? Maybe quadrants would
22 be, might be better as to how those areas are doing with
23 skills, with technology, and working on that college, being
24 skill and college ready.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So I'm not sure that I was
2 saying that I wanted a measure of where the kids are. I
3 wanted to know what their opportunities are --

4 MS. FLORES: That's what I'm speaking about.

5 MADAM CHAIR: -- and what they're taking a
6 part of. Yeah.

7 MS. ANTHERS: I can do that.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

9 MS. ANTHERS: We can actually do concurrent
10 enrollment --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, I think it'll be --

12 MS. ANTHERS: -- and early college by quadrant
13 and where they have opportunities. So I think I see my team
14 out there nodding vigorously, so they can put that together
15 for you.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Their smiles are
17 not that broad, so they're not that happy.

18 MS. ANTHERS: No, I think this is great and
19 this is absolutely, you know, top of mind. And
20 apprenticeships in CTE opportunities --

21 MADAM CHAIR: Exactly, thank you.

22 MS. ANTHERS: And those are really coming up.
23 And we're incorporating those into lots of different
24 pathways for students, and it's actually really exciting
25 work. So we would love to break through on that.



1 MADAM CHAIR: It is, and the more businesses

2 --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Urban and rural also --

4 MADAM CHAIR: The more businesses hear about
5 this, I think the more interest we might start generating.

6 I mean, I think this is sort of a silo -- another one of
7 these silo efforts that we could hopefully expand by

8 communicating. Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you,
9 commissioner.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Whoop. Board Member Goff.

12 MS. GOFF: Kind of a question, more thoughts.

13 Among the many conversations I've had, and I'll go back to
14 the GT group. I spent yesterday with them and this comes up
15 all the time. In the graduation rate, actually, and with
16 one of our districts, this plays into what their plans are
17 as well. They're not only a sole district involved in this,
18 but as time goes by. These students who graduate prior to
19 four years, there's always a question about where are they
20 counted? Do they even count? Does anyone even realize that a
21 less than four-year-rate is something that is, well, it's
22 good. For those students who have it now, there have to be
23 those opportunities need to be available as well. But there
24 is a growing number of questions about that. How do we know
25 where this is happening? Is that in a certain area or part



1 of the state? Is it something that is tied in with actually
2 the instructional programs? And where does that happen?

3 I'm just curious about that, and I think you
4 all have some information about it. But I know that we do.
5 It often comes up still in conversations among our
6 committees and others in the communities that follow this
7 about accountability, you know. Where is that? Does it have
8 a place in accountability indicators? Is there any way to
9 show that without, you know, put it?

10 So that would just be what I would bring up.
11 I do think it's tied into all this conversation about what
12 opportunities are available, and how does that relate to
13 concurrent enrollment increases and the type of students
14 that fall into that opportunities. That's all.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. That's actually
16 even a little more complicated in that there are kids who
17 leave school early and go on to very competitive colleges,
18 but they're seen as dropouts, because they don't take that
19 last class --

20 MS. GOFF: That's kind of the problem.

21 MADAM CHAIR: That fulfills the graduation
22 requirements for their particular school. So we're not
23 going to get perfection on this one. But I appreciate to
24 extent that we have kids fulfilling graduation requirements



1 early and not walking. It would be helpful to know how
2 significant that is and how we --

3 MS. GOFF: Well, I do think it's important to
4 -- and it ties in with what Mr. Durham was saying earlier.
5 You're representing an unfair, inaccurate picture of what
6 our true graduation rate, just that's the part of our work -
7 - and it includes a lot of kids who are not fairly counted
8 or not acknowledged in the rates of finishers, completers.
9 So it's important, and you know.

10 MS. ANTHES: We do, Board Member Goff. Thank
11 you for that. That's really important. We do actually
12 publish three-year graduation rates in Colorado. I don't
13 know if that actual particular report did, but we do see
14 that that is important so we have that as well, and for you.
15 Yeah. Okay.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Our next item would
17 be legislative update, and I'm looking at the clock and I'm
18 wondering Ms. Mello, how long is your report?

19 MS. MELLO: Can I defer to (inaudible),
20 because she and I just had a conversation about this that,
21 and she has an idea for you?

22 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I have an idea too, but
23 go ahead, Ms. Cordial.



1 MS. CORDIAL: There's only one person signed
2 up for morning public comment. But we have two minutes, so
3 it's your call, I think.

4 MADAM CHAIR: In other words, let's do public
5 comment right now and then --

6 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Is that all right with you, Ms.
8 Mello?

9 MS. MELLO: Thank you.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Just saying. Mr. Walker?

11 MR. WALKER: Good Morning, Madam Chair and
12 commissioner, and Members of the Board, and the audience.
13 I'm George Walker. Regarding that report yesterday about
14 Colorado being 43rd in the nation in graduation rates, I
15 heard it. It's distressing. Frankly, it's terrible, but it
16 correlates with Colorado being about 40th in per cap funding
17 for K through 12, dead last in funding for higher education.
18 Last or about last closing the ethnic achievement gap, last
19 in graduating Blacks and Latinos.

20 Our teachers, schools of education, our
21 college and university have done a terrible job in my
22 opinion preparing teachers. Jenny Brundin, Colorado Public
23 Radio this morning, talked about the teacher study, she
24 didn't mention that according to facts I get, Colorado's
25 dead last in paying us teachers, State next to us is



1 Wyoming, is first in paying their teachers. That's a large
2 part of the reasons we're having problems.

3 The report said we're 3500 teachers short
4 this year. That's amazing number. It's hard to believe. I
5 don't want to go on with a list of the terrible's but things
6 get out to the public and it's in my mind, the public's mind
7 that we're 43rd graduation and any way you cut it, that's
8 terrible. It's disgraceful. Colorado is clearly a state
9 that is separate and unequal when it comes to graduation.
10 I'd like to know the quote unquote minority stats on that
11 report.

12 Yesterday, I spent about 15 minutes of light
13 right after I spoke to you last month, I spent probably two
14 hours talking to a CEA, called the Governor and did what I -
15 - say what I was going to do about House Bill 1375. When I
16 say something, I usually followed up. I had a meeting with
17 State Demographer, Elizabeth Gardner this second week of
18 February but a report they handed out CCAT that the ethnic
19 achievement gap is getting worse. I've asked to see her
20 again and I probably will. In other words, I and a lot of
21 other people have trouble with some of the "facts".

22 Donald Trump, President Donald Trump, is not
23 the only one. I spent about 15 minutes yesterday on the
24 phone with a 303 number to guberco -- no, gubernatorial
25 candidate, Jared Polis. I testified to this Board several



1 times when he was on this Board. I think he did a good job.
2 I hope, I think we're friends. I asked him to call in today
3 with that outreach in Washington this morning on my brother
4 and sister Republicans like what is this country coming to.
5 At a baseball practice, someone uses our Elected
6 Representative for target practice. So I doubt
7 Representative Polis will call in.

8 And in closing, I did what I said I was going
9 do. I've called the Secretary of State, Morgan Carroll,
10 chair of the Democratic Party. I am a candidate for
11 Governor and I don't mean to be confrontational, but I'll be
12 saying very clearly, I'll be 83 when I start serving. I am
13 of Anglo -- black Jewish Native American Indian ancestry. I
14 believe that I was made in many ways raised past for white
15 and I'm tired of some people saying I pass for white. I
16 don't. I don't wear some sort of start a day by
17 identification but saying who you are is certainly
18 important. We all know that you are women. And I'm saying
19 it I -- I have a reason for staying, I'm 83. Had a checkup.
20 My heart is strong. I may live to be a hundred.

21 MADAM CHAIR: That's very good news. Thank
22 you, Mr. Walker.

23 MR. WALKER: Who knows. Who knows. But I'm
24 a candidate for Governor and I'll be testifying as a teacher
25 and I'm going to be saying some of the things I've been



1 saying here for many years as strong as I can the way we
2 treat teachers has to change the way we pay them has to
3 change.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Walker, Mr. Walker, please.

5 MR. WALKER: We have to change the things in
6 the state.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

8 MR. WALKER: Thank you for listening and
9 thank you Madam Chair for your courtesy and allowing me to
10 speak to this Board as a candidate for Governor Democrat
11 this time. I ran as a Republican in '94. Thank you.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Were there any other members
13 who came to speak and did not sign up? Thank you. We will
14 move on then to legislative update. Ms. Mello, come join us
15 please.

16 MS. MELLO: I'm on. Okay. I guess I am on.
17 It's nice to see you all. I don't feel like I've seen
18 several of you since the session ended. So hello. I will
19 in respect for your time try to be brief today but please
20 know I'm certainly happy to answer any questions or if I'm
21 not giving you the level of detail you're looking for. Just
22 stop me and let me know.

23 Wanted to just start by talking about the
24 bills that The Board kind of took an active role in this
25 year. There were two of those, House Bill 1271 which had to



1 do with the standard that you all use under statutory
2 guidance for approving Innovation waivers. The bill did
3 pass. Not exactly -- well, not in the form that it was
4 introduced, as introduced the bill would have increased the
5 standard for approval for innovation plans, and would have
6 given you all the authority to review those for good and
7 just cause.

8 Bill got introduced as is very typical of the
9 process. Once it was out there, we heard from some folks
10 who had some concerns about that that this case particularly
11 some school districts had some good conversations with them,
12 and came to a compromise where the review language was
13 essentially -- was taken out of the bill. So in its final
14 form as it passed, it does increase the standard that you
15 all use and apply when deciding whether to approve an
16 Innovation plan. Any -- no, okay, I'll keep going.

17 The other bill that Board Members had a very
18 -- very significant and substantive role in was House Bill
19 1359. This was a bill that addressed some of the staff
20 concerns of the Joint Budget Committee about the way CDE was
21 classifying staff between the personnels -- between the
22 classified personnel system and the out-well system.

23 I think the Board's leadership and devotion
24 to that was incredibly helpful frankly in getting that bill
25 passed. We did pass that bill late in session. We passed



1 it unanimously and well, in the house we passed it
2 unanimously, we passed almost unanimously in the Senate. We
3 had a four votes, Mr. Durham is signaling to me. But that's
4 actually pretty, that's like 96 percent. That's not bad.
5 As pass the bill just kind of clarifies the statutory
6 authority the Department has in regard to this issue in
7 terms of going forward and staffing, and also protects
8 existing CDE employees.

9 And I know that your staff is working
10 diligently on implementing that and I appreciate your
11 leadership on that. There were 11 bills that you all as a
12 Board took a position on. In terms of statistics, I guess
13 I'm going with percentages today although don't make me
14 divide seven by eight in my head. I'm just going to say
15 seven of the eight bills that you supported passed, both of
16 the bills that you opposed died.

17 There was one bill that you had an amend
18 position on that did get amended. I'm not going to go into
19 detail on all of those bills. All of that is included in
20 our end of session report that she received in the last week
21 of session. I will highlight a couple of them right now. I
22 think it's important to remember that House Bill 1181 passed
23 this year. This is a bill you all supported, this requires,
24 or clarifies, or restates the law as it relates to ninth
25 grade assessments for Math and English language arts.



1 Basically, requires that ninth graders take tests in Math
2 and English language arts in the Spring, and requires that
3 those tests be aligned with both the state's content
4 standards, and the 10th grade exam, so that passed. You all
5 supported that.

6 Senate Bill 114 was a bill that you opposed.
7 The bill was introduced early on in session and would have
8 created some fairly substantive changes to the
9 accountability system, to the actions that you are
10 statutorily allowed to take when a district or a school
11 reaches the end of the clock. That bill basically didn't
12 end up having a hearing. The sponsor withdrew it at his
13 request relatively late in the session, so the bill did die.

14 The final one I wanted to mention is Senate
15 Bill 272, has to do with measures of postsecondary and
16 workforce readiness. Again, this is a bill that you all
17 supported. It says that by 2021, so the 2021 school year,
18 schools and districts will calculate the percent of their
19 high school students that demonstrate college and post
20 workforce readiness based on demonstration options that you
21 all adopt. Now, my understanding and I find this area a
22 little bit complex, but you all have already adopted those
23 demonstration options, under this bill you may choose to
24 adopt different ones or keep them the same, that's all your
25 prerogative.



1 The key changes that for each of those
2 options you will have two standards, one of which is the
3 minimal competency. So if you hit this benchmark that says,
4 yes, that -- that counts as high school graduation. The
5 second standard is designed to be a higher standard, and
6 should demonstrate that the student is ready to take those
7 college courses, those core college courses without
8 remediation. So that's, like, I think the key distinction
9 that that bill makes in terms of your work going forward.
10 Those are the ones I wanted to highlight. Any -- I will
11 keep moving.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Can you give an example that?

13 MS. MELLO: I will try and --

14 MS. ANTHES: No.

15 MS. MELLO: -- I will look around behind me
16 to see if --

17 MS. ANTHES: Misti is here if you need help.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Call a friend. You can call a
19 friend.

20 MS. MELLO: Okay. Well, and I -- I mean, I
21 think part of where this was coming from I -- I can answer
22 it this way is; a concern that if you had students who work
23 through the concurrent enrollment program, taking these
24 college courses and getting passing grades that are existing
25 measures didn't really reflect that, right? I mean, clearly



1 if you're taking a college class and you're passing it, you
2 are college ready. And so from an intentionality
3 perspective and I certainly will welcome Misti's input. I
4 think that's -- that's the kind of thing we're talking
5 about. So if -- if a -- a student has taken, you know, I
6 don't know English 101 at Arapahoe Community College and got
7 an A. That's probably a pretty good indicat -- indicator of
8 college readiness. Misti do you wanna supplement that?

9 MS. RUTHVEN: Good morning everyone. Nice to
10 see you. So --

11 MADAM CHAIR: I'm trying to figure out first
12 of all what's the problem with trying to solve with this
13 bill.

14 MS. RUTHVEN: So really what this does is tie
15 together two existing policies between graduation
16 guidelines, and the PWR postsecondary workforce readiness
17 endorsed diploma. So these are things that some of you that
18 have been on this body for some time may remember, that back
19 in 2012. You pass criteria, adopt a criteria jointly with
20 Commission of higher education for the postsecondary
21 workforce readiness endorsed diploma, that is currently not
22 aligned with the graduation guidelines. So that's something
23 that's been on the policy agenda that we will need to
24 revisit. And this bill really just prompts the revisiting
25 of those criteria.



1 MADAM CHAIR: That's all. I've forgotten all
2 about that, actually. It's a long time though.

3 MS. MELLO: Misti and I joke a little bit,
4 that for some reason my brain has a hard time understanding
5 the graduation guideline process. I don't know, I have a
6 little bit of a block. I got a little better this year
7 because of this bill, but I -- I'm --

8 MADAM CHAIR: As your daughter gets older?

9 MS. MELLO: What's that?

10 MADAM CHAIR: As your daughter gets older you
11 will pay more attention.

12 MS. MELLO: Well, there we go, there we go,
13 yes. Fourth it's not really an issue in fourth grade. So
14 just a couple of other topics one, so we're working on the
15 implementation document staff as working on that -- that is
16 produced every year for you all. Essentially, what that
17 does is take every piece of legislation that passed, that
18 has an impact on the department or -- or tells the
19 department to do something, and -- and outlines very
20 clearly, who is doing that? On what time frame will that be
21 done? It's really I think a very effective tool for making
22 sure that the department has fidelity with the legislation
23 that gets passed. My understanding is that it'll presented
24 to you at a later Board meeting perhaps August although I'm
25 not sure if that's been finalized.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You need to find out.

2 MS. MELLO: Okay.

3 MADAM CHAIR: And it will include the
4 responsibilities of The Board and what we should be looking
5 at.

6 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, thank you for that
7 clarification. Yes, absolutely. There's a very specific
8 section of that, that makes it clear what Board
9 responsibilities are if you have to adopt new rules or -- or
10 -- or whatever that is, so -- so that will be coming to you.
11 I will just as a general observation tell you I think that
12 this year the implementation workload is lower than I have
13 seen it in the past. Not to say it's non-existent, not to
14 disparage any of the work that needs to be done, but
15 relative to some of the other years I feel like there were a
16 lot of bills with a lot of work for the department. I don't
17 think there are as many with a ton of work. So whether
18 that's a good sign or not I'll -- I'll leave that to your
19 judgment.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

21 MS. FLORES: Thank you. I wanted to ask you
22 about the bill concerning, if you're through with that one.

23 MS. MELLO: Sure.

24 MS. FLORES: Concerning the poor districts
25 will have to share their revenue, mails and such with a



1 charter schools because I'll be working. I mean, I know
2 I'll be speaking with House District -- House District
3 meetings pretty soon. And I know that that's gonna be an
4 issue that's gonna come up, and I'd like to understand it
5 more fully. Could you explain --

6 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, Dr. Flores, so great
7 minds think alike. Actually, I was about to talk about
8 three bills that I think are -- are substantive
9 insignificant kind of outside of the implementation
10 component for the department, and that was the first one.
11 So let me do that.

12 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

13 MS. MELLO: The House Bill 1375 is what
14 you're referring to, and relates to charter school access to
15 new mill levy revenue, because I know you all are active
16 participants in the policy process and none of you live
17 under rocks. This has been a hot topic for a very long
18 time. This -- there has been legislation around this topic
19 for at least the last two years of legislature, probably
20 even farther back than that. And you know, it is a very
21 interesting example of -- in my personal opinion of
22 sometimes the legislative process works. So at the end
23 there was compromise. Now, whether it goes too far, or far
24 enough obviously people on different sides have their
25 feelings about that. But the -- my point would be something



1 got done and that is something that we can't say for the
2 last several years. So the something that got done is this.
3 Essentially, districts are required to create a distribution
4 plan that is kind of student oriented, right? So districts
5 could say -- this is just an example. For students in our
6 district to have a IEP. Those students we believe require
7 more resources, and so we're going to kind of allocate that
8 accordingly, regardless of whether they're in a Charter
9 School, or whether they're in a innovation school, or
10 whether they're in a traditional district school. Districts
11 get to go through and figure all of that out, and then they
12 have a choice. They can either implement that plan or if
13 they don't want do that planning process, they have to make
14 sure that charters get at least 95 percent of the per pupil
15 mill levy share. So that's essentially, you know, the
16 choice that -- the choice that districts will have. There
17 were some additional components that require the charter
18 schools post and make more publicly available to their
19 website, the waivers that they receive, their replacement
20 plans, all the information that they come. And they talk to
21 Boards about -- they talk to you all about in some
22 circumstances, making that more publicly available. So
23 parents, and teachers, and students, and who -- whomever
24 wants to see that can do that. Now, it's a longer bill than
25 what I just described, but I -- I was trying to distill it



1 to its essence for you and -- and give you the -- I think
2 the key points of that.

3 MS. FLORES: And when they're distributing
4 that information to the public, do they include the, let's
5 see, the school accountability council? Because I think
6 those are very important body. That's a very important body
7 in a -- in a district. And those individuals and the
8 accountability group usually are the informants for -- for
9 the community about, you know, what -- what those exemptions
10 there are, or are. Because I don't think that -- I think
11 that would be a good bargain. I know it didn't name it, but
12 I'm hoping that that is included because those are -- that
13 is a very important body within the school district. And
14 it's not in page 10 or so with little one-inch line in a --
15 in a newspaper. So I mean, I think that needs to be
16 understood. The public doesn't really understand. And most
17 of the time, we get them very long sometimes, where they're
18 asking for this exemption, for this Charter School, or that.
19 Most schools don't know that teachers, for instance, are not
20 rated -- evaluated in the same way as in charter schools as
21 they are in public schools. And I think that the public
22 needs to know that. They need to know explicitly all these
23 exemptions, that charter schools get in half and that we
24 give out, and public schools don't.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Doctor Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: I think that's very important.
2 And I think it -- it's the way the bill is written. It's
3 just kind of a little fluffy. Yes, we have the wording in
4 there, but there's a lot. Just like sometimes, we ask, did
5 you -- up districts, did you really go out into the public
6 and make it known that you were going to do this or that.
7 You know, and then, we get information that they didn't.
8 It's -- there's many ways that you can inform and not
9 inform. And so I think it could be a good way for the
10 public to know just the differences and rules that charter
11 schools are subject to and public schools are subject to.
12 And --

13 MADAM CHAIR: Charter schools are public
14 schools.

15 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry. I'm -- they are --

16 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry but I --

17 MS. FLORES: -- 501 (c)(3), and they're --
18 and they're private. They're private. They're private
19 entities.

20 MADAM CHAIR: No. They are public schools.

21 MS. FLORES: Well, you can call them that but
22 according to --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Public schools by law.

24 MS. FLORES: -- according to the law.

25 MADAM CHAIR: By law.



1 MS. FLORES: Well, I don't -- don't think so.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Can somebody please back me up
3 on that?

4 MS. FLORES: It isn't.

5 MADAM CHAIR: I's straightly very tired
6 appearing that they are private schools.

7 MS. FLORES: They are. They're private
8 entities. A 501 (c)(3) is a private entity. They have --
9 they have a Board, they have their own Board, separate from
10 The Board of --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Folks.

12 MS. FLORES: -- from the school Board.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Folks. Thank you. So I think,
14 unless I missed it, in this very nice analysis that you all
15 did, I don't think you dissected the financial piece of that
16 Charter Bill. And I think it might be really helpful to
17 address what Board Member Flores talked about to be able to
18 explain the difference between just automatically giving a
19 Charter School a 95 percent of an override versus giving a
20 Charter School the -- their equitable share of the funds for
21 specific purposes for which the district saw the overriding.
22 For example, if -- if the purpose of the override was to
23 provide extra resources for a certain group of students,
24 then, however many, then that override is distributed to all
25 kids in the district, whether they're in a Charter School,



1 or not school as you well explain. It would be helpful if
2 you guys could add that explanation --

3 MS. MELLO: Sure.

4 MADAM CHAIR: -- so that as we're trying to
5 explain that difference, 'cause I don't think that's that
6 clear --

7 MS. MELLO: It isn't.

8 MADAM CHAIR: -- when we get out to speak
9 into our public. Most of our districts, if I'm not
10 mistaken, when they go for an override, are very specific
11 about the purpose of that override. It may be for teacher
12 salaries, it may be to enhance the read act, it maybe for
13 special needs kids, et cetera. And that's the distinction
14 that I think was attempted to address in the law. So if --

15 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, we'd be happy to
16 provide a more detailed explanation.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

18 MS. MELLO: You're absolutely right. And our
19 -- and our summary in the report, it was pretty --

20 MADAM CHAIR: You should tell, I can't
21 explain it very well --

22 MS. MELLO: Yeah, yeah.

23 MADAM CHAIR: -- which is why I think we need
24 somebody who can --

25 MS. MELLO: Happy to give you more detail --



1 MADAM CHAIR: -- maybe can give more example.

2 MS. MELLO: Yeah. Let's just -- and I work
3 with your staff too. I mean, I -- I will tell you that
4 there's not a huge increased role for the Department of Ed.
5 And this is really more --

6 MADAM CHAIR: Right. This is --

7 MS. MELLO: -kind of a direct district
8 attorney.

9 MADAM CHAIR: District to district --

10 MS. MELLO: But I understand what you're
11 saying. As public officials, you are in situations where
12 you need to understand this and explain this. So let us get
13 you some additional information on that. Well I -- I'm
14 happy to do that.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Some of the districts to be
16 really clear because they're mumbling about it but --

17 MS. MELLO: Yeah. And to the extent, I can
18 give you as -- I would give as much clarity as I can.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

20 MS. MELLO: Legislation and clarity aren't
21 always exactly the best of friends. We'll do our best.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff.

23 MS. GOFF: Yes. I kind of along with that.
24 An explanation of how this bill, what it does specifically
25 address? If -- if the understanding is clear among people



1 that this addresses -- addresses mill levy -- mill levy
2 revenue usage in application and distribution versus the
3 regular budgeting process that districts go through. So you
4 know, that -- that's a key part of this bill. It's -- it's
5 mill levy decisions. It's what it is. And the timing of
6 those decisions and the communication that should happen
7 ahead of those decisions and so forth. That's different
8 than the regular budgeting process, which this time of year
9 a lot of districts are just coming out of their final
10 adoption of their regular budget which includes a lot of
11 things that have to be worked out, 95 percent. All of
12 regular -- all the stuff that goes on anyway. I'm -- I've
13 picked up that there are a lot of people that are not clear
14 on --

15 MS. MELLO: Okay. Yeah, Madam Chair. Board
16 Member Goff. Certainly we -- I think that's an important
17 distinction to make. You know, I will tell you, this bill
18 was introduced the Monday before session was over. Now,
19 there was another version of it that worked its way through
20 previously. So it wasn't as if that version was the first
21 time people have seen the language. But the first time they
22 saw the language was not actually dramatically before that.
23 So it's not surprising that there's a lot of, you know, this
24 moved really quickly, and it makes sense that people would
25 have questions and just wanting to understand the details



1 more. So we'll do everything we can to make sure you have
2 that information.

3 MADAM CHAIR: That's great. Thank you.
4 Board Member Mazanec?

5 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question on House Bill
6 11 60, the third grade English language learners assessment
7 language. So this says that it would have, as introduced,
8 it -- it would have allowed school districts complete
9 control over the language in which they administer read-act
10 assessments. But it was amended in the Senate Education
11 Committee. That in determining the language for the
12 assessment, the school shall review the student's score on
13 the most recent English proficiency exam. Can we assume
14 there was a most recent Eng -- that there was any English
15 proficiency exam before then?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Absolutely.

17 MS. GOFF: And this is kind of a -- a
18 question maybe for --

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

20 MS. GOFF: -Dr. Anthes. But -- and second of
21 all, it says if the student scores within the range that the
22 local education provider determines -- demonstrates partial
23 proficiency in English, then the student has to take at
24 least one reading assessment annually in English. Two
25 questions on that. Is that completely up to the local



1 education provider on what they consider partial proficiency
2 in English? And second of all, can't they also be assessed
3 in English if their parent requests it? And that's what
4 included in here.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Really, really talking about --

6 MS. MAZANEC: Is it?

7 MADAM CHAIR: -some member summit.

8 MS. MAZANEC: So it is in there?

9 MS. ANTHERS: Yeah, Board Member Mazanec.

10 This -- this does get confusing and I'm gonna ask my team to
11 check me in case I -- Because it gets confusing for me too.
12 But there -- there are read-act assessments.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

14 MS. ANTHERS: And then there are English
15 Language Proficiency assessments. And so --

16 MADAM CHAIR: Which aren't necessarily
17 reported.

18 MS. ANTHERS: They're --

19 MADAM CHAIR: They're happening within the
20 local education.

21 MS. ANTHERS: Right, they are. And we usually
22 do report them, we've had some challenges recently. But --
23 so -- so they can -- the local education agency can get --
24 they will be taking an English test, you know, to determine
25 English language proficiency. And then that ke -- so that



1 is the piece where you asked if -- shall review the
2 student's score on the most recent English proficiency exam.

3 They should have a score --

4 MADAM CHAIR: They sure have.

5 MS. ANTHES: -on that.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. And proficient --

7 there's different types of proficiency. So this partial
8 proficient test --

9 MS. ANTHES: So that would be as determined
10 by the test.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Partial proficient.

12 MS. FLORES: But that's a national standard,
13 right? That's not District standard.

14 MS. FLORES: Well, I guess, it's --

15 MADAM CHAIR: But they could change directly.

16 MS. FLORES: -it's partly --

17 MADAM CHAIR: They could change that

18 standard, you know, but --

19 MS. MELLO: Just if.

20 MADAM CHAIR: -the local control, right?

21 MS. MELLO: It -- the bill is very specific
22 that it is -- that definition of partial proficiency is
23 established by the local education provider. So that is --
24 that is the language in the bill.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So it will be different from
2 one provider to the next?

3 MS. MELLO: I -- I think to that is certainly
4 possible.

5 MADAM CHAIR: And just so you know, we do
6 have a rulemaking hearing to adjust our read rules to
7 reflect this new piece of law, so we will have the experts
8 in the room. If you wanna have some additional back and
9 forth at that time.

10 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

11 MS. MELLO: Thank you.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

13 MR. DURHAM: I think Madam Chair, I did --
14 actually Dr. Anthes just covered, and I think there is an
15 opportunity for some rulemaking and I think that opportunity
16 may extend to the op -- to give The Board the opportunity to
17 put a little -- some parameters around this process and
18 provide some clarity.

19 MS. MELLO: And -- and just to the final
20 question, it is -- you're right that if the district -- if a
21 student's parents request that the test is in English, they
22 can do that. It just I -- I --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

24 MS. MELLO: -was summarizing.



1 MADAM CHAIR: I know it's hard for somewhere
2 else, so --

3 MS. MELLO: Yeah.

4 MADAM CHAIR: So Ms. Mello, I think you --
5 that was your first one you weren't talk about and there
6 were two others and we just completely cut you off.

7 MS. MELLO: No, no, no, actually fine.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Let me see.

9 MS. MELLO: And in the interest of time I
10 will tell you, I was gonna give you a little more
11 information about the school funding that was in that big
12 267 compromise bill, is that -- I -- I can do it quickly but
13 I just. So basically, what the bi -- part of what the bill
14 that -- the bill did a lot of things was set the retail
15 marijuana sales tax at 15 percent. For the '17-'18 year,
16 \$30 million raised in doing, so with that, will go to rural
17 schools. The bill specifies 55 percent of it has to go to
18 large rural and 45 percent goes to small. The money just
19 goes on a per pupil basis, so you just take 30 million
20 divided by the number of kids and send it out that way. And
21 going forward --

22 MR. DURHAM: Ho -- how to define rural
23 districts.

24 MS. MELLO: That is a definition that the
25 department has and maintains, and I --



1 MR. DURHAM: So we'll be able to take time in
2 large rural and small rural?

3 MS. MELLO: -am not gonna be able to take
4 exactly what it is but --

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, I can pull it up.

6 MR. DURHAM: I'm sorry.

7 MS. MELLO: There is a distinction, yeah.

8 MR. DURHAM: That's fine.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure there is a
10 distinction.

11 MADAM CHAIR: We should have a laminated --
12 we should have a laminated sheet.

13 MS. ANTHES: Will get you a laminated sheet.

14 MADAM CHAIR: I've been actually serious.

15 MS. RUTHVEN: There might be more like a
16 notebook.

17 MADAM CHAIR: About some of the definitions.

18 MS. RUTHVEN: There might be more like a
19 notebook, chair -- chairwoman.

20 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know, I did a chit
21 chits to laminate.

22 MS. RUTHVEN: I got some neither.

23 MADAM CHAIR: It can be two sided. But just
24 some of these basics that you all -- if anyone woke you up



1 in the middle of the night, you would be reading answer. We
2 would not. We just don't carry it --

3 MS. MELLO: Great.

4 MADAM CHAIR: -and send them away.

5 MS. MELLO: Great.

6 MADAM CHAIR: But it would be helpful to
7 help.

8 MS. MELLO: Yeah.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Keep us because they're
10 important.

11 MS. MELLO: I would love a copy of that too.
12 Because I know there is a difference between large and small
13 but I don't know what it is. And then the other thing it
14 does. So for 18 19, going forward, So the first year, that
15 30 minus (inaudible) -- going forward, 12.59 percent, I
16 don't know why it's that specific but it is, 12.59 percent
17 of the tax collected from this increase in the retail
18 marijuana tax goes to straight into the school finance
19 formula. So it goes to everybody essentially after that and
20 just gets worked its way through the formula.

21 MADAM CHAIR: So it's only one year of help
22 for the rurals --

23 MS. MELLO: There's only one rural that where
24 the rules are the only ones who get the benefit of it.

25 Moving forward, it's all districts including rural. Yeah.



1 And I wanted to bri -- I just -- I know -- I wondered if you
2 were also getting some questions about that. And again,
3 that was another big bill, it was late in session so I
4 wanted to make sure you had some clarity on those details.
5 The final thing I was going to mention was House Bill 1340
6 which created an interim School Finance Committee and
7 passed, and so that will be starting to meet. I sense you
8 all -- they had -- they named the members of that interim
9 committee, I sent that list to you all. I think just the --
10 the most important thing -- the note here quickly is that it
11 is evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans. So
12 they will have to develop consensus in order to get any
13 majority votes, which is probably not a bad thing. They
14 have not announced the meeting schedule yet. Obviously,
15 that's something we'll be covering on your behalf. And if
16 you need more detail on that, I can give you a tiny bit more
17 right now, otherwise I'll give you back some of your time.

18 MADAM CHAIR: What's it charged?

19 MS. MELLO: Well, it's -- unfortunately,
20 there are one, two, three, there's like eight items on their
21 charge. Look at the cost benefit requirements on -- of
22 state and federal requirements for districts, to look at
23 methods of identifying students who may need more support,
24 to look at funding allocations and models -- and excuse me -
25 - methods, to look at categoral co-funding, to look the way



1 we count students, to look at District organization, to look
2 at local versus state funding levels rates about that
3 ongoing dialogue. We have about how much money is generated
4 by local property taxes versus state funding, and then
5 capital construction needs and bonding capacity. That's the
6 fastest I can summarize it.

7 MS. RUTHVEN: Madam Chair, just to clarify to
8 be -- the rural definition is based on the size of the
9 districts and the dis -- and the distance from the nearest
10 large urban ta -- urbanized area and having a student
11 enrollment of approximately 6,500 students or fewer. And to
12 be a small rural, you have to have fewer than a 1,000
13 students.

14 MS. MAZANEC: I think it would be interesting
15 to see that list.

16 MADAM CHAIR: You betcha. I get confused --

17 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

18 MADAM CHAIR: With my --

19 MS. MAZANEC: Because it --

20 MADAM CHAIR: Own 14 school districts --

21 MS. MAZANEC: So that (inaudible) .

22 MADAM CHAIR: Which vary resides from.

23 MS. MELLO: What I can tell you, just because
24 of having worked on the issue, the number of districts that



1 meet either of those destina -- definitions that are rural
2 is a pretty big number.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Huge number.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

5 MS. MELLO: I mean, it's a very significant
6 proportion of the 178 school districts that meet one of
7 those two standards.

8 MADAM CHAIR: It's over 100.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Probably all of
10 them. Most of them.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 78 percent, now, it's
12 gone -- it's actually gone down a little bit, but 78 percent
13 of our districts are considered small or rural.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Small rural.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Goff.

18 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Was it this school
19 finance bill that included a facilitator --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. (inaudible)

21 MS. GOFF: That was the group that was not
22 part of anything -- work that's ever been done before? I'm
23 just (inaudible)



1 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, Board Member Goff,
2 no. That was included in the different bill that did not
3 make it to the process.

4 MS. GOFF: Such a (inaudible) bills that did
5 not go.

6 MS. MELLO: Correct.

7 MS. GOFF: So it's -- I -- sorry, I haven't --
8 - I'd looked at it, but it was right after session -- end of
9 this finance bill. Is it -- what is the coordination or
10 facilitation? Is there any language on it that's specific?

11 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, Board Member, Goff,
12 it is set up as a traditional interim committee of the
13 legislature. So it'll be staffed by legislative council,
14 its members will be legislators. It will be run in a very
15 similar fashion to how they run other committee meetings,
16 right? So they may invite people to present, or they will
17 invite people to be present, I should say. If people want
18 to present, they can ask to be invited to present. They
19 will be, you know, it will be kind of the setting where
20 people give information, there are questions, you know, runs
21 through The Board chair, kind of a typical committee
22 hearing.

23 MS. GOFF: And there were no -- well, was
24 there any member of the Joint Budget Committee put on that
25 group?



1 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair, Board Member Goff,
2 yes. Representative Millie Hammer's on the --

3 MS. GOFF: Okay.

4 MS. MELLO: -committee.

5 MS. GOFF: (inaudible) details. And their --
6 their timeline is? Is there a completion date?

7 MADAM CHAIR: Forever.

8 MS. MELLO: Madam Chair --

9 MADAM CHAIR: Well --

10 MS. MELLO: Board Member Goff, no. Actually,
11 the -- the other one was forever. This one is two years.
12 So they have two years. So two interims, this -- this
13 summer, fall, and the next.

14 MADAM CHAIR: But then there will be another
15 one, how many of these have we had?

16 MS. MELLO: Well.

17 MADAM CHAIR: (inaudible) .

18 MS. MELLO: That's a larger question.

19 MADAM CHAIR: It doesn't matter but --

20 MS. MELLO: This particular one has a charge
21 of two years.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Two years.

23 MS. MELLO: Yeah.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Ms. Mello,
25 anything else?



1 MS. MELLO: Thank you. Thank you --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much,
3 appreciate it.

4 MS. MELLO: Your attention and --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oops.

6 MS. MELLO: Oh.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin .

8 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Mello, thank you so much for
9 this report. This has been very helpful. I wonder in the
10 future, if it would be possible, when you turn in these
11 bills that relate to education, whether they pass or fail,
12 if they're on our list, if you would put the vote number,
13 you know, like if it passed 100 votes to zero or failed 100,
14 you know --

15 MADAM CHAIR: If you (inaudible).

16 MS. RANKIN: That idea. And then also the
17 support from The Board, I would like those numbers. You
18 don't have put names, but you -- I think those numbers are
19 helpful because if it reflects our Board's questions
20 possibly and the legislature's questions, I think those are
21 things that -- that we should know, and then if we want to
22 go forward and get the names, that's a whole different
23 thing. But just the numbers --

24 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

25 MS. RANKIN: -would be helpful in the future.



1 MS. MELLO: Madam Chairman and Vice Chair,
2 I'm happy to do that. Can I just clarify though that when
3 you ask for the legislative votes, I'm assuming you mean the
4 final house floor vote in the final house sen -- or final
5 senate for vote, not all the committee votes.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Correct.

7 MS. MELLO: Okay. It just would be a lil
8 messy.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Final, final.

10 MS. MELLO: Final, final. Okay. Great.
11 Happy to do that going forward.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it's been helpful
13 that you send us the bills and how they're going through.
14 That's been very helpful.

15 MS. MELLO: Great. I'm glad you to hear
16 that.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. So folks, I'm gonna
18 call a 15-minute break, please.

19 MS. MELLO: Thank you.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Unless you all object.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well about five
23 (inaudible).

24 MADAM CHAIR: Item on our agenda, folks, is
25 consideration of Colorado Springs School District request



1 for a waiver from CRS 27-7-10142, a school readiness
2 assessments. Commissioner?

3 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm
4 gonna turn this directly over to the district. Mr. Engstrom
5 is here, and I'll kick it over to him. Thank you.

6 MR. ENGSTROM: Good morning, chair --

7 MADAM CHAIR: Welcome.

8 MR. ENGSTROM: -- members of the State Board
9 of Education and Commissioner Anthes. We're representatives
10 of Colorado Springs School District 11, and we're here to
11 request a waiver from Colorado Revised Statute 22-7-2014 to
12 a Kindergarten Readiness Assessment requirements. I'm David
13 Engstrom, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum --
14 Instruction Curriculum and Student Services. And with me
15 here today are Dr. Janeen Demi-Smith, our Executive Director
16 of Educational Data and Support Services, and Christy
17 Feldman, our Elementary Literacy Specialist. We want to
18 thank you today for -- for hearing our request, our waiver
19 request.

20 This morning we're submitting our waiver
21 request to you, you should have it at your desk all 293
22 pages of our request, and are presenting to you an overview
23 of our justifications for this waiver request. We truly
24 believe that the waiver will enhance educational
25 opportunities and quality within Colorado Springs School



1 District 11 and that the costs of complying with the
2 requirements of the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment
3 significantly limit educational opportunity within Colorado
4 Springs School District 11.

5 By the end of our presentation, we will have
6 addressed the five stipulations for requesting a waiver, and
7 that is a description and rationale for the waiver, a
8 replacement plan, the majority consent from the District
9 Accountability Committee, license administrators, and
10 teachers, a public hearing, and a signed resolution from the
11 local Board of education.

12 Our Elementary Literacy Specialist, Christy
13 Feldman, will present to you the rationale for the waiver
14 and provide for you the details of the replacement plan.
15 But before she does, I want to assure you that we have met
16 and exceeded the expectations for community involvement and
17 support before our Board of Education passed a resolution to
18 apply for the waiver. Our decision to apply for a waiver
19 from school readiness assessment requirements has not been
20 taken lightly, and our application process has included both
21 staff and stakeholder feedback, which is detailed in the
22 proposal in front of you in the green and white tab sections
23 of your handout.

24 During the past two years, we've worked
25 closely with our kindergarten teachers, building leaders,



1 and building support staff, offering much needed support and
2 gathering feedback from them. And teachers, building
3 leaders, and support staff received monthly and weekly
4 newsletters during the summer and testing window regarding
5 training and testing information as well as links to provide
6 feedback, ask questions, or receive additional support.
7 Those teachers, building leaders, and support staff had
8 multiple opportunities to note their support for or against
9 District 11 seeking a waiver from the school readiness
10 assessments, and over 98 percent of those responding noted
11 support for this waiver request that we are bringing to you.

12 In addition to our district staff, we've
13 reached out to our parents and community stakeholders to
14 offer information and answer questions and receive feedback.
15 And the community stakeholders and district staff, they
16 utilize the District 11 kinder readiness web page, which
17 included information regarding the school readiness
18 assessment requirements, the proposed waiver request and
19 replacement plan, the public hearing opportunity, and a link
20 to the survey, where the public could note support for or
21 against the waiver and give feedback. Over 97 percent of
22 the community respondents supported the waiver request that
23 we have in front of you. Then information regarding school
24 readiness assessments, the waiver request, and the proposed
25 replacement plan was presented to community stakeholders at



1 multiple public forums during March and April, and attendees
2 at those meetings showed 100 percent support for the waiver
3 request that we have in front of you.

4 So as the waiver request move forward,
5 District 11 scheduled a public hearing on April 12th, 2017
6 at 7:00 PM and details regarding our communication of the
7 scheduled hearing can be found on the pink tab, not the
8 purple tab, but the pink tab section of your handout. And
9 there -- there were advertisements of the public hearing
10 which included four weeks of notices published in the Sunday
11 edition of the Colorado Springs Gazette newspaper, four
12 weeks of notice being posted at the administration building
13 on the public notice Board, and four weeks of a notice being
14 posted on the District 11 web page for kindergarten
15 readiness.

16 So at the hearing that was held, there were
17 no public responses noted. So the Colorado Springs School
18 District 11 School Board moved forward with the resolution
19 seeking a waiver from the school readiness assessments and
20 supporting our proposed replacement plan. A copy of that
21 signed resolution by our school Board is at the blue tab of
22 your handout. So here is Christy Feldman to cover the
23 rationale and the replacement plan.

24 MS. FELDMAN: Good morning. My name is
25 Christy Feldman, and I'm the Elementary Literacy Specialist



1 for Colorado Springs School District 11. I've been one of
2 the leaders in the implementation of the kindergarten school
3 readiness assessment legislation for our district, and I
4 appreciate your time this morning. Today, I will cover four
5 main points, District 11th previous implementation of the
6 required school readiness assessment, the rationale for our
7 waiver request, a waiver application process, and our
8 proposed replacement plan.

9 Colorado Springs School District 11 has
10 implemented the required school readiness assessment,
11 Teaching Strategies GOLD birth through third grade platform
12 during the 2015 and 16, 17 school years. During our first
13 year of implementation, seats in the system were paid for
14 through Colorado Department of Education Race to the Top
15 funds. Our teachers observed and noted student behavior
16 relating to the required 50 indicators in the six
17 developmental domains. Unfortunately, due to technical
18 issues statewide, we were unable to effectively use the
19 online system to enter data and generate reports for our
20 parents. Kindergarten teachers did report progress to
21 parents in the sixth required developmental domains
22 utilizing our standard space report card as well as reports
23 from other assessment and data collection systems such as
24 Alpine and DIBELS NEXT. Our use of GOLD was much more
25 successful during the '16-'17 school year. Due to the



1 technical issues in Colorado from the previous year,
2 teaching strategies offered complim -- complimentary seats
3 in the system at no cost to our district. This fall, our
4 kindergarten team was able to complete observations and
5 enter data for the required 31 indicators in the six
6 developmental domains for approximately 2300 kindergartners.
7 A GOLD Report was shared with parents in addition to our
8 standard based report card at October conferences.

9 We are asking today that the State Board of
10 Education grant Colorado Springs, School District 11, a
11 waiver from the school readiness assessment requirement. We
12 believe that the assessment requirement duplicates data
13 collection and reporting that is already embedded in our
14 system takes valuable instructional time away from my
15 teachers and students and adds the burden of an unfunded
16 mandate to the district budget. We believe that the data
17 and reporting that is required by legislation, duplicates
18 work that our kindergarten teachers are already complete
19 through out the school year. The data that is collected for
20 the GOLD assessment is similar to data that is already being
21 gathered using other existing tools such as doubles next,
22 curriculum based measures, Galileo K-12, daily teacher
23 observations and teacher created assessments.

24 These systems and measures are utilized all
25 year, while GOLD is only required during the first 60 days



1 of the school year. The developmental report from GOLD that
2 is shared with parents is also duplicate information.
3 Students strengths, opportunities for growth, and next steps
4 for both academic and behavioral domains are already
5 reporting to parents through the standards based report card
6 as well as other support plans such as replans, response to
7 intervention plans, advanced learning plans and
8 individualized education plans. We believe that the school
9 readiness assessment requirement takes away valuable
10 instructional time from our teachers and students.

11 The GOLD assessment is very time consuming.
12 Collecting multiple data points and documentation for 31
13 different objectives, for each student requires countless
14 hours of planning, data collection, data entry and into the
15 GOLD system. Approximately one to two hours is needed to
16 thoughtfully and intentionally complete the final check
17 point rating for each student, 25 to 50 hours of classroom
18 time -- of time per classroom teacher. Teachers spend extra
19 time planning for the assessment, how and when a data point
20 will be collected and documented, instead of planning for
21 critical academic and social instruction that directly meets
22 student need.

23 The first few weeks of school are precious to
24 build relationship and a sense of school for new
25 kindergartners. Teachers focus should be on building



1 personal relationships with students and creating a positive
2 learning environment that honors every child. The intense
3 requirements of GOLD removes teacher focus from students to
4 the completion of a one time assessment.

5 The use of GOLD as a financial burden of
6 approximately \$50,000 or more each year. A seat in the GOLD
7 system is nine dollars and 95 cents per student. We need at
8 least 2,400 seats in the system, approximately \$25,000
9 dollars each year. We have been very fortunate to receive
10 support from the Colorado Department of Education to offset
11 this cost for the past two years. However, that support
12 will most likely end after the 2017-18 school year and
13 District 11 will have to use general funds to cover the cost
14 of this assessment.

15 We also have teacher support and training
16 costs each year approximately five to \$10,000 depending on
17 the number of new staff and upgrades into the system. As
18 noted earlier, the completion of GOLD is time consuming.
19 Teachers do not have adequate time during the contract day
20 and need release time to complete the checkpoints. A cost
21 to the district to 15 to \$30,000 to pay for substitutes.

22 In addition, we will have technology
23 replacement and support costs approximately \$5,000 each
24 year. We feel the use of GOLD is a burden for our teachers



1 as well as the district and does not meet the -- the needs
2 of our staff, students, or community.

3 As noted earlier by Mr. Engstrom, our
4 decision to apply for a waiver from the school readiness
5 assessment requirement was made with every effort to garner
6 feedback from our kindergarten teachers, building Leaders
7 and support staff, as well as our community and
8 stakeholders. And again that's it part of your handout in
9 the green, white and pink tab.

10 I personally visited with every kindergarten
11 teacher after the testing window this fall to thank them for
12 their hard work and directly ask for feedback. The
13 overwhelming message from our teachers was that the data
14 collected for the GOLD assessment was duplicated through
15 other assessment tools and observations. Quoting many
16 teachers, "It didn't tell me anything that I didn't already
17 know." This is also evidenced by the fact that teachers
18 stopped using the GOLD system after the first checkpoint and
19 instead continued use of all the other processes and tools
20 embedded in our system.

21 I also presented at the community and
22 stakeholder meetings. Attendees responded with thoughtful
23 questions, comments and genuine care for our students and
24 staff as well as respect for what the legislation asked of
25 District 11. Stakeholders felt that the processes our



1 teachers and staff utilized throughout the year meet the
2 intent of the law. Colorado Springs School District 11
3 believes our existing system of data collection, deliberate
4 academic and social instruction, personalized support and
5 parent reporting is more than adequate to meet the intent of
6 the law regarding the school readiness assessment
7 requirement.

8 According to the Colorado Department of
9 Education, school readiness website, the intent of the law
10 is that kindergarten teachers use data to quote, "Create
11 responsive learning environments that ensure academic and
12 developmental growth for students." Details of our proposed
13 replacement plan can be found in the purple tab section of
14 your handout. We plan to continue data collection through
15 existing tools already embedded in our system, including
16 standardized tests such as doubles next and Galileo K-12,
17 teacher observation of classroom academic performance and
18 social behavior, curriculum based assessments through
19 reading wonder's, math expressions and Lucy Cochrane's units
20 of study and writing, as well as a variety of other
21 formative diagnostic and summative assessments. We plan to
22 continue to be responsive to student data. Please refer to
23 the yellow section of your handout.

24 Our professional learning community
25 collaborative teams provide the perfect foundation for



1 teachers to reflect upon and respond to all types of student
2 data. Collaborative teams review data both academic and
3 social, and adjust instruction and support based on student
4 need. With students or showing a need for more intensive
5 support collaborative teams access building specialist or
6 response to intervention systems and build appropriate plans
7 outlining even more personalized intervention. We plan to
8 continue to reporting progress on the required six
9 developmental domains to our kindergarten parents. Please
10 refer to the red and yellow tab sections of your handout.

11 Our standard space report card already
12 outlines strengths and opportunities for growth in the six
13 developmental domains. Academic ratings include reporting
14 in the language, literacy, math, cognitive and physical
15 domains. Academic ratings also include science, social
16 studies and the arts which exceed the state requirements.
17 The report card has a section noted as characteristics of a
18 successful learner. Ratings in this area include the
19 social, emotional, and cognitive domains. As needed,
20 specialized plans such as read, response to intervention,
21 advanced learning plans, and individualized education plans
22 will outline more specific steps that are being taken to
23 meet the specialized need of every student showing the need
24 for additional support.



1 We plan to continue providing the Colorado
2 Department of Education with data regarding the readiness
3 levels of our early kindergarten students. Please refer to
4 the red tab section of your handout. Our educational data
5 and support services already has an alternative plan to pull
6 data from our standards based report card for each
7 developmental domain to meet the reporting requirements by
8 the Colorado Department of Education.

9 Finally and most importantly, we plan to
10 continue providing high quality academic and social
11 instruction to meet the needs of the whole child in each of
12 the developmental domains. Please refer to the large orange
13 tab section for supporting information and sample lessons.
14 In literacy and math, every student receives high quality
15 academic instruction through standards based programs such
16 as reading Wonders, Math Expressions, and Lucy Calkins'
17 Units of Study and Writing. Teachers utilize collaborative
18 teams in a deliberate teaching and learning cycle to
19 collect, analyze, adjust, and differentiate instruction to
20 meet the academic needs of students.

21 In the physical domain, every student
22 participates in structured physical, art, and music
23 education classes that meet or exceed state standards and
24 have opportunities for outdoor recess daily. Classroom and
25 specials teachers routinely assess gross and fine motor



1 skills and adjusts instruction and practice opportunities to
2 best meet student needs.

3 In the language domain, every student
4 participates in language building opportunities during
5 instruction. All of our standards based curriculums have
6 opportunities for students to build language through daily
7 collaborative conversations with peers around academic
8 content. Classroom teachers routinely assess language and
9 communication skills and adjust instruction and practice
10 opportunities to better meet individual student needs.

11 In the cognitive domain, every student
12 participates in a variety of cognitive building activities,
13 such as in academic as well as social domains. Teachers
14 provide rigorous academic performance tasks that build
15 perseverance and problem solving abilities through math
16 exemplars and research in inquiry projects. Socially,
17 students have structured and unstructured opportunities to
18 build problem solving through social interactions.
19 Classroom teachers routinely assess cognitive skills and
20 adjust instruction and practice opportunities to better meet
21 individual student needs.

22 In the social and emotional domain, every
23 student receives instruction in positive, social, and school
24 behavior. Teachers intentionally provide a safe environment
25 for all students to learn, practice and grow. Classroom



1 teachers routinely assess culture, climate, and the social
2 and emotional behavior of their students, and adjust
3 environment, instruction and practice opportunities.

4 We respectfully ask that the Colorado Board
5 of Education support our request for a waiver from the
6 school readiness assessment requirement and additional
7 assessment tools such as GOLD is not needed in our district.
8 Our teachers, building leaders, and support staff already
9 meet and exceed the intent of the law on a daily basis
10 throughout the school year. Our existing instructional
11 tools, assessments, students support plans, and standards
12 based report card are utilized in a seamless manner across
13 all grades to meet the needs of every student. It is simply
14 the way we do business. Thank you for your consideration,
15 Mr. Engstrom.

16 MR. ENGSTROM: Thank you for hearing our
17 waiver request.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Colleagues,
19 comments, questions? Board Member Durham.

20 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr.
21 Dill, could you cite, could you read that part of the
22 statute about what's -- I can do this from memory, that
23 what's required is a replacement or am I having a -- yes.

24 MR. DILL: Yes. It says that this is 22-2-
25 117-1A, any school district Board of education that applies



1 for a waiver (inaudible) specify such application, the
2 manner in which it shall comply with the intent of the
3 waived rules or statutes and shall be accountable to the
4 state Board for such compliance.

5 MR. DURHAM: Then is it -- I'm, I'm trying to
6 remember a language that has to do with scientific --

7 MADAM CHAIR: Research base.

8 MR. DURHAM: Research base.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Valid and reliable to
10 facilitate a systematic measurement of students increased
11 knowledge, skills, etc.

12 MR. DURHAM: And is there a nationally
13 recognized piece or am I missing, am I inventing there?

14 MADAM CHAIR: There is a piece.

15 MR. DURHAM: There is, okay. Good. My
16 memory is not as bad as -- so is that the statute Mr. Dill
17 someplace or is that in a rule?

18 MR. DILL: I think --

19 MADAM CHAIR: It's in the statute.

20 MR. DILL: -- that, that sounds like that's
21 probably in the school readiness statute.

22 MADAM CHAIR: 2-2-12 (inaudible) .

23 MR. DURHAM: Right. Okay, that's what I
24 meant.

25 MR. DILL: Yes.



1 MR. DURHAM: So I guess the question I have,
2 could you repeat those again if we could just get them
3 outlined.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Commissioner, could you please
5 do this. You'll do it, you'll get the right one. I'm just
6 looking at this.

7 MS. ANTHES: Yeah and I, I will say this is a
8 challenge that staff have to when we review these because
9 there's a question on like intent of the statute and the
10 statute, right? And so the statute does say, just pulling it
11 up here, the statutory requirement is that local education
12 providers use assessment instruments that are research based
13 valid and reliable to facilitate the systematic measurement
14 of a student's increasing knowledge, skills, and
15 accomplishments. The state Board adopted assessments must
16 be nationally recognized nationwide as a reliable instrument
17 for measuring school readiness.

18 MR. DURHAM: Could you just tell us how you
19 meet each of those requirements?

20 MS. FELDMAN: We feel like we meet those
21 requirements through the use of the standardized assessments
22 that we use such as DIBELS Next. We have aimswebPlus within
23 the district as well, as Galileo K-12. All of those are
24 national assessments that are standardized a norm.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Of kindergarten readiness or
2 national assessments of something else?

3 MS. FELDMAN: They're, they're national
4 assessments that assess skills.

5 MADAM CHAIR: But not necessarily readiness.

6 MS. FELDMAN: Galileo K-12 does have a
7 readiness piece, piece to it. Then we feel that our use of
8 our standards based curriculums, which are all well
9 researched and our research nationwide and built for the
10 common core standards which our standards are based off of.
11 We feel the use of those curricular tools and then those
12 nationally normed assessments meet the intent of the law.
13 (inaudible).

14 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec?

15 MS. MAZANEC: Are you done sir?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Are you done?

17 MR. DURHAM: Yes. Thank you.

18 MS. MAZANEC: I'm really troubled buying this
19 whole issue as you said. First of all, what do you see as
20 the intent of the law to measure kindergarten readiness and
21 to determine --

22 MADAM CHAIR: And report.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah, but the reporting is, is
24 fairly broad.

25 MADAM CHAIR: But it's actually --



1 MS. MAZANEC: Are they ready or are they not?

2 MADAM CHAIR: No.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Their social, emotional,
4 academic, and all those, but it's --

5 MADAM CHAIR: That's a part of it. The other
6 part of it is to be able to measure whether over time as a
7 result of a lot of policy decisions such as CAP for K, et
8 cetera, that we see a change in kindergarten readiness.
9 Kindergarten readiness piece is part of CAP for K which is
10 sort of a landmark change in how we do education in
11 Colorado. It's about standards, the assessments, college
12 readiness, kindergarten readiness. So this was seen as an
13 integral part of an important and dramatic change in the
14 state.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Okay, but the intent of the
16 law.

17 MADAM CHAIR: The intent of the law was to do
18 -- to have a common measure of kindergarten readiness.

19 MS. MAZANEC: So why do we -- why are we
20 allowed to do waivers? Why, why are we even giving districts
21 the opportunity to ask for a waiver if there is no way they
22 can meet the requirements of the waiver? If it has to be
23 nationally recognized, it has to be one of the state Board
24 approved assessments, then there is no point in providing
25 waivers.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So here's how we started this,
2 if I get my history right. We started this with this small
3 school districts that came forward to us and said, we
4 already use TS GOLD in the preschool, so we already have all
5 the data for the -- our students in TS GOLD, therefore we
6 just don't want to do it a second time. That's how we
7 started with the way it was, and over time the floodgates
8 just opened. The other part was that we were sympathetic to
9 the requirement of having 60 data points. So over time,
10 we've ab -- been able to come up with additional readiness
11 assessments that are dramatically reduce the amount of data
12 points, the amount of time that's necessary that are still
13 relevant, reliable all of those terms

14 MS. MAZANEC: But if we're looking at
15 kindergarten readiness, it could be argued that this
16 applicant or this request as well as many of the other
17 requests still give us that information on kindergarten
18 readiness. It is not perhaps the same way. If, if what
19 we're looking for is centralized assessment, which we seem
20 to always be looking for, no. One more thing that everybody
21 has to do the same, but if we're looking for the
22 information, it's my argument that many of these districts
23 are giving us that information. And I'm just -- I, I find
24 it, I find it frustrating that we continually tell districts
25 that they have to do it our way.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can just answer a
2 couple of the specific questions. Yeah. So you asked how
3 we can give waivers in this area and we did get an informal
4 opinion from the attorney-general's office indicating which
5 -- which areas the state Board can -- can give a waiver and
6 because kindergarden school readiness assessment data are
7 not recorded for the Colorado student assessment program or
8 statutes and rules pertaining to Article 11 or Title 22,
9 that you have the ability to look at a replacement plan and
10 -- and make your own judgment around whether it meets the
11 intent of the statute.

12 MS. MAZANEC: So we can decide that even
13 though CDE recommends that we not because it's not a
14 nationally recognized and it's not a state of (inaudible).

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, how CDE has been
16 approaching it per direction of The Board chair and vice
17 chair in previous iterations and current iterations is that
18 we should review the replacement plans and say whether it
19 meets the statutory language. And so we say that, and we
20 sometimes say it does not, in very specific terms. But your
21 role, as a Board, is to determine whether it meets the
22 intent. And there is a little bit of a nuance there and
23 that's always a challenge. So we say if we don't see it as
24 nationally recognized and we don't have all the research
25 fair, valid, and reliable, we tell you that we don't see



1 that information. But you still make the decision about
2 whether you think it meets the intent of that.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Well, thank you for the
4 clarification. I think that's important for everyone to
5 hear.

6 MS. SMITH: May I interject on the issue of
7 intent. I was a member of one of the governor's
8 subcommittees for CAP4K and during those committees and
9 subcommittees conversations, the intent of the law that was
10 a result of some of that work, from my perspective one in
11 those groups was an effort to eventually get more funding
12 for preschool. So when we say, well, what do they know when
13 they got to kindergarten, that's not about what we're doing
14 educating them during their first year of kindergarten, it's
15 what did they know before they got there. And with that
16 data, Colorado Department of Education then can inform the
17 public, the Board or legislators that students either are or
18 are not coming ready to school to learn and should we then
19 use that information to allocate more funds for preschool.

20 So we believe our plan, the way that we would
21 submit data, would meet that intent and that CDE would have
22 the information from our district that is so similar to
23 what's being collected with TS GOLD that it would be
24 comparable and a way to generalize whether Colorado Springs
25 District 11 students are coming to school ready to learn, in



1 a way that if eventually the state wanted to determine if
2 more money should be put toward preschool, they would have
3 that information in a valid way from our district.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Could you identify yourself
5 please because there are people who are listening?

6 MS. SMITH: I'm Janeen Demi-Smith, I'm
7 Executive Director of Educational and Support Services in
8 Colorado Springs School District 11.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Thanks. Thanks very much.
10 Board Member Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: Thank you. And given this
12 document that they provided for us, they do give examples of
13 what kindergarten teachers have been doing for ever
14 collecting this data. And I think, one of the things that -
15 - that we have not talked about is that we have kindergarten
16 teachers that are highly trained and know what -- what needs
17 to -- what children in kindergarten need to know before they
18 go into first grade. They just know they been training,
19 they've had years of experience and you can't knock that
20 off. One of the things that I think we're doing with these
21 tests is trying to dis -- deskill teachers so that they go
22 by Routt using this -- this test.

23 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think it was any
24 evidence of that whatsoever?



1 MS. FLORES: Well, I'm -- I'm telling you
2 because I have experience in this area and I think that's
3 what's happening.

4 MADAM CHAIR: An assessment for the first 60
5 days doesn't change anything.

6 MS. FLORES: We also don't pay -- where -- we
7 want to think of kindergarten teachers as not being trained
8 and skilled to do what they've been doing for years so that
9 we can pay them less. And I think that is wrong. I mean, I
10 think this and I've said it before, I think that this test
11 that is required by the state should be used for training at
12 the university level. I think, it's great for doing that.

13 But I think that a teacher should go into a
14 classroom and be able to know what to expect and have
15 rubrics such as these that they've developed and have worked
16 on for years. I think probably kindergarten and ECE are
17 probably not only ones who already have a curricula, you
18 know, that -- that probably meets the standards already. So
19 I, I would say given what, you know, what I'm seeing before
20 me, we should give them the authority to continue with the
21 work that they've been doing.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you.

23 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

24 MADAM CHAIR: So I want to be sure to clarify
25 that our discussion has nothing to do to suggest that our



1 kindergarten teachers are not extremely capable. That's a
2 misinterpretation by one person.

3 MS. FLORES: I'm not saying that.

4 MADAM CHAIR: That is not why this assessment
5 was even developed.

6 MS. FLORES: You don't know that.

7 MADAM CHAIR: So please don't -- please don't
8 take it that way.

9 MS. FLORES: You don't know that I --

10 MS. ANTHES: Mr. Engstrom, have you used the
11 TS GOLD in the past?

12 MR. ENGSTROM: Yes. The TS GOLD has been
13 used for the previous two years, fiscal year and the year
14 before.

15 MS. ANTHES: Is it the -- is it the full or
16 the light version?

17 MS. FELDMAN: We -- we used -- in preschool,
18 the full version has been used for five or six years, it's
19 been in place for quite a while in our preschool system. We
20 used the -- we used the full system last year because that's
21 what was required -- the 50 indicators were required. This
22 year, it was the shorting list of 31.

23 MS. ANTHES: What was the input from the
24 teachers that went from the full to the short?



1 MS. FELDMAN: It was better. It wasn't quite
2 as overwhelming. They were still very frustrated with the -
3 - the trying to fit in the assessment into their
4 instruction. They know it's part, it was supposed to be
5 part of their teaching and instructing and gathering data
6 that way, they were still frustrated with trying to
7 purposely fit it in and get it done.

8 MS. ANTHES: And do we have any input from
9 our department about across walk -- the crosswalk? What this
10 -- I mean, this is a lot of information to digest. I am
11 sure that the department has it. Do we have any comments?

12 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

13 MS. ANTHES: I've got it right here.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Those -- those
15 are our comments and I don't know if Dr. Colman wants to
16 come up and say anything addition to the staff response.

17 MS. MAZANEC: May I ask one quick question?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Sure. Board Member Mazanec.

19 MS. MAZANEC: One quick question. So are you
20 still using the TS GOLD for preschool?

21 MS. FELDMAN: Yes.

22 MS. MAZANEC: But it costs \$50,000.

23 MS. FELDMAN: It does. So if there are some
24 specific questions that you have on the staff response, I'd



1 be happy to elaborate on any of those points. So I don't
2 know if there was something specific you would like.

3 MS. ANTHERS: I just wondered if you had any
4 more input from what we've heard today.

5 MS. FELDMAN: What I would just say is that,
6 you know, I think it's an -- it's a really important
7 discussion that you're having about whether or not a
8 particular replacement plan meets the intent of statute and
9 that's a challenging task before you. I think one of the
10 things that when you look specifically at the using
11 assessments that are research base valid and reliable,
12 that's -- that's a challenging piece. One -- one piece that
13 you might consider around that is in each domain, do you see
14 evidence that that -- the particular approach is based on
15 research? So for instance, I think there were a couple of
16 areas, where we had a hard time seeing that I believe that
17 was in the social emotional development portion of the
18 replacement plan. And we did have some questions on the
19 cognitive domain as well.

20 So I think that's the challenge that you have
21 before you is determining whether or not that particular
22 aspect is met. The -- the one piece that I'll say is I
23 believe that the portions where the -- where the plan
24 indicates use of an assessment, for instance, in math or
25 reading, those that are included there are clearly based on



1 research and valid and reliable but the areas where we
2 didn't see that, we tried to point that out for you.

3 MADAM CHAIR: So my question is how and this
4 is my question probably for every waiver request. How can
5 we have a comparable reporting system, so that we know that
6 the report from D11 is the same as report that their
7 observation of the level of kindergarten readiness is
8 similar to any other district when they are using -- when
9 everyone is using different criteria because one of the
10 purposes of this whole piece is to be able to tell
11 policymakers and the public whether the funding that we are
12 spending on early childhood and preschool is making a
13 difference or not making a difference based on the number of
14 kids who participate. The quality of the programs that are
15 available, et cetera. This was a huge piece of cap for K to
16 have a seamless P20 system, so that we could be looking at
17 every level of a child's progression and have some sort of a
18 way to evaluate progress over time. And this is based on
19 some people's opinion, an extremely critical part. Start
20 right. You -- Your chances of moving through are a whole
21 lot greater than if you don't and if we don't use some sort
22 of a common measure, can we make some policy, (inaudible)
23 some policy conclusions.

24 MS. FELDMAN: So Madam Chair we've -- we've
25 considered that when we have looked at implementing the



1 reporting system which will be the first time utilized this
2 fall and so we -- we've thought through whether or not you
3 know as we report that -- that information out, you know
4 aggregating it for the state, but we might also separate out
5 districts that have waivers as well just to see, do we see a
6 difference in the in -- in any of the data from districts
7 that have waivers and are using either a self created or a
8 cong -- conglomeration of tools and resources with those who
9 are using one of the state Board approved tools. So I think
10 that there are ways that we can look at the data but you're
11 asking I think an important que -- an important policy
12 question.

13 MS. SMITH: If -- if I could interject with -
14 - with that piece. We were part of the initial data poll
15 this fall. So Citi has our data from our district. We can
16 take the data that we poll next year and compare the two
17 sets and if -- if they're significantly different because we
18 don't expect anything significantly to change in our system
19 for next fall, if we see something hugely different, then we
20 can revisit and rethink about how we're -- how we're pulling
21 that data whereas if -- the -- the data sets are similar or
22 close -- close in -- in how they look, then we can guarantee
23 that we're providing you similar data.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Can you explain to me why it's
25 -- it doesn't work for you to integrate the questions? The



1 criteria that are on these assessments with the program that
2 you have. What you're telling us that you've already got an
3 established program, and you don't want to modify it in
4 order to integrate and collect the data that's being
5 requested on either TS GOLD or any of the other ones that
6 we've approved.

7 MS. FELDMAN: So I'm not quite sure I
8 understand your question.

9 MS. FLORES: No. She said that they have it.
10 Said it's the same data.

11 MS. MAZANEC: It's similar data.

12 MADAM CHAIR: So what's different? Why are --
13 Why can't you just be doing this as part of your system?

14 MS. GOFF: Be doing TS -- Be doing the GOLD
15 assessment?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. The same pieces --

17 MS. GOFF: I see.

18 MADAM CHAIR: -and integrate them into your
19 system.

20 MS. GOFF: We could do that --

21 MS. FLORES: But that would be duplicating.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

23 MS. FELDMAN: We -- we could do that and we
24 did that this year and we did it last year as well.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So I'm trying to suggest that
2 duplicating isn't the idea of sort of replacing some of the
3 pieces that you already have with this, so that you'll
4 getting the same measure and doing the quality work that
5 you're doing because there are other things that you're
6 doing besides this. I mean, I -- I think there's no
7 question but that you have a very robust system for your
8 kids. Why can't these be melded toward the duplication?

9 MS. FELDMAN: I can give you -- I can give
10 you an -- a specific example where I -- it's not -- We're
11 not being allowed to meld it. This year, we -- I gave
12 teachers the option because in -- in the law or in this --
13 the -- the rules for the legislation, it says that, "If you
14 are in compliance with -- with the READ Act what's required
15 under the READ Act, you don't have to complete the literacy
16 section. So we chose not to do that. We gave teachers the
17 option, if you want to do the literacy portion, which is the
18 most massive portion of the assessment, then, you don't have
19 to. You don't have to input that data. We did the data
20 poll and in talking with the Colorado Department of
21 Education since then, they are -- they're going to have to -
22 - to complete the data pool successfully next year. They
23 will have to complete the literacy section. So again, we'll
24 be duplicating READ Act assessments and TS GOLD assessments.
25 So that -- We -- we have to do both.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So that's conflict
2 (inaudible) Can -- can you expand on that Ms. Colzman?

3 MS. COLSMAN: This is -- I'm gonna try not to
4 get too technical on that piece. In -- the -- In order for
5 the GOLD system to indicate that a student's data is
6 complete like for a year. The -- All of the items for
7 whatever version you're using have to be completed. And so
8 we've been working with Teaching Strategies to determine if
9 we can kind of turn off the literacy section for districts
10 that are using a READ Act assessment in place of that and
11 that's -- it's just not a technically possible piece right
12 now. And so what -- we've been instructing districts to do
13 is in order for that to be complete is that teachers would
14 just need to go through and not assess again but simply,
15 record their -- their students levels within the GOLD
16 system. So it's not an additional assessment. Is -- in a -
17 - additional task in reporting. We're still looking to see
18 if that's a feasible piece to -- to clean up a little bit
19 more.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Cause there's legis -- Isn't it
21 legislation that says you don't?

22 MS. COLSMAN: Think yes. Think of it this
23 way. You're right.



1 MADAM CHAIR: That says tha -- that for the
2 kindergarten assessment, they can skip the literacy piece.
3 That was my understanding.

4 MS. COLSMAN: Correct. So imagine that --
5 think of it as a the GOLD system as like a -- a teacher's
6 report card. And so at the end of a -- a reporting period,
7 a teacher goes through and says, You know. Puts a rating on
8 each item based on their other recordkeeping. It's just
9 click, click, click, click. That's a similar thing that
10 would have to happen within the GOLD. I use my -- I use my
11 reading assessments over here and then in GOLD, I'll just
12 have to indicate what -- what level so I'm not doing any
13 additional assessments just a matter of recording, so that
14 the system can close out the reporting system. It -- It is
15 a -- a technical glitch that we're still trying to work
16 through and I can check with our kindergarten readiness
17 folks to see if there's any more progress on working with
18 teaching strategies on that piece.

19 MADAM CHAIR: It's weird. I think we need to
20 be in compliance with the law on that one.

21 MS. COLSMAN: I -- I agree with you and what
22 we're trying to do is have the system o -- the actual
23 assessment system itself allow that. What we could do is
24 have the -- Yeah.



1 MADAM CHAIR: We have that with the -- the --
2 the GOLD and the GOLD light.

3 MS. COLSMAN: Correct.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Do we have the same problem
5 with the other two?

6 MS. COLSMAN: Since the others were just
7 recently approved, that's going to be something that we'll
8 need to look into.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Do you have one other
10 example for me? I can see that this one is a real nuisance.
11 Is there ano -- any other example that absolute cannot be
12 melded into the system that you're using of the 30
13 attributes, domains, sorry.

14 MS. COLSMAN: I think you probably say the
15 same kind of thing with math assessment or if -- if lots of
16 schools choose to use aimsWebPlus and do their early
17 numeracy screening that looks at where students are with
18 their mathematic knowledge, that would be the same issue.
19 They would have to give that assessment and then they could
20 -- would have to do the same thing that Melissa was -- was
21 referring to. Then double entry their data into the system
22 for TS GOLD

23 MADAM CHAIR: So then, comment please on the
24 areas where the staff has suggested that you're not using.



1 MS. COLSMAN: Yes, the social emotional and
2 cognitive areas.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

4 MS. COLSMAN: Cognitive areas is really of
5 and TS GOLD does. It's a lot of observation. It's watching
6 kids. Watching kids how they problem solve. Watching them
7 how they work through things. How they persevere with
8 tasks? So being able to -- teachers are doing that
9 observation anyway as they watch kids do their academic
10 tasks. We're just asking to use the -- the rubrics and
11 support materials that come with those tests to then assess
12 their level of readiness instead of again, doing a -- a --
13 another entry piece in with the -- with the TS GOLD. Social
14 emotional.

15 We have a positive behavior support systems
16 embedded in every building that work on school behavior as
17 well as social behavior. Teachers spend much more quality
18 time working with kids directly than simply noting behavior
19 and putting it into a system, and almost any kindergarten
20 teacher can tell you within the first week whether a kid
21 walked in ready to go or whether they came in behind and if
22 they came in behind, then that's going to show up on their
23 standards-based report card at quarter one that there's --
24 there's still behind.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).



1 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comments or
2 questions?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

4 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, I think the -- the
5 problem and -- and you know, we've gone round and round on
6 this and I've always maintained that, you know, there really
7 only two choices, it's ready and not ready, and I appreciate
8 the -- the commentary that, you know, the teacher knows as a
9 practical matter within a -- within a week is whether or not
10 they're -- they're ready. I think that's -- that's a fact.
11 The problem -- I think the problem we're into now, though,
12 with this is I think we've approved, as I recall virtually,
13 every waiver that's come before us.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Except the last three. Now
15 they're approved. Except the last three, we have not.

16 MR. DURHAM: Last three. Which -- remind me
17 which districts those were, do you have that?

18 MADAM CHAIR: No.

19 MR. DURHAM: I -- somehow, I'm not
20 recollecting.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't either.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bennett School District
23 was one of them.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we didn't approve
25 Bennett?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't believe so.

2 MS. ANTHES: We sort of decided. They were
3 two that were --

4 MADAM CHAIR: We sort of decided to stop for
5 a spell and have this conversation to that were
6 reconsidered.

7 MS. ANTHES: -- and look into what we -- what
8 we needed to -- what do we need to know about these
9 districts in order to be comfortable about granting the
10 waivers because there is gonna be a huge variety in folks
11 coming forward. As before, it was in part in sympathy with
12 the complexity goal, and we've gotten it from 60 observe --
13 60 domains down to 20. We're actually having a -- a pilot
14 study for a free one that will go down to 10 in an attempt
15 to meet expectations and the law that we look at what is
16 being assessed rather than just having everybody bail, which
17 is where we are right now. We're having -- it's a service
18 systematic.

19 MADAM CHAIR: But not everywhere

20 MS. ANTHES: It's -- it's just over time.

21 MS. FLORES: But when we have -- when we have
22 a district, a large district that's probably worked at it
23 for a long time that has trained teachers and I'm sure that
24 they've developed a means by which and tests and such that
25 are probably better. I think teachers knowledge -- a well-



1 trained teachers knowledge is much better than any test and
2 that's just a given in measurement -- a given in
3 measurement.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we had our waiver
5 request in mind last spring and we really getting feedback
6 from our staff, that's where they wanted us to head. And so
7 we began to work on it and then decided that we really
8 didn't have enough information yet to say whether this
9 really was going to work for us, or whether it wasn't going
10 to work for for us. So we gave it another good faith effort
11 this year to really decide, is this something that we can,
12 you know, make work and embed in our system or is it really
13 truly duplicating work. So again we did not consider this
14 just to get out of something right.

15 MADAM CHAIR: And I don't mean to be critical
16 because you are not the only district that's come before us
17 and there have been different discussions. So please know
18 that I truly respect the work that you're doing for kids.
19 I'm trying to figure out how we best move forward for all
20 the kids in the State knowing full well that you're taking
21 good care of yours. I'm just wondering, is there a way to
22 have this be another pilot. Should we be looking at
23 something different than what we're looking at. Because
24 that's where -- I don't know on what basis staff recommended
25 that we look at this one, but somehow we've got to figure



1 out some common expectation that maybe doesn't have to be
2 based on a national commercial -- commercial assessment, as
3 opposed to these are the specific criteria we're looking at,
4 I mean I do think there there probably is a problem with
5 portions of yours and that's what the discussion that needs
6 to occur rather than suggesting that you're not doing a good
7 job.

8 MS. FLORES: But don't --

9 MADAM CHAIR: But we want to have that common
10 expectation, that common measurements so that we get some
11 idea, so that a district that isn't like yours, that maybe
12 does not have the skill set of users, with a mentoring for a
13 new kindergarten teacher of yours, we still can say this is
14 what -- this what you need to demonstrate and that's the
15 dilemma that we have with the replacement thing because it
16 doesn't. We are having a hard time getting to the one on
17 one. Board Member Flores.

18 MS. FLORES: But if we're talking about a
19 social emotional part of it, I would imagine that a human
20 would do better at getting to it than -- than a test and
21 that you're going to have misses with a test where you're
22 not going to have misses with a human.

23 MADAM CHAIR: This isn't a test, these are
24 observations.



1 MS. FLORES: Observations, you are quite
2 right.

3 MADAM CHAIR: They are human observations.

4 MS. FLORES: But the human human observation
5 of a well-trained teacher, I think will --

6 MADAM CHAIR: They will align with a rubrics.

7 MS. FLORES: Okay.

8 MS. SMITH: On the issues of the that concern
9 about whether our data would be similar to or different than
10 other submitting, using a tool, I think it's the --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Using PA score.

12 MS. SMITH: -- using PA score that it's
13 similar to and the teacher evaluation system that different
14 districts can have different approaches to measuring their
15 teacher's effectiveness. They have to reach a certain level
16 of rigor but we have a method in every district to report so
17 that CDE has comparable data from every district. That's
18 what I see we're trying to do here, is that we're trying to
19 provide a plan where we won't be able to deliver comparable
20 data --

21 MADAM CHAIR: Right, there's a big difference
22 to me though because we're at a policy level, I don't know
23 that we are going to do anything with educator evaluation
24 data. That is left strictly to the districts, whereas the
25 data that is just being sought.



1 MS. FLORES: -- making an example.

2 MADAM CHAIR: This is not about testing, the
3 data that's being sought to help policymakers and taxpayers
4 think about what can we do to make sure our kids are ready
5 to go to school when they come to school.

6 MS. FLORES: It's not for policymakers, it's
7 for kids.

8 MADAM CHAIR: The information that we collect
9 is for parents, number one but then secondly, it's for
10 policy -- policy folks to decide should we expand
11 (inaudible) should we change (inaudible) etc. So I think it
12 was considered an integral part of the whole landmark P20
13 system that was intended was (inaudible) and that's why I
14 think to the extent that we can remain true to that, we
15 should. So I think it's where our legislators, none of whom
16 are still around are Governors or anybody right, do you have
17 a comment.

18 MR. DURHAM: Its a fast turnover. Ms. Dill,
19 l could you advise us on the time frame The Board has for
20 consideration and action on this.

21 MS. ANTHERS: Actually, I have that here, I've
22 been emailing my team upstairs somewhere to get clarity.

23 MR. DURHAM: Any application?



1 MS. ANTHES: Yes. She pulled it for me, of
2 course Tony can probably look at this better but I believe
3 it's a 120 day days or something.

4 MR. DURHAM: From the date of application?

5 MS. ANTHES: Yes the applications from a
6 school district . Yes, the State Board of Education will
7 rul -- rule on a waiver request by a school district within
8 120 days of the receipt of a complete request for review.

9 MR. DURHAM: And when was this requested?

10 MADAM CHAIR: When was it received?

11 MS. ANTHES: When was it received, I think --
12 sorry she's -- she's trying to find the last two we approved
13 or denied.

14 MR. DURHAM: That's all right.

15 MS. ANTHES: But this -- when was this
16 request received in your office?

17 MS. COLSMAN: March 17th, is when we had
18 received it and then the staff review completed was on June
19 7th.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham..

21 MR. DURHAM: Well, I'm sure, I think the rub
22 is the legislature probably relates some point needs to deal
23 with some clarification on these issues. And I think it's
24 probably their decision's is probably going to be in large
25 measure based by Ms Glassman's, when she -- she is asked to



1 answer the question, do you have data that allows you to
2 make reasonable or to reach reasonable conclusions about
3 kindergarten readiness and the impact of various programs on
4 kindergarten readiness. I don't know that you know what the
5 answer to that question is just pointer sort of what it will
6 be in the future. So we -- I think we have some which is
7 legislative -- legislative problems that have perhaps our
8 own inconsistencies, my own personal and consistencies have
9 helped to create. But I do think in looking at -- I mean
10 this is probably a better put together request than most.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Correct.

12 MR. DURHAM: And so that -- that certainly
13 ways -- ways for approval rating of the waiver and I think
14 just on a personal basis, I'm less concerned about social
15 emotional and its potential problems in the use of that data
16 than I am about, hard abilities to read and write those
17 kinds of things. So I'm not not even sure we ought to be
18 assessing the social emotional, just an opinion. So and --
19 and I think -- I think finally that, you know, I think
20 legally we could probably go either way with this, that's my
21 guess on turning it or approving or turning it down for.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: I'd like to move to approve the
24 waiver requested by Colorado Springs School District.
25 District 11, Pursuant 2-22-2-1-17 CR.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Second. For the discussion.
2 Board Member McClellan.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: I'm still struggling with our
4 ability to have an apples to apples comparison statewide.
5 That's truly compliant with the intent.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I bet this is better
7 than --

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: I'm just concerned that we're
9 not using one of the approved options. Therefore, are we
10 gonna be looking at a hole in the data for one of our
11 largest districts. And then, do we set a precedent again
12 for other districts who may be less able to produce quality
13 data for comparison purposes. Moving forward, are we gonna
14 be in a situation where we have failed to uphold compliance
15 with the read act? So if there's any further insight that
16 staff can offer. I know you've offered quite a bit already,
17 but I'm -- I'm still struggling with that right now.

18 MS. ANTHERS: Well, if I had something magical
19 to say around that, I certainly would. I think that -- that
20 really is, you know, the crux of the issue that the -- The
21 Board needs to grapple with.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: So we are really setting
23 ourselves up here. Because the reality is that while we are
24 impressed with the work you do, I'm waiting for one of us to



1 say to another district, "Hey, you're not good enough."

2 Because we don't have the criteria.

3 MADAM CHAIR: That's part of our job though.

4 Is to assess whether they have met the intent of the law.

5 Some districts may have done a very good job of meeting the

6 intent of the law, and some may not. And we have --

7 MS. MCCLELLAN: But we are --

8 MADAM CHAIR: -- we have the right to make

9 that decision based on that.

10 MADAM CHAIR: We may have the right, but the

11 reality is we don't have the skill. We are not the experts.

12 The experts are over there.

13 MS. MCCLELLAN: But we are the elected.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Some of us -- some of us

15 have the skills.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yeah, right.

17 MS. FLORES: We do. We're trained in the

18 area.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

20 MS. RANKIN: I have to agree with Board

21 Member McLellan. And basically, it's because I think the

22 experts, at least, as far as I have to trust, CDE. And I

23 think at every point, that has to be made in this document,

24 was -- there was a crosswalk that said, okay. This is what

25 they do in CAP for K or this is what they do in like GOLD or



1 regular GOLD. And this is what this district wants to do.
2 And each one was addressed. I believe CDE would have not
3 had some of these questions. And socially, I'm having
4 social and emotional problems trying to deal with this right
5 now. But so there's where my problem is and I believe that
6 was Board Member McClelland's difficulty with this too. So
7 I, at this point, I can only go by the questions that CDE
8 has proposed. And I have similar ones.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I would just respond, but
11 with no -- with no disrespect to CDE staff. CDE has its
12 role, and if you look at their staff response to this waiver
13 request, it looks very much like their staff response, to
14 every other waiver request. The answer is always the same.
15 It's not a nationally recognized. It's not valid, reliable.
16 The answer is the same. And I think that CDE in responding
17 this way, is doing exactly what they should do. But I don't
18 think that we, as members elected by our constituents, have
19 to agree with CDE every time. And in my opinion, I do not
20 feel the same -- the same urgency that some may feel about
21 how much we need to know about kindergarten readiness.

22 I'm frankly not a fan of all this data
23 pipeline to support more preschool education, more preschool
24 programs. I'm not a big fan of that. I've said it before.
25 My -- my children's kindergarten teacher came to our house,



1 and talked to my kids, and determined their readiness, and
2 that did include social and emotional. And we know usually
3 in the beginning of the kindergarten year, how ready they
4 are, and we certainly know by the end of the kindergarten
5 year. I'm -- I'm thinking that in particular, I think this
6 district has done a very thoughtful job of trying to provide
7 the state with the data they are looking for, and that they
8 will continue to try and make their -- their assessment meet
9 the needs of the state's requirements. I am absolutely
10 going to vote in favor of this waiver.

11 MR. DURHAM: Perhaps the legislature
12 inadvertently made the -- made the most significant
13 commentary on this, and that, you know, even if you conclude
14 the child's not kindergarten ready, you can't deny them
15 admission.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Exactly.

17 MR. DURHAM: So to some point, to some
18 extent, I think the legislature has created a serious flaw
19 in its own statute to create a standard. But don't worry
20 about whether or not you made it. And I think that's --
21 that's the problem.

22 MS. MAZANEC: I don't understand that at all.
23 Would you run me by that again?



1 MR. DURHAM: As I recall in the statute Mr.
2 Dill, you cannot, you can find somebody to be not ready, but
3 you can't deny them admission.

4 MS. MAZANEC: But you certainly can increase
5 intervention that's on the child's behalf.

6 MR. DURHAM: Certainly. Absolutely. Yes.

7 MS. MAZANEC: And you can look into the
8 opportunities that kid had to achieve readiness through
9 early childhood.

10 MS. RANKIN: I don't think they have to do
11 this assessment.

12 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

13 MS. MAZANEC: They don't have the --

14 MS. RANKIN: Do they have to do it all the
15 time? Yes.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: They don't have to. They
17 don't, the policy members don't have the data as to whether
18 the inter --

19 MS. MAZANEC: You worry so much about policy
20 members. It's the kids we should be worried about.

21 MS. MCCLELLAN: We are worried about the
22 children. We're ready to call the vote. This is not
23 helpful.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

25 MR. DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

2 MS. FLORES: Yes.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

4 MS. GOFF: No.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: No.

9 MS. RANKIN: Board Member Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: No.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

12 MADAM CHAIR: No.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Promotion fails. Four to

14 three.

15 FEMALE SPAKER: Thank you.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes. I would love to have

17 you guys come back at some point when we have a deep

18 discussion about what we want to ask the Legislature for, so

19 that we can do this. Because I don't question that you guys

20 are worried about your kindergarten kids' readiness.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would we delay to do

22 that, or be part of a pilot, if you go in that direction,

23 just let us know.



1 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you. I really
2 appreciate it. This was not a criticism of D11. It was
3 more of a perceived constraint on what we should be doing.

4 MR. DURHAM: Thank you for your time.

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: You do it. I'd like to
6 acknowledge that we have a legislator in our room. Welcome,
7 Mr. Rankin. If you wanna stay here, you gotta smile. Come
8 on. Representative Rankin, sorry. I think he's here for a
9 free lunch, but I'm not sure.

10 MS. RANKIN: Nothing wrong with that.

11 MS. MCCLELLAN: No.

12 MS. RANKIN: It's more of a lunch anyway.

13 MS. MCCLELLAN: Oh, yes. Let's do it. Thank
14 you for your patience folks. And thank you for a good
15 discussion guys. We just need to -- we need more work on
16 this one, definitely.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This will be to hand
18 out.

19 MS. MCCLELLAN: Board Member Goff.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is she going? Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've been bringing you
22 some budget information in the last couple of months, and
23 this is a little more detail. We're bringing you a sort of
24 more detail each time, so I'll turn it over to Miss Emm.



1 MS. EMM: Thank you. And knowing that time
2 is short, I am going to fly pretty fast. However, it is --
3 it is a very important discussion, considering where you
4 have been over the past six to eight months. And knowing
5 that we need to make some decisions moving forward into the
6 '18-'19 fiscal year, so that we can be planning. And I know
7 that sounds like a long time out, but it is still important
8 that we'd be thinking ahead.

9 In prior years, you have received budget
10 decision items from us for example last year, concurrent
11 enrollment in the standards rewrite were decision items that
12 were brought forward to you in May and June, that were
13 basically fully fleshed out at that time. And there wasn't
14 a lot of major discussion over those items, but based on
15 kind of the discussions that you had at that time, and a
16 real desire for more understanding about the budgetary
17 process, and understanding how we are looking at the
18 priorities and the needs. And we've been asking ourselves
19 those hard questions. And so we wanted to kind of bring you
20 along through these discussions, instead of just bringing
21 you decision items that are basically fully fleshed out. So
22 that's why we're kind of going through it in this regard.
23 So back in May, we gave you that overview and the change
24 process timeline, and we identified the high priority needs
25 that we had identified. Support for low performing schools,



1 and some information management system needs, and also we
2 had briefly talked about department administrative support
3 in the purchasing area.

4 So today we just wanna provide a little bit
5 of additional context. We're going to continue to work over
6 the summer. In August, we will bring you those more fully
7 developed decision items, but we really do want some
8 direction from you all today about that. So to go into
9 first of all a broader discussion about the supports for
10 schools in districts to improve the -- the outcomes for
11 students. First of all, we'd like to discuss that a little
12 bit, and given the months of accountability hearings, and
13 ESSA, and all of the work that has been done, we would
14 really like to have your direction as we move forward to
15 develop the decision items around these. So we also feel
16 like we've got a huge opportunity, and given the
17 accountability hearings, ESSA, and looking at those impacts
18 of those supports, we are able to reflect, learn and improve
19 those systems of support. And in order to do that, when we
20 reflect and learn and determine how could we -- how could --
21 could we develop those supports better? What are those
22 resources? How can we deploy resources and use those in
23 order to do this hard work, and get better improvements for
24 all of the schools, so that you do have less schools on the
25 clock and you have less -- we've got better outcomes for



1 students in the long run. How can we do that? What have we
2 learned?

3 So we know through the accountability
4 hearings, that it's hard, it is hard work. In order to move
5 these students and move the districts off the clock, there's
6 complex challenges, there's academic and talent systems that
7 need improvement in the schools in the districts, there's
8 leadership challenges, and there's also the community needs.
9 So having better understanding, and you are having better
10 understanding about that, how can we do this hard work with
11 either the resources that we currently have, or do we expand
12 and scale and -- and identify areas where we can really make
13 some more improvements.

14 So in the ESSA state plan, we know that we
15 learned through that significant public engagement there --
16 there really is a desire to streamline and align the
17 supports, and use differentiated models of those supports
18 based on the needs within the district. We -- we understand
19 that, we know that, we also know that there's not as much
20 alignment in the ESSA in the State's accountability system
21 as there was with the waiver. And we'll talk about that a
22 little bit more in -- in just a couple of slides. This is
23 just a refresher of those turnaround and supports that are
24 available to the districts. You all have had many
25 presentations about this, and how -- how these are working.



1 The district supports, the turnaround network, all of these
2 kind of things are just laid out again there for you for
3 those supports. In addition, through the dropout prevention
4 and support highlights, these are just some highlights of
5 the program.

6 It began back in the legislation was passed
7 in 2009. That original year that it was passed, it was
8 funded through ARRA dollars. Those ARRA dollars
9 subsequently went away. And ARRA was the American
10 Reinvestment and Recovery Act that provided big infusion
11 sent to the states as we went into the terrible recession at
12 that time. So that funded this program for a while, then we
13 were able to support it through other Federal grants, and
14 there -- those other Federal grants are no longer available.
15 So we've got -- we've got some issues around the dropout and
16 prevention, and being able to continue -- continue that in a
17 way that we have been able to in the past. This is just a
18 quick overview of the available resources that we have
19 currently. The Federal ESEA dollars, \$10.5 million, '16-
20 '17. And then that's going to be approximately the same
21 amount in '17-'18. We're unsure what that looks like in
22 '18-'19. The State School Turnaround Leaders Grant has been
23 consistent at two million. And then the dropout prevention
24 State funds was \$900,000 in '16-'17. And then in '17-'18,
25 they reinstated it with -- to the '15-'16 level. So we know



1 that some of the impacts of this support, and we have a
2 little bit of correlational data around the turn around
3 connect for success and dropout. But we're not in that
4 super charged place of being able to say, "We know for a
5 fact, without a doubt, that these supports have created this
6 improvement in these schools." We have not been able to nor
7 have we had the ability or resources to do what is called a
8 full program evaluation of those supports.

9 So we've got some -- some -- some data, and
10 we think we know, but we're not totally positive on those
11 supports. And we wanna continue to learn, we wanna continue
12 to improve. We are a learning organization. That's what we
13 do. We learn, we improve.

14 So you all have seen these slides before.
15 And this is just an example of the turnaround supports, and
16 how the schools have come off the clock due to these
17 supports. And Pat Chapman and Peter and Alyssa have all
18 gone through this with you before. Also we have a slide
19 here on the connect for success. We've also seen this
20 before, and the -- how that cohort has improved. And also
21 we have here the dropout prevention and graduation chart
22 here, where you can see that the dropout -- the dropout rate
23 has declined, while the graduation rate has improved. So we
24 know we've got the report that you all discussed earlier
25 this morning, but we've also seen these gains and the



1 declines. And so that we know that this is helping us in
2 this regard. So as we move forward, we know that we wanna
3 continue to help schools address their literacy, math, and
4 how we're -- how we are helping those students who are at
5 risk for dropping out. And we also wanna know more about
6 how we can continue to positively impact, what are those
7 best supports, and how we can better leverage, not only the
8 federal dollars, but the state dollars. We know there's
9 limited resources. We know that -- that it's just not a
10 hose that we can continue to drink from. We've got to be
11 strategic, and understand how those funds and resources help
12 us move the dial on these schools and districts. We know
13 that ESSA changed the context. There's different
14 identification requirements. We know that these are not as
15 aligned. And when we started talking internally, these were
16 my aha slides, where it was like, I understand.

17 So this graphic here is ESSA waiver, and the
18 Colorado accountability schools, and how those schools were
19 identified for supports. So the yellow around the outside
20 was the ESSA waiver, and the gray on the inside was the
21 state-identified schools under the accountability system.
22 So they were highly aligned. Then, when we got to ESSA and
23 Colorado accountability system, they are pulled apart. So
24 we are not going to have as much alignment under the two



1 systems that we did under the waiver. So with that, we know
2 that more schools are gonna be identified.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Can we interrupt?

4 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec, can you
5 go back and explain what you mean by that? I mean, how is it
6 -- you say much lower alignment in what ways? I mean.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Sure. And I'm going to have
8 Elisa and talk to that.

9 MADAM CHAIR: How you're gonna get there? I
10 mean, if you're gonna get there, you don't have to answer
11 that.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Well, actually I -- at least I
13 can -- can explain that -- that more. So this high level
14 under the ESSA waiver, when they had the waiver. We were
15 able to write it in such a way that the way the US
16 Department of Ed wanted us to identify schools. We were
17 able to use our state system as kind of a requirement. So
18 with that, we had a few other schools that were not priority
19 improvement and turnaround schools identified. But all of
20 our priority improvement in turnaround schools fit into that
21 federal system through the waiver. The requirements in the
22 ESSA are different when they wrote that law about which
23 schools we needed to identify and which one is not.

24 So ESSA is requiring some other ways of
25 looking at schools that have challenges with individual



1 disaggregated groups. So that's increasing the number of
2 schools that get identified, and some of those schools are
3 not the schools we identify in the state system. And our
4 state system identify some schools that are not identified
5 federally. So it really goes from all of our state schools
6 were aligned with federal to know we're in this place where
7 it pulls apart. So there are some ESSA-identified schools,
8 some schools that will overlap, that are both state and
9 federally identified, and then, some schools that are just
10 state identified.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have a good guess?

12 MS. MAZANEC: Numbers. I -- we started
13 looking at things. Things are gonna move when we get new
14 data. We gave you that picture with the Venn diagram to
15 say, it -- it may be about half and half, and then it's in
16 the middle, or a third, a third and a third but I don't
17 wanna give you hard numbers yet 'cause we're still working
18 out what that will look like when we have the final new data
19 in.

20 MADAM CHAIR: I kind of get the part that,
21 the ESSA part being a different definition. I'm a little
22 confused about our identifying districts for priority
23 improvement and turnaround that aren't --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Included.



1 MADAM CHAIR: -- that aren't included in
2 that.

3 MS. MAZANEC: That aren't federally
4 identified?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Can you give me an
6 example, for example, of one that we just addressed for
7 example?

8 MS. MAZANEC: So I think the best way to, can
9 I go back a few sides? So the comprehensive low is 5 percent
10 under ESSA. Think about that as like the most struggling
11 schools. This is what the feds require at.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the federal part, I
13 get. Got it.

14 MS. MAZANEC: So why are some of our state
15 schools not in there?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Why are some of our state
17 schools identified as priority improvement or turnaround,
18 but they don't meet any of those form?

19 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. Because they are not the
20 lowest 5 percent of Title One schools, but they are still
21 struggling and low. And they may not be in a high school
22 that have the low grad rate, and their individual
23 disaggregated groups may not be as low, or they may not have
24 them to end up in that targeted identification.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.



1 MS. MAZANEC: So you could have a school that
2 overall maybe not with disaggregated groups. So overall
3 it's struggling, it's not as low as the lowest 5 percent of
4 Title One, which is only about 30 schools, right? We've got
5 about 190 and our priority improvement turnaround.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Where are the schools that we
7 just looked at Title One schools?

8 MS. MAZANEC: With accountability clock
9 hearings?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

11 MS. MAZANEC: I do not believe so. I think
12 some of them don't get Title One funds.

13 MADAM CHAIR: So I don't think it's helpful
14 for you to go back now, but come August --

15 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

16 MADAM CHAIR: -- I'd be really grateful if
17 you could.

18 MS. MAZANEC: To know which ones are Title.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Cause I'm wondering
20 whether we sh -- I mean, when -- when 163 was passed, the
21 primary intent, I believe, was that we have an
22 accountability system for the State of Colorado.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

24 MADAM CHAIR: And if that is seriously the
25 far GOLD now with the new -- 'cause we don't even know how



1 much of this will hold. But once we do get a sense that
2 this is in fact what the Department of Education is going to
3 hold to, then we need to have that discussion.

4 MS. MAZANEC: I think --

5 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know -- this is not
6 just a challenge for us financially. This is a challenge
7 for our publics to have these different -- different
8 measures of accountability. I think that I find that very
9 problematic, and I think it was very problematic, which is
10 why we went where we went

11 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. And I think that was --
12 you think back when 163 first passed the first few years, we
13 still had AYP, the federal system separate because we didn't
14 have the waiver yet. It wasn't 'til we got the waiver and
15 that we were able to really align. And so this does feel
16 like a step back to some degree.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. Politically -- this does
18 feel politically frustrating.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Madam Chair.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. For more Mazanec,
21 and I apologize.

22 MS. MAZANEC: I forgot my name already.

23 MADAM CHAIR: I can do first names without a
24 problem, but -- so what -- what does targeted school
25 improvement and additional targeted school improvement mean?



1 MS. MAZANEC: We may not want to get into all
2 those details today. We can if you want, but it's -- it's
3 very concrete descriptions in the ESSA about identifying
4 schools with individual disaggregated groups of students
5 that are at certain levels for a ce -- over a certain period
6 of time that are struggling.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Individual disaggregated
8 groups.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Groups. So like the English
10 language learners in a group, or the Hispanic students, or
11 those students that are eligible for free or reduced lunch,
12 for example.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Can we get a waiver?

14 MS. MAZANEC: Let's get our plan approved
15 first then work on that next.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry. Get hungry.

17 MS. MAZANEC: So given those disparate
18 circles, that's where we know we've got some issues with our
19 resources. That the more schools are identified, different
20 schools are gonna be identified, that means dilution of
21 funds. Some are not -- not even eligible, and we have under
22 the eclipse, we've reached our capacity for providing those
23 supports given our resources. That's where we're at. Okay?
24 So when we talk about our next steps as what we are working
25 on over the summer and what we would like your feedback on,



1 is that we're operating currently under the assumption that
2 we sho -- really should continue to support our low-
3 performing schools and districts given all that we've
4 learned under ESSA, and the accountability hearings, and the
5 preliminary data on the supports.

6 And so here's where, you know, if -- if we're
7 assuming that, and if there's maybe, maybe not -- maybe not
8 total agreement, but just discussion where we might go, that
9 we continue to look at areas within CDE, where we can
10 leverage those supports, maybe reallocating fiscal resources
11 or human resources, what we could be talking about though,
12 in that regard, is do we potentially need to look at
13 legislation that would help us align those resources as
14 Angelika, Dr. Schroeder, pointed out. They're -- it is
15 problematic to have those circles pulled apart now instead
16 of more fully aligned. And we may need to look at that from
17 legislative -- from a legislative standpoint. We can
18 continue to investigate grants or potential donations. We
19 have our gifts, grants, and donations policy. And we could
20 utilize that and potentially obtain some funds through that.
21 And then, looking at either legislation or budget requests
22 in order to continue to move this work forward and be able
23 to support additional schools. And we also of course, wanna
24 gather stakeholder input in that regard. So that's kind of
25 the frame around that low-performing schools work.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Feedback, folks, before we go
2 on.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry?

4 MADAM CHAIR: Feedback on this portion of the
5 request.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well --

7 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I think I certainly would
8 like to see more detail around what we're spending now, what
9 we were spending on some of these supports, and what the
10 notion is, what -- what you're hoping for, for next year.

11 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. One of the -- one of the
12 pieces of context that I would like to put forward is; the -
13 - in the turnaround network and those supports there, it was
14 approximately, the spending was approximately \$59,000 to
15 \$60,000 per school on an annual basis in order to move them
16 forward. So just as an example, if we wanted to expand our
17 supports to an additional 10 schools, we'd be looking at
18 \$590,000 to \$600,000.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Well, here's another question I
20 have though is, we have -- we have people that were supposed
21 to participate in the turnaround leaders that did not,
22 correct?

23 MS. COLSMAN: Yes. So what kind of
24 accountability do we have for, you know, or ability to move



1 those funds to some -- some other participant. We have
2 people that were supposed to participate that didn't and --

3 MADAM CHAIR: Do -- do you mean individuals
4 who got the grant that didn't or that we had award money
5 leftover?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In some of our
7 accountability hearings, I was included and part of the
8 information that they had -- they were supposed to
9 participate in but they never attended.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think that was
11 school turnaround leaders, but I'll go back and look and see
12 what that was. You may think it was maybe attendance and
13 some trainings that they had committed to, that they hadn't.

14 MADAM CHAIR: But I think it was the
15 turnaround.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's definitely
17 something that we've been thinking about is -- is that two
18 million focused on school turnaround leaders grant the best
19 way to spend that full two million. But right now that's
20 what the legislature, what the statute says that may be as
21 we investigate and learn, it might be an area to think about
22 exactly.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Maybe not relevant right now.
24 But I'm also wondering if those -- those funds were spread
25 wide enough.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member (inaudible) .

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted to give
4 the feedback that with respect to the -- the new decoupling
5 of schools that are identified as being needed -- needing
6 targeted help, no longer necessarily aligning with being
7 eligible for targeted financial help. I would be happy to
8 see our legislative team of directors Durham and Goff and
9 Ms. Mello engaged on this to see if perhaps there's anything
10 we can do to help mitigate the challenge that that creates.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores.

12 MS. FLORES: Well, I hate to think about
13 charity here but you know, at one point, we used to be able
14 to get monies from people who just donated money to the --
15 to the state to the department. And I'm just wondering
16 whether -- Cookies, remember you're always offering to bake
17 cookies. That's right. Whether 60, I mean 60,000. You're
18 talking about 60,000 per school, whether there would be
19 individuals who might want to provide 60,000 if they are
20 sponsoring a school. I think that would be very attractive
21 to some people. I mean --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I think it would
23 help us if come August, when you have more information about
24 results. We can continue to evaluate how well this has
25 worked. I mean, we're talking today about having had 204



1 schools in 25 districts, and the shift over five years. I
2 think, before I go to the legislature, I want to argue --
3 want to make the argument that that has held as opposed to
4 fluctuations, and there will be some fluctuations. I'm not
5 that idealistic but I'd like to be able to think that we're
6 on a continuum as opposed to -- yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And you didn't like my -
8 -

9 MADAM CHAIR: I think -- I think that
10 evidence is pretty important.

11 MS. FLORES: You didn't like my charity idea?
12 I want you to bake cookies. It's on -- it's on the list,
13 it's on the list. Yeah.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Board Member Rankin.

15 MS. RANKIN: I want to go way back to the
16 first, the budget presentation sheet that we have supporting
17 local firms, schools accountability turnaround support for
18 1819. When we -- when we're setting this can we have the
19 background of the amount of money that we've had in the
20 past? Amount of students that have been affected by it in a
21 number of schools? Just to see what direction we're going?
22 And I also think if our -- if our finances are limited, I
23 know I have worked with Peter Sherman in the past. I have a
24 huge district with 50 some school districts. And some
25 really welcome the help of CDE, some come right after the



1 first year of finding out they're on the clock. They want
2 to improve. They work hard. Those are the ones that
3 encourage you to get -- And then there are those that you
4 can keep throwing money at, and their scores keep going
5 down. So there's a lot of that emotional, of who to help,
6 and -- and how our dollars are being spent. But these are
7 things I think we've -- we've done this long enough. We
8 need to address some of these and come forward with -- with
9 the ones that have worked or not. That's all part of our
10 accountability. I believe that very strongly.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Any more comments before Miss
12 Emm continues or are you --

13 MS. EMM: I'm gonna --

14 MADAM CHAIR: --calling a friend?

15 MS. EMM: I'm going to continue on if that's
16 okay, unless you have any more questions. That's great
17 feedback. That's exactly what we needed. Thank you very
18 much. For the information management systems. We talked
19 last month about some of the needs within the information
20 management systems, and we have many, many complex district
21 and public facing systems. And so it's really beneficial
22 for the department to be able to control and own those
23 systems, in order to provide responsiveness to districts and
24 the public and all of that, but it is complex work. And
25 Marcia Bohan and our Chief Information Officer can provide



1 much more detail around those numbers of systems, and things
2 like that. But -- and there is this one chart that is quite
3 the spaghetti chart of all of the systems that we've got.
4 One of the questions that's been asked is why do we need to
5 come forward for supports for the information management
6 system now? We have over the past few years, we have been
7 prudent to the point of not seeking investments on an
8 ongoing basis, and yet we've managed to stay afloat given
9 the work that's been done in the information management
10 systems. We've put band-aids on systems. We cannot
11 continue to put the band-aids on the systems any longer. We
12 are -- we are stretched to the max and we have not gone to
13 the legislature or to you all, to say we were at a breaking
14 point.

15 And that's where we're at at this point in
16 time. We talked last month that we wouldn't come forward
17 with anything that started with a B, but we are going to be
18 talking about M's, and millions of dollars that we do need
19 to invest in our systems in order to stay afloat. We are
20 not to the point where we would -- well, if Marsha's in the
21 room, she'll be kicking me. But we would like to do a plan
22 over -- over the years because we know that we cannot go and
23 say we need five million dollars in one year. That's not
24 realistic. But what we would like to do is say, we need to
25 invest in these types of systems moving forward. One of the



1 things that when you talk about the information management
2 systems, is capital outlay versus operational outlay. And
3 capital expenditures are those one-time costs when you
4 invest in a system and you implement that system, and then
5 the ongoing costs are those that take -- it takes to support
6 the system going through that.

7 One of the perfect examples that we have that
8 you'll see hopefully a demonstration of tomorrow is the
9 financial transparency system that was a large project. The
10 Legislature approved capital expenditures for that, it was a
11 large capital outlay. And then there was on, there is, and
12 will be ongoing costs in order to maintain that system. So
13 that's an example of capital versus the ongoing expenditures
14 and that's something that we see all the time in information
15 management systems. When we're talking about
16 prioritization, we obviously have our statutory compliance
17 of needs. And again, one of the examples of that was the
18 financial transparency system that was a statutory
19 compliance need, and typically, hopefully fiscal notes are
20 associated with those needs. Not all the time, but we're
21 always hopeful that, that they are incorporated.

22 The other part is those system hardware, and
23 licensing updates, and system upgrades, this is critical.
24 So for instance, when -- when we see on our iPhones, we get
25 our updates and that we just get those automatically. What



1 will happen within our IMS systems, a lot of those, we have
2 to pay for those continual license upgrades and if we don't
3 stay on top of those licenses and those upgrades then we run
4 risks of -- of them not providing updates anymore. We run
5 security risks much like our windows systems at home. If we
6 don't keep those up to date, we run the risk of being hacked
7 into and things like that and our systems become outdated.
8 One of our systems, the -- it's called the (inaudible), it's
9 the Student Unique Identifier System, that's 15 years old.
10 It -- it needs to be looked at significantly. Other needs
11 are security upgrades. We have got to protect student
12 information and ensure that authorized personnel only have
13 that access to the student data and we want to reduce that
14 risk as much as possible. So as we talked about the
15 licensing and that outdated infrastructure and technology
16 that allow, if we allow that to get any more outdated that
17 can allow some of our security to become more exposed.

18 Fourth is the maximizing the use of the data
19 and we feel this has a responsibility by providing
20 clarification, understanding and communicating that -- that
21 to the public. So when we're talking about this, we've
22 identified and Bizzy, could you hand out that hand out? And
23 I so apologize that you are getting this today. It's a very
24 brief overview of the numbers that we're talking about today
25 and we'll come back with you in August. We've been working



1 very closely with the departments and -- and it's been an
2 evolving thing, you know, but this is the most up to the
3 minute information that we have. And again, my apologies
4 for handing this out late. But what it does show is up at
5 the top and Bizzy could I have -- can I have one of those
6 also?

7 Up at the top it kind of shows what we're
8 looking out from the supports to schools and districts and
9 ranges there. Then under the IMS system estimates, we
10 talked about the capital or one time costs versus the
11 ongoing costs. First, to catch up that infrastructure and
12 maintenance, we're looking at around \$1.2 million with
13 ongoing costs of 215. You can walk down that chart's
14 security and privacy about two million data reporting, 950
15 for a total there of those one time costs of about \$4.15
16 million with ongoing costs of \$885,000. So if I'm a budget
17 person sitting over at the Joint Budget Committee or
18 anywhere else on going and even sitting here, \$5 million
19 it's not going to happen. So how can we structure this over
20 time to meet those needs and yet be prudent and look at that
21 spending plan over multiple years? And what I would ask of
22 you all is, as we're developing the August request, what
23 could we look to you all that would make sense from and ask,
24 are we -- should we ask for nothing or should we look at
25 something in order to help our systems be able to support



1 the needs of the department and the districts and -- and
2 everywhere else? You know, should we look at a million
3 dollars or -- or should we look at this first line with that
4 infrastructure being the bare minimum that we should look at
5 or -- that's where we would like some feedback from you all
6 also.

7 MADAM CHAIR: The city qualify for a BEST
8 Grant? I'm absolutely serious.

9 MS. EMM: You know, I think that's a really
10 good --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Because the legislature didn't
12 ad -- add the technology piece.

13 MS. EMM: They add the technology. I have
14 never thought of that.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Or five million from the
16 Marijuana money for one time. You know, the slush fund that
17 you guys have over there.

18 MS. EMM: Well, how about Marijuana, let's go
19 after that.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

21 MS. EMM: That's what she said.

22 MR. DURHAM: They spend that slush fund a
23 lot.

24 MADAM CHAIR: That's right. Let's spend that
25 slush fund.



1 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Please, Board Member Mazanec.

3 MS. MAZANEC: So do these figures include FTE
4 or salaries plus --

5 MS. EMM: Thank you.

6 MS. MAZANEC: -- actual items? And so can we
7 get that broken down about how much is actually FTE and how
8 much is actually items?

9 MS. EMM: Yes, thank you. That's a great
10 question. And I do know that within the ongoing -- ongoing
11 costs, there would be some FTE built into.

12 MS. MAZANEC: That's my assumption too. I
13 just wanna know how much of it is FTE?

14 MS. EMM: Right.

15 MS. MAZANEC: And how many FTE?

16 MS. EMM: Yeah. I think there was possibly
17 two in one of the areas if I remember right. And I believe
18 that was within the security and privacy. But this was very
19 high and level put together and we would definitely come
20 forward with a more fleshed out plan as to what exactly
21 these would cover over the multiple years. So -- so think
22 of a -- think of a chart here that has more lines in it and
23 more columns going over.

24 But we also needed to, in order to move
25 forward, we needed to kind of have an idea of where should



1 we focus our energies on moving forward. What is realistic
2 to go forward. Because this type of thing, we know that we
3 are not going to be able to identify enough resources within
4 the department that could be reallocated. We need -- we
5 need financial assistance in this regard. So what is that -
6 - what is that kind of look like. We may be totally out of
7 luck.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Rankin.

9 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Emm, thanks for that and I
10 know you've spent a lot of time on this and looked at it,
11 but my concern is when you talk about IT, it changes so
12 rapidly. If we're looking out 10 years from now, it's not
13 even gonna look half way what it is now. Have we done a
14 real inventory of what we have? What we have here is very
15 unique because we're dealing with people like student
16 identified information, we're dealing with districts, we're
17 dealing with students. If we go to the legislature and ask
18 for more money and there isn't more money there and there's
19 never gonna be as much money as we think we need and I
20 understand that. Maybe we need a third party IT specific
21 company or whatever, that understands these specific needs
22 that can back up or -- or help us decide what it is we need.
23 If we're going by ourselves and next door and saying we need
24 500,000 right off the bat or.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Million, million, million,
2 million.

3 MS. RANKIN: Five hundred million, right.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thousand.

5 MS. RANKIN: Whatever it is. I -- I think
6 it's gonna be a stop sign right there and I don't blame
7 them. I -- I think we need more of -- of an understanding
8 and -- and a little transparency if at all possible. I know
9 it'll be in the weeds, but -- but I think that will help
10 everyone understand what the issues are here. And -- and
11 they are unique and we are a silo in a lot of ways as to
12 what's going on extra. But anyway, these are the -- the
13 thoughts that I think we have to go forward in order to get
14 a, yes, on anything we ask for.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Agree.

16 MS. EMM: Any other comments, input,
17 concerns, information, you would like by August?

18 MS. MAZANEC: No.

19 MS. EMM: Thank you. Thank you very much.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

21 MS. EMM: Sorry, if you felt rushed that
22 quick.

23 MADAM CHAIR: That's okay, thank you.

24 MS. EMM: I will just offer since this is a
25 complex issue and there are different components and you



1 guys do have a break in July, if you wanna do one on one
2 with any staff members to understand the complexity of IMS
3 systems or school performance or low performing schools
4 work, we are happy to do that so that you're really
5 comfortable when we come to you in August with some more
6 specifics.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, but --

8 MS. MAZANEC: Actually, would it be possible
9 to get something in between now and August and that doesn't
10 require face to face meeting?

11 MADAM CHAIR: One on one can be on the phone.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Because I'm not coming down
13 here.

14 MADAM CHAIR: One can be on the phone.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Can we do on the phone?

16 MS. EMM: Yeah.

17 MS. MAZANEC: But I was just thinking it's
18 something to look at. I don't we have --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Computer?

20 MADAM CHAIR: Like the more detail?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You could look at and --

22 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah.

23 MS. EMM: Yeah, I think we could flesh some
24 things out so that you're not just, you know, so you're not
25 seeing something the first week of August.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

2 MS. EMM: Because we're going to be working
3 on this over the summer and and so if you all are willing to
4 look at things, we can certainly develop some, yeah,
5 something to look at.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Okay.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

9 MADAM CHAIR: So folks we are now going to
10 ask you all to leave. I would like Ms. Cordial to announce
11 an executive session, please.

12 MS. CORDIAL: An executive session has been
13 noticed for today's state Board meeting in conformance with
14 24-6-402 CRS to receive legal advice on specific legal
15 questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III) CRS matters
16 required to be kept confidential by Federal Law or rules or
17 State statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III) CRS.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Any objection to a -- I'm
19 sorry, I need a motion. Just go in second.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Second. Thank you. Any
22 objection? We are in executive session and we get to eat,
23 don't we?

24 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

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

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