



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
January 31, 2014

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on January 31, 2014,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board

Members:

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



1 MS. MARKEL: Today is Friday, January 31st,
2 2014. This is the State Board of Education Special
3 Meeting, Legislative Update, commencing at noon.

4 MS. MELLO: In addition, where we had to
5 evaluate and do all the accountability work we do for
6 online programs within a school, which is never an
7 (indiscernible) task, and it was just an oversight in how
8 the legislation was drafted.

9 So the second piece got a little bit more
10 tricky. Currently, it's very clear under state law that
11 for districts that are in the two highest accreditation
12 categories, we can automatically do their accreditation.

13 The statute is silent as to how to handle
14 the other three categories of districts. The department
15 has been handling a middle category, the -- Keith, help
16 me here?

17 MR. OWEN: Improvement.

18 MS. MELLO: The Improvement category, the
19 same way they've been handling the other -- the two
20 highest categories.

21 And -- and there's a lot of sense to that
22 from what I've learned because, under state law, their
23 accreditation is not as risk as a result of being this
24 category. So to require them to go through extra steps



1 to get that accreditation, I mean, to us it just seems
2 kind of silly.

3 However, it got a little tricky on the House
4 floor. So the bill came out of the House on a straight
5 party-line vote, with all the Democrats voting for it and
6 all the Republicans voting against it.

7 We have worked out a compromise that will be
8 (indiscernible) committee next week by Senator Johnston,
9 who is our Senate sponsor, and we're going to remove the
10 language around the automatic accreditation for
11 Improvement districts. And everybody has kind of signed
12 on that as a compromise, so I hope that the bill will go
13 back to this new (indiscernible) we have in the first
14 place.

15 Now, normally I would not spend near this
16 much time talking to you about such a small little
17 technical bill, but since it's coming from the
18 department, I thought it was important that you all know
19 about that.

20 And I -- I believe -- help me, leg.
21 contacts, but that you had -- you all were recommending a
22 support position in this bill?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct. But
24 can you explain --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, at this stage,



1 wouldn't it make more sense just to wait until next week
2 when we get to see the new bill, to just continue to
3 monitor until it's -- the approval is given for the new
4 (indiscernible)?

5 MS. MELLO: Well, I mean, it's -- it's
6 obviously always in your discretion.

7 I can tell you -- I mean, I know in writing
8 the amendment and I know the amendment is going to go on,
9 but -- so we can do it either way.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can you just explain
11 to us, Jennifer or anybody else, what are the
12 implications of taking out that language, automatic --

13 MS. MELLO: The implication is that the
14 department won't be able to automatically accredit those
15 Priority -- excuse me -- the Improvement districts the
16 way that they've been doing, and I should probably just
17 be quiet and let Keith speak to --

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Keith, go ahead.

19 MS. MELLO: -- the plan for how to deal with
20 that.

21 MR. OWEN: So this is -- this is really --
22 this was the result of OLS going through it, letting us
23 know that the practice wasn't meeting what the statute
24 they felt required and the rules that we have
25 established, and so what this would do, if we go forward



1 with what Jennifer just recommended, would be that we
2 would have to go through the process, just like we do for
3 Priority Improvement and Turnaround school districts
4 every year. They have to submit their accreditation
5 contract signed by the board chair and the
6 superintendent. Improvement school districts would have
7 to do the same thing.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And they're not --
9 they've not been doing that now, but you -- but that was
10 just an oversight on the part of the legislation, right?

11 MR. OWEN: It was -- I'm sorry. I don't
12 know if I need to ask anybody permission to talk, but --

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

14 MR. OWEN: Okay. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

15 The -- the department read -- because the
16 statute was silent on Improvement school districts, we
17 locked them in with the Performance school districts and
18 districts that are accredited with Distinction. That's
19 been the past practice. So they've been automatically
20 accredited from year to year. They didn't have to go
21 through the process of signing each year, like the
22 Priority Improvement and Turnaround school districts do.

23 OLS felt like that was a reach, and so the
24 language that we were proposing would align the practice
25 with -- the statute with the practice, and so if we



1 remove that language, we will just have to treat them
2 like we did the Priority Improvement and Turnaround
3 school districts, which is an annual signature from the
4 superintendent and the board chair of the whole school
5 district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's all? I
7 mean, is that the extent of the burden?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's it.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just the signatures?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that --

11 MR. OWEN: And some collection on our part
12 of the forms and categorizing. But I think it's -- it's
13 not a huge issue, one way or the other.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when you said a
15 compromise was reached, who was the compromise reached
16 with?

17 MS. MELLO: So I went to our House sponsor
18 first to see what her -- you know, since she was the one
19 who offered the bill as introduced on the House floor
20 quite strongly, talked to her about what -- you know,
21 some ideas we had about how we can resolve it.

22 She finally just said wouldn't it be easier
23 just to take it out, and I said, well, yes, if that's
24 okay with you.

25 So then I went to Jim Wilson, who was the



1 House Republican member, who led kind of the opposition
2 to that and said if we too it out, would your opposition
3 go away, and he said yes. And then I went to Senator
4 Johnston, who is our Senate sponsor, to ask if he was
5 okay with it, and he said yes. So those are the people
6 that I have, I guess, negotiated with.

7 ROBERT: From our -- this is Robert. From
8 our standpoint, we would encourage you to support this
9 because, I mean, when it comes to our bill or something
10 like this, it doesn't behoove us to have one side
11 completely negated.

12 I mean, if we -- we want to support both
13 sides, and with this amendment -- and we can work with
14 this. It never was intended to be that way. So I think
15 we -- we have that balance now.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, thank you,
17 Jennifer, for the clarification because I -- I had
18 wondered what the division was, and if doing this thing
19 fixes it for them, I would go ahead and make a motion
20 that we support the bill.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we need to take a
23 vote?

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other -- any other
25 discussion on that?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nope.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Well, my
3 (indiscernible) is -- it sounds like -- and, again, I am
4 doubly disadvantaged of not being in the room and hearing
5 95 percent of what's going on in a conversation, not
6 actually getting everything, but I'm a little bit
7 uncomfortable with -- with the fact we don't have
8 conclusive agreement to the modified language.

9 I'm willing to not object to the motion and
10 just put the motion, with the understanding we obviously
11 continue to work and make sure we have broad support or
12 maybe we seek unanimous support from both parties within
13 the legislature. And it just sounds like we're on track
14 for that, but I just want to make sure we're still moving
15 that way.

16 MS. MELLO: This is Jennifer.

17 Absolutely. And I -- I don't anticipate
18 problems. I mean, I think we're essentially doing what
19 they wanted us to do, so --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can't -- can't
21 underestimate.

22 MS. MELLO: But you're right. I can't -- I
23 don't have votes or anything like that --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

25 MS. MELLO: -- that I can show you yet.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably not -- who
2 knows? I mean, you'd like unanimous support, but at
3 least broad support, I think we'd feel good about that
4 and agree with that.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So, with that
6 footnote, if there's no objection or -- if there's no
7 objection on the motion to support this legislation, it
8 carries.

9 Do I hear objection?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you like me to
11 call the roll?

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Let's just do that
13 since we're on the phone. It makes -- it makes it easier
14 that way.

15 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Berman.

16 MS. BERMAN: Aye.

17 MS. MARKEL: Angelika Schroeder.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.

19 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

20 MS. NEAL: Aye.

21 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

23 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Aye.

25 MS. MARKEL: Debora Scheffel.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Debora Scheffel fell off.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just say "aye," Deb.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could I -- I was about to ask
4 a question when I fell off. Could I ask a question, or
5 is it too late?

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, it's not. Given
7 telephonic challenges we have, we'll kind of suspend the
8 rules here. Go ahead and ask your question.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I'm just trying to get
10 on board with what actually we're voting on. If what
11 we're saying is that we want to treat districts that are
12 not in the category of improvement, the same as those
13 that are and asking everyone to submit a yearly something
14 signed by the board and the superintendent for the
15 district, is that right?

16 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Keith.

18 MR. OWEN: Not exactly, Dr. Scheffel. It's
19 basically having the department have the school districts
20 that are rated, accredited with the rating of Improvement
21 will have to have their board chair and board and
22 superintendent sign off on their accreditation contract
23 annually, like we do in Priority Improvement and
24 Turnaround school districts.

25 So performance --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I see. Okay.

2 MR. OWEN: Performance and Distinction
3 continue on the way they always have.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. And the purpose of
5 this is what? To kind of draw -- making sure that the
6 board chair and that the superintendent, that their
7 attention is drawn to the fact that they are in this
8 category and that they need to keep vigilant about
9 getting out of this category, or what is the intent
10 behind it?

11 MS. MELLO: Dr. Scheffel, I think -- this is
12 Jennifer Mello. I think that is -- that was why people
13 expressed an opposition to the legislation as drafted.
14 It's essentially they thought that these districts should
15 have to go through an extra hoop.

16 Our original proposal was to have them not
17 go through that hoop since by law, we have no authority
18 to revoke their accreditation. So, to us, it seemed like
19 kind of an unnecessary extra bit of paperwork, but the
20 folks at the capitol -- many of the folks at the capitol,
21 certainly not all, made it quite clear that they
22 disagreed with that context.

23 And so for a variety of reasons, we're going
24 to strike that language, which will mean -- I believe
25 will mean most will have pretty good support at the



1 capitol from both parties.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how much of a burden does
3 it place on the district? I mean, you're saying it's
4 more procedural than it is, you know, time consuming?

5 MR. OWEN: Districts that are rated in the
6 Improvement category annually will have to have their
7 board chair and the superintendent sign off on their
8 accreditation contract, so that's -- that's the burden at
9 the local level.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: But they already have the
11 contract, so it's a matter of signing it or developing
12 it?

13 MR. OWEN: Yeah. Right now, the school
14 districts that are rated Performance and Distinction are
15 automatically renewed each year as long as they stay in
16 that category. So this would require the Improvement
17 school districts to follow the procedure that the
18 Priority Improvement and Turnaround districts follow.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

20 And what was the Republicans' problem with
21 it that now has dissipated because of a change? What was
22 -- can you re-create that, Jennifer, real quick? I'm
23 sorry.

24 MS. MELLO: Of course. The Republicans
25 thought the districts who were called Improvement



1 districts should have to go through this extra little bit
2 of work, that they shouldn't get their accreditation
3 automatically renewed.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I see. Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, then with those
6 clarifications, we can continue with the roll call. The
7 motion before us is to support this bill as amended
8 seeking obviously broad support.

9 MS. MARKEL: Debora Scheffel.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

11 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

12 MS. GOFF: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. The motion
14 carries.

15 Next item.

16 MS. MELLO: So the next item -- and I guess
17 I'm not sure many of you actually saw the agenda, so it
18 doesn't matter that the bill never wasn't on the agenda.

19 When we -- when we sent the agenda, this
20 bill had yet to be completed. It has now been
21 introduced, and it's House Bill 11-82 is what we're going
22 to talk about next.

23 This again is a bill that the department has
24 asked -- has been working with the legislature on, and I
25 know that Elliott and Keith and all those folks have been



1 talking to you all extensively about this issue of how do
2 we deal with this kind of gap in data when we make the
3 transition to the new test. How do we deal with that in
4 our accountability system, which is so heavily reliant on
5 comparing one year to the next?

6 So -- and I have to tell you I -- it's just
7 my opinion that the staff did a really amazing job of
8 crafting a proposal that really was sensitive to all the
9 different concerns being expressed. It went through a
10 couple different iterations throughout the fall. That
11 I'm -- I'm really proud of kind of where we landed.

12 And what the bill says is that -- so for
13 this period of time, this year, where we're transitioning
14 from one test to the next, the department is going to
15 give every district a two-year rating. So, essentially,
16 you get the same rating for two years.

17 But if the district feels like that's really
18 unfair, that there's some -- that they -- that that's
19 just not right, they can bring some additional evidence
20 to the table that you all can consider and perhaps adjust
21 their rating.

22 So the example I've been giving that I think
23 has helped legislatures to understand is let's say we had
24 a district that's Priority Improvement and, you know,
25 they kind of are getting assigned that label for two



1 years. And let's say that district does really, really
2 well on the new tests. Well, that might be a good source
3 of evidence and data that the department might want to
4 consider and say -- I don't know -- maybe they're --
5 maybe they worked their way out of Priority Improvement.

6 So it just gives a little more flexibility
7 to the board and to you, staff, to consider those and
8 understand those.

9 The second thing the bill does is -- right
10 now, under the law, you guys have flexibility, a little
11 bit of flexibility of what to do with districts when they
12 reach the end of the five-year clock. There's certain
13 actions specified in the law, but then there's a little
14 flexibility.

15 You don't have that same flexibility for
16 schools. For this one year, for any school that has been
17 in the five-year clock in that one year, we're proposing
18 to give you all that little flexibility.

19 All of these changes were created with the
20 goal of preserving the integrity of the accountability
21 system. As we get to a place where we have districts and
22 schools getting to the end of the clock, this is going to
23 get -- it's going to be hard. I think it's going to be a
24 hard couple of years coming out of the accountability
25 system because it's really -- we're getting to the -- to



1 the end of the clock, and people are going to be upset
2 about that.

3 So preserving these (indiscernible), making
4 sure people have (indiscernible) system, making sure
5 people think the system is fair is a really important
6 goal, and at the same time we are doing that, we've got
7 nobody -- there's no freezing of the clock. There's no
8 timeout of the clock. There's none of that. So we're
9 not taking away the accountability, but we are enhancing
10 I think the perceived level of fairness of -- in the
11 system.

12 So that's what the bill does. It just got
13 introduced I think on Wednesday. I've kind of lost track
14 of my days because this is a new day today, and I'm
15 confused. But it's just been introduced in the last
16 couple of days. Millie Hamner is the House sponsor.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who else has signed
18 onto this bill?

19 MS. MELLO: There's nobody else signed onto
20 it. Well, I haven't asked -- well, I haven't asked for
21 anybody else to sign onto it. It's not as if I've asked
22 and was told no.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No one said no yet.

24 MS. MELLO: Right.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we expect wide



1 support for the bill?

2 MS. MELLO: I am hopeful for widespread
3 support. I think we should have widespread support. I
4 think it's an election year at the capitol, and things
5 are difficult. And this touches on a very sensitive
6 topic for a lot of people. So I don't know. The honest
7 answer (indiscernible).

8 ROBERT: I think that -- this is Robert.

9 The issue comes down to this. Without this
10 bill, there will be a timeout and a counter-bill, and
11 that's what Jennifer is alluding to in the sensitivity.

12 And we believe, as we've talked to you
13 before -- we've worked out a way. There is no timeout,
14 and that we continue forth with accountability system.

15 As we've talked with the chair this week,
16 it's a challenge to understand, but we really need your
17 support on this because we've talked to you several times
18 about this. And this is a compromise -- really, it's not
19 a compromise. We've gotten to a really good place of
20 what we know and we can do.

21 Keith?

22 MR. OWEN: Yeah. I might just add to
23 Jennifer's summary of that -- this is Keith Owen -- that
24 we've worked widely with the advocacy and reform groups
25 to help -- have them help draft and really push this in a



1 way that we think they felt good about.

2 We also worked widely with our -- Senate
3 Bill 16 -- superintendent's advisory group on this
4 concept and also the case with CASB, and all of those
5 groups, I think, have given us a lot of good feedback and
6 really feel like we -- we captured the right flexibility
7 during this transition period. So it was -- I think we
8 have pretty widespread support among all those
9 stakeholders.

10 MS. NEAL: Robert?

11 ROBERT: Yes.

12 MS. NEAL: Hi. This is Marcia.

13 I just wanted to double check that I got
14 this right. So what this does, we all know that there
15 will probably be, you know, a change because it will be a
16 new system. But this is giving those districts that
17 really have improved, but it doesn't show. It's giving
18 them a way to justify their improvements? Is that what
19 you're saying?

20 ROBERT: Right.

21 MS. NEAL: I mean, if somebody wants to end
22 up -- (indiscernible) -- And according to the new scale,
23 they would still be there, but you wouldn't -- this would
24 give you the ability to judge some of those districts or
25 those districts individually. Is that what you're



1 saying?

2 ROBERT: That's correct.

3 And without that, they basically get a hold
4 harmless here, which is not the intent.

5 MS. NEAL: Yeah. Okay.

6 Now it makes sense to me. I know it's going
7 to be a difficult time.

8 ROBERT: Yes.

9 MS. MELLO: Sorry, Marcia. This is
10 Jennifer.

11 I mean, I think this is a place where as the
12 board, you have an opportunity to show some leadership
13 here. I mean, I think if you do decide to support it,
14 that's a -- that's something that could help at the
15 capitol to try to get people to really look at the facts
16 and decide about this bill, based just on the facts of
17 the bill as opposed to other kind of electoral, political
18 considerations.

19 MS. NEAL: Yeah. That makes sense to me.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Makes sense to me too.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. So the
22 question I have, I'm trying to understand, since -- since
23 a one-year -- since you get a two-year rating based on
24 your previous year's activity, why is that not making the
25 current-year status completely irrelevant, except in the



1 cases where somebody wants to gain benefit from it? I'm
2 having trouble understanding that.

3 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, this is Keith Owen
4 again.

5 So one of the things we didn't hit on that
6 we've talked to everybody about as well is that during
7 the first administration of the new assessments, there is
8 going to be a substantial delay in the information coming
9 back to the state and also getting back to the districts,
10 just on the achievement side.

11 So, normally, we get information back on our
12 assessments, July, get that information out to districts
13 in August. We're anticipating in this transition year
14 that that could get close to October, November because of
15 the standard setting that needs to take place.

16 After we get standard setting done, then for
17 our system of accountability, we have to run growth.
18 Correlating growth between these two tests is something
19 we think can be done, but making sense out of it and also
20 helping districts understand it and making it relevant to
21 them, that's going to take even more time.

22 Then pushing that into our current
23 frameworks, that new growth, the achievement data that we
24 have, and postsecondary information that we have, without
25 adequate growth during this transition year makes that



1 even more complex.

2 So the long -- I guess to cut this to a
3 shorter story of a long story, that whole piece will be
4 delayed. The normal SPF/DPF process to school districts
5 typically gets to them in August, and then they're
6 finalized in November and December.

7 In this situation, we could be looking at
8 January and February, and that's going to be a
9 transitional SPF/DPF during that time frame. And with
10 that information being transitional, we thought letting
11 districts use prior year and then getting their
12 transitional information and looking through it, making
13 sense out of that, they could then come to us and justify
14 why that rating has changed once they get their
15 transitional SPF and DPF.

16 So that's kind of why that's going to take
17 such a long time that year to get everything out, why we
18 felt like it would be good to use the prior year, and
19 that prior year will be a default. And then they can
20 make a case as to why it should be adjusted based on the
21 transitional coming later in the year.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

23 I kind of missed a turn somewhere. I was
24 under the impression we were going to be able to
25 calibrate the TCAP data to the new data, and explain to



1 me why that's not in fact a possibility.

2 MR. OWEN: So we will be able to do that,
3 and we will be able to run growth for the transition
4 between the current TCAP and PARCC, but that's going to
5 be exaggerated in the timeline when it gets out to
6 districts and when we are able to utilize it in our
7 system.

8 A key component, though, Paul, that will be
9 lost, which you can't run, is adequate growth. You can't
10 run adequate growth between two different tests because
11 it's predictive. You have to be able to have two
12 administrations of the same assessment to be able to run
13 adequate growth and preferably three years of the same
14 assessment. We can do it, we think, with two years of
15 administration of the new assessment.

16 So that component will be missing, no matter
17 what we do during that transition year, but median growth
18 will be available. We'll use it. We'll run a
19 transitional SPF and DPF for all the districts during
20 that year. So the information will be there. They'll
21 get it.

22 The achievement will be public. That will
23 be released for all the schools and districts in the
24 state, but it's the accreditation process, the SPF and
25 DPF, that will be different during that transition year.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But the achievement data
2 will be available?

3 MR. OWEN: Absolutely. We'll get the
4 achievement data. That's something that we think will
5 probably be released publicly, potentially October,
6 November, during that year.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Other questions?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Obviously, I've got a
10 little bit of heartburn with this, but other questions?

11 MS. GOFF: Yes, I do. This is Jane.

12 Thanks.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 MS. GOFF: The review for -- or the request
15 for review process, does that stay the same? So folks
16 (indiscernible) they would -- if they feel they have
17 evidence enough to change their ratings upwards, I
18 assume, that they would go to the review panel and then
19 follow that process? And (indiscernible) until we have a
20 decision-making spot in that? I mean that --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a great
22 question, yes. The request for review process.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Repeat the question.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can someone repeat that
25 question? I cannot understand it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Do you want me
2 to take a shot at it?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was cutting out.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think what --

5 MS. GOFF: I'll try.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, go ahead.

7 MS. GOFF: My question was -- is as
8 districts want to request a review of their rating, would
9 the process for that be the same as it has been, going
10 through make the request through CE and the review panel
11 has the role in reviewing that request and determining if
12 indeed the change is warranted, and then does it come
13 back to the board based on the department's
14 recommendation for change?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the request for
16 reconsideration process will certainly be available
17 again, even in the transition period. It's actually
18 called out in this bill as a component of our ability to
19 help districts get the most precise rating for their
20 schools for the district.

21 And so we -- we anticipate that we'll
22 actually have more of a response to that request for
23 reconsideration process. They'll have to gear up for
24 more districts wanting to utilize that, more schools
25 wanting to utilize it, and so we might have to



1 potentially staff up temporarily some additional supports
2 for the team to be able to do that.

3 But, yes, for districts, they'll go through
4 the process. The commissioner decides that. If they
5 don't like that final rating, if he accepts or rejects
6 their recommendation, then they can appeal to the state
7 board. The process for schools will go through, again,
8 request for reconsideration. Ultimately, the state board
9 decides whether to accept or reject those requests for
10 consideration.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want me to make
13 a motion, Paul?

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move that the State
16 Board of Education support Bill 11-82, given that it was
17 initiated by the department, and we support the concepts.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second it.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible), call the
21 roll, please.

22 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

23 MS. BERMAN: Aye.

24 MS. MARKEL: Angelika Schroeder.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.



1 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

2 MS. NEAL: Aye.

3 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

5 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No. I still am trying to
7 digest it, so for now, I'll just say no.

8 MS. MARKEL: Debora Scheffel.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is Debora gone again?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I'm here. Sorry. I was
11 on mute.

12 No.

13 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Motion carries.

16 Next item.

17 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, could I interject a
18 bit? Several people, including you, have said they are -
19 - we are in pretty much of a hurry, and we -- we've now
20 used up half of our time.

21 So -- and I don't know, Jennifer, exactly
22 what else you want to bring up, but unless it's
23 something, what they really need, as to support or
24 oppose, I would suggest that we look at -- if it's
25 applicable that we look at just monitoring or something,



1 so that we don't spend 15 minutes on each bill.

2 How many more bills do we have, Jennifer?

3 MS. MELLO: Marcia, we just have one more
4 bill, and then we -- we're just going to talk briefly
5 about the Meeker, DeBeque, Pawnee situation and what's
6 happening with that, so even --

7 MS. NEAL: Oh, okay. Well, then we're in
8 good shape.

9 MS. MELLO: Yeah.

10 MS. NEAL: I thought, you know, having not
11 seen the agenda, I thought if we had four or five more
12 bills, we would be here all afternoon. So that should be
13 fine. I'd suggest we just move ahead.

14 MS. MELLO: So let's talk about the Meeker,
15 DeBeque, Pawnee situation. I believe you're all aware in
16 general of what's going on.

17 The Joint Budget Committee has spent a fair
18 amount of time in the last week or so thinking about
19 this, deciding what to do, but I'm going to let Leanne
20 actually explain to you because school finance stuff gets
21 tricky. And I don't want to say the wrong thing and mess
22 it up. So Leanne has agreed to be here to explain how
23 the legislature is intending to address the situation.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think she needs a
25 mic, and tell us what the issues are.



1 MS. EMM: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I'll go
2 ahead.

3 The Meeker, Pawnee, and DeBeque situation is
4 a result of declining property tax values within those
5 particular districts.

6 The way the School Finance Act formula works
7 is that when you look at the -- when we look at the state
8 share of the formula versus the local share of the
9 formula, these particular districts are funded mainly, if
10 not all, by local shares of their property tax. So,
11 basically, their total formula funding is through their
12 local share.

13 Now, what has happened is that when the
14 actual assessed values came in, the property tax values
15 declined significantly in those districts, which then
16 caused less local share to be available and then some of
17 -- some state monies were kicked in at that point in time
18 to basically fund the entire formula.

19 However, since we have the negative factor
20 in place, the negative factor, when it was applied to the
21 district's formula funding, it is a -- it is taken away
22 from the state share piece. So entire year, they didn't
23 have any state share money that -- that could be cut.

24 So this year, with the decline in property
25 tax values and their (indiscernible) and increase in



1 state share, that amount was available to cut and through
2 the negative factor, and they basically went from having
3 zero negative factor to over 15 percent, causing a
4 dramatic decline in per-pupil revenues.

5 Any questions so far?

6 MS. BERMAN: Why do they never have any
7 state share?

8 MS. EMM: The question posed by Ms. Gantz
9 Berman was why did they not have any state share.

10 Because their property values were so high
11 in those particular districts, they were able to raise
12 all of their formula funding via local share.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So about seven
14 districts like that, seven or eight districts like that.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have a lot of --
16 quite a few districts that don't take any state share,
17 don't we, Leanne?

18 MS. EMM: We have about seven right now.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

20 MS. EMM: We have seven districts right now
21 that receive little to no state share, and then so if
22 their property tax values decline, then the state kicks
23 in some of that formula.

24 MS. BERMAN: No, I understand that. I guess
25 I thought what goes on in those communities that they're



1 --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mining and --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mining. Elaine,
4 mining, which we are cutting back on.

5 MS. BERMAN: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wrote an editorial
7 about it. I'll send it to you.

8 MS. BERMAN: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. EMM: So given that this was a midyear
10 impact to the districts because we don't receive the
11 assessed values until December, there was a midyear
12 decline in these districts' funding.

13 The Joint Budget Committee looked at the
14 situation because the department has no way of just
15 putting money into districts' formula. We don't have the
16 authority to do that.

17 So it took legislative action -- it will
18 take legislative action in order to help these districts
19 out. The way they are looking at doing this is to
20 appropriate enough into the department's contingency
21 reserve fund so that the districts can basically apply
22 for these funds under the guidelines established by the
23 department. It will be just a very simple process that
24 would come in front of the state board to allocate these
25 funds to the districts. And that appropriations will be



1 equal to the amount of per -- to get them back to the
2 original per-pupil funding amount that was originally
3 appropriated through the School Finance Act.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And as I understand it,
5 Leanne, the other districts have gradually adjusted their
6 budgets every year, but because these districts have not
7 been getting state money, it was a big cut for them.
8 That the other -- you know, much more so. They didn't
9 have the gradual decrease that the other ones did. Is
10 that correct?

11 MS. EMM: Yes. That is absolutely correct.

12 MS. MELLO: So this is Jennifer.

13 So we're in a little bit of a pickle here
14 because the legislature is going to move a bill on this,
15 but they haven't introduced it yet. They're moving it as
16 part of the supplemental budget package, which means it
17 will move very fast and may well be done by the time you
18 meet again.

19 So we have -- there's two ways, at least
20 that I thought of, you guys could choose to address this,
21 if you want to. You could vote to support a bill you
22 haven't seen that has been described to you. I get
23 nervous about that, quite honestly, because you never
24 know what can happen.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We won't be doing that.



1 MS. MELLO: So then what I would recommend,
2 to the extent you all feel like you want to weigh in on
3 this issue while it's actually an issue, perhaps the
4 board would consider writing sort of a letter saying we
5 support legislative action to address the needs these
6 districts have raised or -- I mean, we can work on the
7 wording, but that would be a way to have a voice in the
8 conversation before the bill is done and not
9 (indiscernible).

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And as you can imagine,
11 Jennifer, I would be very highly in favor of that action.
12 I mean, DeBeque was looking at a kind of \$2,000 per
13 student, and they only have 100 students, so it was
14 really drastic there for both of them. And I -- I
15 certainly support it. I understand the difficulties of
16 supporting a bill before it's written, but I think a
17 letter would be a good alternative.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So I'm going to take the
19 lead from the vice chair and the member of the
20 Legislative Liaison team to suggest we do exactly that.

21 To the extent that the school finance
22 formula is so byzantine and layered that when situations
23 change, it couldn't possibly have been envisioned and
24 create these kinds of issues that generated an extreme
25 hardship for a school, we need to be able to take action.



1 I think we're supportive of the direction the JBC is
2 headed, and we can craft a letter and circulate it to the
3 Board to make sure everybody is comfortable with that.

4 Does that sound good to my colleagues?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sounds good to me.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sounds good.

8 MS. MELLO: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine and Angelika, do
10 you want to give any feedback on that? Are you okay with
11 that?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it's fine.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, okay.

15 All right. So -- so let's do that.

16 Thank you for bringing this to our
17 attention, Jennifer, and understanding the speed with
18 which it's going to move. We're just not in the business
19 of supporting things we haven't seen yet, so we'll give
20 our feedback to the conversation in the discussion.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would also say that
22 when the bill does come in, if you could send that around
23 to us and even if it is between meetings, I think that
24 would be a quick one we could take a consensus on and
25 actually then provide the support decision hopefully for



1 the bill, so to do both, both the letter and the support
2 of the bill when the bill comes.

3 MS. MELLO: Well, we can certainly remit a
4 letter, and when the bill comes out, we can distribute
5 it. And then if you all want to take some action, that's
6 your prerogative.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Very good, very good.

9 MS. MELLO: Okay. So --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Next item.

11 MS. MELLO: The next item is Senate Bill
12 136. The title is Delay Statewide Testing for the Study
13 of Academic Standards. The bill has been introduced by
14 Senator Vicki Marble.

15 I think you all are pretty aware of this --
16 the content. That you all knew this bill was coming, I
17 should say. So I want to just kind of briefly touch on
18 what the bill actually does. It delays --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Give us (indiscernible)
20 first.

21 MS. MELLO: What?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wait. I had a
23 question. I just wondered if your -- your description
24 would include a fiscal note.

25 MS. MELLO: The fiscal note has not -- it



1 hasn't been produced yet.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. That's what I
3 was curious -- thank you.

4 MS. MELLO: I mean, I --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

6 MS. MELLO: Okay.

7 The bill has been assigned to the Senate
8 Education Committee, but I don't believe the date for the
9 hearing has been set yet. So that's what got us.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And can you tell us who
11 the sponsors are besides Marble, and is it bipartisan?

12 MS. MELLO: It is not bipartisan.

13 There are -- let's see -- 10 Republicans in
14 the Senate in addition to Senator Marble on the bill.
15 Representative Lori Saine is the sponsor in the House,
16 and there are five additional House Republicans.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So we'll talk
18 about the likelihood --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- of it getting out of
21 the Senate and committee when you finish.

22 MS. MELLO: So the bill delay is by year.
23 The inventory is for the new statewide assessment is in
24 English, Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social
25 Studies. It creates the Colorado Academic Standards Task



1 Force to study the implementation of the new academic
2 standards that were adopted by the State Board of Ed,
3 including the standards of English and Math, commonly
4 called the Common Core standards.

5 That sentence really bothers me, but --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, they're not
7 commonly called the Common Core standards.

8 Keep going.

9 MS. MELLO: The task force consists the
10 chairman of the state board, who is the chair of the task
11 force; members selected by the chairman of the state
12 board, including members of the state board, parents, and
13 postsecondary-, secondary-, and elementary-grade
14 teachers; and members of the legislature.

15 The task force has to hold public meetings
16 throughout the state and submit recommendations by
17 December 15, 2015. Testing cannot resume until the
18 legislature and the state board have had a chance to
19 consider those recommendations.

20 Forgive me. I just am going to make sure I
21 hit all of the salient points.

22 Oh, this is also important. The department
23 must ensure that statewide assessments that can be
24 completed using paper and pencil are available to public
25 schools until the General Assembly and the state board



1 have a chance to act on the recommendations as well.

2 Finally, the bill directs the department to
3 contract with an independent entity to conduct a cost-
4 benefit analysis of implementing and assessing the new
5 Colorado academic standards. The analysis must be
6 completed within six months after the bill passes.

7 So that's a summary of what the legislation
8 does. I'll turn it over to your leg. contacts, and we
9 talked about this a little bit at our meeting on
10 Wednesday.

11 MS. BERMAN: Marcia, may I go first, or do
12 you want to go first?

13 MS. MARKEL: Marcia?

14 MS. NEAL: No.

15 MS. BERMAN: Okay. You want me to go first?

16 MS. NEAL: I've got a statement, though.
17 I'll let you talk first.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Elaine.

19 MS. BERMAN: Well, I just -- so the purpose
20 of the task force would be, one, to review the standards,
21 the Colorado academic standards that are already being
22 implemented by 178 school districts right now? Am I
23 getting that right?

24 MS. MELLO: That's my interpretation of the
25 bill, yes.



1 MS. BERMAN: Well, starting right there, I
2 don't know how we could support it because the standards
3 were already being implemented.

4 So unless Senator Marble is thinking of
5 going and changing everything that's already being
6 implemented, which is totally unrealistic, plus the fact
7 that the state board has already adopted the Colorado
8 academic standards, I don't understand this bill.

9 The assessment piece is another piece of it,
10 but just based on that, I can't -- it's totally
11 inconsistent with the work that the department has been
12 doing, is doing, and the actions that the state board has
13 already taken.

14 MS. NEAL: Through, Elaine?

15 MS. BERMAN: Yep.

16 MS. NEAL: Okay. My statement on this bill,
17 I have very little patience with this bill for very --
18 several reasons.

19 You know, having just come back from
20 Washington, D.C., where the main source of enjoyment is
21 laughing at those ridiculous funny Republicans that show
22 up and complain, I think this bill was designed to make
23 Republicans look bad. I think it's a deliberate design,
24 and why didn't they kill it? They kill -- you know, it
25 could have been killed. I can't imagine why it came



1 forward.

2 We all know it is not going to pass. We
3 know that, but they're going to make a circus out of it.
4 And we're all going to be dancing around. Why are we --
5 why are we being dragged through this process at all? is
6 my question. I just don't -- I just don't have any
7 patience with it.

8 I have no idea what the answer is, but I
9 think somebody would probably challenge the fact that the
10 president of the state board was also the president --
11 you know, how can Paul vote on this? And I'm not saying
12 he can't.

13 Believe me, don't -- Paul, I just -- that's
14 just -- that's a rhetorical question.

15 I just don't have very much patience with
16 it. I just think it's -- it's a very deliberate design.

17 But having said that -- well, no. Anybody
18 else want to say anything before I finish up?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. I'd be happy to
20 engage in conversation.

21 I think we've seen -- at least I've seen in
22 the course of my experience on the board, we've seen an
23 increase in the awareness of and conversation around the
24 Common Core state standards.

25 They happened in a fashion that left a lot



1 of individuals -- parents and folks, including teachers
2 and other leaders of schools -- a little bit flatfooted,
3 and as people have become aware -- and they've become
4 aware as it has been rolled out -- they've raised their
5 hands and said we're not so sure we're comfortable with
6 this; we don't think this is in fact the best thing for
7 our school.

8 I know there are a large number of charter
9 schools that I'm aware of that are raising their hand
10 basically saying we are going to continue to teach to the
11 level we've been teaching because the Common Core state
12 standards are in fact -- they meet the level at which
13 we're teaching and therefore irrelevant, and we -- those
14 -- the charter schools are then confronted with the
15 reality that the assessments that will be lined up may in
16 fact line up more appropriately to a set of standards in
17 an educating process that is now more difficult for them
18 to respond to.

19 Long story short, even though they're
20 teaching students to a higher level earlier, they may in
21 fact not assess properly and maybe a penalty as the
22 assessment course comes through.

23 So to continue on with that thought, it's
24 basically the conversation among the public and among the
25 elected officials is catching up to what has in fact



1 already been put in place. So sometimes the fastest ways
2 to make progress is to acknowledge you may be going in
3 the wrong direction and to turn around.

4 And to the idea that this board has spoken
5 on it, in fact, yes. This board embodied two election
6 cycles ago -- did speak on this, but there have been two
7 elections intervening, I think drawing this board perhaps
8 closer to the people of Colorado since then and speaking
9 out on this issue at this time, even though it does
10 create some administrative difficulty, is in fact
11 appropriate, in my opinion.

12 So that would be my opening comment at this
13 point.

14 MS. BERMAN: Okay. I'll respond to your
15 opening comment, Paul.

16 MS. NEAL: Yeah. Because -- so you're
17 taking this bill -- I don't disagree with anything you
18 said, by the way, but you're taking the bill as a serious
19 discussion that might actually lead to this? Do you
20 think this bill will pass?

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think the longest
22 journey to get to the single step, and I think that this
23 in fact may be the first step of that long journey.

24 MS. NEAL: And I understand that, but I'm --
25 you're talking and going -- what I said about this is



1 designed to make Republicans look bad.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You know what, when I
3 stand on the side of what I believe to be principle and
4 right, I don't care whether someone characterizes it as
5 looking bad or looking good. I feel compelled to do what
6 I believe is correct, and --

7 MS. NEAL: You don't believe that it's a
8 deliberate attempt to split the board?

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: In fact, you know, I
10 don't want to get into the politics of the conversation,
11 even though that's --

12 MS. NEAL: Well, it is politics, Paul. It's
13 your politics.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible), but the
15 reality is I would prefer to speak first to the principle
16 and to the issues underlying it, and I would stand on
17 those first. And then I would say I guess I am
18 comfortable with whatever political theater may be being
19 created by this, but I'll just take that as a necessary
20 aspect of standing on the right side of the issue as I
21 perceive it.

22 MS. BERMAN: Yeah, I would, you know, agree.
23 I think what you're saying, Marcia, can be true.
24 Certainly, people can always, you know, hijack things for
25 whatever purpose. That's always part of the mix.



1 But for me, I just think it's kind of a
2 (indiscernible) bill. It means a grassroots efforts on
3 the part of parents who have just become awaken to the
4 standards and the linkage with PARCC, and I think they're
5 sincerely concerned about it. And I think this bill
6 addresses some of those concerns, and so I guess that's
7 the way I see it.

8 MS. NEAL: Yeah. And I understand, Paul. I
9 understand both of you. I understand what you're saying.
10 I agree with what you're saying, but you're not even
11 listening to what I'm saying.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, I --

13 MS. NEAL: It was very deliberate. You
14 didn't even speak to it. You know, that kind of drives
15 me crazy. Why aren't you listening to what I'm saying?
16 You don't have to agree with me, but why aren't you
17 listening? You're totally ignoring it.

18 MS. BERMAN: I think both of us actually
19 acknowledged what you said. We said yes. Things can be
20 used for political purpose, but I guess I -- I know --
21 for me, I feel like a lot of parents are concerned about
22 it, and to me --

23 MS. NEAL: No, I don't disagree with that.
24 I know they're concerned, but I wish you had been in
25 Washington with me and seen the attitude of the people



1 there. I think it might have changed your mind.

2 I will not say anything else unless I make a
3 motion, okay?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: This is Angelika.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough.

6 MS. MAZANEC: This is Pam. Can I weigh in
7 for a moment?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Pam.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, Pam.

10 MS. MAZANEC: Well, I would just -- I'm not
11 -- I'm not entirely sure what Marcia is referring to that
12 this is a bill that is designed to make Republicans look
13 ridiculous.

14 From my reading of parents and taxpayers
15 talking about the Common Core standards, there is a
16 growing concern, and it's not just from Republicans. I'm
17 seeing a growing concern from parents of all political
18 stripes.

19 So without understanding or being privy to
20 whatever political theater she might be alluding to, my
21 take is this bill is a response to a lot of growing
22 concerns around Colorado about these Common Core state
23 standards, and I don't see anything ridiculous at all
24 about it.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Paul? Paul?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

3 Marcia, let me respond directly back to your
4 question. I hear exactly what you're saying, and I guess
5 I'm just willing to take the risk that somebody in fact
6 might be creating a political environment, political
7 theater, political circus, and speak to the issues as
8 clearly as I possibly can and to encourage others to do
9 that as well.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So, Paul, may I speak to the
11 issues? This is Angelika.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead,
13 Angelika.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So a couple things. Maybe
15 partly due to term limits, the legislature and to some
16 extent the board is made up of different people,
17 different individuals; however, what this is is an
18 undoing of Senate Bill 212, which was I believe in 2008.
19 And this is 2014.

20 And I think we have to ask the question
21 whether our education system can withstand that kind of
22 turmoil that we start implementing new standards, and I'm
23 not talking about the Common Core because the Common Core
24 is an extremely small portion of the Colorado content
25 standards. But to suggest that we start all over just



1 about the time that our teachers are really comfortable
2 with what's happened -- and by the way, they do find
3 these standard dramatically better than what we had from
4 the 1995 standards, but that is just such a short time
5 span. And I don't think our education system can
6 withstand that kind of constant change, just because the
7 legislature has changed. I think this is a really
8 dangerous precedent.

9 Thanks, Marcia, for bringing back some of
10 the information that we took -- took to heart in
11 Washington, D.C.

12 There are a lot of conversations, but this
13 particular bill doesn't actually address a number of the
14 concerns that have been expressed. So I'm definitely
15 opposed to this bill as it standards. I'm happy to call
16 a vote if that's what should be our next step, if
17 everybody has spoken.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to make --
19 continue to make a comment here.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

21 MS. BERMAN: Paul, you know, I thought up
22 until now that you as board chair have made an effort to
23 reach consensus on the board and not to split the board,
24 and this is one that there is absolutely no question
25 would split the board.



1 We've also had discussions that to the
2 extent possible, reaching a supermajority when we vote on
3 bills so we don't come down on partisan lines.

4 I think you and Deb and Pam are purposely
5 referring to our Colorado academic standards as Common
6 Core, and I completely agree with what Angelika said. We
7 have ten standards. You're talking about two of those
8 standards.

9 You also said, Paul, that the new standards
10 are less rigorous. They have been proven over and over
11 and over again by very conservative groups, including the
12 Fordham Institute -- Fordham -- that they are more
13 rigorous.

14 Jeb Bush, who may be a Republican
15 presidential candidate, has -- has come down in favor and
16 supportive of our own standards and the adoption of the
17 Common Core.

18 I personally think, Paul, you are making a
19 very strong political statement here, and you are being
20 extraordinarily partisan. And I also think the fact that
21 you're the chair of the state board as (indiscernible) in
22 this bill puts you in a very problematic position.

23 So I think -- I think there are lots of
24 reasons not to support this bill, but I would say my
25 primary one is if we want this board to be taken



1 seriously, we have got to -- we've got to join forces
2 amongst each other. And you are not, as the leader,
3 helping us get there.

4 MS. NEAL: I said I wouldn't say anything
5 more, but I would have to add one last thing is that if
6 indeed I were correct and if indeed this was a deliberate
7 plan, it's been successful already, so that it's managed
8 to produce a split.

9 And I know, Paul, that you're very sincere,
10 and I hope you don't think that I echo Elaine's
11 complaints.

12 I know this will probably fail, but I would
13 move to monitor House Bill 136.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would second that.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Further -- we have
16 a motion and second. Is there further conversation or
17 discussion?

18 MS. GOFF: Yes. This is Jane.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. I'd like to
20 move on -- pardon me?

21 MS. GOFF: This is Jane.

22 I would like to --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Jane.

24 MS. GOFF: I would like to add a comment. I
25 am gratified, I'm grateful, I'm glad that this motion has



1 just been made.

2 One of the things that's concerned me about
3 this conversation and this bill and many other
4 conversations that we have been firsthand witnesses to in
5 this board room, what I don't want to have happen, above
6 all, is that parent -- the parent community and the
7 people that are really working so hard in our schools and
8 districts for the highest and right reasons would have
9 any reason to be led to believe that we are not
10 interested in talking about all the components that go
11 into this system.

12 That as Angelika said, it has been part of
13 our tapestry for six years now. That's the minimum.

14 I am very concerned that there's a
15 perception out there among our own constituents and
16 perhaps among some legislatures that this entire decision
17 to adopt the standards in 2009, going even back that far,
18 was a random act of decision.

19 We have had two years of statewide community
20 conversations and input on a variety of topics, and when
21 push came to shove on both sets of standards, it was
22 really quite difficult to determine if the real concern
23 was the standards at all.

24 As the years have gone by and we've all been
25 taking part in conversations about other important parts



1 of this, I would like to think this board is willing to
2 continue looking at what are some ways within -- within
3 our entire program that we really ought to be spending
4 some time looking at based on what we have heard from the
5 community.

6 I have had several -- several conservative
7 parents, school board members, and other schools, my
8 district, tell me that, you know, nobody is against high
9 standards. Nobody has a problem about giving kids goals
10 and aspirations, but there are some mechanics to what
11 it's all about to do that that will always deserve some
12 further attention.

13 I don't like this bill just at its core for
14 -- because it globs all of it together. I mean, it's
15 addressing the standards. It's addressing delay of that.
16 It's addressed -- which means it's delaying teaching
17 strategies and learning about teaching and learning. We
18 are having to look at the assessment program along with
19 it, which is part of it, but we're -- it also brings it
20 to bear, a lot of other parts of this that is, in my
21 mind, really not -- it's not that that is not the issue.

22 I think we need to continue to monitor this.
23 I for one would be open to considering parts of our whole
24 operation that we might have the ability to talk about it
25 a little bit further and really look at doing, without



1 jeopardizing the entire body of work.

2 To me, it's irresponsible to take this on,
3 especially when it's true. A lot of the sponsors on this
4 list were not in office at the time. I don't recall
5 seeing any of them come to our long series of community
6 meetings and our public hearings, and, you know, in that
7 regard, I respect everything about their views and
8 representing their constituents, of course.

9 I just think we -- this is something that is
10 not set up to be successful for the people it needs to be
11 most successful for.

12 So I'm happy to vote -- I'm happy to support
13 a motion to monitor and give it the respect it deserves.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. To continue, we
15 have a motion and second on a monitor position. I will
16 continue with the comments, if anyone else has comments.
17 I do have comments, but I'll reserve them and let someone
18 else speak first.

19 Okay. Then I'll -- go ahead. Let somebody
20 speaking now.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: What are our options again?
22 We could monitor. We could support. We could not
23 support. Is there any other option?

24 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel, the motion on the
25 table is to monitor. It's been -- the motion has been



1 made and seconded.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. We've got a range
3 of other options should this motion fail, but the motion
4 on the table is to monitor.

5 So my comments are -- did somebody else want
6 to speak?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. Hurry up. Let's
8 go.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So to the notion,
10 I do seek board unity, and I want to be clear about that.
11 And I seek a robust and open and honest and wide-ranging
12 conversation that allows everyone the opportunity to
13 bring their perspective to bear. And we won't always
14 agree, but I do want us to -- in style as well as
15 substance wherever possible, to be unified. And so I am
16 grateful for the collegial atmosphere that we have, and I
17 will do everything I can to maintain that.

18 In terms of this being a partisan effort, in
19 fact, the bill may have only sponsors of one party, but
20 it's clear that among the people that are causing this
21 conversation to raise to a new level of attention and
22 awareness, it is broadly spread across Republicans and
23 Democrats in concern over this Common Core state
24 standards or the Colorado academic standards, that they
25 would be officially known here in the state of Colorado.



1 So I do not think it is specifically a
2 partisan effort. I think that it is an effort that has
3 new life among the grassroots and among individuals,
4 parents, teachers, and others in education leadership
5 roles.

6 To my personal desire, my personal desire is
7 to -- if Colorado would in fact over time -- and it needs
8 to figure its pathway forward to do this, but over time,
9 Colorado would in fact have 10 academic standards that
10 are not found to be common or beholding to any other
11 state. But that we could be following an experiment and
12 liberty here in Colorado, but an experiment in
13 educational opportunity as well.

14 I think that we have the opportunity to
15 lead, and we have the horses in this state in fact to do
16 it. And that would be my preference as opposed to
17 attaching to something that might be other purposes
18 beyond the purposes of the highest and best opportunity
19 for education of students specifically in Colorado.

20 And I think another element that's been
21 missing from this conversation --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Paul?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- and this new
24 conservation that specifically as it's being taken up
25 within the legislature will -- will identify it. The



1 fiscal impact of the Colorado academic standards being
2 rolled out, the PARCC assessment being attached to them,
3 and new curricular efforts that must follow behind both
4 of those, the fiscal impact of all of that has not been
5 discussed in any detailed way.

6 And it's in fact my opinion that the
7 administrative expense for all of these efforts is
8 probably being pulled from the classroom. Funds are
9 being pulled from the classroom to support these, but we
10 could identify more clearly -- in fact, this
11 conversation, as it is being -- the effort is being
12 brought here under SB 136, to have the conversation in
13 the legislature in such a way that the fiscal note, the
14 fiscal impacts would become obvious.

15 So I guess I would oppose the motion to
16 monitor, and my preference would be a motion to oppose.
17 But those are my comments at this point.

18 MS. NEAL: To oppose?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To oppose the bill -- or
20 to support the bill. Excuse me.

21 I'm opposing the motion to monitor. I would
22 prefer a motion to support.

23 MS. BERMAN: Second.

24 MR. MARKEL: Mr. Chair, would you like me to
25 call the roll?



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please call the roll.
2 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.
3 MS. BERMAN: Why don't you repeat it again,
4 the motion.
5 MS. MARKEL: The motion --
6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To be clear -- thank you.
7 MS. MARKEL: The motion on the table, for
8 those, was made by Vice Chair Marcia Neal and seconded by
9 Elain Gantz Berman. The motion was to monitor this bill.
10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please call the roll.
11 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Ganz Berman.
12 MS. BERMAN: Aye.
13 MS. MARKEL: Angelica Schroeder.
14 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.
15 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.
16 MS. NEAL: Aye.
17 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.
18 MS. NEAL: Pam?
19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Have we lost Pam?
20 MS. MAZANEC: Sorry. I was on mute.
21 No.
22 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.
23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No.
24 MS. MARKEL: Deb Scheffel.
25 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.



1 MS. MARKEL: Pam Goff.

2 MS. GOFF: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The motion carries.
4 We'll monitor this bill at this point.

5 Thank you very much for that.

6 Next item on the agenda.

7 MS. MELLO: This ends the legislative part
8 of -- that's all we have on the agenda for the
9 legislative stuff today, so --

10 MS. MARKEL: Mr. Chair, if you could ask for
11 a motion to move into executive session, we'll dismiss
12 the public.

13 ROBERT: Mr. Chair, this is Robert.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Could I have a
15 motion?

16 ROBERT: I would like -- if you allow me one
17 minute, that's all I'm going to take. To end the public
18 session on a happy note, I would like to share something,
19 if I may.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please go ahead.

21 ROBERT: Thank you very much, and I know
22 this is a little bit out of ordinary. Bear with me,
23 Angelika.

24 We just received -- in the process of
25 receiving the results of field testing of fourth grade



1 students. These are fourth grade students in Social
2 Studies that have taken the Social Studies test online,
3 and this is across the whole state.

4 And I just had to read you because I --
5 literally, I pulled a page out of the comments. Let me
6 just tell you what the fourth graders said: I really
7 like this test. I had fuh-un. Okay.

8 This test was awesome. And I can't find any
9 --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: How many (indiscernible)
11 fuh-un?

12 ROBERT: The test was awesome test I ever
13 had because I get to write the sentences and read.

14 This is the best day ever. You guys keep
15 making tests like this one.

16 I like this test, TCAP testing on computers,
17 because it was boring on paper, and it made it exciting
18 on the computer.

19 I like how we got total control on how long
20 we took.

21 When had to use the test booklet, I would
22 turn the page and see a wild bunch of questions which
23 would sometimes stress me out, but when taking the
24 computer test, it was one question at a time instead of a
25 bunch being thrown at me.



1 I felt much more fluent when I took this
2 test, and I was super happy by the layout of it. It also
3 wasn't as much questions.

4 I felt relieved and happy after taking this
5 test, and I hope I did a good job on it. Thank you.

6 I love the test on the computer. I like the
7 tools because they are very handy, and I did not have to
8 deal with them falling on the floor all the time.

9 Anyway, I had to end with that. I hope you
10 don't mind, Mr. Chair. Okay?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Robert, thank you for
12 bringing that. You know, at the end of the day, we mash
13 back and forth on policy considerations and issues, but
14 there's nothing more important than the smile of a child
15 in a classroom and achievement on the way, so --

16 ROBERT: I know. That made me -- that made
17 my day when I read that from these kids. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

19 So if we could have a motion to move into
20 executive session, please?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Mr. Chair, I move we move
22 into executive session.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second it,
24 Angelika.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. If there is



1 no objection, we move into executive session.

2 MS. MARKEL: We'll allow the public time to
3 leave the room.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Recess unless there's
5 other business. Anybody have anything else to cover?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go Broncos.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go Broncos, 24-21
8 Broncos.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excellent. Thank you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bye.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. We
13 (indiscernible) next meeting, we are in recess. Thank
14 you. Goodbye.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Goodbye.

17 (Meeting adjourned)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

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

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

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

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25