



**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 4

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: That is the preliminary  
2 gavel strike as we move forward toward the figure setting  
3 portion of our afternoon, budget and figure setting  
4 update. I suspect that I could probably defer, on behalf  
5 of the Commissioner, to Mr. Jeff Blanford. Is that a  
6 fair motion?

7                   MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

8                   MR. HAMMOND: I will honor that request,  
9 sir.

10                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There we go. Please, go  
11 ahead, Mr. Blanford.

12                  MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Commissioner and  
13 Mr. Chair. Good afternoon.

14                  Well, this is my favorite time of year.

15                  MS. NEAL: Because you get to visit with us.

16                  MR. BLANFORD: Some people like the  
17 holidays. Some people like summer. I like figure  
18 setting. It gives me a sense of closure.

19                  MS. NEAL: You know, he's changed so much  
20 since the time when he started this job. He actually has  
21 more humor.

22                  MR. BLANFORD: And I'm going to take that as  
23 a compliment.

24                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Punchy is another word  
25 for it.



1 MR. BLANFORD: It is rather late in the day  
2 too.

3 You guys have a handout in front of you.  
4 Our figure setting hearing was March 6th, last week. And  
5 there was a little give-and-take but overall, I think it  
6 went pretty well. The first two items are the  
7 statutorily required requests we make for total program  
8 and categoricals. Total program is just the starting  
9 point. As you probably know, the school finance bill has  
10 been introduced, I believe it was February 28th was when  
11 it was introduced. House Bill 14-1298 is the number for  
12 it this year. But the legislature is holding off before  
13 the move on it until they get the most recent economic  
14 forecast, which is scheduled for March 18th. We should  
15 see it get moving after that. They just want the best  
16 revenue estimates, not simply for this line but for the  
17 whole budget. So we will see that get moving here  
18 shortly.

19 This was one of the more exciting years for  
20 categoricals. I don't want to get your hopes up too much  
21 but it was different than most years. As probably know,  
22 categoricals must increase by inflation, which this year  
23 was 2.8 percent, the CPI inflation rate. And those  
24 increases, or that increase is allocated across the  
25 programs in the categorical lines.



1                   Due to the \$20 million increase that special  
2 education saw last year in the school finance bill,  
3 Senator Steadman made a motion to reduce the increase for  
4 special education by \$400,000, and as he put it, spread  
5 the love to other programs.

6                   The reduction in special ed, it takes it  
7 down to about \$3.7 million, so it certainly didn't  
8 eliminate the increase to SpEd, but there were some other  
9 programs the JBC deemed in more need or greater need, and  
10 those are at the bottom of the first page on your  
11 handout. ELPA received an additional \$100,000,  
12 Transportation and Career and Technical Education  
13 received \$50,000 each, and Gifted and Talented received  
14 an additional \$200,000, which notably took it over \$10  
15 million in total funding this year.

16                   Now to the items that we submitted, as a  
17 Department. The information management systems, the core  
18 network refresh was approved in full, so we got the  
19 \$3,064,000, and the 5 FTE we requested there. Assessment  
20 was approved at what we requested and then a little bit  
21 more. The Spanish Language Arts assessment needed  
22 funding for administration next year. Currently that  
23 assessment is included in the TCAP contract with CTB, so  
24 the JBC elected to provide an additional \$826,000 of  
25 funding, which is based on the Department's estimate of



1 what we think that test will cost to administer in the  
2 spring of 2015.

3 The next item was College and Career, and as  
4 you may recall that was a request for staff to help  
5 support and provide technical assistance around the  
6 ICAPs, graduation guidelines, concurrent enrollment, and  
7 innovative schools. The committee approved our request  
8 but they reduced it by \$63,671, based on their policy.  
9 Generally, they do not allow requests for salaries that  
10 are greater than the minimum of that range for that  
11 position, health, life, and dental benefits, or lease or  
12 building rental. I say "typically" because they will  
13 make exceptions, and in our conversations with JBC staff  
14 we did provide some justification but they still elected  
15 to deny those items.

16 The Educator Recognition and Perception went  
17 along similar lines. For those of you who were at our  
18 JBC hearing in December, you may recall Senator Steadman  
19 raising the issue with funding for the Teacher of the  
20 Year. It had been funded with private donations in the  
21 first year of the program. As a result, they denied the  
22 recognition and Teacher of the Year because it is in  
23 violation of current statute. However, they did approve  
24 our request for the TELL survey in the amount of  
25 \$100,000.



1                   School District Support for English Language  
2 Learners was reduced in the same fashion that College and  
3 Career readiness was, for the same reasons. The amounts  
4 are much larger because there's more FTE there.

5                   The Early Literacy Assessment, our request  
6 for the licenses and assessment tool were approved but  
7 our request for the FTE to manage the program, both with  
8 the vendor as well as coordinating with districts who  
9 would be receiving training, et cetera, was denied. We  
10 were instructed to absorb that within existing resources.

11                   And the last three items -- Start Smart,  
12 Building Excellent Schools Today, and the CSDB requests  
13 were all approved in full.

14                   Overall, it was a pretty good year. It  
15 wasn't perfect but with six requests, the JBC is  
16 generally going to make some adjustments.

17                   With that, if you have any questions --

18                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions? Jane first.

19                   MS. GOFF: Quickly, I had gotten used to,  
20 over several years now, looking at this and seeing  
21 Counselor Corps, but knowing that there is another,  
22 separate bill really pretty much singly topiced, titled  
23 on that, what kind of risk is being run here? What if  
24 the fate of the bill is not necessarily in its favor, and  
25 we don't have it?



1                   MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That  
2 was actually one of the brightest spots of our hearing.  
3 Our JBC analyst met with Misti Ruthven, the individual  
4 who manages the Counselor Corps here at CDE. She has  
5 implemented several changes over the last year as to how  
6 the grants are awarded, how they're monitored after  
7 award, how they're made. There's sort of a planning  
8 grant phase now that didn't exist before. And he was  
9 very impressed with those changes.

10                   The reason you've seen those on this sheet  
11 in the past, those requests, is because the JBC analyst  
12 was recommending reductions or elimination of that  
13 program, and he seems fully in support of it now. He  
14 actually took time to comment on how well the program was  
15 being run. So I think we're in good shape there.

16                   And then the bill you mentioned, I believe -  
17 - and someone please correct me if I'm wrong -- I believe  
18 it increases the funding to \$10 million. That may or may  
19 not pass, but the \$5 million we currently have is secure  
20 and we don't expect it to go anywhere.

21                   MS. GOFF: Thanks. You read my mind with  
22 the follow-up question, because is the original \$5  
23 million, that also took a little struggle to get back, if  
24 that's still in there. People ask. Thank you very much.

25                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I just forgot what this \$8  
2 million regarding BEST lease payments is about.

3 MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It is  
4 basically a statutory requirement as well as to meet the  
5 requirements of the debt covenants we have. We have to  
6 have an appropriation that includes the federal subsidy  
7 that goes into this program, to ensure that the issuer of  
8 the debt is covered in full either way. So it's really  
9 to meet that requirement in the debt covenants.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: It's not the total lease  
11 payment.

12 MR. BLANFORD: No. No. It's purely to meet  
13 the requirement of the lender. The Federal Government is  
14 covering those amounts, but because of the covenants  
15 within the debt instrument we have to have an  
16 appropriation in the event the Federal Government elects  
17 not to pay or default.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Is this every year?

19 MR. BLANFORD: Yes, it is.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Sorry.

21 MR. HAMMOND: It was a technical adjustment.

22 MR. BLANFORD: Yes, and actually, in prior  
23 years, we had not bumped up against the spending  
24 authority for this program, so the lender was covered.  
25 Now that we hit the spending authority we had to increase





1 it to cover those requirements.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for the report. Did  
4 we ever get any detail on the IMS Core Network and IF  
5 Infrastructure Refresh? I don't remember. But I  
6 remember when we looked at the budget a while back, we  
7 looked at these line items, but I wasn't sure what they  
8 meant.

9 MR. BLANFORD: Yes. We provided quite  
10 extensive detail. I would be glad to send that to you.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Off microphone.)

12 MR. HAMMOND: No. Half of the money is  
13 literally for equipment that's completely obsolete. The  
14 other half, the staffing part, is really staffing to help  
15 implement the very programs that are coming to fruition  
16 now, related to 191, et cetera. And one of the positions  
17 is a security officer. Their primary job will be to  
18 really assist us in the security, even more. We parcel  
19 it out now. We're focusing all that around one person to  
20 work with the state security officer.

21 MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yeah,  
22 in general, it has five FTE. One of the those, as the  
23 Commissioner indicated, is for security, about half of  
24 the request. So say about \$1.4 million is for equipment,  
25 and not all of it but several pieces of equipment are



1 directed at security as well. So that is a component of  
2 the request.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions?

4 Thank you and we hope you enjoy your  
5 favorite time of the year, Jeff.

6 MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You,  
7 as well. Good afternoon.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The next item is, if my  
9 eyes do not deceive me, board member reports. Does  
10 anyone have anything to report?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not yet. Next month  
12 I'll have a lot.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You're all getting on  
14 airplanes here pretty quick. You will have a lot to  
15 report soon, huh?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I went to the CASE and  
17 CASB conferences.

18 MS. NEAL: They weren't too exciting.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, go ahead.

20 MS. BERMAN: Sure. I was recently asked to  
21 join a National Collaboration on Health and Education,  
22 which is in D.C., and I accept almost all invitations to  
23 go to D.C., for reasons that you all know, other than  
24 political. And it turned out to be really quite  
25 terrific. They had a very high-level, good group of



1 people. It turned out that while our meeting was going  
2 on the First Lady made an announcement at the White House  
3 regarding her next priorities for her Let's Move  
4 campaign, and the National Collaborative got all of us  
5 invited. So we got to go to the White House, and it was  
6 fun. It was fun. It was in one of those big, formal  
7 rooms with the chandeliers and the curtains, where they  
8 have the dinners. I thought maybe I'd get to meet the  
9 First Lady but she came in a side door and went out the  
10 side door.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She knows how to move.

12 MS. BERMAN: The Secretary of Agriculture  
13 also spoke. What?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She knows how to move?

15 MS. BERMAN: Yes. Yes. Yes. But that was  
16 really fun. And then I think this collaborative is going  
17 to be very exciting. So I think those were my  
18 highlights. I'll have to think, go back to my calendar.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Does it relate to what we're  
20 doing here with the Start Smart Nutrition? I mean, did  
21 they talk about state initiatives or was it more  
22 federally driven?

23 MS. BERMAN: No. They had two priorities.  
24 One has to do with how the Affordable Care Act can help  
25 with the intersection with education, and the other had



1 to do with data and data collection. And we did talk  
2 about data privacy and we did talk about what we were  
3 doing in Colorado, and they were very pleased to hear  
4 about our work, and so forth. But those were the two  
5 areas that they're homing in on.

6 MS. NEAL: Well, I have a little one and  
7 then I'll come back and add a big one.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Vice Chair.

9 MS. NEAL: Because I did mention that I went  
10 with Dr. Owen and the Commissioner and we went to the  
11 rural schools meeting in Ridgeway, Colorado, which is a  
12 wonderful place to go.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it's beautiful.

14 MS. NEAL: And it was really interesting. I  
15 always really enjoy hearing that perspective.

16 But as I mentioned already this morning, you  
17 know, they were very much concerned about the negative  
18 factor, and, you know, if I had to do the legislative  
19 thing over again next year -- remember this -- I think I  
20 would say about the legislation, is it necessary? Is  
21 this really filling a need? Because we keep getting  
22 these bills, and I'm going, well, okay, you know. But we  
23 need to have some sort of priority because all of those  
24 things, those kinds of legislations, and the one-time  
25 money that you spoke of this morning, is that necessary



1 one-time money? You know, if they really had a focus on  
2 reducing the negative factor -- I've asked Jennifer a  
3 couple of times and we haven't got it and it's okay --  
4 how much money have we designated in the legislature this  
5 year, in the bills they've passed this year? What does  
6 that add up to? I don't know but I'm sure it's a fair  
7 amount of money. And then we look at all the other areas.

8 So, I would -- you know, we really need to -  
9 - if we want to reduce the negative factor, and that's a  
10 promise we made to those districts a long time ago, you  
11 know, we need to look at ways in which to conserve, and  
12 not -- the legislators mean really well, but, you know,  
13 they get there and they just want to pass a bill. I've  
14 got a bill and I want to pass it, and it's only \$15  
15 million, or whatever it is.

16 So it's very interesting. I always enjoy  
17 that group. It was a lot of fun.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And you preserved  
19 some time?

20 MS. NEAL: Yeah, I preserved a little bit to  
21 add onto Paul's.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Comments? Board reports?  
23 Deb, anything?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will have several  
25 little items next time.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It will be easier at  
3 that point.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough. I have  
5 always enjoyed Mark Twain, and Sam Clements said, "I  
6 didn't have time to write you a short letter so I wrote  
7 the long one instead," and that is a preface for my  
8 comments. I wished I'd had time to write a short letter  
9 but I didn't, and so I wrote this instead.

10 We are in a time of reflection. Not a day  
11 goes by without reading about the Common Core standards.  
12 The stories appear in the national media and the local  
13 media. Many oppose the Common Core for a variety of  
14 reasons. Likewise, many support the standards for a  
15 variety of reasons.

16 Given the current level of dialogue  
17 concerning Common Core around the country, and Colorado,  
18 and consistent public comment during the past several  
19 months here at our Board meetings, I feel it imperative  
20 to reflect on where we are as a state and articulate a  
21 forward-looking vision regarding this issue for Colorado.

22 Let me preface further my remarks by stating  
23 that as much as I would have preferred that the Common  
24 Core had never intruded on the standards effort that was  
25 well underway in Colorado, I deeply respect the work that



1 districts, teachers, superintendents, and CDE are all  
2 doing today to implement the Colorado Academic Standards  
3 which are informed by the Common Core. Do not  
4 misunderstand me as someone who opposes standards in  
5 general.

6 That being said, having learned lessons from  
7 what I will refer to as this current experiment, I would  
8 like to draw a line in the sand which Colorado should not  
9 cross. That is to say, as we move forward, improving our  
10 standards, which we should do in the fullness of time,  
11 Colorado must remain true to its independent tradition  
12 and spirit and develop future Colorado, for Colorado, and  
13 by Colorado, unique standards that will set the bar of  
14 learning achievement ever higher.

15 Colorado has the ability to be more than  
16 common. We have the ability to be exceptional. We must  
17 answer the call to lead, not only among the 50 states but  
18 within Colorado-controlled standards in hand, we can and  
19 should lead the world.

20 A bit of history will explain how we've  
21 arrived at this juncture. I believe you will find this  
22 brief recitation of our recent past helpful.

23 Colorado Senate Bill 08-212, Colorado's  
24 Achievement Plan for Kids, known informally as CAP4K,  
25 called for the development of rigorous standards for



1 students. Pursuant to the bill, in 2008 and 2009, the  
2 Colorado Department of Education engaged in a years-long  
3 process to revise its academic standards in math, English  
4 language proficiency, and 10 content areas -- dance,  
5 drama, and theater arts, mathematics, music, reading and  
6 writing, and communicating, science, social studies,  
7 visual arts, and world languages.

8 CDE released drafts of the standards for  
9 public comment and then conducted a 10-city Colorado  
10 outreach tour to solicit public feedback on the  
11 standards. The Colorado Academic Standards resulted from  
12 this work, and in December of 2009, the State Board of  
13 Education adopted these Colorado Academic Standards.

14 Meanwhile, Common Core development was  
15 running a parallel path. Because we were already doing  
16 work on standards, Colorado was among the six states that  
17 provided feedback to those who were creating the Common  
18 Core standards. Once the Common Core was released, CDE  
19 commissioned a study to compare Colorado's home-grown  
20 CAP4K standards in reading, writing, communicating, and  
21 math, with the Common Core. That study showed strong  
22 alignment of the two sets of standards, and using the  
23 results of the study and feedback from standards  
24 development committees, prior to my time here, on a 4-3  
25 vote the State Board of Education adopted the Common Core





1 state standards in mathematics and English language arts  
2 on August 2, 2010.

3 The inherent shift in ownership and control  
4 over standards at that point, and then later, regarding  
5 assessments, from Colorado to regional and national  
6 unelected bodies, was induced by promises of money from  
7 the Federal Government and enforced by the Colorado  
8 General Assembly. The General Assembly, via legislation  
9 in 2012, mandated that Colorado join one of the two  
10 assessment consortiums, whose charge is to develop a  
11 common set of assessments in English and math. In other  
12 words, Colorado joined the Partnership for Assessment of  
13 Readiness for College and Careers, or PARCC, because the  
14 General Assembly mandated that we do so.

15 As a condition of member of PARCC, Colorado  
16 was required to adopt the Common Core in math and English  
17 language arts. Thus, adoption of the Common Core became,  
18 at that juncture, de facto mandated by the General  
19 Assembly via state statute. And while the General  
20 Assembly mandated in that law that Colorado participate  
21 as a governing board member in a multi-state assessment  
22 consortium, the General Assembly has failed to fund the  
23 statutorily encouraged, the phrase in the law is  
24 "strongly encouraged," fiscal and student achievement  
25 analysis of Colorado remaining as a governing member of



1 the consortium. Thus, while the General Assembly  
2 mandating participation in the consortium, it has stepped  
3 away from its responsibility to appropriate funding so  
4 that a determination can be made as to the viability of  
5 continuing to participate as a governing member of PARCC.

6 So where does this leave us today? Back in  
7 the classrooms, we're now at the point where Colorado  
8 school districts are in the process of implementing the  
9 Colorado Academic Standards, which include the Common  
10 Core. Full implementation is required in the '13-'14  
11 school year, and as I mentioned earlier, teachers,  
12 principals, education leaders in Colorado have done a  
13 yeoman's job of making that happen.

14 Happily, while Colorado adopted the Common  
15 Core state standards in English language arts and math,  
16 the state continues to maintain some unique-to-Colorado  
17 standards within those content areas as well, and, as  
18 always has been the case, school districts maintain the  
19 autonomy to adopt their own curriculum to meet the  
20 standards, and teachers retain the ability to design  
21 their instruction in ways that support students in  
22 meeting the standards. In other words, curriculum in  
23 Colorado is the responsibility and constitutional right  
24 of districts, and we, on the State Board, should take  
25 action to bolster school districts' ability to protect



1 that local control of curriculum and continue the vital  
2 efforts by local districts and boards to evaluate  
3 teachers and develop new ways to reward and encourage  
4 excellence through S.B. 191.

5 This brings me to another pressing issue,  
6 and that is assessment. As we are all aware, school  
7 districts, teachers, students, and parents are growing  
8 increasingly fatigued with the growing number of  
9 assessments mandated by state and federal law. This is  
10 an issue that I will speak to presently.

11 But first, it is appropriate to consider the  
12 effect that the linkage that common standards, when bound  
13 to a common, high-stakes-for-students-and-teachers  
14 assessment will have over what is taught in the  
15 classroom. Educators Evaluating the Quality of  
16 Instruction Products -- that's the name of a group -- or  
17 EQUiP, is an initiative created by ACHIEVE, which you  
18 know is the group that has been key to the development  
19 and maintenance of the Common Core. It is essentially  
20 the staff element of that effort.

21 Today, EQUiP is hard at work shaping and  
22 winnowing curriculum that will line up with the Common  
23 Core-associated assessments. In a recent *Ed Week* report,  
24 Sandy Hayes, the immediate past president of the National  
25 Council of Teachers of English, said the EQUiP guidelines



1 are a, quote, "terrific tool for conversation, and as  
2 teachers write lessons together in their schools." But  
3 she worries that such a rating system could subtly work  
4 to narrow the concept of, again, quote, "good materials."

5 Ms. Hayes continues: "In talking about  
6 what's good, sometimes people can be silenced, or there  
7 is this group-think that happens when you find yourself  
8 compromising to get consensus." That ends that quote.

9 Her concluding thoughts in the article are,  
10 again, a quote, "I just wonder what's lost in the  
11 process," and as to Colorado's control over this  
12 component I'm told that Colorado's involvement in EQUIP  
13 does not exist at this point.

14 Now to the practical aspects we are facing  
15 regarding assessments. The PARCC assessments are the  
16 latest in an increasing burden of standardized  
17 assessments that are or will be required to be  
18 administered in Colorado classrooms. I question whether  
19 PARCC will be able to deliver on its commitment of having  
20 tests ready for the '14-'15 school year. The fact that  
21 the General Assembly and Governor forced Colorado to  
22 participate as a governing member in the consortium, in  
23 my opinion, is not good policy, not good for Colorado  
24 students, parents, or educators.

25 During the 2012 legislative session, and



1 prior to the time that the General Assembly enacted the  
2 law that forced that, the State Board of Education budget  
3 submittal requested that Colorado be allowed to develop  
4 its own assessment, believing that a Colorado-designed  
5 assessment would be the best test of what Colorado  
6 students know, and would be far superior to any  
7 assessment a group of states, driven by layers of  
8 bureaucracy, lacking in transparency, and receiving  
9 private funding from interest groups with their own  
10 agenda possibly in play, could design. The General  
11 Assembly denied the State Board's request and instead  
12 passed the legislation requiring Colorado to join a  
13 multi-state assessment consortium.

14 The projections for the time it will take to  
15 administer the PARCC assessment are staggering, and to  
16 what end? So that we, as a state, can determine whether  
17 our students are measuring up to the students across the  
18 country? That is the wrong vision. Our vision should be  
19 to lead the country in education, and how better to do  
20 that than by defining our own destiny through choosing  
21 our own assessments.

22 The state should investigate state-  
23 controlled alternatives. For example, ACT, well-known  
24 assessment provider, has an available assessment called  
25 ASPIRE. This is an example of the assessments that are



1 now available and would be potentially appropriate  
2 options for Colorado.

3 As Chairman of the Colorado State Board of  
4 Education I respectfully call for action by the General  
5 Assembly and the Governor during this legislative  
6 session. We, as a Board, are constitutionally charged to  
7 oversee the education of students in this state. It is  
8 time to demand action from the General Assembly to repeal  
9 the statute mandating that Colorado participate as a  
10 governing member in the PARCC consortium. We, as the  
11 Board, have a duty to lead the state in the development  
12 of education. We have listened to our constituents and  
13 now is the time to act. I see no further benefit to be  
14 gained from waiting for the development of the PARCC  
15 assessment when serious questions exist as to the ability  
16 of Colorado districts to administer the test and for  
17 PARCC to deliver on its commitment.

18 I will open the floor for discussion and I  
19 suggest that we take this in stride next month, but let  
20 it be clear that at the April Board meeting I will seek a  
21 motion from this Board directing the General Assembly to  
22 repeal 22-7-106, thereby decoupling Colorado from its  
23 mandated membership as a governing member of the PARCC  
24 consortium and freeing up the State Board of Education  
25 and the Department of Education to act in the best



1 interest of students, educators, and parents in choosing  
2 the right assessments for our students.

3 So that is my long letter. Elaine.

4 MS. NEAL: Can I?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

6 MS. NEAL: Because I had --

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Marcia wanted to go  
8 first.

9 MS. NEAL: Paul had forgotten that he had  
10 told me, because Paul and I have talked about this.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yesterday we talked a  
12 little bit.

13 MS. NEAL: I tried to use my English teacher  
14 but it didn't work very well.

15 But, no, we have talked about this a great  
16 deal and I appreciate what Paul has said and agree with  
17 many parts of it, particularly the assessment being  
18 legislated. I was not happy about that at the time. I  
19 thought Colorado should be able to do their own. I have  
20 talked to Michael Johnson about it several times. So I  
21 totally agree with that.

22 On the other hand, as most of you know, you  
23 know, I've not had a problem with the standards, and it,  
24 in many ways, what we've said here, it isn't the  
25 standards that are the problem. They really are not.



1 They're not perfect, but it's not the standards that is  
2 the problem. It's the involvement of the Federal  
3 Government and, to some degree, the state.

4 And, frankly, and I -- it just makes me mad  
5 every time I think about it -- shortly -- in the  
6 President's 2010 State of the Union address, in 2010 --  
7 he'd only been in office a year -- President Obama took  
8 credit for the standards movement. He said it was the  
9 signature accomplishment, the most meaningful reform in a  
10 generation, when he, in fact, had nothing to do with  
11 that. You know, we know that. We started that with  
12 Senate Bill 212. And frankly, I think that's created a  
13 lot of the problem, when he stepped forward and took  
14 responsibility. That is a great deal of the problem.

15 So I have agreed with Paul and I would like  
16 to see this action take place too. I have a couple of  
17 other things but I can say them later. So I just wanted  
18 to let you know that we had discussed this and I think  
19 it's a reasonable --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I appreciate that.  
21 And I want this to have time for discussion. At the same  
22 time, I wanted to get the conversation out in front of  
23 the General Assembly so they have time, in this session,  
24 to take action, should they choose to take action.

25 So this is an issue that we have got some





1 time to think on, and we can interact more fully on next  
2 week. If you want to make comments or respond at this  
3 point I am certainly open to that.

4 MS. BERMAN: Yes, I would. I didn't know  
5 anything about this. I guess you had spoken to some of  
6 your colleagues, but I didn't know anything about this,  
7 so this is the very first I've heard of any of this. So  
8 when you used the term "we, the Board," you really -- we  
9 are not talking we, the Board. You are talking about  
10 Paul Lundeen, as Chair of the Board. So I --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let me be clear. And in  
12 cases where I am, in fact, speaking an issue of opinion,  
13 I am speaking as Paul Lundeen. In cases where I speak  
14 only with regard to fact and the action taken by the  
15 General Assembly, and the requirement upon the State  
16 Board, I am speaking on -- you know, as -- you know, as a  
17 representative of the broader board.

18 MS. BERMAN: Well, I don't have anything in  
19 front of me, so -- but, anyway, that's kind of what I  
20 heard.

21 MS. NEAL: Well, let me just add that that's  
22 what -- it gives you a month. In a way this is the  
23 notification. Paul is saying "I'd like to see this. I'm  
24 going to ask for it next month." So you've got a month  
25 to think about it.



1 MS. BERMAN: No, no. Well, for me you know  
2 I don't have to think about this very much. So, number  
3 one, I hadn't heard anything about this before. Number  
4 two is, in terms of protocol, I'm not sure this fits into  
5 board reports. This is a policy issue that I would say  
6 probably should have been included in the agenda or some  
7 other part of the agenda. But that's just protocol.

8 Number three, there were --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And we can -- to that  
10 point, we'll give it an agenda item for next month, so  
11 that it is, in fact -- it does have an opportunity for  
12 clearer action.

13 MS. BERMAN: Because I always think of board  
14 reports being we just report out on activities and  
15 sharing, not on major policy issues. If you want to  
16 change that we certainly could revisit that.

17 There were a number of things in there that  
18 I agreed with. I think -- I think what, in my tenure on  
19 the State Board, what has been the most disappointing to  
20 me -- and this is for all the different boards, since I -  
21 - you know, every time you add a new Board member there  
22 is a different board -- is how much we let politics  
23 dictate what our policies are. So -- and I know -- and  
24 I'm that way too. I will not say that I'm different. I  
25 wish I were. I wish all of us were.



1                   But in this particular -- on this particular  
2                   topic, one of the things I feel strongest about in the  
3                   years that I've served on the State Board is that there  
4                   is some commonality of standards across the United States  
5                   of America. I have been talking about this for years,  
6                   even before Common Core existed. And this whole notion  
7                   that Colorado has to lead the way, and we have to be  
8                   better than everyone -- I don't believe in that,  
9                   inherently. To me, all kids in the United States should  
10                  have access to high-quality education and high standards.

11                  So that is such a pivotal point for me,  
12                  Paul, in terms of the difference in the way we think. I  
13                  don't care who develops the standards as long as they're  
14                  rigorous and that kids in all states have to reach those  
15                  same standards.

16                  The assessments is another conversation, and  
17                  I kind of wish we could divide them out, because I think  
18                  if we could agree on the standards part then we could  
19                  talk about the assessments. But I don't think we do  
20                  agree on the standards. Let's forget they were called  
21                  Common Core. Let's forget that -- I mean, a number of  
22                  people keep calling them controlled by the Feds. I don't  
23                  believe that. They were started by the National  
24                  Governors Association and the Council of Chief State  
25                  School Officers. But people keep calling them that



1 they're controlled by the Feds.

2 And you are absolutely correct. Governor  
3 Roemer started the standards movement, many years ago.  
4 That was started in Colorado as a national movement,  
5 state standards. You can go back and get the history on  
6 that.

7 Sorry. I lost my train of thought when I  
8 went on this -- no, I know. I think you probably get --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It wasn't a very good  
10 point anyway.

11 MS. BERMAN: It wasn't a good point anyway.

12 In any case, I will look forward to the  
13 conversation. I would -- I think where I was going on  
14 that is if they were called something different and there  
15 wasn't the perception of federal involvement, would we  
16 feel differently about them, and can we have a  
17 conversation at the next Board meeting about the concept  
18 of having high standards for all children in the United  
19 States, and that Colorado be amongst those states that  
20 are meeting those high standards. If we can separate  
21 that out from the political ramifications that have  
22 gotten us all in tangles.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I will respond briefly to  
24 that and then let others comment as they will.

25 I think we do probably have a philosophical



1 difference on this question of whether common-to-the-  
2 country standards is the appropriate path or not. I  
3 perceive that we have had 50 unique experiments in  
4 democracy, and that provides for the opportunity for  
5 unique and ground-breaking things to happen, like charter  
6 schools. You know, they happened because there were  
7 points of light and opportunities that potentially would  
8 not have happened had it had to have a common response  
9 from a broader group of people.

10 So to the extent that standards are  
11 important, I think we're absolutely in agreement. It's  
12 the question of the control and ownership. The technical  
13 ownership over the standards is far removed from Colorado  
14 at this point, and the control is far removed, and so on.

15 So I just want to say I think we have a  
16 philosophical difference, and that's worth teasing out,  
17 and we'll block some good time to walk through that.  
18 Because the questions of politics versus policy and  
19 philosophy, I honestly -- I agree with you. I don't  
20 think there's room for politics in this. I think that  
21 this needs to be a question about what is the best  
22 educational philosophy, what is the best pathway for  
23 education for the purposes of our students. So I look  
24 forward to, you know, working deeper into that  
25 conversation.



1 Other comments, or --

2 MS. NEAL: A quick one, just to Elaine. I  
3 don't mean to -- I -- because I agree with you again,  
4 except that I relate it to local control. We have all of  
5 our school districts, and they are pretty much alike and  
6 they do pretty much the same thing, but they have the  
7 control, and that's what we, you know. Yes, we're pretty  
8 much like other -- every other state. Our standards will  
9 be pretty much the same. But I want them to be -- you  
10 know, if I want to change a standard in Colorado I think  
11 we should be able to. I don't think we should have  
12 exactly all the same standards.

13 MS. BERMAN: I'm not going to get into a  
14 debate today. I'll hold it.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Let's hold the  
16 broader conversation for next month. And that was my  
17 intention of bringing it in the way I brought it, is I  
18 wanted to get it on the table and give people the chance  
19 to ruminate on it so we can interact effectively on it  
20 next month.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And will you send us  
22 your letter?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. It's not actually  
24 written. Yeah, I will clean it up a little bit.

25 MS. NEAL: With my scribbles on it.



1                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN:  And I'm sorry it's not  
2 shorter.

3                   Dr. Scheffel, you had your hand up?

4                   MS. SCHEFFEL:  Well, I just want to say  
5 thank you for the comments.  I think this is a good  
6 discussion.  We've certainly had a lot of public interest  
7 in this whole issue, linkage between the standards and  
8 the assessment, and I think it opened up an important  
9 discussion, and I think it's a good role for the Board to  
10 advise the legislature on the impact of that requirement.

11                  CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN:  Then with no further  
12 comments we will move on to public comment.  Mr.  
13 Commissioner.  Oh, Jane, did you have a comment?  I'm  
14 sorry.  I didn't mean to get past you.

15                  MS. GOFF:  No, I'll do it.  I also  
16 appreciate it, and I will agree, and I think it's a good  
17 thing that over the last six months or so we've had some  
18 -- we've all been able to really get deeper, get a  
19 deeper, better, clearer picture of where we are and where  
20 our public friends are.

21                  I guess, Paul, today is my -- just my  
22 reaction right now, a couple of very -- one technical  
23 thing, one not so technical.  I think it might be worth  
24 our while to look at Senate Bill 212 again for any  
25 language -- and I know it's in there -- about review of



1 the standards anyway. As long as we've had standards in  
2 place through statute there has been a clause, a section  
3 in every single statute pertaining to common -- or to  
4 standards, that outlines a required period of review. I  
5 did it twice when I was in Jefferson County, with my  
6 department members, and I think it's still survive in  
7 pretty much the same language in 212. So we might want  
8 to dissect that a little bit.

9 Two, the answer, if helps make it a little  
10 bit clearer to everybody that, yeah, we do have review.  
11 We do have a review control here, so -- and an  
12 obligation. How does that line up with the new  
13 standards?

14 The other thing is I guess I'm -- we all  
15 have a different brain operation method, M.O., but I find  
16 it -- I am disconcerted a little bit today, hearing this,  
17 after we spent a good deal of time today outlining and  
18 talking about how -- what is in the works, it's right  
19 now, it's March, it's April. And there are some things  
20 that we've been -- we're into the mode of thinking that  
21 we're going to have some kind of answers, even though,  
22 you know, opinion of what we're about to undertake, as  
23 far as the assessment study is going to be different, and  
24 that's a good thing. Work it out.

25 But small scale as it may appear to some, a





1 good start as it may appear to others, whatever that is,  
2 the timing is right when you want to bring this  
3 conversation back, and basically I don't know about  
4 everybody else. I think it's -- it's -- it throws some  
5 types of thinkers off to hear where there's been a  
6 proposed -- basically a big stop in the middle of  
7 something else that the expectation is there will be some  
8 kind of an answer on this other thing, you know, as  
9 beginning stages as it might be.

10 I -- now knowing that we're looking at doing  
11 this in April, next month, I will work myself into that  
12 thinking and work with that, of course. But I just find  
13 the timing of this is -- it doesn't seem to jive today,  
14 with all the other things we talked about all the other  
15 timelines we've come to accept here.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, absolutely, and to  
17 that latter point, it's difficult to find a perfect time  
18 for a difficult conversation, and my effort to bring it  
19 now, with 30 days' notice for a broader conversation, is  
20 anchored to the fact that -- in large part it's driven by  
21 activity that's taking place across the street. I'd like  
22 this conversation to happen while they're still available  
23 across the street, so that they -- to the extent they  
24 would choose to -- can participate in the conversation,  
25 you know, through the means that they have. So that has



1 to do with the timing.

2 But it's rooted in the fact that, you know,  
3 when you're in the middle of a process, which is, you  
4 know, by nature of what it is, an ongoing and permanent  
5 process, there is never really a good point to step into  
6 it, I think.

7 So with that, I guess you had a final  
8 comment and then we'll move to the public.

9 MS. NEAL: Well, I just -- as we move into  
10 public, you know, and speaking to all the people that are  
11 here, I really appreciate the passion and the dedication  
12 coming to our boring board meetings to talk. But it  
13 would be -- I generally sit here and I copy down  
14 everything that's said -- it would be a great help to me  
15 if we would get examples, actual examples of things that  
16 are happening in Colorado. In the time that I've been  
17 writing them down, we've had no actual examples. And,  
18 you know, if you go into court you need proof.

19 So as you prepare your testimony, I'd like  
20 to know where they occurred, because, I mean, you know, I  
21 think there are lot of stories kind of the ether out here  
22 that are kind of, you know, really horrific stories. And  
23 are they occurring in Colorado, in any of our school  
24 districts? That's what we need to know.

25 So I thank you for being here and look



1 forward to listening to what you have to say.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: With that we'll move to  
3 public comment. The rules are the same as they always  
4 are. Three minutes. Please limit yourself to three  
5 minutes. Step to the microphone when your name is  
6 called. Identify yourself. Identify the group that you  
7 represent, if, in fact, you represent a group. You will  
8 hear my little chime go off, and it's maybe too gentle of  
9 a chime, but when you hear it please wrap up the thought,  
10 but do please complete your thought.

11 Carol Kirkstadt is the first speaker.

12 MS. KIRKSTADT: Yes. I'm Carol Kirkstadt  
13 and I live in Loveland, and there's been quite a few  
14 ideas today so I'll try to adjust what I was going to  
15 say.

16 But first, 900,000 students in K through 12  
17 schools here in Colorado, you have an awesome  
18 responsibility to look out for their -- the opportunities  
19 that we give them.

20 And I'd like to speak specifically on this  
21 study, assessment study, that CDE has initiated. I do  
22 feel that it's common sense if you're headed in the wrong  
23 direction, regardless of what it is, you look for  
24 alternatives and you turn around or you make changes. I  
25 understand the concern. Federal tells you what to do.



1 Across the street tells you what to do. We tell you what  
2 to do. So this is really challenging.

3 But for the last 15 years, assessment  
4 activity has not really driven performance, at least as I  
5 see it. You look at the NAEP statistics and they're  
6 flat. Now, within the last year, there is a growing  
7 awareness of these issues of Common Core, PARCC, data  
8 collection issues, et cetera.

9 So what is CDE doing? They're asking WestEd  
10 to do this study. At a minimum, I ask you -- I plead  
11 with you -- to get somebody to do this study that is  
12 unbiased. Everything I see by WestEd, they're funded by  
13 Bill Gates, they've been into the Common Core arena  
14 pretty heavy, they were the ones that corelated the  
15 Common Core stuff with Colorado. I think they're very  
16 inappropriate and there should be somebody in Colorado  
17 that could run a study for you.

18 Secondly, I think -- and Dr. Lundeen's  
19 comments, or Mr. Lundeen --

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No doctor, yeah.

21 MS. KIRKSTADT: -- whatever, are very  
22 appropriate. I think this is an opportunity to take this  
23 level up. Certainly there are issues of implementation,  
24 but take it up to the level of what are our objectives  
25 and what are your assumptions. And one of them is just



1 this assumption of how much assessment is legitimate.  
2 You know, TCAP was once a year. PARCC is supposed to be  
3 three times a year. And I think House Bill 1202 has got  
4 one element in it, as to how much could be done at a  
5 district level versus how much the state could do. You  
6 know, there are, I think, some real big issues there in  
7 terms of what your assumptions are, as to what you're  
8 going to accomplish.

9 And so I plead with you really take a look  
10 at this study and raise the level, and perhaps look at  
11 who's leading it. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Angelique  
13 Matthews.

14 MS. MATTHEWS: Thank you. I'm Angelique  
15 Matthews from Denver, Colorado. I'm not really  
16 affiliated with a group. I am a concerned citizen. And  
17 I always consider it a great privilege to be able to  
18 speak freely in a free country. Thank you.

19 I am so happy to hear Paul Lundeen speak  
20 about PARCC and uncoupling Common Core from PARCC, and I  
21 really hope that you will listen to what he has to say  
22 and really consider it. The public want that, and I  
23 really hope you'll give it some thought, some serious  
24 thought.

25 And if I could just address -- I heard one



1 of the Board members mention that perhaps we should  
2 change the name of Common Core, and changing the name  
3 doesn't change the animal. We still will not like the  
4 animal.

5 I'm entering into evidence -- and I don't  
6 know how to do this, so please help me -- 297 letters of  
7 opposition, which brings our total to about 1,198 letters  
8 of opposition to date. My big topic today, again, as you  
9 just heard the previous speaker, is WestEd. I don't  
10 believe it's unbiased. They are very tied in with Gates,  
11 which scares me. They were very involved with the  
12 implementation of Common Core.

13 I have -- in fact, I have some fact check  
14 sheets for you, that I could give you, and you probably  
15 have seen this already but I would love to give it to  
16 you, so that you can go and research it yourself.

17 WestEd is funded by Gates to the tune of  
18 about 3 -- almost \$3 million. WestEd director,  
19 Rabinowitz, was on the validation committee for the  
20 Common Core standards and signed off on them. WestEd  
21 serves as the project management partner for the  
22 multistate Smart Balanced Assessment Consortium and  
23 helped write these questions. Again, Rabinowitz wrote a  
24 white paper on education reform and next-generation  
25 assessments back in 2010, and he is very tied in with



1 WestEd. And then also the last point is there's an  
2 article entitled, "The Gates Foundation Gets What it Pays  
3 For." Again, Gates money is very heavily tied in with  
4 WestEd. And we are asking you to find another group to  
5 do -- to assess -- not assess but I guess look into this  
6 PARCC assessments. Please, find another group, something  
7 that we would feel comfortable as a public.

8 And then I have a request for you. How much  
9 time do I have?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Twelve seconds.

11 MS. MATTHEWS: Twelve seconds. Okay. I  
12 have a request for you. I would love to be able to have  
13 some kind of discussion group where we can talk back and  
14 forth, instead of this just one-sided talking back to you  
15 guys. We want to hear from you some answers to our  
16 questions. And so I would like to put that off as a  
17 request, and I will email all of you tomorrow or the next  
18 day to find out what your answer is on that request.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Next,  
20 Jennifer Phillips. Jennifer Phillips? No Jennifer  
21 Phillips?

22 Libby Culver.

23 MS. CULVER: Hi. Good afternoon. I am  
24 Libby Culver. I am the Director of Early Childhood  
25 Education for the Durango School District. I'm here



1 today to speak to you about the Colorado Academic  
2 Standards and how we can have come to embrace and use  
3 them in our districts, specifically our district's  
4 preschool and kindergarten classrooms.

5 Our teachers really appreciate the clear  
6 expectations that the standards provide and they've done  
7 a lot of work with their colleagues to better understand  
8 the progression from one grade level to the next and the  
9 importance of strong foundational learning.

10 That isn't to say that we think they're  
11 perfect or that they couldn't be better. The standards,  
12 while they do address the ten content areas, still  
13 overlook the developmental areas that our early childhood  
14 teachers must support, nurture, and focus on.

15 For preschool, we feel the new early  
16 learning and development guidelines better reflect these  
17 additional areas that are equally important in the early  
18 years. So combining the guidelines' inclusion of social  
19 and emotional development, physical development, and  
20 health with academic standards creates a more robust and  
21 effective guidance for our teachers. And we use Teaching  
22 Strategies GOLD as our ongoing authentic assessment tool,  
23 which reports on all of these areas.

24 While some opponents are dismayed that  
25 someone outside our community is telling our teachers





1 what to -- telling us what our teachers should teach, we  
2 disagree. We see the standards are clear evidence for  
3 what our children should know, but we know that there are  
4 a wide variety of ways to get children to that point.  
5 Teachers in early childhood should be observing their  
6 students to determine where there are strengths, areas of  
7 needs and interest are, and then designing the learning  
8 environment and activities to meet those needs.

9 And obviously that looks really different in  
10 every classroom. Of our seven elementary schools, three  
11 of them are a part of International Baccalaureate Primary  
12 Years Program. Those students in IB schools get  
13 different kinds of instruction with units of inquiry, but  
14 we are assured with our focus on the Colorado Academic  
15 Standards that all students, regardless of the method of  
16 instruction or the learning framework, are mastering the  
17 same skills and meeting the same expectations.

18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Janet  
20 Anderson was on the list but crossed her name off. I  
21 wanted to make sure she crossed it off and not someone  
22 else. No Janet Anderson.

23 Dr. George Walker?

24 MR. WALKER: Good afternoon, Board.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Hello, George.



1 MR. WALKER: First of all, I'd like to  
2 strongly thank Board Member Elaine Berman for being part  
3 of United States Court of Appeals 10th Circuit Case  
4 Number 12-1445, wherein she and other people are trying  
5 to make some changes on TABOR so we can afford some of  
6 these grandiose ideas about leading the nation on  
7 standards, assessment, or curriculum.

8 As you know, we are in the bottom quartile  
9 when it comes to state funding -- I think 42nd or  
10 something like that -- just about last in higher  
11 education, and I don't believe that people who talk about  
12 excellence, leading the nation, when you're not even  
13 close to being adequately funded or in touch with  
14 reality. Money isn't everything but it's important, and  
15 we're just very low when it comes to state funding.  
16 TABOR is largely the cause of that. And there's no doubt  
17 that over about the last 30 years, as the number of  
18 students of color in this state increase, the amount of  
19 state funding decreases. That is de facto discrimination  
20 on the part of the governor's state legislature.

21 Now I, for one, have been complaining about  
22 standards, curriculum, assessment for many years because  
23 all the standardized tests talked about making students  
24 of color feel inferior. *Brown v. Board of Education* said  
25 very clearly that negro students are not to be made to



1 feel inferior. So if there's some way or another that  
2 this state can adequately, rationally fund tests,  
3 standards, curriculum documents, I would be for them, but  
4 that's not so, and I don't want to see another round of  
5 tests of any sort wherein students of color are once  
6 again, like historically has happened, are made to feel  
7 inferior because of these tests.

8 And also I hope -- and I know, personally,  
9 that Dr. Owen is doing his best to decrease the ethnic  
10 achievement gap, and I hope that this new round of tests  
11 decreases the ethnic achievement gap, and for once  
12 students of color are treated more fairly and in a valid  
13 way, and that isn't happening.

14 So Mr. Chair, respectfully I say your ideas  
15 about leading the nation, when we're so low on funding,  
16 just aren't realistic, and I am sure that one of the  
17 reasons we had to join the consortium was because we  
18 weren't even close to being able to afford our own  
19 standards curriculum and assessments. That's why you  
20 joined other people, because it's cheaper.

21 Thank you for listening.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, George.

23 Yvonne Joyce.

24 MS. JOYCE: Hello. My name is Yvonne Joyce  
25 and I'm here as an individual.



1 I was part of the Denver Teach Today program  
2 -- it's an alternative ed program -- because I'm a career  
3 changer, a mom, home-school educator, volunteer, coach,  
4 and I'm an immigrant, and I had a strong desire to be a  
5 teacher.

6 Now the Denver Teach Today program is a new  
7 program, of which you are providing that on -- waivers  
8 were provided for the Teacher Residency Program, and the  
9 Teach Today program is for career changers. I was  
10 looking for a program that gave me the route to teaching  
11 -- my area was math; I have a degree in electrical  
12 engineering -- and a program where there was definitely a  
13 need and I was going to be able to get a job. And it  
14 provided the preparation. I truly believed that I wanted  
15 to be a teacher and I wanted a strong teacher to teach me  
16 how to do that.

17 I stand here before you, starting this  
18 program in June, without a job and being kicked out of  
19 the program. I was kicked out of the program because I  
20 waited until -- I finally got a job October 31st. I  
21 interviewed for jobs all summer and all fall, and I was  
22 told I couldn't be hired because I didn't have a license.  
23 Someone else had to -- if they had a license they got  
24 hired before me. I didn't have classroom management  
25 experience. So I went into a program that promised me a



1 position because there was a true need for math teachers,  
2 in particular, minority math teachers, within DPS. And I  
3 had principals that wanted to hire me and could not hire  
4 me because of the regulations that they were given.

5 Towards the end of this program, a miracle  
6 position showed up, which I applied for and I got,  
7 because it was one week left. If I didn't get a position  
8 by the end of October I was going to have to pay back the  
9 money that I taught summer school.

10 So anyway, I took this position and then was  
11 given a mentor that ordered me to sit, stay away from  
12 students, and called students that looked like me  
13 "stupid." So my desire to teach was so that kids  
14 wouldn't have to deal with that. But then I found that I  
15 would still have to deal with that as a teacher.

16 I'm 54 years old. I refused to be ordered  
17 around and set a bad example for children. Please,  
18 before you set waivers for alternative ed programs, leave  
19 them with the other programs where someone can check the  
20 preparation that they're giving teachers. I didn't have  
21 a math teacher teach me how to teach math classes. Make  
22 sure that there is a need, because I was promised that  
23 there would be a need and there aren't jobs out there.  
24 One job out of five months of looking is not a need.

25 I would just like to make sure that someone



1 is checking these programs rather than the people who are  
2 facilitating them. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

4 Kindra Jazwick.

5 MS. JAZWICK: I am Kindra Jazwick. I am  
6 here from Moffat County, your northwest-most county in  
7 the state.

8 Ms. Neal asked for evidence and I am here  
9 today to provide evidence of the bullying behavior of the  
10 superintendent, superintendent-elect, principal, and  
11 assessment coordinator at my school.

12 I have my son with me today. When he was in  
13 the fifth grade, the primary use to determine what  
14 classes he got placed in going into sixth was the TCAP.  
15 And he just doesn't test well. He has full proficiency  
16 in his classes but he doesn't test well. He stresses  
17 himself out. And herein lies one problem with the  
18 standardized tests. My now sixth-grader, leaving the  
19 fifth grade, was medically excused from school for three-  
20 quarters of the testing window last year. He did the  
21 math assessment, was scribed part of the writing  
22 assessment due to his severe shoulder injury, and missed  
23 the rest of it. Imagine my surprise when I got his score  
24 packet back in July with scores of proficient for all of  
25 the tests, that he didn't take.



1                   So this year I turned in my opposition to  
2                   the test. I won't let my kids take it. My -- what I was  
3                   given from the school district was withdraw your kids.  
4                   Withdraw them from the school district for the testing  
5                   window. If you don't withdraw them, we'll segregate them  
6                   in the crisis room for three weeks. No instruction from  
7                   their teachers. They will be given work to do. If they  
8                   are at the school any time during the testing window,  
9                   even if they have been given the test booklet before and  
10                  said, "My mom turned in a letter. I won't take it. I'm  
11                  not going to do it," I've been told that it will be  
12                  repeatedly put in front of them, over and over and over  
13                  again.

14                 That's not appropriate behavior. It's not  
15                 fair to an adult and it's certainly not fair to a child.  
16                 There are teachers in that district that are telling my  
17                 children, "If we lose our jobs, it's on you, because  
18                 you're not taking the tests."

19                 And I have, in emails, I have the evidence  
20                 of it. I'm not here spouting off nonsense, upset. I  
21                 disagree wholeheartedly with PARCC. I disagree  
22                 wholeheartedly with Common Core, and I disagree with  
23                 standardized assessments, in the way they're being used  
24                 for school accountability. As a growth measure, I have  
25                 absolutely no problem with that. I liken the growth



1 measure of a standardized assessment for my kids to the  
2 growth measures that the doctors use with my younger kids  
3 to determine that they're growing on a curve. It doesn't  
4 matter if they're in the 5th percentile. It doesn't  
5 matter if they're in the 95th. As long as they're  
6 growing, they should only be compared to themselves, and  
7 the school funding and teacher evaluation shouldn't be  
8 based on the TCAP.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, Kindra.

10 MS. JAZWICK: And I have evidence to give to  
11 you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolutely. And we would  
13 like the district name and the school name, if possible.

14 MS. JAZWICK: Moffat County School District,  
15 Craig Middle School. The principal is Dr. Joe Libby.  
16 Superintendent-elect is Mr. Brent Curtis.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

18 Jane -- I can't quite read it -- Geyer (ph)?  
19 Jane -- is there a Jan?

20 MS. NEAL: Yeah. Jan Geyer.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jan must not be here, Jan  
22 Geyer.

23 Joanie Funderburk. Close?

24 MS. FUNDERBURK: Close enough. Good  
25 afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak with





1 you today.

2 My name is Joanie Funderburk and I am a  
3 Colorado mom and math educator with over 23 years of  
4 experience. I am here to speak in favor of your support  
5 of the Colorado Academic Standards, and I want to tell  
6 you why the math standards, in particular, are a  
7 wonderful thing for the students of Colorado.

8 When I first meet people and tell them that  
9 I teach math, most respond by telling me how much they  
10 hated math or how they never understood it. This makes  
11 me sad and explains why tech firms across the country and  
12 in Colorado describe a shortage of qualified candidates  
13 for their job. Understanding math is about more than  
14 being able to do procedures and calculate answers. Math  
15 is a system of connected ideas, and the new standards  
16 make those connections explicit for students.

17 I've read and heard about people who are  
18 opposed to these standards and who believe that they  
19 mandate a federal curriculum, taking away control from  
20 local teachers, districts, and states. I could address  
21 these misunderstandings that lead to those comments, but  
22 really I wonder which of the standards they are opposed  
23 to.

24 Personally, and teachers like me, believe  
25 fourth-grade students should use the four operations to



1 solve word problems involving distances, intervals of  
2 time, liquid volumes, masses of objects, and money,  
3 including problems involving simple fractions or  
4 decimals, which is Standard 4.MD.2. I agree that  
5 seventh-grade students should be, quote, "using variables  
6 to represent quantities in a real-world or mathematical  
7 problem and construct simple equations and inequalities  
8 to solve problems by reasoning about these quantities,"  
9 Standard 7.EE.4. And I know, from experience, that high  
10 school students who can distinguish between situations  
11 that can be modeled with linear functions and those that  
12 can be modeled with exponential functions, which is  
13 Standard F.LE.1, truly understand the difference between  
14 making monthly deposits into a piggy bank and  
15 accumulating credit card debt.

16 What parent is against the mathematical  
17 thinking the standards describe? The standards for math  
18 practice allow teachers to attend to students' reasoning  
19 and sense-making, to their ability to construct an  
20 argument and persevere when the learning is difficult,  
21 and to support our students in recognizing the underlying  
22 structure of mathematics, that structure that helps it  
23 all make sense.

24 Change is scary, especially so for us  
25 adults. Some adults feel like they understood the old



1 system and they're afraid of the new one, just because  
2 it's unfamiliar. But change is inevitable and this  
3 change is good. We all want the same thing -- students  
4 who are challenged, learning, and prepared for whatever  
5 future they choose. Your continued support of the  
6 Colorado Academic Standards will help us all to navigate  
7 this change and create good things for our kids. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

10 Denise Goldin Dubois, or if you're from  
11 Wyoming, Du-boys (ph).

12 MS. DUBOIS: It's Dubois. Hi. I'm Denise  
13 Goldin Dubois and I am currently teaching Algebra I at  
14 Eagle Crest High School, and I am a secondary STEM coach  
15 for the Cherry Creek Schools, so I'm working with math  
16 teachers on implementing the new Common Core state  
17 standards. I wanted to share a little bit my experience  
18 in the classroom with my Algebra I students this year. I  
19 have 9th- through 11-graders in that class.

20 The Common Core state standards for math  
21 contain rigorous content for students, but they also  
22 focus on the importance of the mathematical practices  
23 that will help our students become independent critical  
24 thinkers and problem solvers. Students are expected to  
25 construct viable arguments and to critique the reasoning



1 of others. Every day I hear my students defending their  
2 ideas. Our current unit is linear and exponential  
3 functions, and I just gave a test and I was able to see  
4 kids being able to distinguish when it was more important  
5 to use one than the other.

6 The standards that we were using before,  
7 students weren't even exposed to exponential functions at  
8 that point. When we first started this year, we were  
9 nervous because we had never really asked kids to rise to  
10 this level, and as we're asking them to do it, they are  
11 doing it, and they are figuring it out. And when we talk  
12 about the achievement gap, what we're finding for our  
13 students is they're doing better than they did before.  
14 We're asking them to think harder, but they're actually  
15 really able to do it.

16 The standards that we're using now -- I've  
17 been teaching now for 25 years and we've had national  
18 standards in math really since 1989, when the National  
19 Council for Teachers of Mathematics set forth some  
20 standards that we used. So it's not really new to us to  
21 share standards across the country, to be able to go to  
22 statewide conventions and then national conventions and  
23 talk about the same standards, which is the same thing  
24 that is happening with Common Core, so I just kind of  
25 wanted to point that out after something that you guys



1 mentioned.

2                   The letter I handed out to parents at the  
3 beginning of the year this year was titled, "This Isn't  
4 Your Grandma's Algebra I." It's not the Algebra I we  
5 experienced, and it's much more cohesive and rigorous  
6 than it has ever been. We are asking students to think  
7 more deeply and to access content that they never used  
8 to, and they're doing it. They're making use of the  
9 structure of mathematics to understand the idea that we  
10 can rewrite algebraic equations into equivalent forms  
11 that allow us to highlight specific quantities of  
12 interest.

13                   I believe deeply that all our students can  
14 make sense of this rigorous mathematics and I ask you, as  
15 a board, to remain committed to the implementation of  
16 these standards. Thank you.

17                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

18                   Sonja Simiken (ph)?

19                   MS. SEMION: Good afternoon. I'm Sonja  
20 SEMION. I am -- I lead the organization, Stand for  
21 Children Colorado. We are a nonprofit. We are made up  
22 of parents, teachers, and community members who are all  
23 working together to give Colorado students the best  
24 public education we can offer.

25                   So for the past several months you've heard



1 the voices of community members who have been asking you  
2 to reconsider the adoption of the Colorado Academic  
3 Standards, specifically those math and English standards  
4 that are aligned to the Common Core. We at Stand have  
5 heard their arguments with great surprise, because we  
6 talk to parents every day and they want nothing more than  
7 to be sure that the state's public education system is  
8 setting a high bar, one that represents a ceiling and not  
9 a floor, one that is going to develop students' problem-  
10 solving and critical thinking skills.

11 In short, parents want -- the parents we  
12 talk to want the peace of mind in knowing that when they  
13 send their child off to school each day, whether that  
14 school is in the Front Range or the Western Slope, that  
15 each child is going to be prepared for a lifetime of  
16 success.

17 But don't take it from me. On behalf of all  
18 the parents across our state who cannot give up their  
19 daily commitments to jobs and family to attend these  
20 meetings each month --

21 MS. NEAL: Wow.

22 MS. SEMION: -- I want to present -- it's  
23 going behind me -- I want to present the names of 7,243  
24 Coloradans who have pledged their support for the Common  
25 Core and Co Academic Standards.



1                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Say the number again.

2                   MS. SEMION: It's 7,243, but I'm glad you  
3 asked that question because as we -- in the time between  
4 when we printed out this petition and the few days that  
5 have passed we have actually reached 7,510 signatures,  
6 and this does represent all 64 counties within the state  
7 of Colorado.

8                   So one of the supporters who could not be  
9 here today to give up -- to give testimony, her name is  
10 Anita Banuelos (ph), and she wanted to make sure that you  
11 hear her story, so I will submit her testimony as  
12 evidence, along with the full count of the 7,510  
13 signatures. But I'm going to read just an excerpt from  
14 Anita's words.

15                   "I'm the first in my family to enter in  
16 college and I was unprepared for what lay ahead of me. I  
17 tested at the lowest levels in English and math, which  
18 started me in remedial courses for the first two years of  
19 my college career. I was not alone. My remedial courses  
20 were filled with people like me. We felt confused,  
21 ashamed, and discouraged.

22                   "Recently I applied for a promotion in my  
23 company. Unfortunately, I was passed over for this  
24 promotion because of my writing skills. I feel this was  
25 a setback that was a result of my academic career. What



1 standards were set for me? How can I succeed as an adult  
2 if I was not equipped properly in school but still  
3 graduated? How can I make sure this doesn't happen to  
4 others? This is why I support the Colorado Academic  
5 Standards."

6 On behalf of Anita and all the people who  
7 signed this petition from across our state, I want to  
8 thank you all for your time and for your full  
9 implementation of the standards and assessments that are  
10 aligned with that. Thank you.

11 MS. NEAL: Could I ask a question? How did  
12 you gather the signatures? Did you do it by email?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Online.

14 MS. SEMION: We arranged an online petition.

15 MS. NEAL: Okay. Thank you.

16 MS. SEMION: Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I tell you what. Whoever  
18 signed in for these last four people, I have difficulty  
19 reading your names. Kevin Juarez (ph), Mr. Juarez? Is  
20 there a Kevin Juarez in the room? No?

21 Jessica Price.

22 MR. PRICE: Hello. Good to be here. I have  
23 three kids at home and I'm just a concerned mom. I've  
24 been looking into Common Core for the last couple of  
25 months, and it seems very complex. I have a lot to





1 learn. But in my research so far it doesn't seem like a  
2 good thing to me. If the standards and if everything  
3 about it is great why was it implemented in such a  
4 deceptive way? Why was it the states had to commit to it  
5 before they even saw an outline of it, and then why was  
6 the deadline to sign up, the second deadline before they  
7 even received the full -- the core standards in full? It  
8 just seems very deceptive in the way that it's been  
9 implemented.

10 And math and English standards, I can see  
11 why those is what they started with. It's hard to find  
12 too much controversy in those. But when it gets to  
13 social studies and things like that you're going to get  
14 into a lot more issues, and that really concerns me.

15 I -- yeah, I still don't know what to think  
16 about the standards because, in some ways, I mean, just  
17 in the *Denver Post* this past Sunday it talks about  
18 educators in Douglas County say that the Common Core  
19 standards aren't high enough and want to petition, and  
20 Douglas County wants out of it because they don't think  
21 the standards are high enough.

22 And then some -- in some ways, particularly  
23 the math, just on -- my son's in fourth grade, and just  
24 seeing some of his work, like the lattice method and  
25 things like that, just seem like busy work and not just -



1 - you know, I want just repetition on doing it the easy  
2 way. That's what seems what would be better to me.

3 I know that a lot of moms in my area are  
4 very concerned and are looking into charter schools and  
5 things, and, yeah, still a lot to learn about this. But  
6 I believe that my children have been given to me by God  
7 and I'm accountable to Him for their education, for their  
8 safety, for everything, and I'm -- this doesn't seem like  
9 a good path for my kids. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Irene Juarez.

11 MS. JUAREZ: (Speaks Spanish.)

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Gracias.

13 Is there anyone else that cared to speak  
14 that did not sign up? We have exhausted the list of  
15 individuals who signed up to speak.

16 Thank you very much. If there is no one  
17 else we will stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow  
18 morning.

19 (Meeting adjourned)

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 26th 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