



Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

**October 12, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 1**

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 12, 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 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are you ready, Board  
2 Member Durham?

3 MR DURHAM: Yes, ma'am. I'm... I do have to step  
4 out and make a call here in a little bit, but I did silence  
5 the ringer at least.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: State Board will come  
7 back to order. Ms. Cordial, will you please call?

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

9 MR. DURHAM: Here.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: Here.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

13 MS. GOFF: Here.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

17 MS. MCCLELLAN Here.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: Here.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Here.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Great, all present.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. First item on  
24 our agenda today is a presentation on the 2018 School and



1 District Performance Framework Targets. Commissioner?

2                   COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yes, thank you. If you  
3 didn't get enough of targets yesterday at 6:00 PM, then we  
4 decided we'd bring you some more today. I'm going to turn  
5 this over to Alyssa Pearson, Associate Commissioner, Marie  
6 Hetchton (ph), Principal Statistic Consultant, and Ashley  
7 Peash (ph), our Director of Accountability and Data  
8 Analysis. You've seen Ashley before, but she has moved into  
9 a new role here at the department. We're thrilled to have  
10 her. Who knows who would want to move into the  
11 accountability position, but she did.

12                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you saying it wasn't  
13 asked -- or wasn't forced?

14                   COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: No. We're happy she did.  
15 We're happy she moved into this role. I'll turn it over to  
16 you guys, thank you.

17                   MS. PEARSON: Thanks. Good morning, everyone.  
18 Thank you for starting your day with this lovely topic with  
19 us. We will try and differentiate between what we talked  
20 about yesterday and what we talked about today and get real  
21 clear on how these things are similar, and how they are  
22 different. I know it's a lot of data and targets and goals  
23 and numbers, so we'll do our best to get through it, and  
24 then you'll be done. Our goals for today; we wanna review  
25 your role in the target setting for state accountability.



1 Today we're not talking federal, we're talking about our  
2 state system, and specifically our School and District  
3 Performance Frameworks. We'll talk about your role in that.

4           We'll review the existing target setting  
5 methodology and discuss plans for how we're gonna handle the  
6 PSAT 9 test, because you know that will be given for the  
7 first time this year, so we'll talk about that a little bit.  
8 Ashley will go through that with you. We'll review the  
9 existing baseline data, so the grades 3 through 8 we're  
10 gonna kinda talk about how those targets were initially set  
11 and any changes in the actual performance between 2016 and  
12 2017, so you can see what happened in our state with that.  
13 Then what our goal really is, is that you all feel  
14 comfortable and can ask whatever questions or ask us to do  
15 any work in between now and November.

16           Your state board rules require you to vote on  
17 the targets for the 2018 performance frameworks, the ones  
18 that'll come out next August; to do the by November of every  
19 year.

20           We want to do today, today is an information  
21 item to get this information out, ask any questions, for us  
22 to go do any homework for you before November, so that you  
23 feel ready in November to be able to vote. Nothing you have  
24 to decide today at all, we just want to do that prep work.  
25 Here's the state statutory requirement around target setting



1 for the state board. The part in bold is really the  
2 important piece here. The board needs to review this -- or  
3 "After you review our performance as a state, the state  
4 board shall set, reaffirm, or revise the appropriate  
5 ambitious, but attainable" -- there's that language again --  
6 "state-wide targets for the measures used to determine the  
7 levels of attainment of the performance indicators." That's  
8 what's in law.

9                   Then what that actually means, let's talk  
10 about that for a little bit. So on the performance  
11 frameworks I think you all remember we've got the different  
12 content areas: English language arts, math, and Science.  
13 This is the achievement section. The actual achievement  
14 measures. And for each content area overall, and for the  
15 desegregated groups, we report the mean scale score. And  
16 then we have a tibow (ph)that correlates that mean scale  
17 score to what that rating is. If it "does not meet",  
18 "approaching", "meets", or "exceeds rating" for the school.  
19 And then points are assigned by -- based on that. Those  
20 points, in the end, roll up to get the overall rating for a  
21 school or district. It's the achievement, the growth, if  
22 it's a high school the postsecondary, workforce readiness;  
23 all that comes together to the overall rating. But what you  
24 all are asked to do is to figure out what those cut points  
25 should be to assign the "does not meet", "approaching",



1 "meets", and "exceeds".

2 That's what we're talking about today, is how  
3 do we get there. This is really different than the federal  
4 targets we were talking about yesterday. Because remember  
5 the purpose of those is really about "Let's put some goals  
6 out there and we'll report our data across the schools." We  
7 don't need to use it for identifying schools or districts.

8 It's kind of more aspirational. These are  
9 really about how we identify our schools and how we  
10 differentiate the levels of performance that we see in our  
11 schools to direct the support that we have available. So if  
12 we raise these expectations much, much higher we're gonna  
13 have more schools getting identified. The way we have it  
14 set, the way you all decided back in June of 2016 after we  
15 talked for a few months about all the different options, was  
16 really to do this normative approach. So we'll talk through  
17 that a little bit more today. But we --

18 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, may I ask a  
19 question?

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sure.

21 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Ms. Pearson, this  
22 first chart is --

23 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

24 MR. DURHAM: completely theoretical, right? I  
25 mean, these numbers are not -- and if they actually reflect



1 something can you tell me why, because it makes - we know  
2 our participation rate is substantially better than 72.8  
3 percent, so are these numbers... this is...?

4 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. This came from an  
5 example school, so this just came off of this year's  
6 preliminary School Performance Framework for one school in  
7 the state.

8 MR. DURHAM: So this is one school, so then -  
9 - okay, so...

10 MS. PEARSON: And you all got an attachment  
11 that came through with the board materials that had kind of  
12 the proposed cut scores. It's based on what was in what you  
13 approved for 2017, so you've got those actual numbers of  
14 what those cuts are for "does not meet" "approaching" --

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Is this the potential  
16 scoring --

17 MS. PEARSON: The Potential Scoring Guide,  
18 thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's this one right  
20 here.

21 MR. DURHAM: So, so in terms of potential --  
22 when you have the score, that I presume is a test score.

23 MS. PEARSON: Yes. It's using the mean scale  
24 score of all the students in the school that are included.

25 We take --



1 MR. DURHAM: Define again for me "mean scale  
2 score".

3 MS. PEARSON: Sure. So each student gets a  
4 scale score on the test, right? They get a number between  
5 650 and 850 on the CMAS assessments. The science is a little  
6 bit of a different scale, but for English language arts, and  
7 math that's the scale. So each student gets, you know,  
8 whatever their scale score is, 725 or 733. Then when we look  
9 at the performance of the school overall, or of any of the  
10 individual groups, we take the mean of that group of  
11 students and that's what we compare to the target. So the  
12 mean -- the average number of scale scores for all the  
13 students in that group. And then we compare that number with  
14 - with the numbers here.

15 MR. DURHAM: So essentially the score that an  
16 individual student has is based on a number of right  
17 answers, essentially, on the test.

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Okay. Marie is our  
19 testing expert at the table. Yeah, yes.

20 MR. DURHAM: I mean, basically it's a  
21 reflection of your essay was worth 90 points if -- or you,  
22 in the multiple choice you got 50 right answers and...

23 MS. HETCHTON: Correct, mm-hmm.

24 MR. DURHAM: Right, so that gets you a score.

25 MS. HETCHTON: Yes.



1 MR. DURHAM: Then we could equate that score  
2 to a percentage that -- You know, going back to, you know,  
3 if you got the 90th percentile you -- or if your score is x  
4 you did better than 90 percent of the students who took the  
5 test. So that's one way to do it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

7 MR. DURHAM: But we're doing it again through  
8 the normative process, so we're ignore -- we don't compare  
9 averages, we compare -- we've set an expectation based on  
10 what would you say the expectation is set on to -- to get to  
11 the mean scale score. It's obviously not you're in the 90th  
12 percentile. That's not it. So the expectation is -- in other  
13 words I could take a 90th percentile score and you could  
14 tell me it's approaching, or meets, or I could take a 80th  
15 percentile score, or a 70th percentile score, and you could  
16 translate that for me into this language if I asked that to  
17 be done, correct?

18 MS. HETCHTON: So there is a difference  
19 between the individual students' scores, and there really  
20 isn't a percentile ranking methodology that Accountability  
21 uses for the student scores. What we do is we look at the  
22 school ranking and distribution, so once we have done those  
23 mean scale scores to say what the average performance of  
24 schools in Colorado is and then that is what we do the  
25 percentile ranking based upon. So for that we say, "You're



1 at the 15th percentile of schools in Colorado." With -- with  
2 this particular scale score, mean scale score, associated  
3 with your school.

4 MR. DURHAM: I think what makes this  
5 complicated for parents and for - and for board members as  
6 well, is that - that in my years of teaching, and as a  
7 student, if you got 93 to 100 you got an A.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

9 MR. DURHAM: If you got 85 to 93, 92 you got  
10 a B, and if you got -- I'm trying to remember what a C was,  
11 it was -

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Seventy-six.

13 MR. DURHAM: Seventy-something or other is to  
14 84, and then we had generally my scores somewhere down below  
15 that.

16 MS. HETCHTON: Yeah.

17 MR. DURHAM: So there is a way, if we wish  
18 to, to take the data you have and equate it in a way I just  
19 described. Your schools is either A, B, C, D and F, based on  
20 relative rankings. And I guess what I really want to know is  
21 you have how many categories? One, two, three...

22 MS. HETCHTON: Four.

23 MR. DURHAM: Four categories, which is the  
24 wrong number, but -- five would be better.

25 MS. HETCHTON: Yeah.



1 MR. DURHAM: But -- so you have four  
2 categories, but you could tell me the percentage of each  
3 school, or of the students who meet, and if it's not -- if  
4 you're using four you'd probably do 90 to 100, 80, 70, 60  
5 maybe.

6 MS. FLORES: But didn't we -- didn't we have  
7 five earlier?

8 MR. DURHAM: That's for -- that's for...

9 MS. PEARSON: Districts.

10 MR. DURHAM: That's for districts, right.

11 MS. PEARSON: And that's the overall rating.

12 MR. DURHAM: Right, so I just am trying to --  
13 what I'm really gonna want is -- and maybe it's here later  
14 on, that somewhere in this presentation the "exceeds" -- was  
15 that it?

16 MS. HETCHTON: There is an "exceeds". There  
17 is not an example of it on this particular school.

18 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, it's okay. Okay, so  
19 "exceeds"; 3 percent of the schools exceed, or 10 percent,  
20 or 20 percent, or whatever the number is. Will, I have that  
21 information readily available?

22 MS. HETCHTON: Yes.

23 MR. DURHAM: Perfect.

24 MS. HETCHTON: So we do actually set up the  
25 targets so that 15 percent of schools get the "exceeds"



1 rating. That's -- that's the base line conversation we're  
2 gonna get to have.

3 MR. DURHAM: And -- okay, so it's 15 percent,  
4 so it will equate - that seems high for "exceeds".

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So Steve, your -- your  
6 system, historical system that we had in schools was  
7 criterion based.

8 MR. DURHAM: No, I understand.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And that's not -- that's  
10 not where we're starting out. WE do -- I think we have said  
11 that we wanna get to that point where we actually look at  
12 the performance of the kids based on the questions. Right  
13 now what we're saying as we break out these groups; that  
14 it's the 15 percent, the normative. In the state -- the  
15 state-wide or national assessments that our children took  
16 those were normative. They were not the way it was in  
17 school. So the statewide assessments historically were  
18 normative, and it was --

19 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, and I do understand that,  
20 and I think then that, that does get us directly to the  
21 argument: If you wish to demonstrate that our schools are  
22 failing you set one score which is not empirically based,  
23 and if you wish to show that the schools are successful you  
24 set another score which is also not empirically based,  
25 because they're not being compared one against the other,



1 they are being compared against a theoretical opinion of  
2 what someone should know versus -- and that's a -

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is what our  
4 teachers always did.

5 MR. DURHAM: And a reasonable -- no, no, not  
6 what this teacher did. There's -- versus a reasonable -- so  
7 you have -- and reasonable people will disagree as to what  
8 someone ought to know, so that is subjective, whereas if you  
9 did better than 93 percent of the kids who took the test  
10 that's an empirically justifiable number. Now you may - it  
11 may not meet your, or whoever's setting these scores, idea  
12 of what they should know, but it does give you a very  
13 objective measure of what -- of how they compare with  
14 everyone else.

15 And I think the discussion we have not had,  
16 discussion we have not had, and we've allowed the federal  
17 government to drive this issue; if you wanna create a crisis  
18 and you wanna mandate all kinds of change, and you wanna  
19 have 95 percent participation. And you can drive all of that  
20 off a number that represents someone's opinion rather than  
21 something which can be empirically identified. And that's  
22 the debate we haven't had, and I think we need to have,  
23 before we conclude this process. And I apologize for taking  
24 that much time, but I did wanna see if I could make sure  
25 that we had all the information, so that when we get to the



1 end we can actually have a discussion of should there be  
2 four or five? How many should be in each category? Is it 93  
3 to 100, is it 90 to 100, is it -- I mean, 85 -- top 85  
4 percent get the highest grade?

5                   It seems a little easy to me, but those are  
6 the kinds of thing I think we need to talk about, and I just  
7 wanted to try and see if I could understand how to frame the  
8 argument, and I apologize for the time I took.

9                   MS. HETCHTON: Don't apologize.

10                   MS. PEARSON: And that was really helpful for  
11 me to hear. I think the direction we had understood from the  
12 board when -- after we had spent those months talking  
13 through different target setting methodologies that you all  
14 really wanted a normative approach right now. To get at that  
15 -- if you -- and we did some simulations. If you looked at  
16 criterion reference --

17                   MR. DURHAM: I think that -- I think that was  
18 the majority of the board's opinion.

19                   MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20                   MR. DURHAM: I think I've been in the  
21 minority on that.

22                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, and you're looking  
23 for a normative approach also, but it's a different  
24 normative approach.

25                   MS. PEARSON: Yeah.



1 MR. DURHAM: I'm not -- I'm not sure I'm  
2 looking for --

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: You just take 100 kids  
4 and you line them up and you say, "Which is the best score,  
5 and which is the worst score?" You don't actually know what  
6 they know, but it is normative.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It tells you in  
9 relationship to each other this is where there are.

10 MR. DURHAM: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It doesn't tell us in  
12 relationship to what was actually asked. It doesn't tell the  
13 business community what they know or they don't know, they  
14 just know one knows more than the other. So they're all --

15 MR. DURHAM: Which is some value.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: There's nothing --  
17 they're all kinda subjective in some -- they measure  
18 different things. I mean, that's the rub we get ourselves  
19 into.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. And I think for us, just  
21 to know the orientation that we come at this -- it with, is  
22 we're really trying to figure out which schools are in need  
23 of the most support. That's, to us, the goal of us trying to  
24 figure out and differentiate the schools; which ones we  
25 really want to be able to learn from, and which ones need



1 the most support. And just we have real limited resources in  
2 being able to support schools, and I know you guys have  
3 heard this from us before. But we get the \$10 million from  
4 the U.S. Department of Ed. We get about \$2 million from the  
5 state, and that is all we have to give school support. So if  
6 we started identifying more and more schools we wouldn't --  
7 it's fine, we can identify them, but we don't have the  
8 resources right now to really be able to provide much great  
9 support for them. So we were just coming from that of who do  
10 we most need to get at, get resources to and supports to.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

12 MS. FLORES: Do you think we should ask the  
13 legislature for possibly to match the federal fun? Which,  
14 you know, we're talking about \$10 million, instead of the \$2  
15 million, and that would really be helpful, wouldn't it?

16 MS. PEARSON: I think that'd be a good  
17 question -- or conversation for us to have another time.

18 MS. FLORES: Wouldn't it -- wouldn't --

19 MS. PEARSON: To have more -- I think it  
20 would -- the districts would definitely benefit from having  
21 some more resources to support them when they have  
22 performance challenges. So, okay. I'm gonna turn this over  
23 to Ashley now. I'm just gonna reiterate what Dr. Anthes  
24 said, we're so excited that she's joined our team as  
25 Director for the Accountability and Data Analysis Unit.



1 Ashley's got a great perspective having worked very closely  
2 with schools. Also run for Charter Network Accountability  
3 and Compliance, worked for them. So she's got good, in the  
4 field, systems perspective. We're really excited for her to  
5 join us and be here with us. So...

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Welcome

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

8 MS. PEACHE: I am excited to be here. It was  
9 voluntary.

10 MS. PEARSON: I know, I know. Your arm  
11 (Crosstalk) twisted.

12 MS. PEACHE: So a lot of -- I spent two years  
13 on the turn-around team, working really quick with schools  
14 and districts across Colorado, and learned a lot from them.  
15 Excited to learn more from Alyssa and the data team on the  
16 accountability and policy side now. And so I'm gonna go  
17 through some information about the indicators that will have  
18 to be revisited for this year, the 2018 School and District  
19 Performance Frameworks.

20 The specific indicators that will have to be  
21 revised for the 2018 School and District Performance  
22 Frameworks will be the high school English language arts,  
23 and math academic achievement sub-indicators and the  
24 adequate growth metric, which is that growth metric which is  
25 growth to standard, or on-track growth to college and career



1 readiness. Growth indicator for all grades.

2 We will also revisit the other indicator  
3 which has that chronic absenteeism component to it right now  
4 for revisions this year based on where we go with ESA.

5 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Clarifying, yes.

7 MS. FLORES: May I?

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Mm-hmm.

9 MS. FLORES: So we have absenteeism, but yet  
10 from that group we had science. And did...?

11 MS. PEARSON: So what I heard yesterday from  
12 you all is that you would like us to leave the plan as it is  
13 right now and just move science around, but you would like  
14 to talk at a future meeting about whether to -- and how to  
15 include chronic absenteeism in it.

16 In terms of our state accountability I think  
17 we've gotta work out with them across the street. There's  
18 been some understanding that in order to include chronic  
19 absenteeism in the state accountability system that would  
20 need to change in state -- in the state statute, and get  
21 added in there if we wanted to have it in our stat system  
22 too. So I think we have it on here, we know it's this area  
23 that we need to figure out where it goes to (crosstalk)

24 MS. FLORES: So it's across the street.

25 MS. PEARSON: I think it's - yeah, but it's



1 also a question for you all to think about for the federal  
2 purposes of it, but we'll talk to you all about if you want  
3 that on the agenda for November or December when you'd like  
4 to talk about that.

5 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

6 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

7 MS. PEACHE: Great. So we are setting targets  
8 for our high school English language arts, and math academic  
9 achievement indicators due to the addition of the PSAT9  
10 assessment for 9th graders this year. The grade 9 PSAT was  
11 selected because it is aligned in content, skills, reporting  
12 categories, and scores to Colorado's existing high school  
13 assessments, the PSAT10, and the SAT, which is administered  
14 in 11th grade. The SAT suite of assessments in grades 9  
15 through 11 will provide us with a longitudinal, evidence-  
16 based system that measures growth in relation to essential  
17 college and career readiness success outcomes for students.

18 Ninth graders will begin taking the PSAT9 in  
19 the Spring of 2018, and CDE is currently intending to  
20 include the results along with PSAT10 and the Achievement  
21 Indicator by content area with PSAT 10 results from multi-  
22 year calculations and in growth calculations from eighth  
23 grade to ninth grade, which would be the CMAS Grade 8 to  
24 PSAT 9, and from 9th grade to 10th grade, which is PSAT9 to  
25 PSAT10. And they're also -- we will also use it for 10th to



1 11th grade, so that gap from PSAT10 to the SAT. Any  
2 questions there? Just wanted to -- I know I said a lot in  
3 one sentence.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

5 MS. RANKIN: Will we be doing these tests  
6 exactly the same way? In other words, the results will come  
7 back very soon, like in the same year?

8 MS. PEACHE: Yes. They'll be back to --

9 (Laughter)

10 MS. RANKIN: Before summer.

11 MS. PEACHE: Yes.

12 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

13 MS. PEACHE: Yep. So actually, to your  
14 question, the results from the 2018 PSAT9 administration  
15 will be available in late June and we will have to wait for  
16 those results before we are able to calculate the specific  
17 values for the targets that we're talking about today, for  
18 the Performance Framework Targets. But today we wanna  
19 suggest that the State Board approve the calculation  
20 methodology that underlies those targets that will be used  
21 to establish the targets for 2018 School and District  
22 Performance Frameworks.

23 To align with existing performance framework  
24 targets for -- in the (indiscernible) in math achievement  
25 and all grade levels, CDE recommends using the norm-based



1 percentile-rank methodology to set PSAT9 and 10 targets for  
2 2018. PSAT10 targets were temporarily baseline on the 2016-  
3 17 data, but we can now revisit that for 2018 with the  
4 inclusion of PSAT9 results.

5                   With this methodology sub-indicator ratings  
6 will be set based on percentile ranges that align with those  
7 that have been used to set framework targets across all  
8 other grade levels included in the frameworks. And on this  
9 next slide you'll see that distribution we talked about where  
10 consistent with previous performance frameworks this  
11 methodology ensures that the displayed distribution of  
12 school level ratings for each sub-indicator content area for  
13 the baseline year. Which means that 70 percent of our  
14 schools will fall within the "approaching" and "meets"  
15 categories; those yellow and green categories, with 15  
16 percent falling on either end into the "does not meet" or  
17 the "exceeds" categories. We're planning on using these same  
18 targets to be applied to the district performance  
19 frameworks.

20                   This is baseline information, and so for the  
21 2018 performance frameworks we'll see schools in this  
22 distribution, but once that baseline is set, next year we  
23 could have schools that move in between these categories  
24 based on that baseline. So we could see more schools in the  
25 "exceeds" category, more schools in the "does not meet"



1 depending on how their performance is compared to this year.  
2 And want to stop here as well, before we go on to talk about  
3 adequate growth metric. If there are any questions about the  
4 achievement --

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

6 MS. FLORES: So we have a large number of  
7 students who haven't taken the test in districts where they  
8 should be doing much better, and these are top students, and  
9 I'm just kind of going. So let's say that many of those  
10 students who didn't take the test scored high, as they  
11 should, so what this kind of change and -- I mean, it  
12 wouldn't do maybe not much for the gap, but we could get  
13 higher. I mean, 85 would be, like, the cut-point, or where  
14 we are, or 50. And our scores, mean scores, would be higher.  
15 And we could have -- we could see something like that next  
16 year if people are just -- "Well, we're gonna take the  
17 test." We'll see.

18 MS. PEACHE: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We'll see. Right, we'll  
20 see. Assuming that we -- I think -- I think what you're  
21 saying is that we expect a higher participation in 9th  
22 grade.

23 MS. FLORES: Yes. Mm-hmm, yep.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And if those -- if those students also  
25 participated in the prior year, in the 8th grade assessment,



1 then we will have more information. I hesitate to predict  
2 whether they'll necessarily go up.

3 MS. FLORES: Yeah, that's what I'm...

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I don't...

5 MS. FLORES: If they're high performing they  
6 should bring everybody else up.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But we don't know what  
8 they are. I mean, I really don't think we know. They're all  
9 different. They're just all different situations for the apt  
10 test.

11 MS. PEACHE: Yeah, and it's a new 9th grade  
12 test. Right?

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's a new 9th grade  
14 test.

15 MS. PEACHE: So we won't -- it won't be -- we  
16 won't be able to --

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's true. That's  
18 true.

19 MS. FLORES: That's true. Yeah, I forgot  
20 about that, thank you.

21 MS. PEACHE: The scores won't be comparable  
22 that way.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

24 MS. PEACHE: The goal was to also have a  
25 relevant, meaningful, adequate growth measure on the 2018



1 Performance Frameworks. Adequate growth is the idea of how  
2 much growth is needed for a student to make a particular  
3 proficiency level goal within a given timeframe. Since  
4 adequate growth was defined based on previous state  
5 assessment, with the new assessments it makes sense to  
6 revisit the definitions of adequate growth.  
7 CDE plans to work with a longitudinal growth technical  
8 advisory panel, or TAP, over the coming months to develop  
9 options for measuring how schools are helping students grow  
10 toward college and career readiness standards based on new  
11 assessments. And we will come back to the State Board to  
12 present that work in the spring.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Questions? Ms. MAZANEC.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Who's the -- who is the  
15 longitudinal growth technical advisory panel?

16 MS. PEACHE: Yep. That's TAP, and that's who  
17 -- and actually you could probably speak better to that.

18 MS. PEARSON: You want me -- okay. There --  
19 it's an advisory panel we've had since, I don't know, 2006,  
20 2007. It's been a long time. They helped develop the  
21 Colorado's Growth Model. People have changed on it, but it's  
22 national and state experts in measurement and how to measure  
23 growth. Mostly district personnel, but we also have some  
24 more technical advisors. We have a board member  
25 representative. I can send you the full list of membership



1 if that would be helpful. Sure.

2 MS. PEACHE: Great. Now I'll pass it on to  
3 Marie for existing measures.

4 MS. HETCHTON: Thanks. So wanted to sort of  
5 briefly talk about the existing metrics that we have and the  
6 establishing -- the process of establishing baseline  
7 targets. So there's -- there's different, you know, uses of  
8 that word "baseline" which, you know, we frequently bring  
9 up, but just so you know that this is a single year of data  
10 that is chosen as the baseline for creating our percentile  
11 rank targets.

12 And so, for an example, in 2016 the state  
13 assessment data results were -- when we set the 15th  
14 percentile that equated to the scale score of 722.3, and so  
15 we've set that 722.3 as the consistent scale score that the  
16 future scale scores will be compared to, to determine if  
17 you're meeting or approaching this data expectations.  
18 The intention behind that baselining is that future years  
19 can be compared against this consistent baseline  
20 expectation, and then we can see if schools are making  
21 progress in meeting state expectations.

22 And then, just so you know, baselining is  
23 required whenever we have a new assessment, because it is a  
24 new scale and new scores. And so, you know, that's an  
25 important thing for -- activity for us to do. And then also,



1 whenever there's significant changes in an assessment, like,  
2 that is reason for us to consider re-baselining.

3                   And in -- not in general. Often times when  
4 you introduce a new assessment you do see sort of atypical  
5 scores in the first couple of years of the administration,  
6 and so we have been making a point to re-analyze the data in  
7 every year as we've had PARCC to see if, you know, things  
8 have shifted in a significant way that would mean that we  
9 would need to re-baseline. So that's kinda what we're gonna  
10 look at today; is the results from 2016 to 2017, and how the  
11 baselines could potentially shift between those two years.  
12 And so, you know, this is just a chart that sort of shows  
13 when we have set the baselines on our existing sub-indicator  
14 metrics and on the -- the two up in the right-hand corner in  
15 red, I apologize, they're the ones in 2018 that should  
16 really be the only ones in red. Those are the ones that  
17 we're gonna be base-lining this coming year. All of the  
18 others have sort of been base-lined as we've gone along and  
19 gotten the new assessments up and running.

20                   So the first content area that we wanted to  
21 look at was CMAS math at the elementary school level. So --  
22 so from the plot that we're showing you, you can see that  
23 the 15th percentile corresponds to roughly a scale score of  
24 719. And we also did include the PARCC proficiency, or  
25 performance levels, on this graph, so you can see that that





1 math for middle school it shows sort of a similar pattern,  
2 where, you know, the 15th percentile is -- of schools is  
3 around, you know, 716, um, 50th percentile is 731, that's a  
4 CMAS level 3, and -- and then, in this case, the 85th  
5 percentile also falls at a CMAS level 3, around a scale  
6 score of 746. And, again, we have seen, like, a slight  
7 uptick in 2017, but the results are pretty similar from '16  
8 to '17.

9                   We -- since we are going to be re-baselining  
10 the high school math for the PSAT9 and PSAT10 we don't have  
11 graphs for high school. So then moving on to the CMAS, you  
12 know, English language arts for elementary school. You can  
13 see that the scores here are a little bit higher, just, you  
14 know, across the board. The 15th percentile corresponds to  
15 about a 722-724, and that is, you know, on the cusp of the  
16 level 3 performance level. The 50th percentile is around  
17 740, and then the 85th percentile is around a 756-7, which  
18 is a performance level 4. So you can see that for ELA there  
19 has been more improvement between 2016 and 2017. Like, there  
20 has been, you know, sort of a noticeable increase. And, I  
21 mean, it's been small, but it is noticeable, increase in the  
22 scale scores over time. And in general, actually, Colorado  
23 students are performing better on ELA than they are in math.  
24 And then the same also holds true for middle school. You can  
25 see that, you know, sort of that the same level 2, level 3,



1 level 4 performance levels, and the scale scores have  
2 increased slightly in 2017.

3                   So kinda just to summarize, you know, the  
4 CMAS math in 2017, the 15th, 50th, and 85th, you know,  
5 percentiles for schools are between 0.3 and 1.1 scale score  
6 points higher than we saw in 2016, and then for English  
7 language arts they're about 1.1 to 2.1 scale score points  
8 higher than the 2016 baselines.

9                   So, you know, given the small differences  
10 between that 2016 and 2017 results CDE staff is recommending  
11 that we just continue using the existing 2016 baselines for  
12 the 2018 performance frameworks, and, you know, the  
13 intention behind this is to try to ensure consistent  
14 interpretation by the field, and then the opportunity for  
15 schools to demonstrate that they are improving over time.  
16 And so keeping that original baseline and then making --  
17 having them show growth, that feels really good to people.  
18 Science is on a different scale. It's -- it's -- I actually  
19 don't know what the -- the range of score points is, but you  
20 can see here that the 15th percentile corresponds to a 531,  
21 or 532, which is at the performance level 1. The 50th  
22 percentile corresponds to about a 601, which is similar to -  
23 - or which is sort of in the performance level number 2, and  
24 then the 85th percentile corresponds to a performance level  
25 3.



1                   So note that on science we have four  
2 performance levels in total, instead of the five that are  
3 available on CMAS. So -- so just because this is a, like,  
4 the level 1 to level 2 is not actually sort of substantially  
5 worse than we have on the PARCC, it's just a different scale  
6 and different performance levels.

7                   So interestingly enough, in middle school we  
8 did see some more differences in the performance in 2017, so  
9 here you can see that the 15th percentile, you know, is  
10 somewhere between a 518 and a 527. The 50th percentile has  
11 been between a 586 and a 591, and the 85th percentile is  
12 between a 641 and a 643, which is almost to the level 3 cut.  
13 So this is the only place that we have seen that actually  
14 the 2017 results have gone down; that they are actually  
15 lower than what we had originally seen in 2016. So, I mean,  
16 that -- that is just an interesting trend that we are seeing  
17 in our student scores, and we'll have to look at 2018 to see  
18 if that continues.

19                   So we do have CMAS science for high school,  
20 and so you can see here that, you know, the 15th percentile  
21 is a level 2 performance, about a 564. And the 50th  
22 percentile is still in that level 2 it, you know, 609-ish,  
23 and then the 85th percentile's also still in level 2 at  
24 about a 651, and so this one, you know, sort of that level 2  
25 category is quite broad, clearly, that all of our average



1 school performances fall into that range. And there --  
2 there's not a whole lot of difference between the 2016 and  
3 2017. 2017 is a little, tiny bit lower in the middle of the  
4 scale than what we had seen previously, but not anything  
5 substantial.

6                   So as I kind of had said before, you know,  
7 just to summarize it. The elementary and high school levels,  
8 you know, we really saw a lot of parody between the 2016 and  
9 2017 results. At middle school we did see some declines in  
10 2017, you know, up to about 10 points, and so that, that's  
11 something that we should be, you know, paying attention to  
12 as we move forward. But given the small differences between  
13 2016 and 2017 for elementary and high school CDE staff is  
14 still recommending that we continue using the existing 2016  
15 baseline targets for the 2018 Performance Frameworks. And so  
16 this is just, you know, sort of setting that standard so we  
17 can actually tell if, you know, schools are making progress,  
18 and if students are performing better.

19                   And I think that is all of the baseline  
20 target stuff I wanted to talk about.

21                   MS. PEARSON: Sounds good. So like we talked  
22 about; you all are - there're State Board rules ask you to  
23 vote by -- in, at the November meeting on these. We'll start  
24 doing more stakeholder conversations around adequate growth  
25 and what makes sense to do there now that we have multiple



1 years of the same assessment data and we can really start  
2 looking at that, and then once we've got the PSAT9 data  
3 available in end of June we'll start -- we'll plug in actual  
4 numbers if that's the way you all wanna go.

5                   But what would be helpful for me -- for all  
6 of us right now actually, is if -- if there's things that  
7 you want us to look at before November, that you would like  
8 to consider looking at targets different than what we've  
9 done historically, that would be really helpful for us to  
10 know, and then we can do some of that work to bring back to  
11 you for the November meeting.

12                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Colleagues? Feedback?

13                   MR. DURHAM: Just one question.

14                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Durham.

15                   MR. DURHAM: Are the number -- I'm trying to  
16 remember if there's statutory requirement of four  
17 categories, or...

18                   MS. PEARSON: For -- does not  
19 (indiscernible).

20                   MR. DURHAM: Something tells me at least that  
21 we talked about that once.

22                   MS. PEARSON: So statute has the plan types  
23 for schools and they say performance improvement, priority  
24 improvement and turn-around for schools, and it's got the --  
25 the five levels for districts. That's in state statute. I



1 don't believe that the "does not meet", "approaching",  
2 "meets", or "exceeds" is in statute.

3 MR. DURHAM: So we could -- we could go to  
4 five if we elected to.

5 MS. PEARSON: If you wanted to differentiate  
6 the achievement levels, and probably -- you probably want to  
7 do it to be consistent on all the metrics to achievement and  
8 growth in all the postsecondary workforce-readiness  
9 measures. If you wanted to make five levels of achievement  
10 there, instead of four, I think that's in your purview to  
11 do.

12 MR. DURHAM: But it then makes results less  
13 comparable with previous years.

14 MS. PEARSON: It does.

15 MR. DURHAM: So there is a -- there is a  
16 downside if you wanna try and hold people to some  
17 accountability.

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Yeah it -- it would make  
19 the translation across years a little bit of a challenge.

20 MS. FLORES: But since we've done it for --  
21 for the year 2017, I mean, wouldn't comparing it to 2017  
22 and...?

23 MS. PEARSON: Well, in 2017 we've had the  
24 four levels, we've had the "does not meet", "approaching",  
25 "meets" and "exceeds".



1 MS. FLORES: I think -- I think it would -- I  
2 mean, being accountable and being able for the public to --  
3 to understand better. I think the five -- if -- if it's not  
4 just, you know, bring down heaven...

5 MS. PEARSON: So I think -- yeah. If the --  
6 if the goal is to try and explain the overall performance  
7 with more nuance to give more differentiation there I think  
8 you -- I think the area where that would have more impact is  
9 in the overall ratings, and not in the individual measures  
10 of English language arts achievement. Having five levels  
11 there; I don't know if that will add as much more  
12 information as if you did it and had had more -- more  
13 descriptors of performance overall at the turn around prior  
14 to improvement, improvement, and performance level.  
15 Because right now for schools, right, we only have those  
16 four levels, and if your goal is really to help  
17 differentiate the performance of schools more you could do  
18 it at that overall level and that might make more sense.  
19 Julie, I don't know, you probably don't know this off the  
20 top of your head. I gotta go back and look. I think the  
21 board has discretion to add additional -- maybe just  
22 district accreditation levels? I can't remember if it's  
23 school plan types, too. We can go back and --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) district  
25 accreditation levels, but I can't remember about plan types



1 either.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Yeah. We can go and look  
3 that up for you all if you're interested in that. Get that  
4 to you sooner to see...

5 MS. GOFF: And that might even make people  
6 feel better, districts feel better.

7 MS. FLORES: Oh, hell.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Nah, I don't know if  
9 that's the goal.

10 MS. FLORES: We don't wanna do that.

11 MS. PEARSON: No, that's not the goal.

12 MS. GOFF: Well, I think they would, I mean  
13 just be --

14 MS MAZANEC: Well we've had these -- we've  
15 had these targets for two years, right? So we compare 2017  
16 to 2016.

17 MS. PEACHE: Yes, correct.

18 MS. MAZANEC: And if we change it now for  
19 2018 then we lose some of that ability to compare.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

21 MS. RANKIN: Well --

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Rankin.

23 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Pearson, if we differentiate  
24 five levels instead of four wouldn't the trajectory -- I  
25 mean, look at how close these are. Wouldn't it be the same?



1 MS. PEARSON: Would -- would the end result  
2 be the same? Is that what you're saying?

3 MS. RANKIN: Yeah, yeah.

4 MS. PEARSON: I think so. I mean, so this is  
5 so, so in the weeds that getting the numbers to line up, the  
6 points to line up, it makes sense and not go into a  
7 bazillion decimals and make the ratings all work out between  
8 the different measures it's really complicated. And Marie  
9 has worked really hard to make sure that when the numbers,  
10 like, the numbers here add up with the numbers there, and to  
11 add five levels will add a level of complication that might  
12 make her head a little bit explode.

13 So what would be helpful for me is to really  
14 understand what the goal is with the levels, so that we can  
15 figure out the best way to meet that goal. And if it's more  
16 differentiation of schools overall and helping parents  
17 understand better the differentiation of schools --

18 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

19 MS. PEARSON: We can work on that goal. I  
20 don't know that the individual adding "does not meet",  
21 "approaching", something, "meets", "exceeds"; adding one  
22 more in there, I don't know that that will help that, but --

23 MS. FLORES: The points are... I mean 55 to 85 and then 85 to  
24 -- and adding another level would make it seem more fair.

25 Fairness --



1 MS RANKIN: I'm not hearing that from  
2 schools. I think before we start making changes that we find  
3 out whether that really has value for them and for -- and  
4 for parent groups more.

5 MS. MAZANEC: I think it because -

6 MS. RANKIN: Well, I realize you think that.  
7 I'm suggesting we ask the folks who are affected by it.  
8 Because what I keep hearing over and over again is, "Stop  
9 changing things. Let us move forward with what's been  
10 legislated and what we've set the rules for and try some  
11 consistency, so that we are not constantly trying to  
12 adjust."

13 Now if we're doing something that's not  
14 helpful we oughta adjust, but let's find out if there's a  
15 real problem. Just because we think that.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Well I --

17 MS. FLORES: Well not just because we think.  
18 It's because we've worked with students enough to know that  
19 that's an -- an issue, and that's an issue with parents.

20 MS. RANKIN: Well I don't know. I won't --  
21 let's figure out if there's a way to --

22 MS. FLORES: (*indiscernible*) feedback for  
23 students and parents.

24 MS. PEARSON: It's not something that we've -

25 -



1 MS. RANKIN: It's nothing -- certainly not  
2 anything I've heard.

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, it's not -- that hasn't  
4 come up in our stakeholder groups that I can recall hearing  
5 about.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board -- go ahead.

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, no.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Goff.

9 MS. GOFF: Would you be so kind as to remind  
10 me how the science assessment works? We're at once in high  
11 school, correct?

12 MS. PEARSON: Yep. Yep. We're at --

13 MS. GOFF: So...

14 MS. PEARSON: Fifth grade, eighth grade, and  
15 eleventh grade.

16 MS. GOFF: Okay.

17 MS. PEARSON: The 11th grade, I need to pull  
18 it up, but our participation rate when I was -- when you  
19 were showing that high school data, our participation rate  
20 for high school science is one of our lowest participation  
21 rates in the state, if not the lowest. I'll pull it up and  
22 look.

23 MS. GOFF: Thank you for that point. I was --  
24 reminded me it's 11th grade, so even -- which is a  
25 consistent thing, but within that there is -- how does -- I



1 don't know how to say this. How does the course taking  
2 experience line up with that, and what -- what have the  
3 students had? Is there a -- I hate to say this all the time,  
4 but a general mean average selection of courses by that  
5 point? Because if we've got STEM programs developing and in  
6 the works already, continuing to go forth; it's the kind of  
7 age-old problem that the public has had with when we give  
8 certain tests.

9 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, absolutely.

10 MS. GOFF: So if these kids haven't had the  
11 benefit of an experience in a course, you know, we hear,  
12 "They haven't even been taught this, and yet they're being  
13 held accountable for it." So I'm just wondering if, if that  
14 -- if that -- I'm sure you have. If that thinking has gone  
15 into some possibilities for not only perhaps the lower  
16 participation, who knows, but this line is so not -- you  
17 can't even hard -- I can hardly see the blue. And, you know,  
18 it's just -- what could -- what could we do to -- what  
19 should we be thinking ahead about moving this along?

20 Because these kids oughta be -- they should  
21 be advancing if we're doing right by them, in every topic  
22 and subject area, but this science has always been a little  
23 bit of a sticky wicket to talk to people about how that  
24 lines up.

25 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and I think that's



1 probably a good conversation really to have with assessment  
2 and the standards unit, but I know part of the decision  
3 about where in high school to place that assessment, what  
4 grade, was to figure out where along most students would  
5 have taken courses and gotten the content that's being  
6 tested then. But that's about as much as I wanna answer and  
7 we can get more information for you from assessment and from  
8 the standards and understand kinda the course taking better.

9 MS. GOFF: Well and, you know, just one quick  
10 add-on, that in addition to being assessed, or tested,  
11 before this content's been studied is one thing. There's  
12 also way long afterwards. So people who have the concern  
13 about "I've got a" -- well, depends on what graduation  
14 requirements are, actually.

15 MS. PEARSON: Talk about that later.

16 MS. GOFF: How long into high school does  
17 something get...

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

19 MS. GOFF: Okay, thank you, appreciate it.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do we provide -- going  
21 back to the science assessment. Do we, at the end of --  
22 after we've graded the assessments, et cetera, is there a  
23 process at CDE that goes through the assessment, looks at  
24 the various questions, and provides feedback to the field;  
25 whether it's opt out, or not opt out? Where -- where are the



1 strengths, and where are the weaknesses across -- that we  
2 see across the state? I know districts need to tease that  
3 out at the district level, but do we have a broad feedback  
4 that we can provide to schools?

5 MS. PEARSON: Districts and schools are  
6 getting reports, but I don't know -- I don't know well  
7 enough if we're doing it at a state level, but --

8 MR. MORTON: Yeah, certainly not at the --  
9 not at the (indiscernible) level in terms of  
10 (indiscernible).

11 MS. PEACHE: Come join us at the table.

12 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I know. I know. If you  
13 could introduce yourself, Will, thanks.

14 MR. MORTON: Hi. I'm Will Morton. I'm  
15 Director of Assessment Administration with the Assessment  
16 Unit. And in terms of providing statewide feedback in terms  
17 of the science assessment with regard to, you know, overall  
18 performance in subjects within the science assessment we  
19 don't -- we don't provide that. Districts and schools do  
20 have their individual -- individual results, but in the  
21 terms of an overall state -- overall state reporting we  
22 don't -- we don't report that way.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Seems to me that might  
24 be something we might want to talk about as a Board. What --  
25 what information are we providing statewide on the strengths



1 of our students? WE might get -- I mean, we tend to get  
2 feedback, quite frankly, from the business community on what  
3 our kids don't know and do know, and maybe it's an  
4 opportunity for us to say, "Yeah, that's what we see." And  
5 then maybe have some public discussions about where  
6 curriculum -- we're not gonna change the curriculum, but we  
7 can certainly put some suggestions and pressure on "these  
8 are the areas".

9                   In other words, we have these assessments, we  
10 don't put these assessments out so that everybody sees what  
11 the questions are. But we can go in and look at what's the  
12 performance level on these different sub-groups and topics,  
13 so that we can start having some discussions. Having the PD  
14 available, et cetera, and kinda make a difference.

15 I -- I might be naïve here. This might be so complicated  
16 that staff can't do it, but it would just seem to me that we  
17 oughta be able to break that out.

18 Board Member Flores.

19                   MS. FLORES: Well, you're talking about, you  
20 know, the test and I'm -- I think what I saw in schools is  
21 that science and social studies was not really pushed. The  
22 emphasis was really on English language arts and math. And  
23 so there -- there is no push to teach science and social  
24 studies, and that's why I think we need to get those scores  
25 out, so that those very important areas of -- of learning



1 are taught in schools.

2                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, I agree with you,  
3 but my point is not -- I don't wanna just have the score.  
4 I'd like us to be able to have conversations about what are  
5 the areas where there are some real weaknesses in our  
6 student's learning. I think it'd be -- I think teachers  
7 would actually appreciate that, and I think districts --  
8 district... I forgot what they're called. The, the people who  
9 are in charge of the different subjects within the larger  
10 districts could be very, very helpful in helping move that  
11 along.

12                   MS. FLORES: Yeah.

13                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: My -- maybe we should  
14 make that an agenda item at some time? Actually, I'll leave  
15 it to you guys to tell us how we could have that  
16 conversation; what works? What can you do given the  
17 mechanics of our system, so that we don't go off and suggest  
18 something that can't be done. But I think there'd be strong  
19 interest in that.  
20 Board Member Rankin.

21                   MS. RANKIN: Mr. Will, I'm sorry, I didn't  
22 catch your last name.

23                   MR. MORTON: It's Morton.

24                   MS. RANKIN: Do we -- I know we have a lot of  
25 prep for these, for these tests, 9th, 10th, 11th. I mean,



1 I've been online, and I've been able to take a lot of those  
2 myself, just to get familiar with them, and I think, I think  
3 that's a very good idea, and I know none of those questions  
4 are on the test.

5                   But if a certain area seemed to be missed by  
6 a lot of students in the state, either the test is wrong, or  
7 you need -- you say that the tests are -- are at each -- at  
8 the school level, but they don't have that broken down, and  
9 it sounds like we, at our level, don't have it broken down  
10 to emphasize the areas of weakness. Even by the different  
11 targets. You know our -- our red and gold areas. I mean,  
12 those should be something we really work on.

13                   Is there any alignment with remediation along  
14 those lines? I think that's kind of what we're talking about  
15 here.

16                   MR. MORTON: So the -- the test itself is --  
17 and the blueprint, so to speak, for the test is -- is  
18 published, and we can -- we can -- we can get you that  
19 information. So the schools and districts; they -- they  
20 understand going into the test so much of the test is gonna  
21 be on this content, so much of the test will be on that  
22 content within -- within the overall science test. And --  
23 and that information is available to -- to schools and  
24 districts.

25                   MS. RANKIN: Then is there follow up into



1 those same areas where the school may not have done well in  
2 a certain area following the test?

3 MR. MORTON: To be honest, I don't know the  
4 answer to that question.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Another way of say --  
6 another way of asking that question I think might be: Can  
7 you show us the kind of information that is sent back to  
8 schools?

9 MS. RANKIN: Yeah, yeah.

10 MR. MORTON: Mm-hmm. Yep.

11 MS. RANKIN: Yep.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Maybe back to the  
13 student, but also back to the school?

14 MR. MORTON: Yep.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And then maybe the  
16 comments that we make about what we should be sharing state  
17 wide will make a little more sense when we see what it is  
18 that is -- that is analyzed.

19 MR. MORTON: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And then I -- at the  
21 same time it would be, I think, interesting to see that  
22 blueprint as well, just for us, since we -- we don't live in  
23 the weeds.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: Thank you for suggesting that. I  
2 was gonna ask about the report card, or the report page,  
3 that families and, or the classroom is aware of. I would --  
4 I wonder could that be done a general area where the -- on  
5 that scale where the weaknesses are and where the strengths  
6 are? Could that -- would it be valuable at all to us, or  
7 anyone, to see a state-wide picture of that?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's kinda what we're  
9 talking about.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah.

11 MS. GOFF: If, you know, let's just take the  
12 11th grade science exam. Is there a way where we could get  
13 the whole, statewide, big-level view of how the state is  
14 doing on certain strength areas and, and where we need more  
15 work? Like you tell -- we tell kids. But I think, too, a lot  
16 of - like, a lot of that might fall into place when we're  
17 discussing and working around this whole idea of is science  
18 being disregarded.

19 MS. RANKIN: It is.

20 MS. GOFF: Social Studies being disregarded,  
21 or not? It depends on where and, you know, if we're hearing  
22 about all of these developing STEM programs and certificate  
23 availability now tied in with graduation completion and  
24 matriculation, and how that goes, I just think it would be  
25 helpful to have those parts so we -- we get a general idea



1 from the high-level view of how our state's doing on these  
2 things. And I -

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: All three -- all three  
4 levels.

5 MS. GOFF: Yes. And I've all -- I've always  
6 wondered why -- not why -- that -- about, that we don't see  
7 a general overview, even a sampling, couple of examples,  
8 three or four examples, of what our schools and districts  
9 see. I don't need -- we don't need to have individual  
10 students, but I think pictures of even within our  
11 congressional districts. But I'd prefer to start with a  
12 whole state-wide picture about where are the areas of study,  
13 instruction, that sort of thing, where we are doing great  
14 and we can spread that around, and where we're not doing so  
15 great.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, thanks. Board  
17 Member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Dr. Anthes, the students you  
19 tell -- tell me -- refresh my memory. The SAT and PSAT; do  
20 they incorporate science with...?

21 MS. FLORES: Yeah, they do.

22 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I don't know. I would  
23 have to (indiscernible) about the science. I'm not sure.

24 MR. MORTON: So the, the SAT and the PSAT do  
25 not assess science content. They do have -- they do have,



1 essentially, reading in the science content, or writing in  
2 the science content type of questions. They provide a sort  
3 of a -- a cross-content performance score, but it's not  
4 actual testing of science content within the PSAT or the  
5 SAT.

6 MS. MAZANEC: So then the truth is we don't  
7 really have a good indicator of how our students are doing  
8 in science, specifically. I mean, we know that a lot of  
9 these students are not taking the science assessment in the  
10 11th grade, because they have SAT and other tests they find  
11 more valuable, probably, but we don't really have a good  
12 measurement of high school science performance.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's it.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, even if we have  
15 the one --

16 MS. PEARSON: We have a limited understanding  
17 of what the performance is.

18 MR. MORTON: Right.

19 MS. PEARSON: I think the assessment's a real  
20 strong assessment, but because of the participation we have  
21 a limited understanding of...

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: I'll say it again.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You don't need to say it  
25 a second time, it's just (indiscernible).



1 MS. FLORES: No, I do. Because, you know, you  
2 don't seem to believe me when I say to you that I have done  
3 a study of text books and such out in Colorado schools.  
4 They're not available. And, in fact, I invited Allen  
5 Schaeffer Kennedy yesterday to come and tell you about what  
6 was going on in high schools, and how demoralized teachers  
7 are, because they can't teach when they don't have tools,  
8 and books are tools that are very necessary. When I -- and  
9 what started this all is when I came to the state 20-some-  
10 aught years ago and I didn't see any ESL material. And I  
11 mean, in English and -- so that it was helpful for kids to  
12 learn the various areas on science and such. There was -- I  
13 went to several school districts when I was teaching at the  
14 University of Colorado and I just couldn't find any -- any  
15 text books.

16 And texts books, when you ask students and  
17 teachers, they do not have them. So school districts do not  
18 spend money -- it is not being taught, and I'm not one for  
19 testing, seriously, you know I'm not. But when I -- I think  
20 in an area that is so important, and when business is  
21 telling us that kids come with no -- little knowledge in  
22 science, and then in other areas, social students, then we  
23 have to kind of goad people to teach it. And it may take a  
24 test to do that.

25 And when we only test it once, and now you're



1 saying that -- that it's really not, you know, constants are  
2 not tested but reading and math, so --

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: He was talking about --

4 MR. MORTON: Yeah, I was talking about the --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: SAT.

6 MS. FLORES: SAT?

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Not the CMAS Science  
8 stuff.

9 MS. FLORES: We have our own assessment.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, we have our own  
11 science assessment.

12 MS. FLORES: Right, once.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But -- but it's not  
14 highly taken. It's not participated in.

15 MS. FLORES: Right. Well that's what I'm  
16 saying. It's -- I don't know, we have to teach science and  
17 we have to teach social studies also, because these are  
18 areas that -- that kids need to -- and knowledge base that  
19 kids need to know!

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I don't think anyone  
21 would argue with you about that. But I would love to move on  
22 to the next --

23 MS. FLORES: Right. But how do we do it?

24 That's --

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Let's --



1 MS. FLORES: Well, that's something we need  
2 to think, and we need to (indiscernible) on the list.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sure, but can we get on  
4 to the next topic, please? Thank you. So --

5 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair, can I ask -- quick?

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sure, quick.

7 MR. DURHAM: You all want some direction on  
8 this, right?

9 MS. PEARSON: We would just like -- we would  
10 like to know what you need to feel comfortable voting in  
11 November; if there's things you want us to look at, if  
12 there's other proposals you want us to bring forwards, what  
13 that -- what you would need. And if you want to talk to us  
14 afterwards we can also (indiscernible)

15 MR. DURHAM: Well I always speak -- well I  
16 think it would be helpful, I mean, certainly on your  
17 workload if there was some sorta consensus. And as much as  
18 I'd like to see five measures instead of four, I, you know,  
19 I -- I guess I think I've reached the conclusion listening  
20 to the discussion that comparability is probably more  
21 valuable at this point in time.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At the moment, yeah.

23 MR. DURHAM: Than -- an you're sacrificing a  
24 little bit of clarity and understandability to get it. But I  
25 think the trade-off is there. So if you're looking for



1 guidance at least from my perspective I wouldn't go to the  
2 work of trying to revise and do everything for five  
3 categories. I think -- and I think what you've presented is  
4 very likely to be close to a final product, and so I --if  
5 that's the guidance you're looking for that's at least where  
6 one member is.

7 (Chorus of "thank you".)

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you very much.  
9 Mazanec.

10 MS. MAZANEC: And we do this every year?

11 MS. PEARSON: We do this every year.

12 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

13 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah. This is not the  
15 end. This is just to, to move forward.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. You guys don't get rid of  
17 us, sorry.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Well we (indiscernible) don't  
19 know why, but (indiscernible) might be every two years. But...

20 MS. PEARSON: No, this is an annual.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We do at some point need  
22 to have this more serious discussion about how we want --  
23 for now I think given this insignificant changes between the  
24 years I -- I think your recommendation that we just move on  
25 forward with this one and then see what happens next year is



1 appropriate. But also provide the time to incorporate a  
2 serious discussion about what we're doing.

3 MS GOFF: If we can keeping moving along in  
4 the future by threading in some of these topics that we're  
5 bringing up here and how that relates to future  
6 conversations on this and many other things. But I'm -- I  
7 agree with Mr. Durham. I think this is not the time to be  
8 upheaving too much. And it's -- thank you.

9 MS. RANKIN: I just wanted to add one more  
10 thing.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: I just think it -- it's amazing  
13 to see how these track like they do. If there was a big  
14 difference we'd be having a whole different conversation, so  
15 it says that by -- by using the right numbers and the same  
16 numbers we're gonna get a better picture of what's going on.  
17 So thank you for the work that you've done on it.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes. Thank you very  
19 much, folks.

20 MS. PEARSON: Thank you all.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for being  
22 willing to work with the numbers.

23 MS. PEARSON: I know, I'm sorry. Now your --  
24 you might be done with numbers. It won't be -- it won't  
25 (indiscernible) in (indiscernible) at least.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The next item on our  
2 agenda is an update on our State Board operating procedures.  
3 Commissioner?

4 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yes, thank you. I  
5 believe I am turning this over to Ms. Cordial and Tolson.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Great. Thank you, Commissioner.  
7 So good morning, board members. I want to just quickly go  
8 over the draft operating procedures; what we've done, where  
9 we are right now, what next steps will be, and then answer  
10 any questions that you may have about the current draft that  
11 you have.

12 So at the board retreat we provided you with  
13 the draft version of your operating procedures. From that we  
14 gathered feedback or edits from you, and so since that time  
15 we've incorporated those recommendations and comments. I  
16 also met with a few board members whose questions did not  
17 get answered at that time and addressed those questions  
18 then.

19 Then since that time I've incorporated all of  
20 the recommendations that you've made so far, and then Julie  
21 had also added a few more just kind of clarifying edits, so  
22 that the language is a little more clear in your operating  
23 procedures. So we've provided you with that draft version in  
24 your board packets to review and let us know if you have any  
25 further questions or edits, and we also anticipate that the



1 board will vote on -- you will vote on your operating  
2 procedures at the November meeting, so we just wanna make  
3 sure we get all of your questions answered.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Right. Thank you.  
5 Colleagues; any questions, changes upon the changes upon the  
6 changes? Go ahead, Mr. Durham.

7 MR. DURHAM: I'm trying to -- I've had a  
8 chance to review it, and I think it incorporates certainly  
9 all the items where there was consensus, and I don't know  
10 that we had many outliers, so I don't -- you know, they say  
11 -- Churchill said, "There's little I would change, and not  
12 much to regret." or something. So I think it's -- I think  
13 they're in about as good a shape as they're gonna get in.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Ready for a vote.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Remember we look at  
16 these, what, every two years?

17 MS. CORDIAL: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Or as needed.

20 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Counselor, do you have  
22 any comments you wanna add?

23 MS. TOLSON: I really don't. I mean, I  
24 enjoyed being able to get down into my grammar geek mode. I  
25 mean, you know, removed to passive voice and simplified some



1 sentences. And I really -- I think they're just  
2 substantially more readable than they were when this process  
3 started.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I do to, and I thank you  
5 -- oh.

6 MS. TOLSON: I don't think that they needed  
7 this latest round changed, you know, substantive content  
8 from anything you all had discussed.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you folks.  
10 So ready for a vote next time? Board Member Goff.

11 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I'm not gonna raise  
12 anything major. I'm just looking at picky words here. On  
13 page 5, in the middle of the page, about nominations. When  
14 we're electing officers, the current wording has,  
15 "Nomination shall be made from the floor." I mean, have --  
16 this is -- I'm getting into the minutia here, but by use of  
17 the word "from the floor" what kind of interpretation?  
18 Because we do this at a public meeting. Is there any danger  
19 that that can be interpreted as literally, literally from  
20 the --

21 MS. MAZANEC: (indiscernible) would like to  
22 stand up and nominate?

23 MS. CORDIAL: That floor instead of this  
24 floor.

25 MS. GOFF: Well, this is -- this is the



1 floor, I think, we intend to portray here, but it's kind of  
2 just an off word to me. I don't know how else it would be  
3 phrased, but, you know, we don't wanna -- I just -- just  
4 thought I'd bring that up. You can mull over -- you can mull  
5 over that.

6 MS. MAZANEC: It'd be from the floor of  
7 people able to make nominations. That already clear  
8 somewhere earlier.

9 MS. GOFF: No, I don't know if -- I don't  
10 think it is.

11 MS. MAZANEC: That only the board members a  
12 lot their leader?

13 MS. GOFF: It's first time it came up when I  
14 was reading through these, so...

15 MS. TOLSON: And -- and I noticed that turn  
16 of a phrase as well, and it's in the version that we  
17 inherited. And I, I certainly think it could be phrased in a  
18 better way. I read it to distinguish between something where  
19 you'd be coming in on nominations that were made in advance,  
20 or submitted in advance.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Nominating committee  
22 kind of a thing.

23 MS TOLSON: Yeah.

24 MS. GOFF: There you go, yeah.

25 MS. TOLSON: But, you know, and if it would



1 simplify it to say, "from the dais" instead of "from the  
2 floor", to at least say it's just that you're in open  
3 session, you're sitting where you're sitting, and you make  
4 motions and they were -- or nominations and they require a  
5 second.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Does that help?

7 MS. GOFF: Yes. I mean, I'm sure I'm --

8 MS. CORDIAL: That's a good idea.

9 MS. GOFF: I just think it's interesting. And  
10 then one other -- this is totally only a typo and I --

11 MS. CORDIAL: (indiscernible) this?

12 MS. TOLSON: Where?

13 MS. GOFF: Sorry. I'm looking for it. Just a  
14 typo. There was a place out - sorry. There was a place where  
15 the word "engaged", it should be "engages" but it says,  
16 "engage" It's a -- I think it's the part busy under  
17 committees, or... (talking in background) and then I believe  
18 our previous conversation about open meetings and such  
19 clarified some things. Oh, and one last one and I'll stop on  
20 that. Page 15, under C, Electronic Meetings, page 15. "Board  
21 Members may attend board meetings by electronic means with  
22 prior permission from the chair if they attend the relevant  
23 portion of the meeting in its entirety." What's "relevant"?  
24 Relevant to what? Because to say you can attend  
25 electronically is one thing, so what part of that means...?



1 MR. DURHAM: I think that has to do with  
2 quasi-judicial. That you have to listen to the entire  
3 presentation in order to be able to vote.

4 MS. GOFF: So -- so the relevant is the part  
5 upon which action will be resulting, or something.

6 MR. DURHAM: I think so.

7 MS. GOFF: So I'm just thinking we might need  
8 some added words.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In which action is  
10 taken.

11 MS. GOFF: Relevant to what.

12 MS. MCCLELLAN: We're all relevant.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The entire section upon  
14 which (crosstalk)

15 MS. GOFF: Yeah, what is that?

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: In other words, you  
17 can't just call in to vote.

18 (Chorus of "yeah")

19 MS. GOFF: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I think that's the short  
21 (crosstalk)--

22 MS. GOFF: The point about it. We understand  
23 that -- we interpret it truly, but when you -- we -- we need  
24 to clarify it, I think.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.



1 MS. CORDIAL: That's it, thank you.

2 MR. DURHAM: I'm sorry. I do have one  
3 clarification on page 10. We struck M, which I under -- I  
4 understand the logic for, however, since it's still in  
5 statute any board member could suggest at any time that we  
6 enter into a contract with the board of community colleges,  
7 and nothing -- the fact it's not here doesn't prohibit us  
8 from doing it.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Correct.

10 MS TOLSON: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Agreed.

12 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Alright. With those  
14 changes would you be kind enough to bring it back next time  
15 -- should we put it on consent, folks?

16 MR. DURHAM: Alright with me.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, does that work?

18 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that make you feel  
20 better?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it makes me feel a  
22 lot better.

23 MS. CORDIAL: To do consent?

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Uh-huh.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Okay, thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Next item; we'll now  
2 conduct a public rule-making hearing for the rules for the  
3 administration of the School Health Professional Grant  
4 Program 1CCR301-97.

5 The State Board voted to approve the notice  
6 of rulemaking in its August 16, 2017 board meeting. The  
7 hearing to promulgate these rules was made known through  
8 publication, public notice, on September 10, 2017 through  
9 the Colorado Register and by State Board notice on October  
10 4, 2018. State Board is authorized to promulgate these rules  
11 pursuant to 22-2-107-1CCRS.

12 Commissioner, is staff prepared to provide an  
13 overview of these?

14 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yes, thank you. I'll  
15 turn this over to Misty Ruthven.

16 MS. RUTHVEN: Excuse me a moment please.

17 (Extraneous conversation)

18 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Alright, I will turn  
19 this over to Ms. Ruthven.

20 MS. RUTHVEN: Thank You, Commissioner Anthes.  
21 Good morning, everyone.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Good morning.

23 MS. RUTHVEN: Nice to see you all. So as you  
24 know my name is Misty Ruthven, I'm the Executive Director of  
25 Student Pathways, and before you today is the hearing for



1 the School Health Professional Grant rules. So this was --  
2 these -- these rules were noticed in August, so two months  
3 ago, which brings us forth to the hearing today.  
4 You will notice that you have three resources and items in  
5 front of you. You have a memo of an overview of the rule-  
6 making process. You have the red line of the rules as well  
7 as a clean copy of the rules. This rule making was prompted  
8 by a direct result of the passage of senate bill 17-068,  
9 which is early support for students, which expanded  
10 eligibility of the School Health Professional Grant to  
11 include all schools before it was only secondary schools.  
12 As you may remember the School Health Professional Grant,  
13 the purpose of the grant is for districts to hire either  
14 school psychiatrists, nurses, school counselors or social  
15 workers, and focus on substance abuse prevention and  
16 education.

17                   Following the notice from the August meeting  
18 we did send these rules out to multiple stakeholders,  
19 including school districts, et cetera. We did not receive  
20 any external comments to the proposed rules. However, we did  
21 -- and I'll go through the rules in just a moment -- we did  
22 add a comment that was received from all of you as a  
23 potential change for your consideration. So I'll go through  
24 the rules in detail. Excuse me. (sound of coughing) That  
25 cold is going around.



1 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Clarifying question,  
3 yes, otherwise let's hold the questions.

4 MS. FLORES: Okay, so why isn't it July 1st,  
5 due July 1st to July 1st of the following year? Because, I  
6 mean, the end of the year, in May -- May 1st is, for  
7 schools, is just hectic. So why not let the school --

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores,  
9 where are you? For the benefit of those of us who don't know  
10 where you --

11 MS. FLORES: I'm on page 2, at the very top.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Page 2 of the red...?

13 MS. FLORES: Yeah, at the very top, and  
14 that's the only question I have. Is, you know, I mean, May  
15 1st is hectic enough, and especially in small districts  
16 where you don't have the, the people to really look at that.  
17 And if you just kind of end the year to -- and then have it,  
18 you know, be at July 1st when people have time to just  
19 breathe and then get on sending this, as opposed to having  
20 everything at the end of the -- of May. I think it would be  
21 -- and it's only a month, and it -- I think it would give  
22 people time to breathe and respond and be more at ease to --

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Did you get any feedback  
24 on this? I mean, I'm...

25 MS. FLORES: I'm just thinking of schools.



1 Because I --

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I know you are, but  
3 schools were asked and -- and they didn't say anything, so I  
4 don't know if they didn't read it, or if they thought it was  
5 okay.

6 MS. FLORES: Sometimes it just passes by. If  
7 the state says it then it's the state and they don't wanna  
8 mess with having more -- in the State Department, that's an  
9 issue, but knowing schools and having worked for a school  
10 district in that area, I just think that we need to think  
11 about that. If it's not going to be a big..

12 MS RUTHVEN: Madam Chair, would you like me  
13 to address that now?

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Please do.

15 MS RUTHVEN: So one of the reporting measures  
16 that's a requirement for us, as well as districts, is  
17 statutory in 2296-105, which requires May 1st to be the  
18 deadline.

19 MS. FLORES: It's statutory.

20 MS RUTHVEN: Mm-hmm.

21 MS. FLORES: Well some --

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

23 MS. FLORES: Somebody in statute was not --  
24 over there was not thinking.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Could you proceed where



1 you were going?

2 MS RUTHVEN: Yeah. Yes, thank you Madam  
3 Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

5 MS. FLORES: Well, they don't. Look at what  
6 happened with having to have another session.

7 MS RUTHVEN: So thank you so much. The --  
8 just to reiterate that we did not receive any external  
9 comments on the proposed rules, and I'll go through the  
10 rules one by one as far as we did include the addition that  
11 was recommended by this body by a few members from our last  
12 time that we had this discussion.

13 So in going through the rules you'll notice  
14 that the -- the primary change that is consistent again and  
15 again is the change from secondary to inclusion of all  
16 schools, to include all levels, including elementary. The  
17 one change on page 2 that you will see that is different  
18 from what was directed in the senate bill that is prompting  
19 these rules changes, was the conversation from the last  
20 meeting, and at the August board meeting there's a note in -  
21 - in one of the little bubbles. We've been, you know,  
22 yesterday there was a theme about bubbles, so we'll continue  
23 that.

24 At the August board meeting, board members  
25 suggested this change, which was the removal of the



1 assurance to participate in Healthy Kids Colorado survey and  
2 the school health profiles. So as mentioned to you in August  
3 that is not a requirement that was in the original rules  
4 adopted by this board a few years ago, so it is at your  
5 discretion if you would like to make that change.

6 On pages -- on page 3 the only additional change then is  
7 just ensuring that the rules include the based on available  
8 appropriation language, and then again, the consistent  
9 change of secondary being struck and the inclusion of all  
10 schools being available to apply for this grant.

11 So Madam Chair, is there anything else that  
12 you'd like me to cover?

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Questions, colleagues?  
14 Board Member McClellan.

15 MS. MCCLELLAN: Hi, yes, thank you so much  
16 for -- is this on?

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah.

18 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thanks so much for this  
19 presentation. On page 2 with that board input regarding  
20 removing section 2.01 2i, what is the practical implication,  
21 or the practical impact, of the removal of that clause?

22 MS RUTHVEN: Sure --

23 MS. MCCLELLAN: Does that lessen the  
24 requirement on schools? Does that -- does that have a  
25 practical change in what we should expect from schools?



1 MS RUTHVEN: From what we've heard from  
2 schools it's not substantive in that they could voluntarily  
3 continue to do that at their discretion. So it was something  
4 if they found that information valuable they can continue to  
5 do that if they chose. So one of the things that was asked  
6 last time is what information and how what evaluation might  
7 be required for the school health professional grant and how  
8 would we move forward?

9 Right now we are following the statutory  
10 minimums and what's in the rules, which basically is process  
11 information, such as how many folks are hired using these  
12 dollars, how many schools are involved, and then also  
13 measures that are established by schools and districts  
14 themselves, and then schools and districts measure  
15 themselves against those goals that they establish. So those  
16 are the current -- those are the type -- that's the type of  
17 information that we're currently reporting for this  
18 information, but certainly there's nothing that would  
19 prevent schools from participating.

20 MS. MCCLELLAN: And so this doesn't open up a  
21 pathway to non-participation that did not previously exist?

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No

23 MS RUTHVEN: Correct.

24 MR. DURHAM: Participation's never required  
25 in that survey.



1 MS RUTHVEN: Correct.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is now requiring it  
3 for this grant.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In order to get this  
5 grant.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. Any other  
7 questions? Board Member Durham.

8 MR. DURHAM: Final version of the rule, page  
9 3.201, prn. 5, prn. a, behavioral health is -- I thought you  
10 -- did I understand this was to be directed at substance  
11 abuse, so why do we have the words "behavioral health" in  
12 there?

13 MS RUTHVEN: Certainly, so that's a statutory  
14 reference. I can find that for you...

15 MR. DURHAM: So that is statutory?

16 MS RUTHVEN: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, where are  
18 you? Which paragraph?

19 MR. DURHAM: I'm on the final -- at rules,  
20 page 3, number 205, prn. 5, prn. a.

21 MS RUTHVEN: I mean, certainly since it is in  
22 statute it could be considered duplicate in the rules. I  
23 would, you know, rely on the (crosstalk) --

24 MR. DURHAM: No, it's what I was asking is --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Behavioral health is?



1 MS RUTHVEN: It might just be in the  
2 declaration, though? I'm, I'm looking for it to see it if  
3 it's in the body of the law. It is in the body of the law.  
4 In 2296-104 is -- that's -- Behavioral Healthcare  
5 Professional Matching Grant is what the legislature  
6 originally named this grant, and then we called it the  
7 School Health Professional Grant.

8 MR. DURHAM: We're revising these rules  
9 pursuant to the new bill. What's the new bill's title?

10 MS RUTHVEN: The new bill's title is School  
11 Counselors Early Support for Students.

12 MR. DURHAM: And am -- am I correct that they didn't  
13 increase the amount of money, they just divided the pie  
14 smaller?

15 MS RUTHVEN: So there's a bit of confusion  
16 with what this bill did, in that it impacted two grants that  
17 are very different from one another. The School Health  
18 Professional Grant did receive an increase outside of the  
19 parameters of this bill. The School Counselor Core Grant did  
20 not receive -- it's -- that's the one that's getting its  
21 pall -- pie divided smaller.

22 MR. DURHAM: Alright. Thank you.

23 MS RUTHVEN: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: If there are no further  
25 questions we don't have anyone who is signed up to testify



1 today, so that concludes our hearing. I would love to have a  
2 motion, please. Anybody got a motion? Board Member Mazanec.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I have the motion  
4 (indiscernible).

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, you don't have it.  
6 Does anybody have --?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) a  
8 hearing and the vote on a different day?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we -- don't we  
10 have to --

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, may so. But --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe if it's unanimous.

13 MS RUTHVEN: If it's unanimous today than you  
14 can vote today.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Then you'll be done with  
16 it.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Then we'll be done with  
18 it. And this is not the first time it's come forward, so  
19 therefore -- do I have a motion? Do you wanna --

20 MS. MAZANEC: I don't have a motion. Do you?

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Right there, a motion.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I had the  
23 (indiscernible) I would move.

24 (Indiscernible speaking in background)

25 MR. DURHAM: I'd say the chances of unanimity



1 are slim.

2 MS RUTHVEN: Oh really?

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are they?

4 MR. DURHAM: They are.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Alright, then bring it  
6 back next time.

7 MS RUTHVEN: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Because?

9 MR. DURHAM: The mental health.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: The health -

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wouldn't this be the  
12 time to ask...

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well it's statutory.

14 MR. DURHAM: I just don't like it.

15 MS RUTHVEN: I would -- thank you. We're  
16 gonna bring it back next time.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So folks, we're ahead of  
18 schedule. Which, yay.

19 (Chorus of "What?")

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I don't even like to use  
21 those words, because I know this is gonna come back to bite.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Jinx.

23 MR. DURHAM: We'll get even with you.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So, if you don't mind,  
25 let's put the -- we put off board reports last night.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Mm-hmm.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And I mean last night, I  
3 don't mean yesterday afternoon. So would it be alright if we  
4 did that right now? Because we've invited folks and I don't  
5 wanna start early if they haven't had a chance to be here.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well they're ready.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are we back on?

8 MS. CORDIAL: I think everybody's here.

9 MS. FLORES: Let's do it then.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Everybody's here?

11 MS. CORDIAL: Uh-huh.

12 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: It's not a timed item,  
13 though, so...

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's not a timed item.

15 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yeah.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: You all feel ready?

17 Thank you for coming. So the next item on our agenda's  
18 consideration of the graduation guidelines. Do we really  
19 want a motion first?

20 MS. MCCLELLAN: Based on yesterday's  
21 fumbling's we do.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Based on yesterday's  
23 fumbling, or...?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think maybe you should  
25 do the (crosstalk) testimony.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Have a discussion.

2 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, let's do the testimony. I  
3 think so too, if that's okay with you guys.

4 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yep.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So, Commissioner, staff  
6 prepared to provide an overview and have a presentation?

7 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Yes, thank you. I will  
8 turn this over to Misty Ruthven, but I do wanna thank your  
9 panelists for coming today to provide a little extra  
10 perspective, so thank you so much, and I know Misty will  
11 introduce each of you, so thank you.

12 MS RUTHVEN: Great. Thank you so much,  
13 Commissioner, and good morning, again, to the Board of  
14 Education. So this is a follow-up discussion from our  
15 conversation in September regarding graduation guidelines.  
16 And from our long conversation of an hour plus or so we had  
17 several questions come up that were directed toward  
18 districts and what had happened in the graduation guidelines  
19 work group that was convened, as well as the community  
20 conversations around the value of a high school diploma and  
21 what was really happening on the ground from the  
22 implementation perspective.

23 So I know that you had asked to also hear  
24 from business folks. Unfortunately, we had some challenges  
25 with scheduling, and we did have a few business folks



1 secured that at the last minute were unable to make it, but  
2 they certainly offered to come in November, if that's  
3 something that's helpful to all of you, if you'd like to  
4 continue the conversation into next month.

5           As a reminder of the conversation for today;  
6 so certainly, we have three fine folks from the panel that  
7 will kick off here in just a moment. The other things that  
8 will come in front of you today are consideration of the  
9 technical recommendations. If you'd like to have further  
10 conversation that's certainly an option to continue into  
11 November. If that's something you'd like to vote on today  
12 that's up to your discretion and where you'd like to go with  
13 this conversation.

14           So the other piece, just as a reminder to all  
15 of you, in 2015 you -- the reason why this is before you  
16 today, is you directed CDE staff to come back to you every  
17 two years with considerations and updates to the graduation  
18 guidelines menu.

19           So without further ado we're proud to have  
20 three education leaders with us today, and thank you, thank  
21 you, thank you. Just to really reiterate Commissioner  
22 Anthes' welcome as well. We are so, so appreciative of you  
23 being here. And one of the thing -- we've asked them to each  
24 provide three to five minutes of remarks just to introduce  
25 themselves, their schools as well as some of the initial



1 questions that you'd had regarding implementation of  
2 graduation guidelines and what their local graduation  
3 requirements look like.

4                   From there they are prepared, but may not  
5 speak to this in their initial remarks, if you do have  
6 additional questions about other menu options, or  
7 specifically the high school equivalency conversation that  
8 has come up regarding GED and the other high school  
9 equivalency tests, they might be able to share -- they're  
10 prepared to share their opinions with you about that  
11 conversation in the work group, as well as their individual  
12 district opinions.

13                   With that I'd like to turn to Senator Keith  
14 King to talk about the great work that you're doing in  
15 Colorado Early Colleges.

16                   SENATOR KING: Uh-huh. Well thank you, and  
17 good morning. Thank you for having us today. We have a  
18 little thing that maybe we can give all of you. We, we have  
19 a theme every year at our school, we started with Grin and a  
20 Growth Mindset, and we really try to get our kids to think  
21 about being successful and carrying on other than what they  
22 would normally do in a high school. And then we went with  
23 hope, trying to give them hope for the ability to see what  
24 they can do with their future is done with high school. And  
25 so now we're doing champions. Our champions is to make them



1 feel like they can accomplish things, that they can go  
2 someplace and they can do things that nobody has ever done.

3                   So we're finding that that's possible. The  
4 Early College is a great place for kids to find where they  
5 wanna go and how they want to accomplish their things, what  
6 they want to do. And we are really -- as you can see we're  
7 graduating a lot of students with associate's degrees, or --  
8 this is saving you guys and the parents of these kids lots  
9 of dollars as far as it goes as far as the money that we're  
10 spending.

11                   So we have four schools now. we have one  
12 school in Colorado Springs, one in Parker, and our newest  
13 one in Aurora, and then in Fort Collins, so we have about  
14 2500 students. We're -- we're in the heart of the south part  
15 of Fort Collins. We're in the heart of the tough area of  
16 Aurora, 6th Avenue and I25, and we're in Parker and Colorado  
17 Springs.

18                   So we're really excited about what we're  
19 accomplishing or the kids. The -- the things that they are  
20 accomplishing are just outstanding. The average student  
21 graduates about 47 college credit hours and they are able to  
22 accomplish that with us paying for those college courses,  
23 and they are able to get them a degree, and do things that  
24 we just have never seen happen before.

25                   I just will make a quick comment. I -- we --



1 I came back to the legislature last year and carried senate  
2 bill -- I didn't carry it, but I helped do senate bill 272,  
3 and that was a bill to make these guidelines go into the  
4 school performance framework, and make it go -- the one  
5 thing that we did not have in our schools, and we did not  
6 have the ability for kids to demonstrate that they were  
7 college ready by taking concurrent enrollment. And if you  
8 can go past concurrent enrollment; our kids are passing  
9 their college courses 95 percent of the time. They're  
10 college ready. They're demonstrating they can do it. And  
11 they're doing a very good job at being successful. We have  
12 just tremendous success, so that's probably as long as you  
13 want me to go for now, and I'll come back and talk more if  
14 you want.

15 MS RUTHVEN: Great. That's (indiscernible) So  
16 Diana Zakhem, you're District Administrator for Englewood  
17 Schools, and I was remiss in mentioning that both Susan and  
18 Dianna were part of the conversation about the graduation  
19 guidelines workgroup, so that might be helpful.

20 MS. ZAKHEM: Good morning. I do have some  
21 formal remarks that I have prepared.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can you use your...?

23 MS. ZAKHEM: Of course.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Our  
25 microphones are a little -- so you have to really talk into



1 them. Thank you.

2 MS. ZAKHEM: So thank you for the opportunity  
3 to speak with you today. My name is Diana Zakhem and I'm the  
4 Director of Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness for  
5 Englewood Schools. I have had the honor of leading college  
6 and career readiness initiative within the district since  
7 2008, and leading the graduation guidelines work within  
8 Englewood for the last three years.

9 Englewood engages in a multi-year process to  
10 identify the priorities for the new graduation requirements  
11 for the class of 2021, or this year's freshman class. We met  
12 with several stakeholder groups; including parents,  
13 teachers, community members, administrators, our  
14 superintendent and school board members. And in February of  
15 this year we adopted a policy that reflects our value -- the  
16 values of our community. And there are really four main  
17 priorities.

18 The first is we value a comprehensive high  
19 school experience. We want our students to have multiple  
20 opportunities to explore a variety of interests in addition  
21 to completing a rigorous core academic program, and so this  
22 is reflected in our requirement of students completing 23  
23 credits in required subject areas.

24 The second is that students will demonstrate  
25 college and career readiness in English and in math



1 proficiencies via the CDE menu of college and career -- on  
2 the CDE menu of college and career demonstrations. We opted  
3 to adopt the entire menu, because we wanted to provide our  
4 students with as many options as possible.

5           The third is that we wanted students to have  
6 a meaningful plan for life after high school, and that is  
7 demonstrated through our requirement of an ICAP.

8           And the fourth is that we wanted our students  
9 to contribute to our community, and this is reflected in our  
10 requirement of 20 community service hours. So engaging our  
11 community and adopting the policy was very important and  
12 powerful work for us, but this work really continues now as  
13 we focus on implementing these graduation requirements.  
14 So at this stage in the work there is still a great deal of  
15 analysis, discovery, and reflection occurring within our  
16 district, and we are reviewing policies, systems and  
17 processes all with the lens of increasing opportunities and  
18 removing barriers for students, so that they can achieve  
19 their dreams for the future.

20           So there have been several positive outcomes  
21 that have occurred because of this work, but due to time I'd  
22 like to just briefly highlight three of the positive  
23 outcomes that have happened because of our graduation  
24 guidelines work.

25           So the first is we have really been doing a



1 deep dive in analyzing our K-12 programing and looking at do  
2 we have the right courses and programs in place, and do we  
3 have gaps and redundancies. And so, for example we -- we,  
4 through our analysis, we knew that we had excellent 7-12  
5 STEM programing in place in our middle school and high  
6 schools, but what we found is that we had nothing at our  
7 elementary schools. And so graduation requirements were not  
8 just about what was happening at the high school, it was  
9 systemic work. It was K-12 work. And so this helped us  
10 actually pursue outside funding from the Gill Foundation. We  
11 were able to secure STEM labs in all of our elementary  
12 schools for this school year, and so we now have an aligned  
13 K-12 STEM program to support our ultimate STEM pathways at  
14 our high schools that connect with concurrent enrollment and  
15 AP programs. So this is really aligned work.

16                   Another area we were looking at was  
17 increasing access to program that we know has a powerful  
18 impact on postsecondary outcomes. So, for example, we know  
19 that students who take concurrent enrollment courses are  
20 more likely to go on to post-secondary education, so we have  
21 been doing a deep analysis of how do we increase access to  
22 concurrent enrollment? So we've done a lot of work on  
23 increasing concurrent enrollment offerings. How do we  
24 communicate with our family populations and get students  
25 access to concurrent enrollment? We've been working with our



1 post-secondary partners, increasing the number of faculty  
2 members that are adjunct professors, so a lot of systemic  
3 work on concurrent enrollment, which is a portion of the  
4 graduation guidelines work.

5           A final example is our need to start college  
6 and career readiness work earlier. Most of our district work  
7 initially had started at 7th grade, but now we know that we  
8 actually need to start as early as preschool, so we are now  
9 working with our preschool -- our elementary principals on  
10 ways that we're doing systemic college and career readiness  
11 and this has manifested itself and we are now working with  
12 our elementary counselors and their collaborating with our  
13 secondary counselors and we're doing aligned work on  
14 systemic college and career readiness P-12.

15           So these are just three examples of positive  
16 systemic work that has come out because of the graduation  
17 guidelines. We firmly believe that all students should be  
18 prepared to achieve their individual postsecondary plan, and  
19 that as a K-12 system it is our duty to deliver the programs  
20 and services to help them achieve their dreams for their  
21 future. In fact, our superintendent, Dr. Wendy Rubin, just  
22 sent out a district-wide communication earlier this week to  
23 all of our families about the importance of college and  
24 career readiness and the programs that we have to serve our  
25 families. So there's still a great work -- great deal of



1 work to be done in this area, but there's also great  
2 momentum and great commitment.

3 I'd like to add one, final note on this.

4 There has been a great deal of support that has come from an  
5 informal group of district leaders that have met from across  
6 the front range, and this has just been district leaders  
7 that have come together very informally to meet to talk  
8 about how we can collaborate on this work. And CDE has been  
9 a great champion of supporting these informal meetings, and  
10 there's been representation from small districts and large  
11 districts, but from across the front range as we come  
12 together talking about how do we share resources and work  
13 smarter, save time, and I really believe there's been great  
14 momentum and we're sharing a lot of -- we're championing  
15 this work about college and career readiness, so thank you  
16 for your time.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

18 MS RUTHVEN: Susan and -- Susan Ortner is the  
19 Principal of Holyoke Schools. I think Holyoke High School,  
20 specifically.

21 MS. ORTNER: Actually junior/senior high  
22 school, so...

23 (Laughter)

24 MS. ORTNER: Good morning

25 (Chorus of "good morning")



1 MS. ORTNER: Thanks for the opportunity to be  
2 here. I feel like I'm representing rural schools today, and  
3 was one of the few members of the grad guidelines committee  
4 who worked as a rural school member. So, wow, you have an  
5 awesome program in place. That's impressive.

6 Small schools are different. We all wear  
7 many, many hats, and I'm talking from our para-  
8 professionals, to our parents, to our students, to our staff  
9 members. And so this has been an ongoing process for quite  
10 some time.

11 In 2010 we revised our graduation  
12 requirements in Holyoke feeling like it was very important  
13 for our students to leave us well rounded. We added, at that  
14 point in time, two years requirements of career and  
15 technical education classes, so students have three  
16 different CTE programs that they can dip into in Holyoke and  
17 they can choose all three, or they can choose one. So we  
18 have an ag. education program, a business program, and a  
19 family and consumer science program.

20 We also wanted students to have opportunities  
21 to experience fine arts, so they have a one-year fine art  
22 requirement and a year of PE requirement, as well as  
23 additional elective requirements. At that point in time we  
24 added an ICAP requirement and we have a year-long program  
25 for students in 9th grade, 10th, 11th and 12th grade with



1 the curriculum that we've developed over the course of time  
2 including seven mindsets; wanting our students to be more  
3 mindful about going out and being able to compete on a  
4 world-wide level.

5           Most of our students are involved in a lot of  
6 different activities, so 90 percent of our students are  
7 involved in extracurriculars, including athletics, other  
8 activities, organizations, drama, music, that sort of thing.  
9 So they get a lot of different opportunities. Most of them  
10 are involved in two to three different activities. See a lot  
11 of kids at school from, like, 6:00 AM until they finish play  
12 practice at 9:30. It's crazy, but they still manage to do  
13 well in classes also.

14           We had 42 students graduate last year, and  
15 those 42 kids earned \$2.4 million in scholarship money. We  
16 have about 75 percent of our kiddos go on to postsecondary  
17 education. About half of those kids leave us with at least a  
18 first semester under their belt in a postsecondary program.  
19 We have a program that we share with Northeaster Junior  
20 College in Sterling, which is 50 miles away.

21           So where are we at with graduation  
22 guidelines? We adopted the graduation guidelines menu in  
23 2016. We've been talking with parents and students, staff  
24 members, about that for a long time. We did tweak it again  
25 this past summer. We added, or updated, the SAT scores and



1 we added the -- oh my gosh, the sentence skills score from  
2 Accuplacer.

3                   We do not have some things on the menu in our  
4 policy. At this point we don't have a capstone course. I've  
5 got 23 staff members, 250 students, 8 period a day, most of  
6 my elective teachers teach 7 preps, all of my teachers teach  
7 7 classes, and to add a capstone on top of that is  
8 difficult. It's something that we're still looking at with  
9 room to revise our plan as we go forward. 96 percent  
10 graduation rate. Community that's very supportive of our  
11 students and our school. So that's where we're at.

12                   MS RUTHVEN: Thank you. Madam Chair,  
13 questions? Questions for --?

14                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Colleagues, questions?  
15 Maybe I should start down the line if that's okay? Ms. Goff.

16                   MS. GOFF: Good morning. Thank you very much.  
17 It's always great to hear people tell about their lives and  
18 their stories. For any of you I think I know the answer in  
19 some cases. How -- how involved, or how active, Is the BOCES  
20 structure? Maybe a Holyoke would be the place to start with  
21 that. Just thinking as you were talking about your -- what  
22 sounds like a desire and an interest in developing a  
23 capstone project situation, how might that -- has it been  
24 conversed about, or brought up? Just what are possibilities  
25 for things like that through the regional support, which is



1 I'm assuming with the -- with Englewood as well, would be  
2 part of your concurrent enrollment -- the regional notion of  
3 the community college structure and such as that, or even  
4 four-year universities, for that matter, but another topic.  
5 So I just would like to know that.

6                   And also if you all -- I don't believe --  
7 I'll look at the statue again, but I don't believe there's a  
8 timeline, or a dead -- rather a deadline type of situation  
9 here for anyone, but considering the fact that it is this  
10 year's freshman who are entering into our first cycle of the  
11 new requirements did you all kind of set up your own  
12 deadline, your own -- you put your own emergency, you know,  
13 our -- our point here in time where we're going to do this?  
14 And how has communication with your communities gone as far  
15 as the message around any big changes if that was perceived  
16 to be the case for your communities as well?

17                   So BOCES involvement, perhaps deadline, and  
18 communication successes or observations, I mean, as much as  
19 anything.

20                   MS. ORTNER: So our BOCES has been very  
21 involved, and we had a principal's meeting yesterday. We  
22 meet monthly, they're providing professional development for  
23 us and have for several years now, and so that's been very  
24 helpful. Having the conversations with principals throughout  
25 the area is extremely helpful.



1                   We haven't really dug into capstone classes.  
2 It's been a topic of discussion, but... there's room to do  
3 more.

4                   MS. GOFF: Thank you.

5                   MS. ZAKHEM: We are not formally working with  
6 the BOCES through this process. I think the biggest  
7 collaborative group that we've been working with is that  
8 kind of informal front range group that I had mentioned, and  
9 that's kind of provided those same structures of "what are  
10 you doing in Jeffco? What are you doing in Cherry Creek?  
11 What are you doing in Avenputer (ph) that's kind of provided  
12 that collaborative structure and -- of support?"

13                  SENATOR KING: So we're a CSI school and we  
14 are not a -- we do not belong to a BOCES. We do some  
15 collaborative stuff within CSI, and that works for us, and  
16 we have the ability to cooperate and work with the people at  
17 CSI. They -- the graduation requirements really flow very  
18 nicely with an early college, because we -- everybody that  
19 comes in takes the Accuplacer and they -- when they complete  
20 a course they have to take the Accuplacer again to see if  
21 they're college ready, so everyone one of our students --  
22 before they go in to college courses they are proving that  
23 they're ready by the Accuplacer, and they are demonstrating  
24 that before they go in, so they are -- we're very used to  
25 that. It's very useful and it's a -- the scores on the



1 graduation menu here are really low. They're -- they're made  
2 for probably an Associates of Applied Science Degree, but  
3 they're not -- they're way too low for a kid going into  
4 regular -- regular College Algebra or, or English then they  
5 need a lot higher score than these, so if we accept the kids  
6 into the 121 math and English they would be -- at his level  
7 they would have a lot of kids failing in courses.  
8 So we have -- we make sure that they're ready and we make  
9 sure that they have the opportunity to succeed and they -  
10 we, we don't put them in those courses unless they  
11 demonstrate that they know the -- the material and can do  
12 it. So it's working out very well for us, and the guidelines  
13 are flowing real -- very well with what we're doing. And the  
14 other -- I'm really happy about it, their concurrent  
15 enrollment issue. That really made a big difference for us  
16 in how we go about doing what we're doing, so that worked  
17 out well.

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Did you have a question  
19 Board Member Mazanec?

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, thank you all for coming,  
21 and congratulations on all of your success in what you're  
22 doing. I was wondering -- I have heard occasionally some  
23 criticism of the graduation guidelines, specifically that it  
24 -- that it's a big menu, and I think the criticism I've  
25 heard seems to indicate people think -- that some districts



1 think they need to adopt all of them. I was wondering what  
2 your experience is with that. Do you feel like having a  
3 large menu of options is helpful to you, or is it pressure  
4 to offer them all? I mean, are you hearing from families, or  
5 are there -- "Well, you need to offer" for instance, "the  
6 capstone, we want the capstone." and you're feeling a little  
7 squeezed on being able to offer that. So just kinda an  
8 overall on what you think about the menu, and whether it's  
9 been positive or negative for you.

10 MS. ORTNER: From a rural viewpoint I think  
11 the menu has a lot of things on it that most of our kids can  
12 meet easily. I think there's a lot of things that our upper-  
13 end kids will meet without any problem. The kids that I'm  
14 worried about are the kids that aren't ESL or IEP students,  
15 and they're below that mid-line we're gonna have to really  
16 work to get them to that point.

17 We do have the ACT workKeys program available  
18 on our menu, and the ASVAB score, so as we get closer to  
19 having our freshman have to meet these guidelines we'll  
20 really be pushing that for those students.

21 MS. ZAKHEM: We saw the multiple options  
22 actually as a positive. We wanted to provide as many  
23 different venues and opportunities for students to be able  
24 to demonstrate readiness. We also are - Englewood is also a  
25 very small school district; we have less than 3000 students,



1 and we, as a school district, are not able to offer all of  
2 those options. Like, for example, we do not have an IB  
3 program, but the way we worded it in our policy was that we  
4 would -- if a student were to transfer, because we do have a  
5 high transfer rate -- if a student were to transfer into us,  
6 that we would honor a student that would transfer into --  
7 into us with that. This -- so we adopted everything because  
8 we wanted to have as many options as possible. So we saw  
9 that as actually as -- as a positive. It didn't seem  
10 overwhelming or intimidating, we --

11                   SENATOR KING: I like the choice. I -- I  
12 think that's really powerful for districts to choose what  
13 they wanna do with their kids. It gives the kids an  
14 opportunity to take several different tracks if they wanna.  
15 If they wanna take an AP track they can do that. If they  
16 wanna take a concurrent enrollment track. If they wanna take  
17 a -- like an Associate of Applied Science track it -- it  
18 gives them flexibility to kinda become what they are wanting  
19 to be, and I think what we need to do is -- education is  
20 about educating students, it's not about them conforming to  
21 what we wanna teach them. They -- we need to be market  
22 driven, and we need to be fulfilling the -- the needs of  
23 these kids as they're getting out of high school and college  
24 for a job. And so the jobs are -- they're just really  
25 changing. We are looking at doing cyber Security, for



1 example. We're trying to connect with those people in  
2 Colorado Springs, and we're looking to see what kinda  
3 opportunity those give our kids. So that -- that needs a  
4 flexible way of measuring how we are sending the kids out.  
5 So this is a really good menu. I like it a lot. It's -- it  
6 gives us a lot of choices and I think it gives us a chance  
7 to demonstrate that the kids can do things that we weren't  
8 able to say we were giving them credit for before. So I  
9 think it's a -- I think it's something that we can find that  
10 we can motivate our students a lot better with this menu, so  
11 I like it a lot.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member McClellan.

14 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you, all of you, for  
15 being here. It's really exciting to hear about the success  
16 stories that you're having, and in particular, Senator King,  
17 I was excited to hear about the opportunities going forwards  
18 in the middle of congressional district 6 at 6th avenue and  
19 I25. That's right where we want to be offering that  
20 encouragement for children who might be first-generation  
21 college students, so that's -- and hearing that they are  
22 graduating, in some cases, with 47 credit hours; that's --  
23 that's fantastic. Particularly given the rising cost of  
24 college. It can make that 4-year degree feel like it's out  
25 of reach.



1 SENATOR KING: Yeah.

2 MS. MCCLELLAN: I hope this isn't too much of  
3 an indulgence, but I wanted to share something that I hope  
4 students are hearing about when they're in the concurrent  
5 enrollment classes, and that is that one thing we learned  
6 with several college recruiters and with a couple of pre-med  
7 advisors that my daughter talked with recently in 2016, and  
8 that is that it's not a choice at some campuses whether or  
9 not you transfer over those concurrent grades. You have to,  
10 in some -- for some campuses you must transfer them over.  
11 Which means we have to have that mature conversation and  
12 warning to sometimes 15, 16, 17-year-olds, that "The work  
13 you're being graded on now may be a part of the picture when  
14 you're applying to law school or medical school." And so  
15 it's a fantastic opportunity, but also a really serious  
16 warning that it -- you can't just not transfer those grades  
17 over. Your live for grad-school application records.

18 So I'm just hoping that wherever you touch  
19 folks who are offering concurrent enrollment that that word  
20 of warning is going out as well. Because one thing we  
21 learned from recruiters is that there are lots of students  
22 who are coming in with C's and B's, because of the maturity  
23 issue and -- or because maybe they're just emerging  
24 students. They're -- they're coming into their own, but not  
25 quite there yet. And so for some, depending on what they



1 think they might wanna do after undergrad, that can be  
2 relevant. So just a little bit of -- a little bit of input  
3 from a parent.

4 SENATOR KING: Yeah.

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: And thank you for the work  
6 that you're doing. It's very exciting.

7 SENATOR KING: I -- can I respond to that?

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Please.

9 SENATOR KING: I think all these courses  
10 should be transferable. These should not be -- these are not  
11 high school courses, these are taught by adjunct professors.  
12 They're all in the catalog of the community colleges or the  
13 4-year institutions, and they're GT Pathway courses, so they  
14 are really something that they can do and use. So I think  
15 they're very, very beneficial and I think that they get an  
16 opportunity to -- to get that -- those kind of things done.  
17 So I think the opportunity to save the money and everything  
18 is very prevalent, so I think it's good.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Rankin.

20 MS. RANKIN: Good morning. I have -- I too  
21 thank you for being here today, taking the time and sharing  
22 what you do at your schools. I -- I'm just curious about how  
23 you use the menu. And -- and who -- who helps decide what  
24 things you offer. I know if you don't have IB you can't have  
25 that on it, but do -- do you just offer the whole menu to



1 all the students and they get to choose, and they can change  
2 as they go through high school? If you could just speak to  
3 that at your school, and each one of your, I'd appreciate  
4 that.

5 MS. ORTNER: In Holyoke it started as a staff  
6 conversation and recommendation to our District  
7 Accountability Committee. District Accountability Committee  
8 talked some more about it, made a recommendation Board of  
9 Education, Board of Education then adopted -- and they  
10 adopted the staff recommendation.

11 MS. RANKIN: And -- and what was that? Was it  
12 the whole menu?

13 MS. ORTNER: No, it's not. It doesn't include  
14 the capstone. We don't have IB classes. We only have AP  
15 classes in English, composition and literature, so those are  
16 all my limitations.

17 MS. RANKIN: And the SAT? Did you just --

18 MS. ORTNER: Yes.

19 MS. RANKIN: Hit the floor of that, like we  
20 had put forth, or...?

21 MS. ORTNER: We added the new recommended score this past  
22 summer, so we changed it from what it was with the old SAT  
23 test, and now we're up-to-date with the new SAT test that  
24 started last spring.

25 MS. RANKIN: And they have to accomplish the



1 970 combined score.

2 MS. ORTNER: Yes, yeah. It's split out into  
3 the English and math score, so... yeah.

4 MS. RANKIN: Yes, okay, thank you.

5 MS. ZAKHEM: So are you referring to the --  
6 the menu as we adopted it as a policy, or are you referring  
7 to how we're using it with students?

8 MS. RANKIN: What you adopted and -- unless  
9 you just adopted the whole menu.

10 MS. ZAKHEM: We adopted the whole menu.

11 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

12 SENATOR KING: We're basically using  
13 concurrent enrollment. We use that a lot. The Accuplacer,  
14 obviously, we use. Because every -- every student comes in  
15 and does that. We are really orientating ourselves toward  
16 college courses, so we don't do all of these, but I think  
17 what's -- as we go forward we're starting to work with  
18 CareerWise, I don't know if you're familiar with them. They  
19 -- they're starting work with apprenticeships and  
20 internships. And we are doing that with three of our schools  
21 anymore. The only one we're not actively doing that is -- is  
22 Colorado Springs, and we are getting -- going there, and  
23 we're gonna do that.

24 And so I think that's a really important  
25 plus, because we were trying to connect jobs to kids, and I



1 think that let them have some experience in those workforce  
2 areas. So anything that's related to a job area, the  
3 competencies that they need for being successful in a job,  
4 we would allow them to emphasize this.

5                   We -- we're an open minded kinda  
6 organization, so give us any proof that you are gonna be --  
7 can be successful and these are menus that we will use, but  
8 we -- we like the demonstration that they do as far as their  
9 -- completing their graduation requirements and how they go  
10 about doing their education. So...

11                   MS. RANKIN: Senator King, I just have a  
12 little follow up. I like your idea of market-driven, and  
13 what's market-driven for your students today may be  
14 different four years from now.

15                   SENATOR KING: Absolutely.

16                   MS. RANKIN: The flexibility; how do you --  
17 how do you account for that in your school?

18                   SENATOR KING: Well we had -- (indiscernible)  
19 had a school in Colorado Springs. She's sitting right behind  
20 me. So what she did was she went to the workforce readiness  
21 place in Colorado Springs and she did, "What is the -- where  
22 are the jobs in Colorado Springs?" and cyber security is a  
23 big job, and medical is a big job, and so is the trades,  
24 like the wood -- construction and those types of things. So  
25 what we were doing is we're trying to focus on those areas



1 that have opportunities inside Colorado Springs and will  
2 give them an opportunity to have a -- contacted those  
3 people.

4                   So we had the national cyber security  
5 convention, I guess you call it. Is at the Broadmoor in a  
6 couple weeks, and we're having these kids that we're gonna  
7 expose them to that, and we're gonna try and see who wants  
8 to go to that and get an opportunity -- opportunity to, to  
9 see how they would fit into that.

10                   We're talking to CTU about a degree that  
11 would continue with a 4-year degree. We're talking about  
12 Pike's Peak, we're gonna be talking about them with their  
13 cyber security, so we're just trying to connect the  
14 opportunities for these kids to have multiple types of  
15 opportunities to go and see the careers and just not --  
16 they're doing very good in completing high school. They're  
17 doing good in their college courses. Now we just need to  
18 connect the careers to them and give them that opportunity  
19 for that.

20                   MS. RANKIN: Thank you very much.

21                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Flores.

22                   MS. FLORES: Thank you. I was just wondering,  
23 Dr. Ortner?

24                   MS. ORTNER: Oh, no Dr.

25                   MS. FLORES: Oh, Ortner and Ms. Zakhem. I



1 think both of you are -- I mean, given the -- the big  
2 support that you're giving STEM and given the big support  
3 that you're giving just the arts and in general, I just  
4 think writing is so important and, I don't know, I mean, a  
5 capstone would seem to be -- or a mini-capstone would be  
6 kind of exciting, I think, for -- for your -- your students.  
7 Especially you have, let's see, you said you had advanced  
8 kids that were taking advanced courses, and I think the  
9 outcome for something like that would be a paper that they  
10 would write just naturally. Wouldn't that be kind of an easy  
11 thing that -- and it would be so important. I know that  
12 that's something that in my high school we did for -- for  
13 those courses, because it was kinda bringing all that  
14 together and in an area that you were interested in, and  
15 certainly English and history was something that was very  
16 interested -- interesting to me in high school, and it kind  
17 of continued. And a paper kind of bringing all that together  
18 would be something that -- I, I'm just thinking of the --  
19 the extra work that you're saying it would put on your --  
20 I'm trying to understand the extra work. And it is extra  
21 work, but how -- it just is a, a corollary and, and a mint  
22 result to all the work that your teachers and your students  
23 are doing. The same for you. And probably, in some cases,  
24 for early college -- Colorado Early College, as well. Could  
25 you speak to this?



1 MS. ZAKHEM: We adopted the capstone, and we  
2 are in the throes of trying to figure out what that means.  
3 Because the capstone can look so many different ways.

4 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

5 MS. ZAKHEM: It could be a four-year  
6 culminating project. It could be an end-of-course project.  
7 It could be a senior-hear project.

8 MS. FLORES: Right.

9 MS. ZAKHEM: I mean it -- and it looks, if  
10 you look at what's happening across the state; capstone  
11 really looks so many different ways depending on where you  
12 go, and really across the country it looks so many different  
13 ways.

14 MS. FLORES: Right.

15 MS. ZAKHEM: So that is what we are  
16 navigating right now. Our board said, "Yes, we -- we like  
17 the idea of capstone." And now our charge as a district in  
18 building leaders and teachers is trying to figure out what  
19 does that mean for -- for our -- our schools. And we haven't  
20 figured that out yet, because similar to Holyoke we have  
21 limited staff members. Limited staffing, and so we're trying  
22 to figure out how do we create a meaningful, culminating  
23 experience for students that honors their passion and can  
24 capture that -- the element of -- in demonstrating  
25 proficiency in mastery with the resources that we have



1 available for us.

2 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

3 MS. ZAKHEM: And we're -- we are -- we will  
4 figure it out.

5 MS. RANKIN: Okay, so you're thinking of it  
6 is, is as a thesis, possibly.

7 MS. ZAKHEM: Or a project, or a -- it, it  
8 could be -- it could be many different things.

9 MS. FLORES: Right. But I think it would be  
10 so helpful to get that in high school for college, and for  
11 careers, as well, I think, because people have to -- you  
12 know, their project managers and they have to come up with a  
13 final report and the -- all the findings and such. So I just  
14 think that it, it's just a natural next step and -- but I'm  
15 glad that you're thinking of the various ways in which that  
16 could be done. And in -- in your case I think it's just  
17 people -- kids would wanna do that.

18 MS. ORTNER: So in Holyoke it's something  
19 that we're very interested in. It's something that we don't  
20 want to include in the menu until we have a plan.

21 MS. FLORES: Sure, okay.

22 MS. ORTNER: And it's gonna take some time to  
23 develop that. Our students that are in career and tech ed  
24 organizations frequently qualify to go to national meetings  
25 with projects that they've worked on all year long.



1 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

2 MS. ORTNER: Perfect.

3 MS. FLORES: Yes.

4 MS. ORTNER: But putting it in place --

5 MS. FLORES: Okay, so you're thinking about  
6 it.

7 MS. ORTNER: Yeah, absolutely.

8 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

9 SENATOR KING: I'll just quickly respond. We  
10 are -- we concentrate on three things from when they come  
11 into the school; reading, writing, and math. If they can't  
12 do that, they're not gonna be successful in college, and  
13 it's really -- that's basic thinking, but that's the --  
14 that's the honest truth, so we -- we really work hard on  
15 that and everything becomes secondary to that issue. So we  
16 have a lot of writing which the kids do. We have a lot of  
17 work on the -- the types of things that would be -- help  
18 them to be successful and essays and that type of stuff at  
19 the college level. So we are doing that a lot and we are --  
20 and we're getting really good results. We have them do a  
21 writing sample when they come in, and they do that, too, so  
22 we're -- we're really working hard to make sure that they're  
23 ready for college by -- with what we're doing on those types  
24 of tests.

25 MS. FLORES: Very good.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. Board Member  
2 Durham, do you have any questions, comments?

3 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think  
4 the testimony's been helpful in giving us some confidence in  
5 the menu that we have and that it seems to be serving a  
6 variety of districts and circumstances reasonably well.  
7 Senator King, just one question. You serve a fairly  
8 disadvantaged population, and I presume a lot of those  
9 students require remediation before they are ready for the  
10 college courses and that you do that remediation. Does that  
11 create sometimes a -- an inordinate, or significant number  
12 of graduates who take -- who take five years to graduate as  
13 opposed to four, and is the four versus five causing you any  
14 kind of trouble that you're aware from a regulatory  
15 standpoint?

16 SENATOR KING: Okay, well thank you for that  
17 question. The -- in Aurora, for example, we have a high --  
18 our population is probably as high as the Aurora population  
19 at 90 percent minority. We have probably the free and  
20 reduced lunches comparable to what we -- we went and wanted  
21 to go into that market because we -- we have proven that  
22 this works, this model works for kids that are from homes  
23 that are thinking about college, but we wanted to go into an  
24 area where they weren't thinking about college.

25 So it was a challenge for us to go in there,



1 and it's been a really difficult challenge for us. In fact,  
2 I've had -- over there today, unfortunately, doing three  
3 expulsions for guns and for things that we are not gonna  
4 tolerate in a school, and we are gonna be very strict about  
5 what we do. And I think the culture is a little bit  
6 different in Aurora than it is other schools, because  
7 they're used to kinda doing what they wanna do, and they  
8 wanna -- they kinda have -- are on their own path and we are  
9 trying to give them a trajectory for a disciplined path to  
10 an opportunity for an associate's degree.

11 MS. FLORES: Right.

12 SENATOR KING: And so it's a really new  
13 challenge for us and we are -- we're up to it. We are --  
14 we're having fun with it, and ten we have 250 kids that we  
15 started with there, and we -- I went around the first day  
16 and I said, "You are going to make a difference, because you  
17 have chosen to come into a school that you are gonna have to  
18 really work hard to make a -- to get what you wanna do, get  
19 an associate's degree, and you are stepping up in an area  
20 that people don't care too much about education."

21 And so I think we are doing a great job with  
22 them. We are -- we'll -- we'll see. It's gonna take -- a lot  
23 of these kids -- they came in -- our average student came in  
24 at 030, and 030 is like 5th and 6th grade level of  
25 achievement. We're four and five grade levels below where we



1 need to have these kids. And so we are working very hard to  
2 move them up multiple grades in a year, and we are trying to  
3 get them to college courses as quick as we can, but there's  
4 a challenge, and it's something we have a really good  
5 tutoring program. We have a lot of individualized things  
6 that we do with the kids, and we are really concentrating on  
7 Aurora being a success story. So we need five years for  
8 some of these kids, because they're coming in and two and  
9 three grade levels below, and I mean, I don't know how you  
10 necessarily get that done if you don't have some extra time  
11 with kids.

12                                   And we are bringing in -- we don't -- we  
13 don't -- we're an open enrollment school, so we don't refuse  
14 anybody. You know, a lot of high schools they have a  
15 continuation of kids that go through their core. We accept  
16 all kids, and we accept junior, seniors, and sophomores, and  
17 those kids sometimes need an extra year because of the fact  
18 that they are -- are not able to come to us -- even as a  
19 junior and be anywhere close to college ready, so we are --  
20 we work really hard with them, and we -- we do a lot of work  
21 with them, but it's a challenge. And I think we're gonna be  
22 successful. We'll, we'll find out how the year goes. We'll  
23 see how it plays out, but it's definitely a different  
24 culture in Aurora than it is any of our other schools. But I  
25 -- I'm thrilled what we're doing over there.



1                                   And I wanna make a -- I wanna make a  
2 statement that kids at all -- we say all students can  
3 succeed and we -- I don't care what their nationality is. I  
4 don't care why they come into our school. We accept all  
5 kids. We have a lot of special education kids enroll, and  
6 we're taking all kinds of needs of kids, so we are -- we're  
7 excited about what we're doing there, and it's a really fun  
8 challenge for us to go there, so it's -- it'll be  
9 interesting to see how it turns out. So...

10                                  MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Senator King. And I  
11 appreciate the efforts you've made on behalf of Colorado  
12 students and the innovations that you've brought really to -  
13 - to Colorado, and I think the -- have forced on a  
14 marketplace basis a lot of schools to adapt to -- to the  
15 model that you have created, so thank you.

16                                  SENATOR KING: Thank you.

17                                  CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Welcome, and thank you  
18 for coming. I have a couple, I would call, maybe mechanical  
19 questions around graduation requirements. In order to be a  
20 fulltime student and get the PPOR you gotta be there, so  
21 what is -- what is in your system -- I believe you spoke to  
22 that, Ms. Zakhem, because you said that there were a number  
23 of hours that were a part of your graduation requirements.  
24 But if -- if Senator and Ms. Ortner would talk to that.  
25 Because I've been wondering about that. I would -- I -- I'm



1 worried about possibly having graduation requirements that  
2 doesn't actually require kids to be in school, therefore we  
3 have a whole different financial system for our schools. Ms.  
4 Ortner, do you wanna address that please?

5 MS. ZAKHEM: So our graduation requirements  
6 include 56 credits, okay, students can earn 2 credits per  
7 class over the course of a year, so -- and I outlined 4  
8 years of English, 3 then of math, science and social  
9 studies.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, I may -- I may  
11 have missed that.

12 MS. ZAKHEM: I didn't say 56.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. Senator, same  
14 thing, do you have an attendance.

15 SENATOR KING: Well, we kinda do two things  
16 in two different ways, because their college courses count  
17 differently for attendance than what the courses do for the  
18 -- because you get -- you get 7 to 10 credit hours you're  
19 considered a fulltime student. On count day we had the  
20 professors take attendance and we have sure that they're all  
21 attending and they're going to their classes and we also do  
22 the, the regular hour schedule with our college prep  
23 program, so we have kind of a hybrid situation, but they are  
24 definitely doing the time in the class and they are --  
25 they're not -- they're not doing the -- the traditional



1 schedule with a college, just because they're on the college  
2 campuses and they're -- they're fulfilling those  
3 requirements for those college courses. But they are --  
4 they're -- we hold them accountable. If they fail their  
5 courses we make them work it out or pay for it, and we make  
6 them -- they are -- they come and they -- they understand  
7 that they can do it, but they have to get the attitude to do  
8 it, so I think that that's something that we do. So I -- we  
9 just are basically -- we're definitely requiring attendance.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, so in trying to  
11 understand what this looks like; there is still a  
12 requirement to go to school, and to go to class, but how you  
13 fulfill the expectation is no longer based on having a  
14 passing grade in certain courses, but is in fulfilling the  
15 expectations on whichever parts of the menu that you adopt.  
16 Am I close on that? Because I've been trying to get the  
17 picture.

18 When I talk to people about this they say,  
19 "Well don't they have to school? Can they just come and take  
20 a test and that's all they need to graduate?" And I think  
21 that piece, because that's at the district decision level is  
22 not something that folks are aware of; that you still are  
23 expected to go -- in your situation take particular  
24 subjects, maybe not in all the other courses. Sometimes it's  
25 internships that give you hours. I'm not really sure. It'll



1 be interesting, I think, for us to look at the differences  
2 when we finally get the graduation requirements for each of  
3 the districts, but there is that attendance requirement that  
4 fulfills the funding piece of K-12 ed. Would you agree?

5 SENATOR KING: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Our students will have  
7 to meet our graduation requirements, as well as the criteria  
8 and the menu.

9 SENATOR KING: Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, and that is  
11 (indiscernible). And then the other question that I have is  
12 will it show up on the -- on the student's transcript which  
13 criteria was used to fulfill the graduation requirements?  
14 Will a college see that a student -- be able to note that a  
15 student did a capstone project, had a certain score,  
16 whatever the criteria is that it was met?

17 MS. ZAKHEM: That's actually something we're  
18 talking about in that front range group right now.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, good.

20 MS. ZAKHEM: We -- so far the conversation  
21 has been a yes, no, met the -- met the proficiencies, yes,  
22 no. But now we're starting to dig deeper. Do we wanna denote  
23 how was it met? Was it met via SAT? Was it met via  
24 concurrent enrollment? Was it -- so and part of that is  
25 conversations with our postsecondary partners.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Good.

2 MS. ZAKHEM: What would they want to see?

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's been my biggest  
4 worry is been -- I haven't -- I haven't physically seen or  
5 heard a lot of input from them about how this is moving  
6 forward.

7 SENATOR KING: Our stand --

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And not -- not only in  
9 state, but also out of state.

10 MS. ZAKHEM: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Senator.

12 SENATOR KING: Our students get two  
13 transcripts; they get the college transcript and they also  
14 get the high school transcript, so they -- they have high  
15 school graduations very much like we -- they have to do both  
16 our regular graduation requirements and they have the  
17 opportunity to get the associates degree. So they are --  
18 they have to attend these courses or they're not gonna pass  
19 them. I mean, it's a pretty simple thing of at the college  
20 level you gotta show up and do your work. And it's -- we --  
21 we treat them like college kids. They show that they are  
22 able to do that and we let them go about doing it. But if  
23 they are getting transcripts of -- and we're putting that --  
24 those things on their transcripts. The -- the -- when Pike's  
25 Peak issues a transcript, or whoever it is, issues a --



1 that's a college -- transferable college credit, so it's  
2 good for a college degree.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. Did you have  
4 something you wanted to add to that?

5 MS. ORTNER: I just wanted to add, Madam  
6 Chair, that -- so staff have a meeting with the department  
7 of higher education, and also all the admissions directors  
8 from the 4 and 2-year colleges across Colorado. Certainly,  
9 we can extend potentially beyond some of that, but they're  
10 very interested in knowing how students -- which criteria  
11 they've met on the menu.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. So we're gonna go  
13 around again. Board Member Flores.

14 MS. FLORES: I just have a short question,  
15 and that is I have a -- a mentee who is working on policy,  
16 and right now he -- he works for Dianne DeGette; he's -- and  
17 one of the things that he was given a responsibility for was  
18 to look at applicants who were going into the military  
19 academies. And he had a big problem going into high schools  
20 to talk about applying for those military. So I think, I  
21 mean this used to be something in the '60s that I know, you  
22 know, that kind of happened, but I thought that that had  
23 been sort of dissipated and was not done anymore.

24 So do you allow people like this to come in  
25 and -- and -- and talk?



1                   SENATOR KING: Absolutely. We allow  
2 recruiters -- we allow recruiters into our building and we  
3 hope that the kids sign up for this.

4                   MS. FLORES: Right.

5                   SENATOR KING: So we've had some tremendous  
6 success stories of kids in the military.

7                   MS. FLORES: Do -- do you find that that's  
8 still an issue in -- maybe not your high school, but other  
9 schools?

10                  SENATOR KING: Well, I don't -- I don't know  
11 about other schools.

12                  MS. FLORES: Other districts.

13                  SENATOR KING: I think -- I think it depends  
14 on their attitude. I mean, we are -- that's a great job for  
15 a lot of kids.

16                  MS. FLORES: Sure.

17                  SENATOR KING: And it's a great place for  
18 them to learn things.

19                  MS. FLORES: Right.

20                  SENATOR KING: And we had a -- we had Irvine  
21 Wallace come back at -- he graduated four years ago. He was  
22 in Culinary Arts at Pike's Peak Community College, and he's  
23 a -- now becoming a sergeant in the Army and he's now  
24 serving the generals at the Pentagon!

25                  CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Awesome.



1 MS. FLORES: That's great.

2 SENATOR KING: So that's a -- that's a  
3 success story that we have, because we encourage them to --  
4 so he - he won three culinary arts competitions in the  
5 military with a --

6 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

7 SENATOR KING: I -- I looked at his -- the  
8 menu. That was fit for the Broadmoor, I mean, it was  
9 unbelievable. It was -- and he won these contests and he --  
10 that's the kinda kids that we get going into the military.  
11 So we -- we're -- there's nothing wrong with the military.  
12 That's a great job and he's gonna make a career out of it  
13 and he's gonna be a lifetime cook for -- now we're going  
14 into the Pentagon, you know, just four years that he's been  
15 in the military.

16 MS. FLORES: That's wonderful.

17 SENATOR KING: Lot of success stories with  
18 kids in the military.

19 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

20 MS. ORTNER: I wear my Air Force Parent  
21 (indiscernible). My son's a captain in the Air Force.

22 MS. FLORES: That's wonderful.

23 MS RUTHVEN: So --

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Goff.

25 MS. GOFF: Oh I -- it's just so tempting just



1 get off on that topic. Have fun the rest of the -- of the  
2 day. Maybe -- Maybe in connection with Val's question, or  
3 comment, at the -- toward the end of my life in the high  
4 school classroom is when I believe there was a bit of a  
5 kerfuffle around bringing in military recruiters and -- and  
6 people to talk to students. I -- I don't wanna say it  
7 incorrectly. I think the timing was somehow connected to the  
8 U.S.'s involvement in the Middle East ramping up and there  
9 was -- there was just some worry on the part of parents and  
10 others about whatever.

11 But at the time when I was teaching I had an  
12 opportunity to administer the ASVAB test, and I learned and  
13 awful lot at that point about the -- the caliber and the --  
14 and the expectations and how -- how kids were being -- had  
15 the chance, then, to learn how the military experience and  
16 their high school life and other studies just were so  
17 integrated into -- to so many things. Very valuable.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 MS. GOFF: In the years since I have -- I  
20 have several nieces and nephews, but the older -- oldest of  
21 my nieces is a former F-18 pilot who was fortunate to be --  
22 to become involved with ROTC in high school, but then  
23 received a scholarship to -- that carried her all the way  
24 through the University of Colorado and her commission years  
25 and everything like that.



1 SENATOR KING: Right.

2 MS. GOFF: And I used to tell my own students  
3 after -- before she had her experience, but afterwards how  
4 this is -- it is such an overlooked and under-rated avenue  
5 for kids not only for higher ed, but also for job prospects  
6 and placements and potentials. So I -- I'm totally  
7 appreciative of that and I - I would like to see adequate  
8 and appropriate and enough emphasis on all kinds of strands  
9 of opportunity for these kids, and that is certainly one of  
10 them. The military advantage that a lot of kids may not  
11 have.

12 At the same time, those students are --  
13 they're not -- they're not qualifying up to the par they  
14 should be, and part of what we're finding out is that the  
15 academic preparation, and -- and in some cases the physical  
16 qualifications, are still falling short. So it -- it's like  
17 we've got a -- we've got a multi-pronged effort to pay  
18 attention to hear about that. But the -- the potential is  
19 incredible. Kids wanna -- if they have adults, all of us,  
20 who support their interest in fostering their interest.  
21 I would just really quick, mechanical question sort of, too.  
22 On your full menu option list how do you -- I -- I guess it  
23 goes back to my communication with parents, and the kids.  
24 How do you -- how do you explain to them what they need to  
25 have? What does that mean? If you've got this full menu, and



1 yeah, every, single one of these is terrific, and so you  
2 have 10, 15 choices, and here's the full menu. Then what?  
3 Combined with a certain number of credit course -- for  
4 coursework what does it take to -- what becomes of this  
5 menu? I guess that goes back to my longtime question, I'm  
6 sorry for putting this board through it again. I -- I've  
7 been uneasy all along. Today makes me feel a lot better,  
8 because I hear how you're applying it -- unease in that only  
9 one choice of the English and one choice of the math, if I'm  
10 hearing it right, constitutes satisfaction of the menu. How  
11 does that work? Because if a kid has -- a student has a  
12 capstone project under their belt, and they have some --  
13 they acquired an industry certificate, and they have -- they  
14 passed a score on SAT, or ASVAB, or whichever one of these  
15 they're involved with. Which -- which one carries more  
16 weight in the -- in the eyes and ears of our communities  
17 about how -- what it takes to graduate from high school,  
18 meaning get a diploma.

19                   SENATOR KING: Well, may I respond to that? I  
20 will say that the -- what carries the most weight in our  
21 schools is associates degree. I mean, that carries a lot of  
22 weight, because it --

23                   MS. GOFF: It does.

24                   SENATOR KING: The kids are coming out with  
25 that and its a -- that's a two years ahead type of program,



1 so that's -- the concurrent enrollment is really, really  
2 huge. I think that is -- that's a demonstration that they  
3 can do the work.

4 MS. ORTNER: That they're ready. So their  
5 readiness has been achieved.

6 SENATOR KING: That they're ready. We've --  
7 these kids have proven time and time again that they can do  
8 college work in high school and they -- they're very  
9 successful at it. And so I think that is really a key  
10 component of the success that we demonstrate that the --  
11 they do the college work and they get that done. I think  
12 that the other thing that they -- they have is an ability to  
13 look at their opportunities as far as jobs and careers go  
14 and they drive their own career. And they have a -- that is  
15 something that's really meaningful to kids. I mean, they --  
16 we have kids that are gonna be doctors, we have kids are  
17 Harvard creating nanotubes to do away with silicone in  
18 chips. We have kids doing -- we had the highest scoring  
19 girl, probably, in the State of Colorado with 120 college  
20 credit hours went through the Wharton School of Business,  
21 the number one business school in the nation. So we have  
22 these kids accomplishing just phenomenal things. And so it's  
23 a -- they, they drive it, though. They -- they're involved  
24 with it. They -- their ICAP is their choice.

25 And so we had a -- I'll just tell you quickly



1 about another girl, Makayla, who was in one of our courses  
2 and she went into the UCCS, she got her 4-year degree, and  
3 she was a victim's advocate for the -- some of the troops  
4 and the people on the Navy bases and she's now working on  
5 towards a law degree. So, I mean, these kids do things that  
6 I don't -- I -- they just have choices that they make and  
7 they -- they make their own choices and they go where they  
8 wanna go and they accomplish great things. So it's just a  
9 fun thing to watch them and see what they do.

10 MS. GOFF: Yep, right.

11 MS. ZAKHEM: And I -- I would piggy-back on  
12 that. I mean, I would think we don't wanna -- we don't wanna  
13 put a weight, or a value, on the menu for the students,  
14 because we want it to be driven by the student and their  
15 passion. So if their passion is based on an industry  
16 certificate we wanna put all of our support on -- on that  
17 for them.

18 You know, I think the -- that ICAP process  
19 and the -- the supports we put in place for them to explore  
20 and investigate who they are, and what they're passionate  
21 about, and then support them in taking the courses that  
22 align with their passions. That -- that's how we navigate  
23 that menu, that we use -- we use the menu to support their  
24 passions and their interests.

25 And the menu is relatively flexible, right? I



1 mean, AP could support it and concurrent enrollment could  
2 support it, and concurrent enrollment and CTE are so aligned  
3 right now that there's a lot of overlap in a lot of this  
4 menu. So we want to be able to use that menu to help  
5 students navigate their passions for -- for their -- their  
6 own future.

7 MS. GOFF: Thank you. And -- thank you.  
8 That's really -- that's -- that's heartening, and it's  
9 encouraging, and that kids -- kids and families are starting  
10 to see how it all blends and -- and supports each other.  
11 Everything --

12 SENATOR KING: Mm-hmm.

13 MS. GOFF: One of you mentioned -- I -- that  
14 ICAP was actually a requirement, a graduation requirement?

15 SENATOR KING: Mm-hmm, it is.

16 MS. ZAKHEM: Yeah.

17 SENATOR KING: All of us.

18 MS. ZAKHEM: For all of us.

19 MS. GOFF: So having -- well completing it  
20 and following through with the various stages is, is also,  
21 as you graduate, then we -- we wanna have a record that this  
22 has been done as well, so is that accurate for that?

23 MS. ORTNER: So our students in ICAP are  
24 working with that menu from the time they enter high school,  
25 but it's in our student handbook, which they get in 7th



1 grade. It, it's part of the process throughout their time in  
2 our school, so it's not something we spring on them as  
3 they're juniors, or some such thing, you know, "Oh, by the  
4 way..."

5 (Chorus of "yeah)

6 MS. GOFF: Thank you, answered my question.

7 SENATOR KING: One of the thing -- one of the  
8 things we do. I -- we have really worked very hard with our  
9 advisors on how they work with our students. It's one-on-  
10 one. It's the parents coming in with the kids, it's meeting  
11 with them and saying, "Where are you wanting to go? How are  
12 you wanting to get there? Are you on target to get there?  
13 Are you doing the courses that are gonna help you get  
14 there?"

15 They -- they keep on trying to push down the  
16 number of kids that they serve, because they serve them so  
17 well. I think we're down to about 150 kids that our advisors  
18 serve, and they -- they work with these kids and they --  
19 they get to know these people. I mean, this is a -- this is  
20 a one-to-one relationship that we do with this. This is a  
21 very, very important part of our program to make sure that  
22 we're listening to them and -- and helping them get to  
23 accomplish what they wanna get accomplished. So I think that  
24 the advising is just critical for a successful ICAP and how  
25 they go forward with what they're wanting to do, and we



1 spend a tremendous amount of time on that.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. Senator  
4 King, do you know off the top of your head what your per  
5 pupil expenditure is? Per student?

6 SENATOR KING: Well, this varies from  
7 Aurora's about \$7800 to about \$7200 in Fort Collins and  
8 Colorado Springs.

9 MR. DURHAM: So you're -- I think the average  
10 in the state is, what, \$10,000 or \$11,000, so you're  
11 accomplishing this for what would be considered a bargain  
12 for the taxpayers?

13 SENATOR KING: Well, I think that we -- we  
14 don't have any -- the opportunity -- we're a CSI school, so  
15 we have no opportunity for a meal levy in our schools, and  
16 we -- that was a bill that was going through last year and  
17 was trying to help us. We get some facility funding, \$200 a  
18 student, and -- but we are -- we are delivering college  
19 degrees with \$7500, basically, per student, and we get some  
20 grants for different things. We get the -- some grants this  
21 year and we -- we worked very hard on that, so I think we're  
22 a tremendous bargain for kids. Because we are saving the  
23 parents of these kids -- the debt is just killing this  
24 middle class in this country, and with college debt it's the  
25 number one debt now.



1 MS. FLORES: It is.

2 SENATOR KING: And we got to get rid of that,  
3 especially for these kids that are come from low income  
4 areas that we have to make sure that they can go and get  
5 those degrees and get them paid for. So I think that's a  
6 tremendous value for what we're doing for the kids.

7 MR. DURHAM: Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Any other questions? So  
9 thank you so much for coming. I do have one more question  
10 I'd be grateful for your comments, and that is there's been  
11 a recommendation that we include the successful completion  
12 of the GED --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or any high school  
14 equivalency assessment.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Or any high school  
16 equivalency assessment in the -- in the graduation options.  
17 I'd appreciate your comments.

18 MS. ZAKHEM: Go ahead.

19 MS. ORTNER: I have really mixed feelings  
20 about that.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

22 MS. ORTNER: And -- and I spoke earlier about  
23 being worried about our low-end kids that aren't our IEP or  
24 ESL students, for that very reason. I'm afraid that they  
25 will take that as an out and leave us.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Leave you without  
2 staying and fulfilling your classroom expectations?

3 MS. ORTNER: Leave -- yes, and then go try to  
4 get that GED. They have to do that on their own, and most of  
5 the students that would fit that criteria in Holyoke  
6 probably would not complete for quite some time.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I'm a little  
8 confused, just because I thought I understand that in  
9 addition to an item on the menu that you also, your  
10 graduation requirement, included --

11 MS. ORTNER: Fifty-six credits.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Fifty-six credits. So...

13 MS. ORTNER: I'm afraid that those low-end  
14 students will take that GED as a way to get out of the 56  
15 credits and --

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But I thought they  
17 couldn't. I thought that was --

18 MS. FLORES: I thought that was

19 SENATOR KING: You'd have to include it.

20 MS. FLORES: You'd have to include it.

21 MS. ORTNER: Well they -- no. They would  
22 leave us and then go get their GED.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But then they would not  
24 -- it would still be the same GED that we have today, which  
25 is --



1 MS. ORTNER: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Which means they are not  
3 a graduate of Holyoke, they just got the GED or the high  
4 school equivalency.

5 MS. ORTNER: Right. Right.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Which is the risk that I  
7 believe you have today.

8 MS. ORTNER: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: And by putting it on the  
10 menu -- I'm, I'm trying to put words in your mouth and I  
11 shouldn't. By putting it on the menu it makes you  
12 uncomfortable that that might --

13 MS. ORTNER: It does.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

15 MS. ORTNER: I think we'll have more take  
16 that option, and I don't want them to do that.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

18 MS. ZAKHEM: I support that decision.  
19 Englewood has an alternative high school right now, and we  
20 support multiple pathways to a high school diploma, and we  
21 value high school equivalency, so we would be in support of  
22 that.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. Senator?

24 SENATOR KING: I would support it based on  
25 the condition that we establish the cut points at the right



1 place. I think -- that's really critical. I think we -- I  
2 think these cut points are too low and -- on Accuplacer  
3 here, for example, I think we need higher cut points and I  
4 think the expectation should be if you take an assessment  
5 and it's a valid assessment and it shows you you're --  
6 you're ready to go on to college and you're able to  
7 accomplish college work a lot of them take that assessment.  
8 I have -- I have no problem with that. I want -- I want to  
9 see as many kids go forward as we can. It will not lower our  
10 standard at all to do this. It would be -- if it happened it  
11 would -- our standard is associates degree. We have kids  
12 that we're trying -- they're coming to our school and  
13 they're accomplishing a lot more -- they're -- they're not  
14 looking for the bottom. They're looking for the top.

15 MS. FLORES: Right, right.

16 SENATOR KING: And so I think that -- I think  
17 that it's the focus of the school and that if they -- if  
18 that assessment gives them opportunity let's create  
19 opportunities for them. Let's create another chance for them  
20 to have a job. And maybe it would be like -- I gotta tell  
21 you one more story.

22 About Michael, who was a -- just came back  
23 and we talked to him. He only accomplished one college  
24 course in our school, and he went to work for SIMA, the  
25 people that are -- you know, you see them on the freeways



1 all the time? He went to work for there as a laborer. They -  
2 - but he learned how to give a job his all, and we -- we  
3 taught him that at our school. So in three years he's now  
4 the foreman of the -- the crew that finishes these bridges.  
5 He's done 13 of them around the State of Colorado and he -  
6 he credits his discipline that he had that he learned at our  
7 school to the fact that he was able to go up and do what  
8 he's done. And so he's just a -- that's just an example of  
9 the kinda kids that what they see is an opportunity. He --  
10 when he -- (indiscernible) was here he says, "It's okay. I'm  
11 just about at a six-figure salary. So it's a -- it's just --  
12 he's just -- this is huge, and these kids are just doing  
13 great things and they are accomplishing things. That because  
14 we gave them multiple options and we gave them opportunities  
15 to accomplish things.

16                   So if that's -- if that's a hot button for  
17 some kids let's -- let's make it high enough and make it  
18 rigorous enough. Let's give them opportunities.

19 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So, senator, clarify for me please.  
20 When we've discussed the menu, we have said that we've set  
21 the floor, and we assume that districts would be setting  
22 higher standards. So for the items that you accepted on your  
23 graduation guidelines did you raise the -- the level?

24 SENATOR KING: I know we raised it -- I raised it in the  
25 senate bill 272 that I wrote for the -- the school



1 performance framework.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Right.

3 SENATOR KING: We said that those kids have  
4 to be college ready for that measurement to happen on the  
5 Accuplacer, so that's a score -- that's a --

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's higher than  
7 what's in the menu?

8 SENATOR KING: That's about 20 points higher  
9 than this score, and it's a -- it's a higher score and it's  
10 a lot more rigorous and it's good enough to get them into  
11 college courses at 121 levels and it's -- that's rigorous  
12 type of English and math. It's not -- that's college  
13 algebra. That's -- so we're not -- we -- we don't shoot for  
14 the bottom. We shoot for the top and we -- we let the kids  
15 show us and demonstrate it to us.

16 I'll just say one thing. We don't really  
17 focus on the state assessment. We focus on the kids doing  
18 what they need to do to, to be successful in their career,  
19 or their work that they're doing. And the assessment comes  
20 by as a by-product.

21 MS. ZAKHEM: Yeah.

22 SENATOR KING: These kids are doing well on  
23 the assessments. I mean, we have -- we have storage like a  
24 high school achievement and reading and some of our schools  
25 are 97 percent. The writing and the math is in the 80s and



1 they -- for some of these schools, but we have overall  
2 school scores -- I just would like to talk a little bit  
3 about this, because it's really powerful. Almost 90 -- we're  
4 in the 90s on a lot of these school's campuses we're on we  
5 were doing things that, "No, we don't care about the test.  
6 We care about them getting some that's meaningful in these  
7 college courses."

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Good. Agree with that?

9 MS. ORTNER: Yeah.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So let me go back, if I  
11 may, to what's on the transcript, because there -- I have  
12 district constituents who are concerned about comparison  
13 between districts, where some districts set, as you did, to  
14 set a higher level for the items on the menu and some have  
15 left it at the -- what we would call the basement. Should  
16 that be on the transcript? In other words, if I -- if I look  
17 at a student's transcript do I know how prepared they really  
18 are? It's -- it's not a new issue, because back when I  
19 looked at A's, B's and C's it certainly depended not only on  
20 the school district; it depended on the school, and it  
21 depended on the teacher. So we're still in that same  
22 position. But do you have any suggestions on how to allow  
23 for some comparability between graduates from different  
24 districts based on the graduation requirements that they  
25 chose?



1 MS. ZAKHEM: Well, as I think about the --  
2 the different components of the menu, like I'm thinking  
3 about AP -- like an AP score. So if a district kept the menu  
4 as written, which is a score of a 2, so a student may have  
5 met it as a score of a 2, but the student still carries that  
6 AP score. So a -- a student -- even though the -- the  
7 district may have changed the floor of that score, the  
8 student's score would still be a 3, or a 4, or a 5. Like, I'm  
9 saying like the student's score still goes with them.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It still goes with the  
11 transcript, and so that shows.

12 MS. ZAKHEM: Yeah, so the concurrent  
13 enrollment grade would still go with the student. So --

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So it's more about setting high -- by  
15 setting higher scores you, basically, are incentivizing your  
16 students to reach higher.

17 MS. ZAKHEM: I -- I haven't thought -- given  
18 much thought to -- to your question, but I'm just thinking  
19 more in terms of, like, the different menu items for  
20 individual students; they have an individual score in terms  
21 of concurrent enrollment, or AP, or an IB score. They're  
22 still going -- walking with an individual score that would  
23 be reflected either in a transcript, or a score report, or,  
24 or something that is a level playing field in comparison to  
25 other students.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are transcripts common?  
2 Is there a state-wide transcript? I think maybe that --

3 MS. ZAKHEM: No, there is not.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: There is not, so  
5 districts do their own anyway.

6 SENATOR KING: Well, there's a standard for  
7 the concurrent enrollment standard, because if you get a  
8 English 121 on your transcript from Pike's Peak Community  
9 College, for example, you have proven that you are college  
10 ready in that -- in that assessment, because it's a GT  
11 Pathway course, and that course is common to all  
12 (crosstalk).

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So in high -- in higher  
14 ed. there's a commonality.

15 SENATOR KING: Yeah, right.

16 MS. ZAKHEM: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Not the -- but not by  
18 school districts.

19 MS. ZAKHEM: No.

20 MS. ORTNER: No.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Necessarily.

22 MS. ZAKHEM: By concurrent enrollment there  
23 is, so if you're using --

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: By concurrent enrollment  
25 there is.



1 MS. ZAKHEM: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you. Thank  
3 you so much for coming, and if you have any final thoughts  
4 you want to share with us, that you want us to know that you  
5 haven't already shared with us? Who's been grateful --

6 SENATOR KING: Well, I just want to thank you  
7 for the opportunity to you. We are --

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you for coming,  
9 very much.

10 SENATOR KING: Excited what we're doing with  
11 kids and we're excited about them reaching for higher things  
12 than they've ever reached for. And they -- we've had several  
13 kids graduate -- graduate with bachelor's degrees, and we  
14 have a electrical engineer that's in Colorado Springs, Jenna  
15 Rock, who graduated -- she came and developmental math, and  
16 she was determined to get a bachelor's degree, and she's now  
17 working as -- my son actually, RT Logic, he's an engineer  
18 there and he's -- she's doing a fantastic job. Kids can  
19 accomplish more than we expect!

20 MS. ORTNER: Yes.

21 MS. ZAKHEM: Totally agree.

22 SENATOR KING: Now we do not have a rigorous  
23 enough academic rigor in our -- in our schools today.

24 MS. FLORES: I...

25 SENATOR KING: They are -- they're a lot more



1 intelligent than we think they are, and they can accomplish  
2 a lot more than we ask of them. We just don't ask.

3 MS. FLORES: Mm-hmm.

4 SENATOR KING: But they step up, if they have  
5 the opportunity, and they do great things. So thank you very  
6 much.

7 MS. ORTNER: Thanks for what you all do, very  
8 much.

9 MS. ZAKHEM: Thank you for the opportunity.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

11 (Applause)

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I would entertain a  
13 motion.

14 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Madam Chair, we do have  
15 -- we didn't really orient you to your decision today. We  
16 wanted to start with the panel, so do you want Misty to go  
17 through the rest of the presentation?

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Do we? Alright.

19 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Just to help you  
20 understand what you need to decide on today, versus --

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We did it last time, but  
22 let's repeat it.

23 MS RUTHVEN: If you'd just like a quick  
24 refresher I can do it five minutes.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, I think so, but if



1 you want to go through the whole parts?

2 MS. FLORES: She said five minutes?

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sure.

4 MS. RANKIN: I'd like a quick refresher,  
5 please.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Quick refresher please.

7 MS RUTHVEN: Okay, up to you, Madam Chair,  
8 would you like the panel assisting?

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: You're more than welcome  
10 to stay if you want to watch us slog through this.

11 (Laughter)

12 MS. FLORES: But feel free to leave at any  
13 time.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But it is 12:04, so...

15 MS. FLORES: You could go to lunch, too.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Should your stomach be  
17 telling you something else, please feel free. Thank you so  
18 much.

19 MS RUTHVEN: Great, thank you. So I will then  
20 dive in to the conversations some of which you asked about  
21 in September, or all of which we asked about in September,  
22 as well. So, please, panelists, thank you, thank you.

23 SENATOR KING: Thank you. Thanks for the  
24 opportunity.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you so much.



1 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Could you remind me what  
3 page you were on up there?

4 MS RUTHVEN: So -- sure, I am on slide 4.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

6 MS RUTHVEN: And this is just a reminder in  
7 the conversation, because it came up last time why the name  
8 "guidelines" right? And so this is statutory. As you heard  
9 from the local school districts that they are certainly  
10 requirements once they are turned over into the district  
11 hands. So -- and statute does reflect that, just I wanna  
12 briefly read you one sentence that, "The requirement is a  
13 comprehensive set of guidelines for the establishment of  
14 high school graduation requirements to be used by each  
15 school district of education and developing graduation  
16 requirements."

17 Again, you all set guidelines, the local  
18 Boards of Education set requirements based on the menu you  
19 establish, and it its -- the statute goes on to say that  
20 they must meet or exceed, so I just know that that was a  
21 conversation last time. I wanted to make sure that was  
22 clarified.

23 So the other pieces, just to remind you, go  
24 back one; in addition to the menu of options the alignment  
25 with description of postsecondary and workforce readiness is



1 required, ensuring that this -- there are options in  
2 English, at least one option in English, and one option in  
3 math that is met, and that there are multiple pathways  
4 available for students, as you heard the panel say.  
5 This also requires alignment with -- when I say "this";  
6 graduation guidelines require alignment with Colorado  
7 Academic Standards, the Individual Career and Academic Plan,  
8 or ICAP, and the Essential Skills, or the former 21st  
9 Century Skills, so I want to just make sure and reinforce  
10 that, because this also requires ICAP, as you've heard from  
11 these folks. Right?

12                   One of the things that came up in our  
13 conversation last month is alignment with higher education  
14 remedial policy. I think it's probably of interest to this  
15 group that what you see in front of you is the remedial  
16 chart that colleges in our state use, so public colleges in  
17 our state, use to say, "Is a student ready to enter a 100-  
18 level credit bearing course, or not?" and the only -- so for  
19 example, ACT's at the top, you'll see there's direct  
20 alignment between 18 English cut score, graduation  
21 guideline, 18 in English, so it's the same because we're  
22 required to align with "not in need of remediation".  
23 The option that we'll be talking about today is SAT, the new  
24 SAT, that was started in '16, so last year, that higher  
25 education has already adopted the aligned scores. You'll see



1 direct alignment between the old 430 and the new 470 for  
2 English. The old test 460, and the new test is 500, so those  
3 are the same score, and higher education has adopted those  
4 as well. And then you'll see, certainly, the high school  
5 equivalency exams that -- and the scores that are "not in  
6 need of remediation" that higher education institutions are  
7 currently using across our state.

8                   So this I know is a lot on one chart, and I  
9 will just briefly walk you through it, but it is information  
10 that you requested. So specifically, you requested how many  
11 students are passing the cut scores for English and math on  
12 SAT. In addition to SAT we looked at all of the other  
13 options to say, "How many students currently are  
14 participating in these different pathways, and then how many  
15 of them are meeting the expectation that's been  
16 established?"

17                   So if you take AP for example, Advanced  
18 Placement, the readiness step is set as a 2, and that -- 55  
19 percent of students are participating -- and I apologize,  
20 that's also 55 percent of students taking the AP exam are  
21 getting a 2 or above. Does that make sense? I think that is  
22 a little confusing.

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are what?

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Getting a 2 or above.

25                   MS RUTHVEN: So getting a 2 or above.



1 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: So there's supposed to  
2 be 55 in both of those?

3 MS RUTHVEN: Yes, yes.

4 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: Okay.

5 MS RUTHVEN: And then 45 in both. So ASVAB it  
6 might be another example that this is a little bit different  
7 in that it is a percentile, so 31 percent.

8 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Where are you?

9 MS RUTHVEN: Sorry, so ASVAB, the score is  
10 31.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Under Advanced  
12 Placement.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Got it, got it.

14 MS. FLORES: Armed Services Vocational --

15 MS RUTHVEN: Sorry, at Armed Services  
16 Vocational Aptitude Battery.

17 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I found it.

18 MS RUTHVEN: And that currently 10 percent of  
19 students are taking the ASVAB.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Taking it, okay.

21 MS RUTHVEN: If that makes sense.

22 MS. FLORES: It's not 10 percent are passing.

23 MS RUTHVEN: Correct.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: No, 69 percent are  
25 passing.



1 MS RUTHVEN: Exactly.

2 MR. DURHAM: So 69 percent of the 10 percent.

3 MS RUTHVEN: Does that -- am I making sense?

4 (Chorus of "mm-hmm")

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah. I do have a  
6 question, though. You said that 55 should be in the percent  
7 meet and Advanced Placement" that seems -- so 100 percent of  
8 the folks participating are also --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Meeting.

10 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I have a feeling that's  
11 a different number.

12 MS RUTHVEN: No, I think those are flipped.  
13 Yeah, sorry. I -- we'll go back and get you an update, I  
14 apologize.

15 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: So we'd have to get  
16 clarity on that for you. Just I --

17 MS RUTHVEN: Yep, for you Just I...

18 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Which category?

19 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: AP, we have a missing --  
20 we have a couple missing things there, and so --

21 MS RUTHVEN: AP. I think what happened  
22 actually is the "participation" number should be in the  
23 "meets" number and then the "Participation" number is  
24 missing, so I apologize for that.

25 MS. FLORES: Oh.



1 MS RUTHVEN: So let me pick one more that's a  
2 little cleaner, just to try to not confuse you all. So you  
3 did ask specifically about SAT. There's 93 percent  
4 participation in SAT across our state. Currently 65 percent  
5 of all students of the 93 percent that are taking SAT are  
6 meeting the 470 in English, and so that is the new SAT,  
7 right? So that is one of the technical amendment's  
8 recommendations from the work group. So again, in math its  
9 53 percent are meeting 500. Am I -- okay. So here's the  
10 information that you had asked for last.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

12 MS RUTHVEN: You had also asked for local  
13 school district policies, and this also came up with the  
14 panel. We looked at 56 school districts, 37 of them were  
15 rural, so as you heard today; folks are trying to adopt as  
16 much of the menu as they possibly can. 27 of the 56  
17 districts that we took a look at have adopted the entire  
18 menu, and then 29 had adopted a subset of the menu.

19 So the primary things that are not being  
20 adopted are things that folks may not be able to offer, as  
21 you heard today, such as IB, or they may not offer AP  
22 courses, or they may not have put capstone on the  
23 (crosstalk) yet.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Capstone, yeah.

25 MS RUTHVEN: So -- and then Holyoke and



1 Durango are the two that we found out of 56 that have set  
2 "exceed".

3                   Okay, so here's the technical considerations.  
4 These are the items that you have seen before. So the three  
5 items in front of you today for your consideration, if you  
6 choose to vote.

7                   One, that -- the -- the removal of ACT  
8 Compass, because this was discontinued by ACT, and is no  
9 longer available. Accuplacer, the addition of sentence  
10 skills, because this is reflective also of higher education,  
11 so I'll go through that in a little more detail, and then  
12 updating the SAT scores from the old test to the new test.  
13 So these are the three options and where they fall on the  
14 menu that you have in front of you.

15                   And ACT Compass is pretty straightforward,  
16 right? The test no longer exists. Accuplacer; it would be  
17 the addition of sentence skills as an option with English on  
18 the menu. So keep in mind that colleges right now offer  
19 students the opportunity to show that they're ready, not in  
20 remediation, in reading comprehension or sentence skills,  
21 and that these scores, as Senator King has mentioned; the  
22 area aligned with Applied Associates entry requirements. And  
23 then SAT in front of you. So again, as you saw from "not in  
24 need of remediation" chart from higher education; these are  
25 the same scores. It is a different test, and it is directly



1 aligned between the old scores and the new scores. The test  
2 changed, which is what changed the scores.

3                   Okay, so with that, Madam Chair, would you  
4 all like to consider?

5                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, Board Member Goff?

6                   MS. GOFF: I don't -- yes. Back to -- quickly  
7 back to page 8 where the -- oh, that far back? What am I  
8 looking at? The page where the local school district -- yes,  
9 page 8. 56 is what the top adds up to... the top line -- the  
10 top section, 56 districts. We have 178 -- where are the  
11 rest? I mean what -- what's the status? And maybe that's why  
12 I was curious earlier about a target date to have this. I  
13 mean, where are they all, in general?

14                   MS RUTHVEN: So -- yeah, yeah. Absolutely. So  
15 this is a sample of districts that we had an opportunity --  
16 so we didn't have time, because we don't have authority to  
17 collect graduation requirements.

18                   MS. GOFF: Right.

19                   MS RUTHVEN: And so we went to everybody's  
20 website, or asked folks, "What are your graduation  
21 requirements?" and that took some time, and so we haven't  
22 had a chance to check with all 178, so that's --

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a requirement  
24 that it's on the website for each district?

25                   MS. GOFF: Yeah.



1 MS RUTHVEN: It is, but some of them we have  
2 a harder time finding than others, so...

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah. I've looked at  
4 some of the websites. It's a mystery. Board Member Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: Do you foresee any problems  
6 when, in the future, and I think it's this coming year, when  
7 the SAT will be giving ESL students more time to finish  
8 than, say, other kids? Kids who speak a second language,  
9 they will be given more time to finish that test. And I  
10 remember back in the 80s and so on when ETS did work on the  
11 SAT it -- research showed that kids needed a little bit more  
12 time because of English structure. English has these  
13 constructs in sentences where you have -- and I'm --

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Can -- can she answer  
15 the question?

16 MS. FLORES: On --

17 MS RUTHVEN: As far as does SAT allow more  
18 time, is that the question?

19 MS. FLORES: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well, no. It's whether  
21 you expect there to be a difference. Like, isn't that what  
22 you asked?

23 MS. FLORES: No, not a difference.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What'd you ask?

25 MS. FLORES: I -- I'm thinking that there



1 would be kind of people who would say, "Why are they getting  
2 extra time? I mean, this is a standardized test, and why  
3 would ESL kids get extra time?" But the research does show  
4 that they do need extra time. And I was explaining about  
5 sentence structure in English that uses -- and I -- and this  
6 is not grammatical; that uses two negatives and it's very  
7 difficult for Spanish speakers who may be translating to  
8 really get the -- the idea. So it takes a little bit more  
9 time to take that -- a sentence that has a double negative.  
10 And I'm not talking about grammatical, just where it's  
11 negative, to take in. And so the research is there that it  
12 does take more time.

13                   But will there be a blowback to -- to CDE, to  
14 -- just in general from other people, parents, who think  
15 "Well, why are they getting extra time? Isn't a standardized  
16 test a standardized test, and will it be a standardized test  
17 if you're giving some kids more time?" That's the question.

18                   CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Good question.

19                   MS RUTHVEN: Board Member Flores, I don't  
20 think so. I -- and this -- for this purpose is the  
21 graduation guidelines, sort of the score is the score, and  
22 the administration and all of those other things are kind of  
23 a -- a different part of the discussion. But I -- I think we  
24 -- we have all sorts of things on accommodations with our  
25 assessments, and we usually take the recommendations of the



1 assessment. So I don't foresee any blowback. I thank you for  
2 making us aware of that, but for this purposes the score is  
3 the score, so however students are allowed to take the test  
4 to get the score it will be standard for this graduation  
5 requirement.

6 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you. Are we ready  
8 for a motion? Board Member Rankin.

9 MS. RANKIN: I just have one quick question.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, go ahead.

11 MS. RANKIN: What's the remediation rate  
12 right now? I mean, we talk about having students career and  
13 college ready, but when they go to college and they're not  
14 ready, obviously there's just no consequences, so what --  
15 are we changing that from year to year? I mean, is it  
16 getting better?

17 MS RUTHVEN: It actually is, yes. So it's  
18 gone down by 6 percentage points over the last two to three  
19 years, and we anticipate that it -- well, that's one of the  
20 purposes, right, of graduation guidelines, is the  
21 expectation is that will continue to decrease as these ramp  
22 up.

23 MS. RANKIN: So what is it?

24 MS RUTHVEN: It's currently 34 percent.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But they changed it,



1 too, didn't they?

2 MS. RANKIN: No, the latest remediation  
3 report from higher ed, because I don't think I have the most  
4 recent one.

5 MS RUTHVEN: Oh, the sub -- the actual  
6 courses -- so there's -- there's been some language changes.  
7 If -- if you're below a certain level, then it's still  
8 remediation. If you just need a little help in one 100 level  
9 class then it's called Supplemental Academic Instruction, so  
10 it's a technical... yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Board Member Durham, did  
12 you have another question?

13 MR. DURHAM: No, you just rename something  
14 and get less of it. We gotta try that. It's a great  
15 technique.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Did you have a question  
17 or not? Somebody told me you had a question. A giggle's  
18 okay, too, but --

19 MR. DURHAM: Well I did have a question.  
20 What's the status of the -- well, I'll wait for the motion,  
21 then I'll pose the question.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Sure.

23 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Motion please.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She has a question.



1 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Woops. Can we have a  
2 motion and then ask questions, or not?

3 MS. GOFF: I don't know, it's really not  
4 germane to what I think the most --

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Ms. Goff, go ahead.

6 MS. GOFF: I just wanted to say the  
7 Supplemental Academic Instruction is not separate,  
8 necessarily. The whole goal; wasn't it to integrate that in  
9 with current level coursework, so if somebody needs help in  
10 math, or algebra, beginning algebra level, they'll be  
11 getting that support, but it's -- they're still in their  
12 current course level. It's not a separate session,  
13 necessarily. So it -- I understand what you're saying, but  
14 you need to understand what I'm saying. Is that -- it's that  
15 it's put together.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are you saying they  
17 don't pay extra for that supplemental help?

18 MS. GOFF: No that what --

19 MS. MAZANEC: Doesn't cost the student?

20 MS. GOFF: If I'm right the goal of this  
21 going back four or five years, whenever the new policies  
22 were being developed, was to avoid cost, both to student and  
23 to the system, but to speed this along, because it -- a lot  
24 of -- all people really needed in many, many cases was just  
25 a touch base again on a topic, not necessarily a whole



1 reteaching of an entire content area.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Does that happen at no extra  
3 cost?

4 MS RUTHVEN: So I apologize. I -- I know I  
5 answered the question rather quickly. Essentially what's  
6 happening right now in higher education is supplemental  
7 academic instruction is basically additional tutoring that  
8 students would pay for that's combined with a 100-level  
9 class. So the student is getting for credit coursework,  
10 they're paying for that, and they're paying for supplemental  
11 tutoring, basically, which is a less cost than what  
12 remediation would have been previously. If that's helpful in  
13 any way.

14 MR. DURHAM: Well there're two possibilities.  
15 One is that the graduation standards are too low, or I think  
16 the more likely cause is that there is a catastrophic  
17 failure in the admissions policies and the implementation of  
18 those policies in higher education. I don't personally view  
19 this as a problem for K-12. This is a problem created solely  
20 by higher education and their chasing of dollars which  
21 causes them to admit students they should not admit.

22 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Can we get to a motion  
23 by any chance? I'm ready.

24 MS. RANKIN: I move to approve the technical  
25 changes to the Graduation Guidelines Menu of Options and



1 direct staff to bring any future changes as needed, or as  
2 requested, by the board.

3 MS. FLORES: I second that.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Thank you.

5 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So Board Member Rankin  
7 moved to approve the technical changes to the Graduation  
8 Guidelines Menu of Options and direct staff to bring any  
9 future changes as needed or as requested by the board. And  
10 that was seconded by Board Member Flores. Comments,  
11 questions, discussion.

12 MR. DURHAM: Question is what is the status  
13 of the addition of -- keep wanting to use the GED -- high  
14 school equivalency.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's the next --  
16 that's the next topic after we vote on this.

17 MR. DURHAM: Well, if we're going to adopt  
18 these standards shouldn't it be part of this discussion as  
19 to whether or not it should be included in these standards?

20 (Chorus of "yeah", "I agree")

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Well --

22 MR. DURHAM: Because I would -- I would move  
23 to amend the motion to include GED as an option.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I would rather we have a  
25 discussion on that next month, and then we can add it. I



1 believe this motion allows us to add that next month.

2 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, we can always add, so I --  
3 that -- I'm perfectly happy with that.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay.

5 MR. DURHAM: If we come up with it next week.

6 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay. I'd like to hear a  
7 little bit more. I'd like to hear from the business  
8 community about this.

9 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, okay.

10 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: What I asked when we had  
11 the -- the individual discussions with Ms. Ruthven is  
12 districts can add this at their own choice. It does not have  
13 to be on our menu, and after --

14 MR. DURHAM: Right. Well, no. They can't add  
15 -- they can't add something's not on the menu.

16 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh yes, they can.

17 MR. DURHAM: No, no. Oh no, no.

18 MS RUTHVEN: They can't use it for  
19 graduation.

20 MR. DURHAM: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But they had other  
22 graduation requirements. They have the hour requirement.

23 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So then I misunderstood  
25 what you said, because what you -- what I thought you said



1 was a district can choose to do that, just like they add 56  
2 hours, or whatever all else.

3 MS RUTHVEN: So they could add it, but it  
4 wouldn't be the only thing that they could use to show that  
5 a student's ready in math or English. They would still have  
6 to show that they're ready in another area.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: In another area, okay.

8 MR. DURHAM: Yep.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Because I -- I have  
10 serious concerns with -- exactly as expressed there, so I --  
11 I want us to just talk about it.

12 MR. DURHAM: That's fine. I won't make -- I  
13 will not make a motion to...

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, and we will talk  
15 about getting it on the agenda either next month or the  
16 following month, depending on how much we have to do. Board  
17 Member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: I want a refresher on civics,  
19 which is our only state graduation requirement, and where  
20 that fit in here.

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Oh, that's a good  
22 question.

23 MS RUTHVEN: Oh, yes, and I apologize,  
24 though.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Because one -- one of my  
2 concerns is that I -- I don't know how civics is being --  
3 you know, not that I wanna --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's not a graduation  
5 requirement. It's a requirement --

6 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, it is.

7 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: It's a -- it's a  
8 graduation requirement?

9 (Crosstalk)

10 MS. MAZANEC: It's the only requirement the  
11 state has.

12 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, I just thought it  
13 was required to be taught, not learned.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. So, and I would like --

15 (Laughter]

16 MR. DURHAM: I think you're right.

17 MS. MAZANEC: but I would like to, you know,  
18 I talked with Dr. Anthes about this. I would like to see a  
19 little more discussion on this about what this looks like in  
20 the various districts and, yeah, whether -- whether we are  
21 meeting the intent of the requirement.

22 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: I would too, yep.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So I think that one of  
24 the things you've heard from some of us is that we actually  
25 wanna see the landscape, and I'm -- I think I'm recognizing



1 that's gonna be a lot of work.

2 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: It'll take us a while.

3 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: But I don't --

4 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: We can try.

5 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah. I don't think our  
6 comfort levels can be very high without that. Because we  
7 hear, or I -- I think we all hear anecdotal stuff, some of  
8 which is correct, some of which is downright incorrect, and  
9 for us to get sort of a picture of the landscape of -- based  
10 on a local control, what decisions are being made by  
11 districts, so that I can say with some comfort to a business  
12 person, "Here's roughly how this is working across the  
13 state. Here's where you look for the information regarding a  
14 hire that you wanna make of a graduate -- Colorado  
15 graduate." Goes back to that question "What does it mean to  
16 be a Colorado graduate, high school graduate?" And I think  
17 it's something that we oughta have some way of answering.  
18 Please. Doable, what do you think?

19 COMMISSIONER ANTHERS: We'll give it our best  
20 shot.

21 MS. CORDIAL: . Does anybody wanna vote?

22 MR. DURHAM: (indiscernible) the previous  
23 question.

24 MS RUTHVEN: Please.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.



1 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

3 MS. FLORES: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

5 MS. GOFF: Yes.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

9 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

11 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Passes unanimously.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So we wanna talk about

16 GED and we wanna talk about Civics. Anything else,

17 colleagues, that you'd like to have added either next month,

18 or the following month? I'm -- I'm a little blank on what

19 the draft is for next month already. Yes.

20 MS. FLORES: Teaching of science and --

21 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's not a -- no,

22 that's not a graduation -- we're talking about the

23 graduation guidelines.

24 MS. FLORES: Okay.

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Please.



1 MS. FLORES: But could we --

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: That's another topic.

3 MS. FLORES: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I'm looking forward to  
5 the response from the assessment folks about where we are on  
6 science, and then I think it's a very appropriate topic once  
7 we know what that looks like across the state.

8 MS. FLORES: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Ms. Goff.

10 MS. GOFF: How -- is there a -- is there a  
11 end-time point where we really oughta be done talking about  
12 this right now? I mean, we've got districts in the middle of  
13 doing this four-year thing for kids who are gonna be  
14 graduating.

15 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Are they in the middle,  
16 or are they done? I'm a little confused about that.

17 MS. GOFF: Well that's kinda where I was  
18 trying to figure out if is there a even unspoken deadline to  
19 have --

20 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yeah.

21 MS. GOFF: For districts to have this wrapped  
22 up for now before we have -- the other thing I'm thinking  
23 we're gonna talk about at some point is are we gonna do this  
24 every two years, or are we gonna change this --

25 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: We just voted -- we just



1 voted different. We just said --

2 MS. GOFF: Well, okay, now we know that, but  
3 the longer we go into this --

4 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Staff relate any future  
5 changes as needed or requested, instead of two years.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Wasn't it supposed to be for  
7 the graduating class of 2021?

8 MS RUTHVEN: Correct, yes.

9 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Yes, so they needed to  
10 be done as of August of this year, so they could tell their  
11 incoming freshman what they're --

12 MS RUTHVEN: Right, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: So this should be  
14 findable information.

15 MS RUTHVEN: Yes, so one of -- one of the  
16 things that we could bring forward to you are things that  
17 we've heard from districts as far as if you do choose to  
18 consider an addition, like high school equivalency, is that  
19 you could direct staff to do a pilot with a few districts  
20 and bring back those results to you. Obviously certainly not  
21 adopt it, adopt it on the menu, and then districts can  
22 choose if they want to add it or not, certainly.

23 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Okay, but they don't  
24 have to add it, yeah. Ms. Goff, are you okay?

25 MS. GOFF: Yeah. I'm finished for now. I'm



1 not finished, but I'm done for now.

2 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: I believe we're going to  
3 go into exec session? Please.

4 MS. CORDIAL: An Executive Session has been  
5 noticed for today's State Board meeting pursuant to  
6 2564023BICRS concerning the evaluation of the State Board of  
7 Education employee who requested that the matter be  
8 addressed in an executive session.

9 MS. RANKIN: I move.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you, Board Member Rankin.

11 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Have a second -- oh, I  
12 don't need a second, right?

13 MS. CORDIAL: Nope, don't need a second.

14 CHAIRMAN SCHROEDER: Anybody opposed? Lunch.

15 (Whereas, the meeting was adjourned for lunch;  
16 continuation contained in Part 2)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 STATE OF TEXAS )

3 COUNTY OF TRAVIS )

4 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and  
5 Notary in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that  
6 the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

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

12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
13 and seal this 5th day of October, 2018.

14

15 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

16 Kimberly C. McCright

17 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

18

19 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

20 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

21 Houston, Texas 77058

22 281.724.8600

23

24

25