



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
March 11, 2014, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on March 11, 2014, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The State Board is back
2 in order. Item 10.01; correct? I'm just making sure I'm
3 in the right space here. Yeah.

4 Colorado State Board of Education will now
5 conduct a public rulemaking hearing for the rules
6 concerning the administration of statewide accountability
7 measures for the Colorado public school system, charter
8 school institute, public school districts, and public
9 schools, 1 CCR 301-1.

10 The State Board approved the Notice of
11 Rulemaking at its January 8, 2014, Board meeting. The
12 hearing to promulgate these rules was made known through
13 publication of a public notice on January 5, 2014,
14 through the Colorado Register, and by State Board notice
15 on March 4, 2014. The State Board so authorized to
16 promulgate these rules pursuant to the Colorado
17 Constitution, Article IX, Section 1, and the Colorado
18 Revised Statutes 22-11-207.

19 These revisions have been made to
20 incorporate new statutory requirements established by
21 H.B. 12-1238, the Colorado Reading to Ensure Academic
22 Development Act; S.B. 13-217, concerning accreditation
23 criteria and alternative education campuses; and S.B. 13-
24 193, concerning increasing parent engagement in public
25 schools.



1 Mr. Commissioner, is the staff prepared to
2 provide an overview.

3 MR. HAMMOND: Yes, they are.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Just in time
5 presentations.

6 MR. HAMMOND: I will turn it over to Jill or
7 Katie and Allysa is also present. It covers various
8 areas in this particular rulemaking hearing.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Katie.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted to
11 present the changes that we're recommending since the
12 draft revisions that you saw in December. There were
13 just three additional changes that we're recommending.
14 And I think you guys have got copies of the newest
15 version, that should be dated February 27, 2014.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Who selected this (ph)?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the first change is
18 just a typo that we caught. It's in Section 10.01. It
19 should be around page 32 of your document, and it's just
20 changing the word "district" to "school."

21 The second change is to Section 3.02, which
22 should be around page 10. This change would require
23 districts with an improvement plan to enter into an
24 annual accreditation contract instead of having their
25 contracts automatically renewed.



1 And so just the background on this is that
2 when the Office of Legislative Legal Services reviewed our
3 rules back in the fall they identified a discrepancy. They
4 thought that the statute didn't really permit the automatic
5 renewal of districts on improvement. And our rules have
6 been in place for a few years and have allowed this.
7 That's been our practice. But it was just kind of a new
8 reviewer with a different set of eyes that thought that
9 this wasn't permitted by statute. And so we actually
10 sought a legislative fix that would just explicitly allow
11 us to do this, but the legislators didn't agree with that
12 change so now we're back in the place where we need to
13 reconcile what we've been told, per the statute allows us
14 to do and what our rules say.

15 So what this would mean is that districts
16 that are on improvement would need to submit signatures
17 from their superintendent and their board chair annually in
18 order to have their accreditation contract renewed.

19 And then the last change that we're
20 recommending is on -- it's in Section 4.01(D), which would
21 be around page 12, and this is just changing our wording to
22 hopefully better clarify how we would look at the
23 information for alternative education campuses when we
24 assign district accreditation ratings. So just so that you
25 understand what we're proposing, I'm not sure. I hope



1 we've communicated it a little bit better with this
2 language.

3 There would be two tests that we would ask
4 districts to meet if we're going to remove their AEC data
5 from the DPS. First, they would need to make a difference,
6 so we'd need to know that if we remove that data it would
7 actually give the districts enough additional points that
8 they would be in a different accreditation rating. And
9 then, second, we would look to see if either the AEC has
10 been closed and is no longer serving students, or the AEC
11 has earned a performance plan assignment, which is the top
12 rating on the AEC framework, or if the district is in the
13 Improvement category and they have shown that they've made
14 progress on the performance indicators. So it would be
15 kind of a multi-part test, and if all those criteria were
16 met then we would remove that data.

17 So that's just a summary of what our team
18 did, that we are recommending, and then we can also answer
19 any questions that you have from anything that we submitted
20 to you in December.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, okay.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'm just thinking in
24 terms of uniformity, since we've talked about uniformity
25 this morning. Why would we not remove the data even if it



1 didn't apply to their rating? In other words, why would we
2 treat some districts differently than others? Why wouldn't
3 we just do it all the same?

4 MS. NEAL: And then we're going back and do
5 the WestEd.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yep.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're not thinking
10 about doing this as a calculation, an automatic
11 calculation. We will calculate the impact here. We think
12 it is really important that when you report the district
13 performance framework in a district's data to include the
14 alternative education campus students in there. If we make
15 an allowance, like we're allowed to, based on the state
16 legislature, do a statute change, to look at the
17 performance removing those AEC students, we can do that,
18 but we don't want to report the data officially that way,
19 because then it changes the picture of performance in the
20 district. Right? You look at how the grad rates changes
21 or the dropout rate changes, if you remove those students,
22 it doesn't accurately show what that real dropout and grad
23 rate is in the district.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we report it, it's
25 include it, but in terms of accreditation it's calculated



1 differently.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll take it into
3 consideration in looking at the district's performance.

4 MS. NEAL: And only when they request that
5 it be removed.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we'll run it for
7 them. We have been able to fix the programming so that we
8 can run it and we can identify any districts that are
9 eligible for it and reach out to them, help them go through
10 the process. It will be straightforward and quick and
11 easy. But we just want to make sure that we're not
12 reporting misleading data to the public, because the
13 outcomes look very different, or can look very different.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

15 MS. GOFF: Well, wasn't that the central
16 issue of a previous appeal that we had? Mapleton. Or this
17 discussion was in process at the time of the appeal?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are six districts
21 we were piloting this fall, trying to figure out the exact
22 right criteria. We've adjusted it a little bit from where
23 we started but we there were six districts that were
24 approved for the request to reconsider, using these
25 criteria, using the allowance looking at the performance of



1 the AEC.

2 MS. GOFF: Is there any trend yet or record
3 yet of how -- where -- six districts is not very many, but
4 as far as a percent of, is there any -- is it long enough
5 yet to see any kind of -- does it make a difference?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

7 MS. GOFF: Do we know yet?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we'll have to
9 look at more time and see. There are a handful of other
10 districts where if you remove the AECs it didn't change the
11 rating, and there were one or two other districts where it
12 did change the rating. But the AECs were performing so
13 poorly it wasn't something, based on the rules and how
14 they're written, that you'd want to take into
15 consideration.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Other questions?

17 Is there anyone present to testify? I have
18 no one on the list but I would ask if anyone wants to
19 speak.

20 Seeing no one --

21 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, I move to approve the
22 rules concerning the administration of statewide
23 accountability measures for the Colorado public school
24 system, charter school institute, public school districts,
25 and public schools, 1 CCR 301.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There's a second. Is
4 there any objection?

5 Hearing none, motion carries.

6 MS. NEAL: There you go.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

8 So, do the WestEd, pick up the WestEd. So
9 we're going to jump back in the out-of-order. I was trying
10 to make it funny but I'm too tired. We'll do the WestEd
11 report at this point.

12 Mr. Commissioner?

13 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair and members of the
14 Board, what we'd like to do is just talk a little bit about
15 the WestEd study, where we're at in the progression of that
16 study, and what we're seeing.

17 But I just wanted to relate this to the
18 Board. I know this has turned out to have different
19 opinions, obviously, as we move forward on this study. But
20 I just want you all to know that one of the things that I
21 took into consideration -- one of the things, as Senator
22 Steve King stated this morning, we do recognize that there
23 is a burden out there in the testing system, and I define
24 "system" as not only the required testing but when you look
25 at the early readiness assessments, you look at the READ



1 Act assessments, and the list goes on -- the ACT, CMAS --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Social studies.

3 MR. HAMMOND: -- everything. When you look
4 at a system, we recognize it's a burden, especially at the
5 high school level. Because I remember our staff some time
6 ago coming up to me saying, "I'm not so sure how these
7 districts, some of them, are going to do it, given their
8 own testing," which usually at a high school level has 50
9 percent of the time.

10 And so recognizing that as a concern, we
11 talked with my Superintendents' Advisory Council, we
12 invited 10 other superintendents to be a part of that.
13 That resonated very high with them, and they really
14 encouraged us, is there any way you can start studying
15 this, since we're giving the test now?

16 And we are part of the regional
17 comprehensive center system of which WestEd is our assigned
18 comprehensive center. And we reached out to them, as we
19 normally would on any other project, and adjusted our work
20 plan to accommodate the study. The study is very, very
21 focused. It is not about our standards. It is not about
22 PARCC per se. It's about the testing burden and what can
23 we learn and what options could come out for us to consider
24 with our Superintendents' Advisory Council, as well as
25 staff, and bring it back to you, as well as we would



1 forward onto the legislature for them to consider as well.
2 It's extremely focused on how we're doing this and
3 approaching this.

4 We have already started the study. It's
5 been well received by those districts that are a part of
6 it. We have been able, to the extent that we can, expand
7 it to include charter focus groups, parent focus groups,
8 and in those parent focus groups we're trying to look at
9 the various groups that have come before you, reach out to
10 those groups, and have one or two representatives from
11 those groups.

12 So, so far, so good. But anyway, I'm just
13 making you aware of that. Jill?

14 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chairman, so building on
15 that I also want to clarify one question that's come up,
16 and that's the cost of the study. So the way that we work
17 with WestEd, WestEd is actually funded to serve a set of
18 states. We're one of the states that they provide services
19 to. We work with them in a workplan every year to focus
20 the work, based on the state implementation initiatives.
21 They work with Utah, Arizona, and Nevada. So they have a
22 wide range of states, some of which participate in state
23 assessment consortiums, Common Core, some of which do not.
24 They focus their workplan based on what the state needs, so
25 it is a state-driven plan.



1 It is no cost to us to focus the work from
2 WestEd on this project, so there is no contract and no
3 cost. Essentially, we decided not to do some activities
4 we'd originally thought we wanted to do and instead focus
5 it on this need, because we wanted to be responsive to our
6 districts.

7 To date, we've had four focus groups, and so
8 those have been at Cherry Creek, Strasburg, Platte Valley,
9 and then a teacher focus group. The team will be coming
10 back in late March to do two other sets of focus groups.
11 Those will include the remaining districts, and you'll see
12 those other districts that are listed on page 2. So
13 they'll come and do Buena Vista, Woodland Park, Delta
14 County, La Veta, and Archuleta. They will also come back
15 then in early April to do a parent focus group and a
16 charter school focus group.

17 At the same time, later this week, we will
18 be launching a survey that will go to all district
19 assessment coordinators in the state with a copy to the
20 superintendent. The survey will be a tool for districts
21 that are not part of this to have their voices heard. One
22 of the things -- we do not participate. CDE does not
23 participate in these focus groups or in the survey at all.
24 It's being administered by WestEd. So that there is no
25 sense of the state being in the room while they're trying



1 to give honest feedback, and they can feel free to say
2 whatever they need to say.

3 The focus groups leaders, the WestEd
4 researchers, are very open to receiving additional
5 information. Folks who want to submit their own studies,
6 their own research articles, ask questions of the
7 researchers, they've been more than open to accepting any
8 kind of additional information that folks want to submit.

9 Our initial feedback from folks was that
10 they really found the focus group format helpful, and some
11 initial feedback from the researchers was really exciting
12 and that the lead researcher said, "I think the state is
13 going to be really excited, not only about some of the
14 options that might emerge short-term but some of this
15 longer-term thinking," which ties back to our earlier
16 conversation this morning, of districts have some really
17 innovative ideas about how to take us to the next system
18 that we're all anxious to try to move to. So I think we'll
19 have a rich array of ideas from which to build on.

20 So that's kind of a synthesis of where we
21 are. We should have the first results from the study by
22 the end of April, so our hope is to be able to have an
23 agenda item for you in May, to share with you where we are
24 on the study results. They will then be doing a Phase 2 to
25 look at post that first implementation of science and



1 social studies online, how people's opinions may have
2 changed, new concerns may have come forward that we can
3 capture those and get those back to you in June. That's
4 the hope for that second phase of getting some additional
5 data.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

7 MS. GOFF: She can go.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You were waving first.

9 MS. GOFF: I was?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, you were.

11 MS. GOFF: Thank you. You mentioned it. I
12 know it's come up a couple of times before, but if one of
13 the desired end purposes is to be able to recommend to the
14 legislature, how does that line up session-wise? Is there
15 -- are the groups -- are we all looking towards something
16 this session, or nothing necessarily maybe formal
17 introduction of a piece of legislation but a conversational
18 introduction, at least? And then if we're looking at next
19 year, to be prepared for more of a structured approach next
20 year, in the middle of new testing?

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I would expand that a
22 little bit to say how does this integrate with 1202, the
23 conversation with 1202?

24 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

25 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, so the way that



1 House Bill 1202, as amended, what you saw earlier today,
2 actually has a statement in it that the task force that
3 formed through that piece of legislation would build on the
4 work that the Department is doing with the WestEd study.
5 So it actually says that that would be something that the
6 Department would share with that task force and they would
7 build on it.

8 That build goes further in terms of also
9 including a cost study analysis, some feasibility analysis,
10 a couple of other things that our WestEd study just -- that
11 then becomes something you'd have to contract for to get a
12 deeper look at those. A cost study versus focus groups and
13 surveys of opinions are very different kinds of scopes of
14 work. So it amplifies the current work that we're doing
15 but builds on it.

16 In terms of thinking up with legislative
17 process, I think the Department really engaged on this to
18 see what can we do right away? What's within our locus of
19 control that we could work on this summer, from a policy
20 standpoint, flexibility standpoint, phasing-in standpoint
21 that all could be within existing state law? That's what
22 we would want to act on, so that's what we would move very
23 quickly on.

24 We think there will be a bucket of ideas
25 that are statutory. Those, then, we would see



1 conversations happening over the summer and fall months to
2 tee up for appropriate policy based on your guidance and
3 direction about where those should go.

4 MR. HAMMOND: Which, Mr. Chair, would
5 probably fit in the whole discussion of 1202, if that keeps
6 going forward.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

8 MR. HAMMOND: It's another input channel for
9 them to do as they want.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Vice Chair?

11 MS. NEAL: I know this is just a beginning
12 process, but we are hearing such overwhelming things about
13 how much time it will take and how difficult it will be. I
14 assume that's pretty much where the focus is on that --
15 will they be that long, or should they? Are those the
16 kinds of answers you're seeking?

17 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, yes. So in the
18 questions, in our focus group questions, as well as in the
19 survey questions, we'll be looking at -- the questions
20 include things around concerns with administration,
21 scheduling, staffing, space logistics, expectations for
22 students, impacts on specific populations of kids, impacts
23 on specific grade levels and subject areas, impact on local
24 assessment systems and uses, impact on technology use,
25 impact on instructional time, duplication of testing, and



1 technology readiness, which are the biggest topics we've
2 heard raised.

3 MS. NEAL: Implication might -- might mean
4 that some tests you might give up, like, you know, like ACT
5 has been mentioned. Is that the kind of discussion, again,
6 you know, how can we do all of these, and if we have to
7 give something else, what is it? Are the kinds of
8 questions?

9 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, I think those kinds
10 of ideas are what are emerging in the conversations that
11 are happening in the focus groups, and then in the survey
12 tool we actually have sort of a value question that allows
13 folks to sort of say what's the value to students of this
14 particular activity, what's the value to the program,
15 what's the burden? So you can do kind of a value-burden
16 tradeoff. And then there are also questions about when you
17 look at the ideal assessment system, how much do you value
18 these different pieces. So we'll be able to kind of see
19 how folks are thinking about those very options.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine? I'm sorry,
21 Angelika.

22 MS. BERMAN: I think Angelika was next, and
23 then Deb, and then I'm last.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. We'll save you for
25 last.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So there are two pieces.
2 One, I've been approached by some constituents about the
3 assessments for second language learners. So I would be
4 grateful if that somehow was looked into. Apparently, for
5 that particular subgroup there are a lot of time
6 challenges, there are concerns, and I don't want to go into
7 what they are but I would like to hear from districts what
8 their concerns are, or if they think they're okay.

9 And then the other piece, for the part that
10 you do later, after the assessments have been given, I
11 would love to get some feedback from kids, just as we did
12 with the pilot, especially high school kids. I think we --

13 MR. HAMMOND: That would come from our field
14 tests. I think that would be separate. Part of that field
15 test is getting that input back like we did with science
16 and social studies.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: But if you can make that as
18 part of the final report, I think that would be great.

19 MR. HAMMOND: This report will -- no. This
20 report is independent, and we have, already -- it's a
21 research design study. So we can do that separately. We
22 can get that from our assessment folks. But, you know, if
23 it does come up through then, in the comments, that's one
24 thing, but right now it's a set research design.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: How about timing? Can at



1 least that separate independent report be coming about at
2 roughly the same time?

3 MR. HAMMOND: Jill.

4 MS. PITNER: I'm sorry. The same time as --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: How long would it take to
6 get that student -- the feedback that we get from the kids
7 who are taking the test, in order to bring that together
8 into something that's reportable to us?

9 MR. HAMMOND: The field tests are in April -
10 - I think March, April. I don't know how quick we'll get
11 those results back.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

13 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, there are a number
14 of tests going on, so I want to make sure that we're clear
15 on which one we're talking about. So there will be the
16 science and social studies, which is what I thought you
17 were talking about, and how kids react to those tests.
18 What I don't know, and I can find out for you, is whether
19 or not kids will be asked a question when they complete
20 those assessments, like what did you think of the test?
21 And I can find out if that's being asked. That's how we
22 found out, on the field test. It was just a tacked-on
23 question when they were done. Could you tell us what you
24 thought of this? That's where we got those 45,000 comments
25 and all that information.



1 PARCC field testing, which is what Mr.
2 Hammond was talking about, I can also find out if they are
3 doing a question at the end of that as well. If so, we can
4 see how quickly we can get that back.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Schroeder? I'm sorry
7 -- Scheffel. I might need to get a cup of coffee here.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: My question is just around
9 the whole parent piece. You know, we've heard a lot from
10 parents in these meetings and a lot of parents comment on
11 using WestEd to do this work. And I guess I'd like your
12 perspective on it. As I look at the methodology, the focus
13 groups, the surveys the (ph) we don't really know exactly
14 who is surveyed, in other words, how many parents get
15 surveyed. So that the people who reach out to a range of
16 parents who represent both perspectives on assessment, but
17 that same caveat isn't put in there for the other groups
18 that they're reaching out to, which includes the districts,
19 right? Twenty-three districts are chosen to be part of
20 this study.

21 MR. HAMMOND: No. Mr. Chair --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

23 MR. HAMMOND: -- there are a total of nine
24 districts. There were 23 that volunteered. The
25 superintendent -- my advisory council recommended 9.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you've got nine districts.

2 MR. HAMMOND: Right. We were able to -- it
3 was not going to include parent groups or charters. We
4 were, I think, in hearing some of the concerns, tried to do
5 our best to expand the research study to include a focus
6 group of parents and charter schools. And what we have had
7 to rely on is trying to get representatives -- it won't
8 include all parents -- try and get representatives from the
9 various groups that have come before the Board both ways,
10 and just get as much input as we can.

11 Quite frankly, we're also getting input
12 because every time we talk to a district a parent has to be
13 a part of that as well. Usually it's the DAC chair that
14 represents the parents in that district.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So maybe if you look at just
16 numbers, you've got the superintendent, the assessment
17 coordinator, the (ph) coordinator, the technology
18 coordinator, the principal, the teachers, and then the
19 parents and the students. My question is, given that those
20 entities pretty much outnumber the parents, maybe the Board
21 wants it that way but I'm just saying, I know when you do a
22 research study you look at the nature of the questions, the
23 nature of the participants, how they are chosen, relative
24 valences, voices, and I'm just saying is it okay that the
25 parents are in there, but they're pretty minimally in



1 there?

2 MR. HAMMOND: Right.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a whole
4 separate focus group for parents?

5 MR. HAMMOND: There is. I'm not quite sure
6 what you mean by relative valences.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: How many voices in various
8 slots, I guess. I mean, usually you do a stratified sample
9 of the constituents, and I'm not sure if you put all those
10 other entities together, then you have parents kind of in a
11 --

12 MR. HAMMOND: This is really designed to
13 test and assess the assessment burden that is happening in
14 our school districts. That's how it was originally
15 started, at school districts and schools. We expanded
16 that, knowing there are parental concerns out there, and we
17 want to make sure that's heard. It's not a complete -- we
18 can expand that as much as one would have money and time to
19 do, but it was the best that we could come up, given the
20 limited study and the resources that are available.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So the Department will use
22 these -- it seems like it's relatively high stakes -- the
23 Department will use these findings to make change in
24 policies and implementation.

25 MR. HAMMOND: Well -- Mr. Chair? -- nothing



1 could really be done without your approval or the
2 legislative approval. If there is some internal policy or
3 procedure we can do, we'll do it.

4 Let's say one example comes up, that really
5 resonates, that in many cases they cannot do the
6 assessments online. We heard -- quite frankly, we hear
7 mixed messages about that. One thing could come out, that
8 a dissertation item could come forth that we -- because 50
9 percent of our testing is based on paper and pencil on
10 PARCC. If we expanded that, you know, paper and pencil
11 costs more than online, that could be a decision item that
12 we bring to you, saying this is what we've learned, and we
13 could ease the burden in the field by maybe making one more
14 year, adding some extra paper and pencil.

15 There may be other things and processes that
16 we're doing in the Department to relieve the burden. So I
17 don't know all those, but that comes back -- really, WestEd
18 is collecting data and information for us. We're going to
19 take that information, we're going to review it with our
20 Superintendents' Advisory Council -- we promised them we'd
21 do that -- and those 10 additional superintendents. Then
22 we'll get their input as well. Then we'll bring that back
23 as part of a discussion we'll have with you. Then that
24 also feeds whatever we come up with, and it may need to be
25 changed, and how that feeds into, what is it, 102?



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 1202.

2 MR. HAMMOND: 1202.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Does the Board have any
4 interest in seeing the questions that will be posed to the
5 various constituents, or do we feel that's outside our
6 purview and WestEd will just handle that? Because I know
7 the way the questions are asked really drives some of these
8 and can definitely influence.

9 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

11 MR. HAMMOND: That isn't -- WestEd isn't it.
12 We've asked them. That's why we're not even a part of the
13 group, so as not to influence it. We would be more than
14 happy to supply the questions to you.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Supply the questions, or does
17 the Board want any input on that?

18 MR. HAMMOND: No.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Or just review what they --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They've already
21 started.

22 MR. HAMMOND: They've already started that
23 and that's been my decision, as this is --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is that typical that the
25 Board just --



1 MR. HAMMOND: That's within --

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- look at the way this kind
3 of a study would be conducted in greater depth, given that
4 it will drive any changes, or is that kind of typical that
5 we keep at arm's length on that?

6 MR. HAMMOND: Pretty much, with some like --
7 Mr. Chair? -- pretty much. Something like this falls
8 within my latitude of the Department and our due diligence,
9 that we're trying to serve our superintendents at a time
10 when they are expressing a real concern. When you don't
11 have a variety of money, that's why we reached out to
12 WestEd. And, quite frankly, we're limited in the
13 resources.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: And the superintendents
15 primarily are your advisory council?

16 MR. HAMMOND: Of course.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is a
18 Superintendents' Advisory Council.

19 MR. HAMMOND: Right.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: But they're the ones that
21 receive -- who receives the results? The State Board?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The supes.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair?

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

25 MR. HAMMOND: As stated in the report, and I



1 found it in the first paragraph, at the end, the people
2 that get the report will be us. The Superintendents'
3 Advisory Council, we'll be reviewing it with them, getting
4 their input, and then it will come back to us and then
5 we'll share that with you.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Elaine.

8 MS. BERMAN: So maybe we've gotten this
9 before, and I apologize. But we keep hearing -- and I
10 don't know whether it's accurate or not -- that we're doing
11 so much more testing now. Do we have a side-by-side about
12 what we have been doing and what we will be doing, both in
13 terms of additional assessments and the amount of time the
14 assessments will take? But I realize that the amount of
15 time assessments will take is dependent on access to
16 computers and all that. So I don't know how you calculate
17 that.

18 But just some sense of where we were and
19 what is being proposed, because that would give us a real
20 sense of -- and maybe that's a quick answer you have right
21 now.

22 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

24 MR. HAMMOND: We have that document. I
25 thought we had provided it.



1 MS. BERMAN: You probably have.

2 MR. HAMMOND: But we'll be glad to send that
3 out to you.

4 MS. BERMAN: It was a long time ago.

5 MR. HAMMOND: Senator King, he asked for a
6 copy of it too. It's the same. But the one we have is
7 nice and colorful. I mean, the colors do help to discern.

8 MS. PITNER: And, Mr. Chair, just for the
9 quick answer is that we have a document that shows what is
10 federally required, what Colorado requires, so you can see
11 what we require above the Federal minimum. And then we
12 have another document that looks at testing time, between
13 what has been the testing time with TCAP and what will be
14 the testing time with the CMAS science and social studies
15 and the PARCC.

16 What it does show, for just what's required,
17 Colorado does require, at the high school level, more than
18 the Federal minimum. The Federal minimum is once in high
19 school, starting at grade 10. We do 9th and 10th, so
20 that's additional. And then with the PARCC assessment it
21 has the 11th grade assessment, so that's where that gets
22 additional. And then we made the choice, as Colorado, to
23 do social studies. So those are the additional
24 assessments.

25 From a time perspective, obviously those



1 grades that had social studies that didn't have it before -
2 - so there's an increase of time for social studies
3 assessments. There's an increase in time in 11th grade to
4 accommodate that new assessment. For the most part, with
5 the exception of a couple of grades, the testing time is
6 fairly comparable between TCAP and the new assessments.

7 What is harder for districts, so for kid
8 time, sitting down, taking the test, it's pretty similar.
9 For a district time perspective, to manage the logistics
10 with computers, that's what's the difference. But we'd be
11 happy to provide those documents for you.

12 MS. BERMAN: Okay. Thank you. That would
13 be helpful.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, the other piece
15 that we don't know about, Elaine, are the additional
16 assessments that districts are doing. Remember that we
17 assess --

18 MR. HAMMOND: -- about half at the high
19 school level.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- well, we assess in
21 language arts, and math, and in some grades, science and
22 social studies, but we expect, under the standards, for
23 districts to develop district assessments, or buy district
24 assessments in other areas. And what that amounts to is
25 not something that we know but, at the district level,



1 they've got to integrate all that.

2 MS. BERMAN: And it will vary in the 178
3 school districts.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It will vary.

5 MS. BERMAN: But that's always been an
6 element. That element hasn't changed.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes and no. It's
8 always been an element, and the reality is that districts
9 didn't do it. Some did. Some districts did. Under the
10 old standards, some districts did develop assessments in
11 the non-tested areas, and some districts never even adopted
12 the 1995 standards. So again, it's all over. It's 178
13 different photographs to look at.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Marcia.

15 MS. NEAL: And this is one of those, I want
16 you to imagine. No, I just -- I was thinking. In the
17 overall scenario, can you -- I know you can't dictate
18 because we don't know what we're going to find out, but
19 what is the -- what are the kinds of things and decisions
20 we might need to make as a result of this? Are you able to
21 do that at this point?

22 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, a few of them might
23 be about -- one option that's been discussed that
24 Commissioner Hammond mentioned is could there be
25 flexibility to let all math assessments be paper-based? So



1 they only are implementing the English language arts
2 online. Because we did ask the JBC for 50 percent of the
3 PARCC assessments, the cost of paper for 50 percent. That
4 right away relieves half the burden to districts. That's a
5 possibility that we would have to explore. I don't know --
6 I couldn't promise today that we could offer that --

7 MS. NEAL: No, and I wouldn't --

8 MS. PITNER: -- but just, those would be the
9 kinds of things that we could look at.

10 It could be phasing in timelines, perhaps.
11 There's -- you know, it's hard to speculate of the
12 different kinds of options --

13 MS. NEAL: No, I know that.

14 MS. PITNER: -- but it's those kinds of
15 things, like where we might have some ability to look at
16 timelines and look at paper, administrative policy windows,
17 things of that nature, testing windows.

18 MS. NEAL: And it might be, again, different
19 for DPS and Norwood. You might be able to -- you know,
20 what are you going to do about the tests in the little
21 rural schools versus the big schools? I assume some of
22 that would be in it too.

23 MS. PITNER: Right. Right. Yep.

24 MS. NEAL: I was just wondering.

25 MS. PITNER: We are finding, just



1 anecdotally, a bit of -- from some of what the feedback
2 we're getting is, there seems to be some districts that are
3 just in a sweet spot. They're just the right size where
4 they can accommodate this, and they have the bandwidth,
5 they have the technology. And that it's sort of, you get
6 to be a larger district it gets to be harder to figure it
7 out, and you get to be super small and have a technology
8 problem.

9 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

10 MS. PITNER: But there is a core where this
11 -- they're well positioned to move to this online
12 environment.

13 MS. NEAL: But we have hopes for the
14 technology part of it, don't we, Dr. Owen?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

16 MS. GOFF: Yeah. Well, to follow up a
17 little bit, I would think that down the road it's going to
18 impact -- it could, possibly, especially if you take the
19 core set of state assessments out of the mix. And we just
20 talked district level, maybe add the READ Act in their
21 requirements. But it seems like it would impact what
22 happens with unified improvement planning as well, and
23 whatever goals districts work together to set, that a great
24 amount of that goal-setting is based on what they're doing
25 within the district.



1 So it's got a long-range impact that, until
2 we know it's -- we can be both hopeful and very careful.

3 MS. PITNER: And, Mr. Chair, those are the
4 kinds of unintended and intended consequences and why we
5 want to move forward, thoughtfully, is that some districts
6 actually don't run their own performance frameworks. They
7 do not use the state's. They want to really exceed the
8 state's performance framework, so they rely on that data.
9 They run their own growth measures. They do a lot of
10 things. So if we pull certain pieces without thinking
11 about the implications, you've just had several very large
12 districts in the state that now don't have that data that
13 they rely on for their processes. Some districts really
14 value different components for their own improvement
15 planning.

16 So that's why we're out there trying to talk
17 to folks so that we don't think we're fixing a problem and
18 actually, unintentionally, creating another one.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To say that assessments
20 is a big issue is an understatement right now, and
21 understanding, you know, where we're at with regards to the
22 assessments, currently and future, is an interesting
23 challenge. I perceive this WestEd study to be a sliver,
24 just a very narrow glimpse into that bigger question of
25 what's going on with assessments and what are the



1 consequences.

2 I will speak, in our board report section,
3 at length about some perspectives on assessments and where
4 we're at. But I would think that 1202, if this is a
5 sliver, 1202 is a slice of the pie in looking at what's
6 going on in assessments, and I think we need to have, if we
7 could, a 360-degree view of what this is all about.

8 So I appreciate the fact that this
9 particular study has been reshaped slightly, in response to
10 the conversations that were brought from this Board to
11 involve more parents, to involve charters and so forth. So
12 I appreciate that. At the same time, I want to make clear,
13 my voice is that I perceive this to be a very narrow sliver
14 of understanding a very big issue. But I appreciate the
15 report.

16 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you.

17 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So with that we will move
19 to art.

20 The next item on our agenda is an artwork
21 presentation, and with that I will turn it over to you, Mr.
22 Commissioner.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. We're really
24 excited about this and working through -- Karol, do you
25 want to come on up and make the presentation?



1 Ms. Markel has been very much involved in
2 this, as well.

3 MS. GATES: It's been a nice collaborative
4 project. I really do appreciate Ms. Markel's and Ms.
5 Burdsall's vision, I think.

6 So as you've noticed you have a new piece of
7 art that you get to look at now, over here, on the right-
8 hand side. So it is my -- just -- I'm just very happy to
9 present -- this is a very quick agenda item for you. And I
10 know that you have a busy agenda so we'll get right to it.

11 So I'm happy to present an artistic
12 rendering of the Colorado map. It's going to be displayed
13 here in the State Boardroom. It is your piece, today, and
14 it's going to be -- it's really meant to celebrate
15 Colorado's unique beauty, features, and history.

16 In addition to unveiling this piece of art,
17 as we began speaking about what kinds of artwork we could
18 just be very proud of being a Coloradoan, we thought it
19 would be really great to have a hope of offering an artwork
20 that could actually benefit all the students and teachers
21 around the state as well, since not everyone could come and
22 see the piece and enjoy the piece, because we are a state
23 entity and we want to be able to outreach as far as
24 possible.

25 So with this in mind we chose the main



1 audience for the piece to be fourth-graders, who conducted
2 an in-depth study about Colorado. The artwork was designed
3 with this age level in mind, so you can see the reason why
4 we chose certain symbols, et cetera. To ensure educators
5 and students can enjoy this artwork regardless of where
6 they reside, we will make a downloadable digital image to
7 view, and that will be available for anyone to use, no cost
8 to them. The artist in the room and has given us copyright
9 permission to use the image at will, for any needs that are
10 in our schools.

11 Because this image will be offered
12 copyright-free it can be used throughout our academic
13 visual arts standards as well as our social studies
14 standards, et cetera.

15 In addition to making the image available,
16 we have actually had a collaboration of filmmakers from
17 Metro State University of Denver, and they produced a short
18 artist interview that I'd like to show you. We have got a
19 five-minute snippet. I think it will probably be seven
20 minutes when I post it for teachers. But we gave you the
21 big highlights of it and we'll show you. And we want to
22 really highlight that creative process, as an artist goes
23 through, when creating the final work of art.

24 So I will let you view that. It's about
25 five minutes.



1 (Video plays.)

2 MS. GATES: What's exciting about having a
3 piece is that, you know, when we wrote the Colorado
4 Academic Standards and revised them we really looked at the
5 balance of process and product, and so we really wanted to
6 be able to produce something for the students and the
7 teachers that shows that balance. The product is the
8 piece. The process getting there is really where the magic
9 happens in your art classroom.

10 So that creative process really is the
11 cornerstone of our art standards and we really want to have
12 that interview available for people to see a glimpse of the
13 process that folks take to get to those wonderful pieces,
14 like we get to view most days.

15 So we believe making these resources readily
16 available and on the CDE Arts Education website will aid in
17 offering dynamic and engaging learning opportunities to
18 Colorado educators and students. So if you could indulge
19 me a minute I'll have the folks who put these things
20 together for us stand up. I'll introduce them to you and
21 then we'll get you to move on through your agenda. But I
22 appreciate your time and I hope you enjoy the artwork.

23 So first I'd like to introduce you to Debbie
24 Brooks. She's the artist of our piece that you just heard
25 from.



1 (Applause.)

2 MS. GATES: As you heard in the video,
3 Debbie is an elementary visual arts teacher in Adams 12
4 Five Star Schools and she is a commissioned artist. One of
5 her largest endeavors, which is one of my favorites, you
6 would have seen, if you visited the Tidepools at the
7 Butterfly Pavilion, she is the person behind that good
8 work.

9 And then second, I'd like to introduce to
10 your filmmaker team, Ryan Stutzman (ph) and Samantha Terry
11 (ph).

12 (Applause.)

13 MS. GATES: They are both finishing their
14 student teaching in music education, so they're just
15 multitalented media artists. And they are from Metro State
16 University here in Denver. They were the collaborative
17 volunteer team that filmed, photographed, edited, and
18 finalized the artist interview to highlight the process an
19 artist engages in. So it really was a collaborative
20 effort, the State Board team working with teachers. And I
21 got the fun part of seeing it all happen.

22 So I want to thank the Board for giving us
23 this opportunity and agenda to present this one-of-a-kind
24 art piece to your collection, to be displayed here in the
25 Board Room and to recognize the hard work of the



1 individuals that made it happen. Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, Karol. You're
4 fine.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I just add this
6 really quickly?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ryan is my former
9 student.

10 MS. GATES: Yeah. He was one of her
11 students at elementary. We didn't know that when we got
12 them together. She just said, "That's my prior student,"
13 so it was pretty funny.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The legacy rolls forward.
15 That's awesome.

16 MS. GATES: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, thank you, Karol,
18 for the presentation. We appreciate that very much. To
19 Ms. Brooks and Ryan and Samantha, thank you for the work
20 that you've done. And, Ms. Brooks, thanks for letting this
21 beautiful piece that you've created be a part of our Board
22 Room now. We will look forward to having a slightly more
23 cheery room to come to for our meetings. Thank you very
24 much.

25



1 MS. NEAL: We've got our pictures on the
2 other side, to kind of balance it out.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What is that right to
4 the west of the bunting?

5 MS. GATES: This, right here?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's the Air Force
8 Academy. That's the chapel.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was trying to decide
10 if that was the chapel or if that was the cabin. I
11 couldn't see from here.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You don't drive by it as
13 often as I do.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. GATES: I'm a native. Yeah, I've been
16 in the Springs all my life. I see it. You forget how
17 wonderful it is when you don't see it all the time.

18 But this is a wonderful piece. Thank you
19 again for letting us do this and we're excited. We're
20 going to use it in curriculum resources from here on out,
21 so it will be a fun resource for all of us.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent. Thank you
23 very much.

24 Shall we press on?

25 MS. NEAL: We might as well.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The next item on the
2 agenda is Denver Public Schools' proposal for waivers
3 pertaining to alternative teacher preparation and
4 induction.

5 Mr. Commissioner?

6 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. We just want to
7 make this presentation. Denver very much wanted to go over
8 this with you, and so we'll start out with Colleen O'Neill.

9 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Good afternoon.
10 Thank you, guys, for entertaining us this afternoon. We
11 have a couple of people here from Denver who are going to
12 present reapplication for their waivers. Their waiver was
13 approved originally for teacher preparation and induction
14 programs, alternative programs, in 2009, so they are up for
15 reauthorization of those waivers.

16 And at this time I'll turn it over to
17 Shannon Hagerman, and she can walk you through a lot of the
18 key points, the high points of the waivers.

19 MS. HAGERMAN: Good afternoon, Board
20 members. Thank you for having us this afternoon. I am
21 joined by Shayne Spalten, who is the Chief of Human
22 Resources for DPS, and I am the Director of Teacher
23 Preparation Pathways for the district.

24 Five years ago, DPS approached the State
25 Board and requested some waivers to allow us to define



1 alternative licensure pathways for individuals who are
2 interested in pursuing teacher careers in DPS,
3 specifically. And now, five years into that project and
4 that endeavor, we have exciting results to share with you,
5 and I am happy and pleased to be the recipient on a daily
6 basis of the benefits that I think this waiver package has
7 provided, and I want you to understand or know how we have
8 leveraged the waivers to deepen and enhance our teaching
9 pipeline and then provide a number of very highly qualified
10 teachers in DPS classrooms.

11 So you have the application. I also
12 forwarded a presentation to you. I won't spend too much
13 time focused on the back story, if you will, but if you
14 just move ahead there, Colleen, for me, to the third --
15 there we go.

16 So the waiver package was designed to help
17 us define and to build out our pipeline of teacher talent.
18 It's become a very important part of our talent management
19 strategy. We attract and recruit teachers from traditional
20 teacher prep programs across the state and across the
21 country, but that still doesn't allow us to meet our hiring
22 needs, as the largest district now in the state and hiring
23 upwards of, well, hundreds of teachers on an annual basis.

24 So we knew that we had to provide
25 alternative pathways to attract candidates into our



1 teaching vacancies, and so that's what the waiver has
2 allowed us to do. And then it has also allowed us to
3 deepen and enhance our relationships with our partners who
4 are preparing teachers in traditional teacher prep programs
5 at universities across the state, and then we are branching
6 into the career lattice and the teacher development
7 pathway, if you will, as well.

8 So if you could go to the next slide, the
9 next one, please.

10 So we will spend a little more of our time
11 focused on the impact of the waiver and some of the things
12 that have gone well. The waiver was always designed to
13 focus on enhancing and increasing student achievements and
14 ensuring that the outcomes continue to be very high for
15 students.

16 There are two pieces that I would showcase
17 that have been implemented as a result of the waiver.
18 There are two alternative route programs that we now
19 showcase. One is the Denver Teacher Residency, which is a
20 partnership with University of Denver. As of just this
21 week, we have, I think it's 180 teachers that will be in
22 DPS classrooms who have graduated from this program, and
23 one of the biggest success stories is that teachers who
24 come through this program are outperforming novice teachers
25 across all indicators on our LEAP Framework. So in their



1 novice year as a teacher, they do very well because they've
2 had a long runway and they've become well-versed in DPS
3 teacher effectiveness evaluation tools, the DPS curriculum,
4 et cetera.

5 Another program that has been very
6 successful in its launch this year is Denver Teach Today
7 program, and that is a program that allows people that have
8 had different types of experience to apply and to
9 participate in an alternative route program that gets them
10 into teaching in a much more condensed fashion, if you
11 will. They take a five-week institute. They've typically
12 had teaching experience. They've passed the PLACE or
13 Praxis, and then with intensive work and support throughout
14 that year they step into classroom positions. And I will
15 tell you that the growth that we have seen, some of them
16 are also outperforming some of our highest performers in
17 the classrooms as well.

18 And then the beauty of the waiver is that we
19 have really been able to fine-tune and to connect
20 everything that we do with teacher preparation to our LEAP
21 Effectiveness Framework. So when you use that tool in
22 addition to ensuring that they have passed the PLACE or
23 Praxis tests, we really do feel like we get a very high-
24 quality caliber candidate, and then they are very
25 successful when they step into the classrooms.



1 Ninety percent of the teachers who have gone
2 through these programs are still teaching today in DPS
3 classrooms. In fact, I think that number might have gone
4 up to about 92 percent. So it has helped us with our
5 retention, which is also a central concern.

6 Where to from here? I think part of the
7 exciting work that has come through the waiver is this
8 partnership and our ability to take a look at how teachers
9 are performing in the classroom and be able to map that
10 back to different preparation programs, specifically the
11 ones that I've mentioned here.

12 But then it's also opened up a nice
13 conversation between DPS and then teacher preparation
14 programs at different universities across the state,
15 locally. And we've had real strength and success in
16 examining the data, talking to our partners, explaining,
17 you know, where strengths exist, where we need to address,
18 perhaps, areas of instruction. We've been able to partner
19 on a quarterly basis and have these conversations with the
20 partners, and that's been a very big value-add.

21 And it's become a very important part of our
22 human capital strategy in how we manage the talent that
23 comes into the district, if you can find them, grow them,
24 keep them. It's hard for us to find people who are very,
25 very deeply dedicated to not just teaching in Denver but



1 teaching in Denver for a very long time, and this allows us
2 to do that by getting them, training them, supporting them,
3 and then keeping them in the classrooms over time.

4 So because of the momentum and the results
5 that we have achieved over the last five years, we are
6 seeking renewal of this waiver package. We feel strongly
7 that it has had an important part in our ability to attract
8 top talent into the district and to develop them. We've
9 worked closely with CDE in partnership in defining what
10 requirements need to be there and how we can guarantee that
11 the candidates are highly qualified and that they will meet
12 the needs of our students and continue to push on student
13 achievement.

14 And that's everything I had. Do you have
15 questions?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions, please.

17 MS. NEAL: I was curious. I noticed, in
18 reading through there, and Board members may notice I sent
19 you that piece about Mesa 51, you talk about compensating
20 them. How does that work? Is it bonuses, or --

21 MS. HAGERMAN: It depends on the program
22 design. We have a couple of different funding streams, and
23 again, each program has different funding streams. Some of
24 them are through federal grants. Some of them are through
25 private donations. We have a very strong partnership with



1 the University of Denver where there is a financial
2 agreement on the tuition side. Some of it is our ProComp
3 money, staff development funding that's available in the
4 district, multiple sources.

5 MS. NEAL: So would you say that you have, I
6 assume, a regular salary schedule, but you are able to add
7 to it from these other various sources?

8 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes. So when a candidate,
9 when they are in their preparation stage, depending -- one
10 of the programs is preservice and then another is
11 alternative licensure. So when they enter into the
12 teaching positions in the district they slide into the
13 district salary schedule. While they're in their residency
14 year there are some financial incentives available to them,
15 because they are not yet a contracted employee. So those
16 financial incentives.

17 MS. NEAL: But do they -- do they -- once
18 they are hired as a teacher do they get these --

19 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes.

20 MS. NEAL: -- compensations?

21 MS. SPALTEN: They fall within our normal
22 teacher compensation structure. So their salary is set,
23 and then they actually advance their salary through our
24 ProComp teacher performance pay system.

25 MS. NEAL: Okay.



1 MS. SPALTEN: I think the other thing is, on
2 the compensation side, you know, I think the programs have
3 been incredibly valuable in creating meaningful roles for
4 strong, experienced teachers as well, who serve as lead
5 teachers in classrooms in which our residents are serving.
6 They receive stipends on top of their normal pay, as well,
7 and those, I think, have been just tremendous career-
8 building roles for those teachers as well.

9 MS. NEAL: That's good to hear because as we
10 talk about 191, which is, of course, just being
11 implemented, many of the districts seem to be not talking
12 about that part of it, and I think that's such an important
13 part of it. That's one of the main reasons to do it. So
14 I'm pleased to hear that you're able to do that. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: I think I'm a little bit
18 behind. I was trying to find some of the evidence of what
19 the program has been up to now. Can you direct me, in your
20 report?

21 MS. HAGERMAN: Mr. Chair, that would be
22 included in the appendix that was sent with the original
23 application document. It's not included in the slide
24 presentation that you have.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. And I'm in the



1 appendix.

2 MS. HAGERMAN: There was some sample charts
3 and graphs. I don't remember. They were toward the latter
4 third.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: The three? You compare the
6 three?

7 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

9 MS. HAGERMAN: That was one.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: That is your evidence.

11 MS. HAGERMAN: That is what -- it is a
12 sample of evidence that was provided. I believe that that
13 sample was for the Denver Teacher Residency Program, and we
14 are able to provide that information in a disaggregated
15 format, based on program type.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

17 MS. HAGERMAN: I didn't include all of the
18 programs. It would have been a lot.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: And do you have the Troops
20 to Teachers also?

21 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes, and that is not covered
22 by -- well, actually, yes, it is. So with our recruiting
23 strategy, when we are looking for candidates to enter into
24 Denver Teacher Residency or Denver Teach Today, we reach to
25 Troops to Teachers and we actually have -- I think at last



1 count there were three or four graduates of DTR that come
2 into us from that pathway.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And then my last
4 question, because you didn't really describe the program,
5 what I'm curious about are what are the opportunities for
6 some of your experienced master teachers? Are they ones
7 who are mentoring?

8 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you just give me a real
10 quick picture of how this happens?

11 MS. HAGERMAN: Sure. So the Denver Teacher
12 Residency is based on the medical residency model, and we
13 have an extensive screening process to bring candidates
14 into the program. Once they are screened and selected then
15 we also have an equally extensive mentoring selection
16 process, and we take a look at performance indicators and
17 principal nominations, et cetera. And then we select the
18 mentors who are then matched with the various residents.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Are they compensated for
20 this additional responsibility?

21 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes. Yes. And then because
22 the backbone of all of the instruction that the residents
23 receive, and our DTT candidates also, is based on our LEAP
24 Framework, it has a tremendous value-add for the current
25 teachers as well, because that is the tool that they use



1 for their own professional practice and evaluation. So
2 it's streamlined all the way.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's a one-year
4 residency?

5 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: And in the subsequent year -
7 - in the first year of full-time --

8 MS. HAGERMAN: -- they slide into our New
9 Educator Institute and all of the novice supports that we
10 provide in the district

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So then that's sort of the
12 induction. Is that right?

13 MS. HAGERMAN: Yes.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Sounds great.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

16 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Is the dispersement
17 of teachers in this group, throughout the district, are
18 charter schools involved, or are there some innovations
19 schools that have these teachers on their staffs? And
20 actually, in the leadership -- in the mentors and the
21 teacher leadership corps, is that also included? Do they
22 all get a share of wealth?

23 MS. HAGERMAN: So, yes, we have teacher
24 residents and DTT candidates across all schools in DPS, not
25 as many in the charter field, if you will, because there's



1 some ongoing conversations about how to align with -- they
2 don't use the LEAP Framework, et cetera. So we are
3 branching into those conversations. They do have a
4 presence in innovation schools and traditional schools.
5 DTR and DTT are typically our first and top priority as
6 Title I schools in ensuring that we have top talent
7 teaching in some of our hardest-to-serve schools.

8 MS. GOFF: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm sure it's in here but
10 I don't -- I can't lay my hands on it quickly. Just as a
11 percentage or a proportion to traditional pathways, what do
12 the number of teachers you're bringing in look like?

13 MS. HAGERMAN: In the alternative -- do you
14 want to --

15 MS. SPALTEN: So generally, among our
16 alternative routes, we're bringing in about 200 -- 175 to
17 200 teachers through our alternative pathways. That's of a
18 total of about 850 to 900 new teachers that we hire every
19 year.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So is that about a
21 quarter?

22 MS. HAGERMAN: Fifteen to 20 percent.

23 MS. SPALTEN: About a quarter, pretty
24 significant portion coming through these routes.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. And the conversion



1 is very high and there's some really interesting positive
2 data.

3 MS. SPALTEN: Yes. I mean, I think one of
4 the incredibly powerful aspects of these programs is that
5 they are focused on serving in Title I, high poverty
6 schools and in hard-to-staff positions. These have been
7 some of our major pipelines for positions for ELA-S
8 positions, for secondary math positions, positions in which
9 we see much lower applicant ratios than we do in other
10 positions within DPS.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

12 MS. BERMAN: Well, I'm happy to see that DPS
13 is being a leader once again in this particular area. And
14 I'm also happy to see that you're taking full advantage of
15 the statute and the ability to seek waivers and to do
16 creative things in terms of teacher preparation. So I
17 would only hope that other districts can learn from you,
18 because I think you're probably doing more progressive
19 things in this area, not in all districts but then
20 certainly some districts. But, of course, that is because
21 of your size and so forth.

22 So I think this is terrific. I am sure the
23 Board will approve your request for -- is this another five
24 years?

25 MS. HAGERMAN: Mm-hmm.



1 MS. BERMAN: -- another five years. And I
2 have to say I've known Shannon since you first became a
3 principal at Montclair Elementary, and she participated at
4 the University of Denver in a principal leadership program,
5 and she completely turned Montclair Elementary around. It
6 was a very low-performing school. She was able to attract
7 a mixed economic parent population, and did a phenomenal
8 job. And what always happens when you've got a good
9 principal is they end up downtown. But now you're doing
10 more good work, so I just wanted to recognize that, and, of
11 course, you as well. So thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any further questions?

13 A motion is in order.

14 MS. NEAL: I move to approve Denver Public
15 Schools' proposal for waivers of Colorado Revised Statutes
16 and Regulations pertaining to alternative teacher
17 preparation and induction.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We have a motion. Elaine
19 seconds. Any objections?

20 Hearing none, the motion carries.

21 Congratulations. Thank you.

22 MS. HAGERMAN: Thank you.

23 MS. SPALTEN: Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My 5:00 was cancelled
25 because of the snow.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good. We're staying
2 until seven.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So I'm trying to figure
4 out how to read this next section in a 3/4 metered time,
5 because the waltz is my favorite dance.

6 Item 12.11 is the next item on the agenda.
7 It's a request to issue a notice of rulemaking concerning
8 rules for a dance endorsement.

9 Mr. Commissioner. Is staff prepared to
10 dance an overview?

11 MR. HAMMOND: Yes, we are.

12 MS. NEAL: We want a demonstration.

13 MR. HAMMOND: Do you want to go ahead and
14 start, Colleen?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want a
16 demonstration, because I'm going to do a demonstration.

17 MS. O'NEILL: I have some great people in
18 the back.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We have had a lot of
20 dancers in the room. There's no doubt about that.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's an interpretive
22 dance. Interpretive dance, anyone?

23 (Laughter.)

24 MS. O'NEILL: Tableaux (ph) are the best
25 ones.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think we need to
2 establish a study session on what exactly a rule would look
3 like through interpretive dance, but let's do that at
4 another time perhaps.

5 MS. O'NEILL: Mr. Chair and members of the
6 Board, we are here this afternoon, and Ms. Gates is going
7 to present you with some information about coming forward
8 with a rulemaking process for our dance endorsement. So at
9 this time I will turn it over to Karol Gates and she will
10 do the interpretive speak as we go forward.

11 MS. GATES: Great. You are familiar with
12 our request. We have had a chance to come to you pre-
13 rulemaking, just to get a nice conversation flowing about
14 this need that we've seen. We appreciate your willingness
15 to let us move forward and giving us that green light at
16 the last meeting we were together.

17 So just going through a few revisitations of
18 what we've discussed in the past, why do we need that dance
19 endorsement? It is the only one of the 10 core disciplines
20 of S.B. 212 that does not have that endorsement
21 opportunity. The quantity and quality, without that dance
22 endorsement there is a wide variety of quality and quantity
23 within private and public programs, along with our
24 community partnerships. And competitiveness, Colorado is
25 in the minority of states that do not offer that dance



1 endorsement. There are 37 other states, about 4 or 5 more
2 we've learned since our first data dive, are starting that
3 process as well. So there will be a good over 40 states
4 with this type of endorsement on the books.

5 The Dance Endorsement Committee has been
6 working on this for three or four years now. This is a
7 representative group that comes together. They do their
8 best to include districts of different sizes. They ensure
9 that they talk with the folks who have encountered issues.
10 But you can see a sampling of who is on that committee. We
11 include our community partners, the Colorado Ballet, et
12 cetera, our higher ed partners, our district partners, so
13 that we can get that great sampling, and they have been
14 hard at work at making the quality and the need and getting
15 you the information you need to make an informed decision.

16 The rules were developed fall of 2012 and
17 fall of 2013. We did a lot of information gathering with
18 stakeholder input. In November and December, of course, we
19 were with you and obtained some permission to begin that
20 rulemaking process. We did the draft rules and wrote that
21 in collaboration with the Dance Endorsement Committee.

22 The December 2013 to January 2014 time frame
23 we did send this to various internal and external
24 stakeholders to review and give feedback on the rule
25 language itself. We did receive by February of 2014 that



1 feedback. We did do the -- we put the draft rules together
2 and updated, through another second-round interview for
3 statements and kinds of things that may or may not work
4 within putting this into final rule. And then we did
5 submit those final draft rules for today's meeting.

6 The external group, we do have a list of who
7 has taken a look at these and given us the feedback. We
8 made a few adjustments, based off that feedback. We also
9 were mindful of the fact that we did want to work within
10 the endorsement rules that are currently on our books from
11 that 1990s legislation. So we tried to do our very best to
12 bring in the new things we know about our academic
13 standards and our expectations of teachers as well as how
14 those rules are written for music and theater, which we
15 used as primary reference for that, to make sure we're
16 somewhat consistent in those as well.

17 The internal CDE units, as well, have been
18 of great help in finalizing these draft rules that you have
19 before you today.

20 The highlights for those rules are basically
21 four larger segments that you would look for in that
22 qualified dance educator. The art of dance, which is
23 understanding the larger context of what dance is as a
24 discipline. The second, 8.20(2) section, is really that
25 pedagogical theory. You heard from the National NDEO



1 president last time she was visiting with us, and she
2 explained that doing doesn't mean teaching, and there is a
3 real pedagogy to teaching others to that degree, so there's
4 a section on that.

5 The advocating that critical thinking and
6 reasoning, this is really what we've put in place with
7 those 21st century skills so that language is directly
8 related to our 21st century skills here in Colorado. And
9 then self-assessing and acting upon, so that evaluative
10 piece of what a teacher does, constant refinement,
11 evaluating teachers, self-assessment, et cetera, and
12 looking forward to ongoing life-long training, professional
13 development, et cetera. Very similar to what we have for
14 our other core areas. We tried to stay right in line with
15 that while bringing in some of that newer language we know
16 that we're using as well.

17 The frequently asked questions, these were
18 directly related to some of our conversations with you as
19 well. The big questions we walked away with from our
20 conversations with you was would this added endorsement
21 require schools to change their currently offered dance
22 program? No, it will not. There will be that grandfather
23 option that we will make very clear to districts, and they
24 will have that option to continue to use PE, under the PE-
25 PS (ph) and dance within those standards. We feel like



1 that's a very nice way to make sure we don't somehow remove
2 programs for kids or cause undue pressure of districts.

3 The added endorsement, will it require
4 current teachers to become endorsed in dance? No. Again,
5 we will offer that grandfather option. This will open the
6 door to people who actually have that dance background,
7 though, to become an endorsed teacher, which is where we
8 were seeing those roadblocks. And what are the primary
9 benefits of adding the endorsement is that flexibility for
10 our school districts that we're hearing from, that are
11 having difficulty getting the best person they want for the
12 job, and yet it will support the dance core content in
13 Colorado Academic Standards and let it live in the same
14 place that our other core subject areas do as well.

15 And I think that our next steps we have up
16 here are those written comments, posting those on the
17 educator licensing website. We are scheduling that
18 rulemaking, or hoping we can do the rulemaking hearing in
19 June. Obviously, because you will be in, I believe, Grand
20 Junction in May, so we felt it was important to be back
21 here for our constituents to come and voice their needs.
22 And then hoping for a vote in June, should you deem that a
23 good timeline, and then we hope to make those rules
24 effective the summer of 2014 and getting our communication
25 out on the changes for that.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Any
2 questions? Pam.

3 MS. MANZANEC: So the grandfather clause is
4 a straight grandfather clause? Even if they want to move
5 around districts they don't have to get an endorsement now
6 if they want to move to a new position?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, that's an
8 interesting question, because, really, there are highly
9 qualified considerations and there are a number of
10 individuals that, depending on how they classify in their
11 actual structure, course structure at the school level,
12 whether it needs to be a dance-certified instructor or
13 whether it can actually be a PE teacher. So as far as the
14 grandfather clause, if they choose to apply for a program
15 that lists dance teacher, they will have to become an
16 endorsed dance teacher. But there are small --

17 MS. NEAL: So the dance clause only applies
18 if they want to stay where they're at.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or if they want to go
20 to somewhere else that has a full dance program, or
21 applies. So it's a little bit about posting more than
22 anything, for where they can go. So there are individuals
23 that are PE teachers right now, teaching dance, because
24 it's actually a PE class, and it's identified as a PE
25 class. So you can hire a PE teacher, be highly qualified,



1 be perfectly fine in that position. There are other
2 programs that have full dance programs, all the way across
3 the board. They post for a certified -- they wish to post
4 for a certified dance teacher.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So -- and I'm going to
6 jump in here with my two left feet and say this is
7 something that I've been, you know, barking about since
8 early on in the process. Are we, in fact, going to limit
9 the opportunities, are we, in fact, going to restrict those
10 people who are able to and would like to teach dance from
11 teaching dance? And what I'm hearing -- you know, it's a
12 yes/no question, is it grandfathered, and the answer comes
13 with 16 qualifications. It doesn't sound a grandfather to
14 me.

15 So, you know, my radar is now running back
16 into the concerned zone.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very well. Thank you.
18 Do you want to try to explain it better than I did?

19 MS. GATES: The way the grandfather would
20 work, because we have dance standards within the PE
21 standards, which was what we --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, let's just back up.
23 I'm a simple guy. Let's just make it a simple question.

24 MS. GATES: Sure.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is someone who wants to



1 teach somewhere else in the state grandfathered or not?

2 MS. GATES: It would depend on the course
3 they're applying for. I think it's the course description.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So that falls
5 under the no category. But go ahead and explain.

6 MS. GATES: Is that correct?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is your question really
10 about how they can teach, or is it about should they be
11 certified teachers? So if a PE teacher is teaching today -
12 - and maybe this is the same question -- teaching today, in
13 dance, do they have to become endorsed in dance, and when,
14 or do they not have to become endorsed in dance, in order
15 to teach?

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. What I'm trying to
17 get to is just in the basic issue. Someone who is teaching
18 dance today, let's say they have the minimal qualifications
19 but they're teaching dance today, and they want to move
20 somewhere else within the state and teach dance, under
21 similar circumstances. Would they be able to do that or
22 not?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. So the answer,
24 truly, to that is yes. Will they be grandfathered in?
25 Yes. We were trying to answer a hiring question, not a



1 grandfathering licensing question.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, in actuality, that
3 only depends on -- that's actually dependent upon whether
4 the hiring district is advertising for a certified dance
5 instructor or a PE teacher.

6 MS. NEAL: And we had this discussion when
7 they --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what's going to
9 happen with school districts? Are they all going to -- so
10 this is one of the concerns that was presented to me by a
11 high school principal, is that it is difficult for them to
12 find qualified dance instructors for the classes they were
13 talking about because they are wading through PE teachers.
14 There is no way to identify.

15 MS. NEAL: Can I jump in?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which I completely
17 understand. But what I'm worried about is that will it
18 effectively wipe out all those PE teachers who want to
19 teach dance? Will all districts now start advertising for
20 certified dance instructors?

21 MS. NEAL: Can I jump in, because I had this
22 -- I think I got it the first time, too, we had this
23 question. There are districts who are mostly going to be
24 the larger districts that have very advanced, and they want
25 dance teachers, you know, DPS, Colorado Springs, some of



1 those. Most districts are not going to want them, but the
2 PE teacher may teach dance, and that's all right. Nobody
3 is going to tell them they can't teach dance. But if they
4 get the certification and one of these districts is looking
5 for somebody to really teach dance, that's who they will
6 get. Am I right?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So as long as it's
8 broadening opportunity, not restricting opportunity.

9 MS. NEAL: Yeah. No, it will not.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's my concern.

11 MS. NEAL: And we talked about that before.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I can give you an
13 example, a personal example when I was a human resources
14 director in Greeley. It was very much about -- we had one
15 high school that had a full dance program, very full dance
16 program. We wanted someone that had that pedagogical
17 understanding of the dance program. But we also had a
18 middle school who had a dance class. Very different in
19 structure. We were not able to actually post for a dance
20 instructor because there was no such certification, so we
21 didn't. And we a lot of times had PE teachers, or, you
22 know, we had adjunct faculty, or we had something else
23 around that. So it really does offer more flexibility than
24 restriction.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Angelika.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I know we haven't seen the
2 rules and the detail yet, but how much of a challenge is
3 this going to be to get an endorsement, should you choose?
4 And I know a lot of teachers who seek multiple
5 endorsements. Do you have a guess? I know that you're not
6 in the weeds yet.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We did go ahead and
8 give you the rules, so the draft rules are with it. And
9 I'm going to let Karol --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: I couldn't get from the
11 draft rules a sense for how many courses it would take.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. I will let Karol
13 try to answer, because we talked to our institutes of
14 higher education about some of what does that look like.

15 MS. GATES: So we used the template for the
16 endorsements for music and theater as performing arts
17 samples. So that falls directly in what we have as rules
18 currently for those. What then happens is the higher ed
19 institutions, you got those letters of intent at the first
20 meeting, who want to pursue offering these programs to
21 endorse teachers, would then meet our criteria for
22 accrediting those teaching programs like we do for all our
23 subject areas, using these rules as their guidepost. So
24 how they put together the -- whether they do an intensive,
25 or they do a basic, you know, how many courses you need,



1 that kind of thing will be up to those higher ed programs
2 to decide. The Dance Endorsement Committee is working on
3 trying to put together a field guidebook, in a sense, of
4 all the different possibilities out there that higher ed
5 might look at to make this endorsement possible, depending
6 on how many credits a teacher comes in knowing, and how
7 much life experience they have, et cetera.

8 So it's going to be very much dependent on
9 the various programs and what they offer. UNC will
10 currently be unveiling -- they just are starting their
11 master's in dance program, so they can envision putting
12 that educational requirements, dovetailing into those
13 programs. So it depends on how they build their program,
14 frankly.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: That was not specific, but I
17 think what you're saying is it's going to depend, because
18 different institutions are going to offer -- they're going
19 to include the rules that you gave us --

20 MS. GATES: Yes.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- but it's going to be
22 structured as they want to structure it. And it may mean a
23 master's degree as well as an endorsement.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's the way it
25 is for every discipline right now.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's no different.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I thought you could get an
4 additional endorsement without an additional degree,
5 without a master's.

6 MS. GATES: You can.

7 MS. NEAL: Well, you don't have to have a
8 master's, but you said it may be a master's.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. Right. But you can
10 do it with a lot less, in some areas, at least.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're saying
13 endorsement rules, so at this point you can get an
14 endorsement. Once you have a teaching degree you can get
15 an endorsement one of three ways, at a secondary level. So
16 by degree, 24 semester credit hours; or by PLACE or Praxis
17 or assessment.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So those are the three
20 options that we have. So what we -- we expect to come
21 forward, and this is one of the reasons that we're very
22 interested in being able to move forward with the
23 endorsement rules themselves, is because then our
24 institutes of higher education can come forward with
25 requests for authorization and approval rights. Then we



1 would have our rules in place to balance that up against,
2 as well as our standards that have been in place.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb, Jane, questions?
4 No?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I have one more.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, sorry. Angelika,
7 please.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, if I could add to
9 that. Is it conceivable that a dance company, a stationary
10 dance company in Colorado would create something that would
11 serve as an endorsement?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it conceivable?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I guess in New York
14 you've got bigger dance companies and a broader array of
15 resources.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we do not --
19 statute right now does not open the door, necessarily, for
20 us to approve third-party programs that are not associated
21 with institutes of higher education. So that -- I mean, is
22 it conceivable in the statutory changes? Yes.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or alternative
25 pathways, potentially, if someone were to look at that area



1 too.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you.

3 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: If no further questions
5 or comments I would entertain a motion.

6 MS. NEAL: Oh, he's got me on my toes.

7 I move to approve the notice of rulemaking
8 hearing for the rules concerning a dance endorsement.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Seconded by the ever-
10 nimble Elaine Gantz Berman.

11 Any objections?

12 Hearing none, the motion carries. Thank you
13 very much.

14 MS. GATES: Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dance your way out of
17 here.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a motion
19 concerning agenda item 12.12?

20 MS. NEAL: With regard to agenda item 12.12,
21 OAC Case No. ED 2012-0011, I move to reverse the decision
22 of the administrative law judge and order that the holder's
23 license be revoked.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?

25 Seconded by Dr. Schroeder.



1 Any objection?

2 Hearing none, the motion carries. Thank you
3 very much.

4 Yeah. Let's take a one-minute break and
5 then we'll come back --

6 MS. NEAL: Yeah. Let's take a short break.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- to number/figure
8 setting, board member reports, and then public comments.
9 That's what the rest of our day looks like.

10 (Meeting adjourned)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 23rd day of April, 2019.

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

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