



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
September 10, 2014, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on September 10, 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 will come
2 back to order.

3 The next item on the agenda is a
4 continuation of the discussion of state assessments,
5 options, and next steps. Mr. Commissioner.

6 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At last
7 month's State Board of Education meeting you heard the
8 final report of the WestEd study, and as some of you have
9 talked about, as we've gone through the process and the
10 research that was involved with WestEd, as well as being
11 knowledgeable of what's happening with H.B. 1202
12 committee as they study the assessment and burden of
13 assessment to the state right now, you really wanted to
14 have some questions answered. You also wanted us to come
15 back and kind of help you through with some
16 recommendations, either to separate or, more importantly,
17 probably lead to some statements in your legislative
18 platform about this very issue, again, based upon some of
19 the recommendations in the WestEd study and what we've
20 talked about.

21 So in line with that request, we bring back
22 to you, you know, some stuff that we learned and to
23 reiterate some stuff and see where we want to go with it.

24 MS. PITNER: Good morning, Mr. Chair --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please proceed.



1 MS. PITNER: -- and members of the Board.
2 Thank you for the opportunity to have a follow-up
3 discussion on assessments. As Commissioner Hammond
4 stated, at our last meeting we had a rich discussion
5 after the WestEd study about different options, different
6 areas, and additional questions that you asked us to go
7 back and come back to you on. So we're going to frame
8 for you what those high-level topics are and then between
9 the four of us here we'll be taking on different pieces
10 of the questions that you had asked.

11 So we are going to give you a very brief
12 updated on some department activities that have taken
13 place in response to the WestEd study, some of the
14 actions that we have taken that are kind of within our
15 control, to be able to just go ahead and make. So we'll
16 talk to you about that.

17 We'll also talk to you about one of the
18 discussions last time was we know that there had been
19 work done by stakeholder groups and committees in 2009
20 and 2010, around whether the desired attributes of a
21 statewide assessment system. It was that work that
22 really launched where we are today. And so going back
23 and getting a little history on that, seeing what those
24 attributes were. So we did pull up those and we'll go
25 over those with you as well.



1 And then an exploration of pathways for use
2 of local assessments. We'll give you a status update.
3 That is a topic that people spent a little bit of time
4 on. It's one that we'll have to probably reserve for
5 further discussion in October, as we are still waiting
6 for information. We didn't have enough time to get all
7 the information from that.

8 But we will spend a good deal of our time on
9 the last question. As you know, a big amount of feedback
10 that we have received from both the WestEd study and
11 through other avenues has been an interest in exploring
12 what it would look like if we went to the federal
13 minimum, in terms of the required assessments. So our
14 team has done some analysis of what the impact and what
15 that would look like, and we are prepared to share with
16 you some of that initial information today.

17 So with that I'm going to turn it over to
18 Joyce to just give you an update on some of the actions
19 in our assessment unit since we last spoke with you.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: As Jill indicated, this
23 should be relatively brief. There were a couple of areas
24 that were identified by the WestEd study. One dealt with
25 phasing in online assessments. Another dealt with the



1 length of the assessments. Another dealt with the level
2 of complexity in terms of test administration procedures.

3 Looking at the first, Colorado has been
4 engaged in studying whether or not we could offer math
5 assessments for this upcoming year on paper, and it does
6 look like we will be able to do that, from a physical
7 perspective. So we have started to have some
8 conversations with districts. Districts obviously will
9 be allowed to opt into the computer online format if
10 that's what they would prefer to do, but we will make the
11 paper format for math available.

12 Also, one of the areas that we have heard
13 some concern about is the readiness of our third-graders
14 to complete the assessments online. In response to that,
15 we also investigated the feasibility of allowing our
16 third-graders to take not just the mathematics
17 assessments on paper but also take the English language
18 arts on paper, and with our current funding we will also
19 be able to allow that to occur within our districts.
20 Again, districts will have the option of opting into the
21 online assessments. As we have been having conversations
22 with districts, by no means is it a unanimous, "Oh, thank
23 you so much. We want all of our third-graders to take
24 this on paper." That is not the case, just like it is
25 not the case for the math assessments. So we will have



1 both of those available, district, local decision as to
2 which direction they go in.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I ask a quick
4 question?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please go ahead.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Quick question. Does
7 using paper change the time period for results?

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, folks will get,
9 this year for sure, their results from both online and
10 paper at the same time. Remember that we're going to
11 have the same kind of delay with the ELA and math
12 assessment results next year as we did with the science
13 and social studies results this year. Kids will need to
14 take those assessments, they will need to be scored, they
15 will need to go through the standard setting, and then
16 results will come first in the fall. So we'll definitely
17 have that delay.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Standard setting, you
19 mean establishing cut scores?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes, the establishment of
21 cut scores. So in the long run, having a lot of kids
22 taking the assessment on paper, that does take more time
23 to go through the scoring process. Again, I think we
24 were looking at this from a transition kind of a
25 perspective, not a permanent solution. Obviously we will



1 listen to the districts in terms of how their
2 transitioning is going, but I do think it's fair to say
3 that in the long run, especially with the mathematics,
4 the expectation is that we'll be able to move fully
5 online within the next couple of years.

6 The second issue is in terms of the length
7 of the assessments. There has been conversation,
8 obviously, within Colorado but also across the PARCC
9 consortium in relationship to the length of the actual
10 assessments. The consortium has indicated all along that
11 they would look at the results of the field tests for
12 information about how long did it take students, what
13 kinds of adjustments needed to be made. PARCC did
14 announce that they are making some adjustments to the
15 number of passages and items in grades 3 through 5 for
16 English language arts. They are now having conversations
17 about what are the implications of those changes for
18 actual testing time.

19 Both the Commissioner and I will be heading
20 out to meet with our consortium friends in a couple of
21 days, and talking about what set testing time should
22 actually look like, and I think it is fair to say that
23 Colorado is very supportive of reducing the testing time,
24 and we have been very vocal about reducing that testing
25 time, and I expect that will be a position that we take



1 on Friday.

2 The last piece is the administration
3 procedures. We did hear feedback, especially in terms of
4 the PARCC field test, about some of the administration
5 procedures and the language was used in terms of giving
6 direction to students, and PARCC has been working on a
7 new test administration manual and Colorado does sit on
8 that group, to simplify those instructions for students.
9 We are also very much paying attention to the guidance
10 that we have received from districts and input from
11 districts in terms of the science and social studies
12 assessments. We have been working with Pearson to try to
13 simplify as much of the technology as we possibly can,
14 and we do believe that we will have easier procedures for
15 folks to follow. We continue to explore and provide more
16 flexibility in terms of some of our procedures than we've
17 had historically, in response to the request to the field
18 to --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you just give us some
21 examples, one or two examples, to understand this better?

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Absolutely. So one of the
25 pieces for the PARCC assessments, at the beginning of the



1 literary analysis section, said, "You are about to engage
2 in the literary analysis section of your assessment.
3 This assessment will have," you know, X number of
4 questions and it will take you this much time. And it
5 went probably longer than it needed to, as opposed to
6 saying, "Hey, guys, you're about to start testing. You
7 have this much time. Go to it."

8 There was also concern with the Pearson exit
9 procedures, how a kiddo actually signs out of the system.
10 We continue to work with Pearson on that and it will be
11 simplified, even this fall. It is not as far along as we
12 would like for it to be, but there are a number of steps
13 that students have to take in order to actually get out
14 of the system and make sure that their answers are all
15 submitted appropriately.

16 So in terms of some of the work that we've
17 been engaged in, this is, again high level, some of the
18 pieces that we are attempting to address and be
19 responsive to the field in terms of their requests.

20 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

22 MS. PITNER: So we wanted to give you that
23 brief update, really, largely, to also talk about the
24 paper options that you heard Joyce mention, because that
25 is a big request that we think will help with the



1 phasing-in of online, which was one of the requests from
2 the surveys.

3 The other piece that we kind of wanted to
4 switch gears here and talk a little bit about gathering
5 some of the historical data on what have been the values
6 and the attributes that were articulated for the state
7 assessment system. And so we've pulled together some
8 historical documents for you. The PowerPoint just gives
9 you a high-level overview. There is a fact sheet in your
10 materials, that looks like this, that's called "Statutory
11 Expectations and Desired Attributes of Colorado Statewide
12 Assessment System."

13 And I will apologize -- there is a -- thank
14 you, Board Member Schroder, for finding this for us. But
15 there is a typo in the first sentence -- second sentence,
16 that says "from fall of 2009 through spring of 2009." It
17 should say "fall of 2009 through spring of 2010." It's
18 the time frame, so we'll fix that, and I apologize for
19 that oversight.

20 But what this document does is it summarizes
21 some of the places in statute or in Board action where
22 there has been an articulation of the desired values or
23 attributes of an assessment system.

24 So the first piece of this is sharing some
25 of the history of action taken by the Board in November



1 of 2010 to adopt a set of attributes for the state
2 assessment system. This was also adopted unanimously by
3 the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, as it
4 required both K-12 and higher ed to work together.

5 There was a significant amount of work prior
6 to that action that summarized here in terms of
7 stakeholder committee meetings. The committee consisted
8 of 35 members. You can see in this document who all of
9 those folks were. After some recommendations were
10 drafted, the Department of Education and CCHE then
11 oversaw a regional town hall process, where they held 10
12 meetings across the state to gather feedback from
13 Coloradans. That's what generated recommendations to the
14 State Board in November, and then action, and we've
15 excerpted that action so you can see what the State Board
16 adopted at that time.

17 You can see that, at a high level, there was
18 an emphasis and focus on ensuring that the assessments
19 were aligned to the standards. There was a value on
20 formative assessments and interim assessment, and some of
21 you may recall when we did our first ask for a statewide
22 assessment system we did include interim assessments in
23 the state ask, but it was not funded.

24 There is some acknowledgement too on the
25 second page about school readiness assessments and some



1 concepts there, as well as some guidance around
2 assessments for English language learners, and then how
3 to think about postsecondary and workforce readiness
4 measures.

5 So that's the piece that talks about the
6 attributes adopted by the Board at that point.

7 We also have some information that
8 articulates some values that come out of the Education
9 Accountability Act that was passed in 2009, and you'll
10 see that summarized at the bottom of page 2, onto page 3.
11 And this is where the General Assembly was identifying
12 its values for an assessment and accountability system
13 that can provide student growth. And both the
14 conversation about attributes of an assessment system and
15 desire for growth over time and what that looks like kind
16 of go together. So this pulls out for you some of the
17 value statements that are in statute around growth, and
18 you can see those articulated in the bullet points.

19 We then made an effort to synthesize those
20 pieces, and you'll see where it says "values and
21 expectations embedded in Educational Accountability Act
22 and assessment attributes," that's an attempt to kind of
23 synthesize between those two documents some of the key
24 themes that emerge, in terms of the attributes.

25 So that's -- I wanted to kind of also then



1 show you, that gives you a bit of the historical look of
2 what the State Legislature, State Board said from about
3 2009 to 2010, around the values. That's a lot of what
4 was the basis for the Department moving forward and
5 crafting the request for proposal for an assessment
6 system and all those pieces.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the ball kind of
8 began rolling with the CAP4K effort --

9 MS. PITNER: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- which was a Colorado-
11 specific effort.

12 MS. PITNER: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

14 MS. PITNER: And that's the legislation that
15 kicked off the assessment attribute work.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes.

17 MS. PITNER: Then we wanted to pull out the
18 more recent list of some attributes that we received out
19 of the WestEd study, just to remind you that we did get
20 this list. The study did ask, what would you see and
21 what would you desire out of an assessment system,
22 essentially. And this is the slide that was shared at
23 our last meeting in August, and we just thought it might
24 be helpful to have that piece of information connected
25 with this historical information, so you can compare and



1 look at how maybe values or, you know, how people have
2 thought about it over the time, as time has changed, what
3 that looks like as well. And you'll see a lot of
4 similarity between the documents but then some different
5 things will also pop.

6 MS. GOFF: Can I --

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane has a question. Go
8 ahead, Jane.

9 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Just a little
10 clarification on the -- I do math pretty well in my head,
11 but I'm looking at the overall column. Is that basically
12 an average, and are the numbers that are showing, for
13 example, the bolded on, indicators of school readiness,
14 is that a percentage of those types of schools that
15 responded, or is that the number of responses? I'm not
16 sure what I'm reading.

17 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, yes, that's a great
18 question. It's percentages, and then what the WestEd
19 folks had broken out in the prior column was of folks who
20 identified themselves as rural, 90 percent said timely
21 results was an important characteristic. And I'll have
22 to go back to the exact question but I believe they were
23 able to answer multiple -- they were able to give a list
24 of their top -- I think it was top three or five
25 characteristics. And so this is reflective of that.



1 MS. GOFF: And they're basically in
2 descending order, but the last column is -- so overall,
3 93 percent of our schools listed timely results as a
4 topic, not the topic.

5 MS. PITNER: Yes. Mr. Chair, it would be 93
6 percent of the districts, because it was a district-
7 level, not a school-level survey. And I think the N
8 size, we had about 87 districts that responded to the
9 survey, so that's important to note as well.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika. I'm sorry.
11 Jane, were you -- did you get your answer?

12 MS. GOFF: I'm finished. Thank you very
13 much.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Angelika.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So this isn't really just
16 since 2010. This is since 1995 or '97, whenever we
17 started this conversation. It was well before CAP4K.
18 it's when we started CSAP.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: And I continue to be
21 troubled by what may be a misunderstanding or not, which
22 is that when I've listened to psychometricians they have
23 assured me that using summative assessments for statewide
24 accountability does not give the kind of information that
25 folks are looking for, specific information to be used in



1 their school, et cetera. They are different purposes for
2 different assessments. And what I keep hearing is folks
3 wanting these assessments to provide the information that
4 really would come from formative assessments, and the
5 fact that we don't fund them and don't choose them, or
6 whatever, seems to be causing this expectation that we
7 can use the results of the tests to determine what
8 individual kids' needs are.

9 And I don't know whether that isn't
10 something that we need to look into more deeply. Is
11 there a way to use the same assessments for both, in
12 which case a really quick turnaround would make a
13 difference, or is a quick turnaround not really relevant
14 because that's not the best tool to use to identify what
15 individual kids need?

16 I need help with that because my information
17 had been you can't use one assessment for two very, very
18 different purposes. Is that history or is that current?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Great question.
20 Thank you, Angelika.

21 MS. PITNER: I think you have identified a
22 key issue in terms of people's expectations from the
23 state assessment system. And when we are trying to have
24 an assessment that gives information at the end of the
25 year, right -- did the student make it to the point that



1 we hoped the student would make it -- the importance of
2 having the information back quickly is questionable.

3 To ask an assessment to give the high level
4 covering all of the standards information and also ask
5 the assessment to go down to the detail in terms of what
6 you know and what you know and what you know and what you
7 know would require an assessment that is very, very long
8 and filled with lots and lots of items, right?

9 So the state assessment can get kind of
10 high-level information. We can give you information when
11 we look at science as overall science, some life science
12 information, the physical science, but if we really want
13 to probe deeply about what you're missing in terms of
14 life science, that is more appropriate for the interim
15 assessments, formative assessments, classroom-based
16 assessments, that can then influence instruction the
17 following day.

18 The summative assessments give strong
19 information in terms of programmatically, how are we
20 doing, and do we need to look at a high level,
21 programmatically, to make sure that all of our students
22 are getting access to physical science?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, therein lies our
24 dilemma, and I believe that last month we had some
25 conversations even about social studies and what would



1 happen if we would make the social studies assessment
2 shorter. And the question was, can we do that? And
3 absolutely, we can make the social studies assessment
4 shorter, but then we would lose that information specific
5 to history, civics, economics, geography, and already
6 we're getting pushed to say we want even deeper
7 information than that. Short assessment, deep
8 information is going to be a difficult challenge.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Then the other part is do we
10 get enough information to measure growth? Because
11 initially when we had CSAPs we did not measure growth,
12 and it was the education community, it was largely the
13 teachers who came back and said, "Wait a minute. That's
14 not helpful. That's not a measure of what's happening
15 for your child. It's how much growth did a child that's
16 behind make more than a year's growth? This is what we
17 want to know. And can we retain enough information
18 within the assessment to be able to get to that?" That's
19 the issue with making them shorter, right?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

22 MS. PEARSON: We need enough score variation
23 on the assessment, so enough differentiation between
24 students' performance to use our Colorado growth model to
25 measure growth.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you explain that a
2 little bit more?

3 MS. PEARSON: We need enough -- so if all
4 students are scoring at the same scale score, or if you
5 have a school, like 50 percent of your kids are at the
6 level of unsatisfactory, we won't be able to see how kids
7 grow because you've got a whole bunch that are performing
8 the same way. So you need to be able to have an
9 assessment that can differentiate the performance of
10 kids. That generally means you need to ask more
11 questions on the assessment, and a wide variety of
12 questions. Did that --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. You got it the second
14 time. I got it the second time.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And that's in the
16 summative as well as the formative environment?

17 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, that's in terms of
18 the summative assessment and using the Colorado growth
19 model. We haven't used the Colorado growth model on
20 locals and formative assessment.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

22 MS. GOFF: Can I add -- oh, go ahead.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane first.

24 MS. GOFF: Please finish.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: So we keep talking about the



1 Colorado growth model. Is there a lot of difference
2 between growth models that are used throughout the
3 country?

4 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, there's a range of
5 different types of growth models and different options in
6 the country. About 24, I believe, states are using the
7 Colorado growth model, the student growth percentile.
8 The other major growth model that other states use is the
9 value-added model. I'm not an expert in either but I
10 know the Colorado growth model well. The value-added I'm
11 not as familiar with so I can't answer those questions.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Would any of you even be
13 able to describe what you mean by value-added model?

14 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, I don't want to
15 give you an explanation that's not a full, comprehensive
16 --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

18 MS. PEARSON: Do you want to add anything?

19 MS. PITNER: Well, Mr. Chair, I can at least
20 give you an idea of why it's called value-added. It's
21 really geared at more what value has the teacher added
22 during their time with the student, what value has been
23 added during that time. So it was actually set up to be
24 more about how much contribution is the teacher making to
25 a student's growth over time, and the model actually does



1 take into account some things that we don't take into
2 account in our growth model, which is the same way, which
3 is things like low-income students, where they might have
4 started, English learners that will build in some at-risk
5 factors. It's a different model that has been out there
6 a little longer than our growth model and was geared more
7 at a teacher level than at a student growth level.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I remember. It
9 started in Tennessee, or --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel? Deb?

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you just clarify the
12 color bands and their meaning and also the three numbers
13 with the arrows, or were you going to do that later?

14 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair, so I excerpted this
15 exactly from the WestEd study that they shared in August.
16 And so I think that the color bands were really just to
17 show where she was seeing chunks of the data from sort of
18 the -- I think she was showing just naturally where they
19 fell, to help you see the areas --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So visual clarity.

21 MS. PITNER: The bolded ones, I think what
22 she was showing there is just to show the difference, the
23 lowest-rated one for rurals with cross-district
24 comparison, that cross-school comparisons was very
25 important to suburban, that indicators of readiness, just



1 where those were quite different than their peers. So
2 you can see the peers were very -- had very different
3 ratings. It's where they may have popped. Like the
4 urbans are really valuing that school readiness
5 indicator, less so for the others. Cross-school
6 comparisons is real important to the suburban, less so,
7 and so forth.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. PITNER: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So basically the arrows
11 are dissonance among these categories.

12 MS. PITNER: Yeah. Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, please. Go ahead.

14 MS. NEAL: Considering the fact that we're
15 having this discussion this afternoon about AP history, I
16 was very disappointed to see the last figures on this
17 chart. I don't know what we can make of that. I hope
18 that it's not seen as something that's not important
19 because of the numbers on a chart. That's more or less a
20 personal thing and I will continue to stress that.

21 And I, again, go back to, I think, some of
22 that accounts from the fact that we left that assessment
23 out when we did the No Child Left Behind. So if we
24 didn't assess it wasn't important, so why are we
25 assessing it now. I think it's a leftover from that.



1 And you don't -- yeah, I'd appreciate a response.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, I mean, I would
3 echo that. I would say it's a window into this
4 conversation we're having, how it drives behavior and
5 attitudes, as well as behavior. The attitude is walking
6 away. In this, you know, high-pressure, intense moment
7 where everybody has an opportunity to get feedback, that
8 particular item is falling because it's something that we
9 drove -- changed behavior on by virtue of policies set
10 previously.

11 Go ahead, Jill.

12 MS. PITNER: Yeah, Mr. Chair, so remember
13 this is excerpted from the larger study which asked a
14 variety of questions. There were also questions about
15 should you eliminate social studies? Remember, that one
16 had mixed results. There was not -- it didn't look like
17 this. This question was around annually assessing, so
18 the idea was could you do samples, a sampling approach,
19 where kids are tested every other, or something like
20 this, and a district isn't assessed every year.

21 So I think that's what you're seeing, less a
22 value statement about social studies. The rest of this
23 study had several types of question that show just very
24 mixed answers. People aren't quite sure where they are
25 on all of, as you tease out the different questions.



1 MS. NEAL: But doesn't this refer to how
2 they felt about assessing it annually instead of 4th,
3 7th, and 12th? Is that an agreement that it should only
4 be -- and it's not a strong agreement. Is that why it's
5 the 4th, 7th, 12th?

6 MS. PITNER: Yes. So right now we currently
7 assess in grades 4, 7, and 12, and we assess annually.
8 So it's asking for affirmation of the importance of
9 assessing those three levels.

10 MS. NEAL: And it did not get a strong
11 affirmation. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So we'll let you move on.

13 MS. PITNER: Great. All right.

14 So that's hopefully just something to keep
15 in your back pocket as you're looking at this discussion,
16 the values and attributes from 2008 through 2010, and
17 then the latest information from WestEd.

18 What we're going to do now is just
19 transition to a couple of other areas, and I'm going to
20 turn it over to Dr. Owen for this next piece.

21 MR. OWEN: Good afternoon, or good morning.
22 I'm jumping ahead to afternoon.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Almost.

24 MS. NEAL: We're getting there. Wishful
25 thinking.



1 MR. OWEN: So why we had the slide in, at
2 the last State Board meeting we had had some discussion
3 about ability of using local assessments to satisfy
4 federal and state requirements. We are working right now
5 with the U.S. Department of Education to really better
6 understand the required federal assessments, and there's
7 a nice handout, I think, in the packet of -- it's kind of
8 a fact sheet that shows federal statute for ESEA. It
9 looks like this. And then it also has state statute,
10 Colorado revised statutes, and it shows, at the level,
11 what's required right now as far as assessments, and then
12 what is required federally.

13 One of the pieces that we had hoped to have
14 some feedback from USDOE on was are there any examples
15 across the country with states that you've allowed states
16 to veer off of any of these federal statutes and do
17 something different or unique around assessments, local
18 assessments, using them to supplement or supplant federal
19 required assessments at the state level? And while we're
20 still continuing that conversation we did not get
21 anything back from them yet in writing, and we hope to
22 have that here in the next week or so, and then we will
23 share that with you at the October State Board meeting.
24 So there will be another discussion. We just did not get
25 the information.



1 And the Commissioner is pushing the
2 Department very hard there. We had a personal phone call
3 with the Secretary. We are really trying to make sure
4 that they understand how important it is we get this
5 information. I anticipate that we'll get this within
6 this next week, and then when we get that information it
7 will give us an opportunity to put together a
8 presentation for you at the State Board meeting in
9 October.

10 So with that --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let me amplify this.

12 MR. OWEN: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: This is kind of the piece
14 of the conversation where I've asked, don't ask why but
15 ask why not. You're really going back and kind of having
16 that conversation -- what would it take an act of
17 Congress or perhaps a different interpretation of the
18 previous act of Congress to give us some freedom. And
19 you're pushing on that, and the short answer is you don't
20 have the answer yet but you're still pushing to get the
21 answer.

22 MR. OWEN: Correct.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, that's correct.

24 MR. OWEN: And I do think that we will have
25 information from them, and again, we'll be prepared to



1 share that in October.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Please proceed.

3 MR. OWEN: So the next section, and Alyssa
4 and I --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You know what? I'd make
6 one other -- and excuse me, before you get going -- this
7 fact sheet and many of these one-pagers that you've
8 referred to in the course of this presentation are
9 available through the CDE website. I refer people out to
10 them. They're very helpful. They're very useful. They
11 give a lot of factual information that gives light into
12 this conversation as well.

13 Please go ahead.

14 MR. OWEN: Great. So another topic that we
15 had discussed --

16 MR. HAMMOND: Keith, I might also --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You're not going to get
18 to talk.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. HAMMOND: I interject my prerogative.
21 Anyway, if you don't mind.

22 Once we get the information, and we will get
23 the information if it's the last thing we do -- we're
24 trying -- but once we get that we're also going to turn
25 that over to Tony Dyl, because I need him to weigh in on



1 that, because they've already warned it will be very
2 legalese, and I need somebody to take the legalese and
3 break that out into a more understandable fashion. So
4 we're trying to cover two things with that, okay?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. We're looking --
6 you know, first run at this is what can we do without a
7 lawsuit. You know, that's where we'd like to be able to
8 proceed.

9 MR. HAMMOND: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. OWEN: And, Mr. Chair, to point that to,
11 with the Commissioner's remarks is that the intersection
12 between state statute and federal statute needs to be
13 clearly understood, and what kind of flexibility, if any,
14 that we have in understanding their required assessments
15 for both of those perspectives. So I think it's very
16 important that we have Mr. Dyl look at that as well.

17 Okay. So impact of federal minimums. Why I
18 also pointed this sheet out is that I think there's still
19 quite a bit of confusion around what federal minimums
20 are. And so we're going to highlight for you exactly
21 what's required at the federal level, what Colorado has
22 done in addition to that, and then if we were to go, as a
23 state, to the federal minimum requirements what kind of
24 window would that play for us with school and district
25 accountability in the state? So what we're prepared this



1 morning to share with you is an overview of what that
2 looks like on 2013 school and district performance
3 ratings. Okay? And so we'll share that with you and
4 then we'll have an opportunity to show the impact to
5 districts, based on that 2013 modeling, and then take any
6 questions that you might have around that analysis that
7 was done.

8 We did also share with all superintendents
9 across the state yesterday a communication to let them
10 know we were having this discussion today. We didn't
11 want them to be surprised by seeing their school district
12 going up or down. And again, we tried to emphasize in
13 that communication that we were modeling this for a
14 discussion with the State Board. But I did have some
15 superintendents immediately reply back to me, "Well,
16 you're changing my rating," and I was like, "No, please
17 look through your email and read this more carefully.
18 We're not changing your rating. This is for discussion
19 only, and it's at the request of the State Board."

20 So with that, the federal minimums for
21 English language arts and reading, if you look, right now
22 are grades 3 through 8 and once in high school. This
23 does get confusing for some of the schools and districts
24 out there because what this means is that you have to
25 annually assess in grades 3 through 8 for language arts



1 and math, and you have to do it once in high school but
2 it's not required at 9th grade. So that's an important
3 piece to remember as we go through this presentation,
4 because not requiring an assessment in 9th grade does a
5 fundamental shift in how we do growth at the high school
6 level and how that plays out for growth district
7 performance frameworks as well.

8 So then you look at what Colorado has added
9 on top of that is we require language arts and math all
10 the way through 11th grade. Okay, so that's the
11 difference is that we require 9th, 10th, and 11th grade.

12 Mathematics, if you look at the sheet there,
13 grades 3 through 8, once in high school. Again, same
14 federal piece. Can't be grade 9 that you count as a
15 federal minimum. Colorado requires all three high school
16 assessments in math.

17 Science is required as a federal minimum
18 once in each level, in elementary, middle, and high
19 school. At federal, again, that matches up exactly to
20 what the federal requirements are.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Pam.

22 MS. MAZANEC: When you said Colorado
23 requires three math assessments, are you saying these are
24 different assessments or three times?

25 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. Could you



1 repeat that one more time?

2 MS. MAZANEC: When you said Colorado
3 requires three math assessments in high school, three
4 different -- three assessments or three times?

5 MR. OWEN: Three different assessments, and
6 there's a sequence. It used to be called as a 9th grade,
7 10th grade, and 11th grade, and 9th and 10th grade is
8 what we've had with TCAP in the past. Now with the
9 addition of moving to PARCC we will have a sequence of
10 assessments that are available for Algebra, Algebra II,
11 or an integrated approach with mathematics.

12 So there's kind of two pathways that school
13 districts at the high school level could take with
14 mathematics, and some of that could be satisfied
15 potentially in middle school, if you have an advanced
16 student in mathematics. So that progression gets a
17 little bit different at high school. But the general
18 progression in high school, as currently laid out, is
19 three assessments right now.

20 MR. OWEN: If you look again at science,
21 science is pretty much straight across what we're doing
22 with the federal minimums right there.

23 Social studies, you'll see, is in addition
24 to -- is an addition to our assessment system. It is
25 required at the federal level. It's something that



1 Colorado requires at 4th, 7th, and 12th grade. And then
2 in addition to postsecondary readiness, we require ACT
3 11th-grade assessment. That's a Colorado requirement
4 that's on top of all these other pieces that are the
5 federal requirements.

6 So those are the differences between the
7 state and the federal requirements.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

9 MR. OWEN: Unless you want to move on?

10 So we had to make some assumptions about
11 calculating school and district performance ratings,
12 based on that change to federal minimums, and I want to
13 just briefly outline what those changes are.

14 So if you look at the left side you see the
15 2013 SPF, all the required components that go into
16 building a school performance framework at the elementary
17 and middle level, and then what would happen if we pulled
18 out and went to just federal minimums.

19 We would pull out writing from each of those
20 areas. Essentially writing was an assessment that the
21 state did that went above and beyond the federal
22 requirements. And so we pulled that piece out, and
23 again, there's not a huge change at the elementary and
24 middle school level because those assessments are, for
25 the most part, required across the board. Did everybody



1 get that?

2 All right. Let's move on to the next sheet
3 for high school. This is where we get into some
4 differences between our current assessment system and how
5 it plays out for school and district accountability and
6 what the federal minimums would do. And I think I'm
7 going to let Allysa walk you through this one and then
8 kind of talk through the impact at the school and
9 district level.

10 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

12 MS. PEARSON: So high school looks a lot
13 different than elementary and middle, and I just want to
14 reiterate this is on 2013. This is when we were still in
15 the TCAP system. We haven't moved to PARCC. We can't
16 simulate what it's going to look like under CMAS because
17 we don't have that data yet. So where you saw us take
18 out writing, we know we're not going to have a separate
19 reading/writing going forward. We're going to have
20 English language arts. But just remember we did this on
21 2013. It was the best data we had to run these
22 simulations on.

23 So high school level you see a lot of
24 differences. Currently we've got high school
25 achievement, 15 percent in the frameworks, which includes



1 9th- and 10th-grade reading, writing, math, and science.
2 Growth was 35 percent, reading, writing, math, and
3 English language proficiency growth. Growth gaps for
4 reading, writing, and math, and then our postsecondary
5 and readiness, which is weighted 35 percent, looking at
6 11th-grade ACT, and graduation and dropout.

7 Going to the simulated federal minimums,
8 there are some different choices you can make in doing
9 the simulation, and we went back and forth and we ran
10 things a few different ways. So there are definitely
11 some other options than how we chose to do it. We tried
12 to make decisions that seemed the most aligned with
13 where, at the time we ran this, we seemed like we were
14 going in a policy direction for the state. So just know
15 there would be some other choices you can make here.

16 When you do this, achievement becomes about
17 30 percent of the frameworks, and again, you could make a
18 different choice about that. But if you just remove
19 growth and growth gaps that's how the weighting
20 redistributes.

21 We looked at TCAP. We took out the 9th-
22 grade TCAP, since the No Child Left Behind, when you go
23 to federal minimums, it doesn't allow for 9th grade. And
24 we looked at 10-grade reading, math, and science scores.
25 We took out the writing.



1 Growth and growth gaps, in terms of the
2 content areas would not be available, because you're
3 going to go from 8th-grade to a 10th-grade assessment.
4 There are some states that run growth that way. I think
5 we, as a state, would have some huge concerns about the
6 validity and what that really means when you're measuring
7 growth from 8th grade to 10th grade, and what that
8 represents. But there are options, but again, we made
9 that choice not to include that here.

10 In black up there, English language
11 proficiency is blacked out. We will still have English
12 language proficiency growth if we don't change those
13 assessments. We didn't want to include it because if we
14 left it in it might end up with all the weight of growth.
15 Additionally, not all schools in the state, especially at
16 the high school, have English language proficiency
17 growth. So we just took it out for now. It's something
18 that if we really go in this direction we'll need to work
19 with stakeholders and decide how that fits in and how you
20 weight it appropriately.

21 And then, finally, the postsecondary and
22 readiness, we moved to about 70 percent of the framework
23 weight, looking at 11th-grade ACT. We kept that in
24 there, although that would be a choice. You could remove
25 that if you wanted to, and then graduation and dropout



1 rates.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Question. Can you
3 remind us what the difference is between growth and
4 growth gaps?

5 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair? Growth is overall
6 for the school, and the growth gaps is looking at those
7 same metrics but for English language learners, for
8 students eligible for free or reduced lunch, for students
9 with disabilities, for minority students and students who
10 need to catch up. So it's just disaggregating the data
11 out.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But doesn't the growth
13 -- it's at the school level but it's also at the student
14 level.

15 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair? Growth,
16 absolutely. It's calculated first at a student level and
17 then aggregated up. But if we don't have those 9th grade
18 assessment we won't have any student-level growth to
19 aggregate up, either as a whole school or for any of the
20 disaggregated groups, for us.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if we go to the
22 federal minimum, we would get rid of the growth
23 altogether, the growth and the growth gaps.

24 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair? For the high
25 school?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the high school.

2 MS. PEARSON: If we went to the federal
3 minimums where we didn't assess at 9th grade and kept the
4 10th, or with CMS PARCC, 11th-grade assessment, the
5 assumption we made when we ran this simulation is that
6 you wouldn't have growth. The growth model would work.
7 You could calculate a number.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Whatever you want. It's
9 a sliding bar. Move it however you choose to.

10 MS. PEARSON: Based on our technical
11 recommendation on looking at growth -- and we can run
12 some simulations; we haven't done that yet -- you -- we
13 would recommend not going from 8th grade to 10th grade
14 and calculating on growth percentile.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So earlier you were
16 saying, and I forgot the number, that -- what's the
17 number of states in the United States that use the
18 Colorado growth model?

19 MS. PEARSON: There's about 20 to 24 states.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So 20 to 24 states.
21 Are any of those at the federal minimum?

22 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair? So we're going to
23 work, and we'll see it in one of the last slides, we're
24 working with the Center for Assessment, who is a leader
25 in the growth model, that we use to see which other



1 states that are using that model and what they're doing,
2 if they have high school assessments or not. They're
3 going to do a report for us and collect that information,
4 because exactly, we want to learn and see if there are
5 some other options that we haven't thought of.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You are always ahead of
7 us.

8 MS. PEARSON: You're right there.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead, Angelika.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So one of the items we look
11 at for students is how much growth they would need to
12 make in the next three years in order to be proficient.
13 We would no longer have that available at the high school
14 level, which is actually where it counts. Am I right?
15 Do I understand this right?

16 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 MS. PEARSON: So, yeah. There's going to be
19 kind of a ripple effect because right now what the
20 legislation says is adequate growth is calculated by
21 proficiency within the next three years or by 10th grade.
22 And so we won't be able to -- for the elementary and
23 middle, up through 8th grade, we'll have those next three
24 years, but we won't have that by 10th-grade readiness
25 idea in there anymore, if we don't have a 9th-grade



1 assessment, to keep consistent.

2 So there's a few questions that come out
3 when you look at this. One is a simple question of --
4 relatively simple -- what is the student outcomes in the
5 school and district performance framework, and that's
6 what we're going to share with you later. But they also
7 bring up some larger questions, where I think you all are
8 starting to go as well, about what is the role of growth
9 in high school accountability. That's something we value
10 in the state. Something that initially that was a high
11 value and we've got to re-evaluate these things. But
12 they warrant some further conversations.

13 Today we're just going to talk about the
14 change and the impact on the frameworks.
15 So we did these recalculations of the SPF and DPF of the
16 calculated ratings for those two years. So we didn't
17 look at request to reconsider, when there's
18 recommendations to change ratings, just the actual clean
19 calculations.

20 So we compared those two. Again, I just
21 want to reiterate that this is a simulation of 2013
22 results, using TCAP, using growth as we've had it. It
23 could look very different under the new CMAS system.
24 We'll have new baseline for targets, we'll have English
25 language arts instead of reading, and we may need to make



1 decisions as a state about how we want to weigh that, and
2 if English language arts will just take the place of
3 reading and we'll lose writing, or if you want to weigh
4 that more.

5 We will have CMAS social studies achievement
6 in the way we're planned out right now, and we are
7 looking at potential revision to postsecondary and
8 measures and cut points. So that's something that will
9 come to Board in the next year, looking at if there's
10 other measures that would be useful to add and if we want
11 to adjust what those targets are.

12 So when you take all those assumptions and
13 run it this way these are the district results. It
14 doesn't change tremendously. There are 11 districts that
15 would receive a higher rating. You all have that handout
16 that shows you which 11 districts those are. There are
17 28 districts that would receive a lower rating, but the
18 majority of districts would have the same rating.
19 And the way you can read this chart, on the left-hand
20 side -- so you can see, on the left-hand columns over
21 here, the districts with higher ratings, and it's color-
22 coded so you can see Boulder Valley there, in 2013, their
23 calculated rating was Performance. They moved to
24 Distinction with the federal minimums. So you can kind
25 of see how that plays out. On the right-hand side are



1 the districts that would've gotten a lower rating. So
2 you can see, for example, Littleton at the top, their
3 2013 calculated rating was Distinction. With the federal
4 minimums, the assumptions we made, they would move to
5 Performance.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the districts that
7 aren't on there would stay the same.

8 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. Yeah. Thanks.

9 Tatiana had a good point. The percent of
10 points that they've earned may change but it wasn't
11 enough to change their rating. And we'll talk about
12 percent of points and how that looks in a minute, as
13 well.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So basically were these
15 districts that were on the border, in terms of their
16 points? They were close to the next, or either up or
17 down, and that's what did it? Or is there a way to tease
18 this out, what this means?

19 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair? We can go look at
20 that more, but knowing those districts and where they
21 were, not necessarily.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not necessarily. Okay.

23 MS. PEARSON: There was -- you know, we're
24 looking at the high school and those changes, losing
25 growth had kind of a big impact for some districts that



1 get a lot of points that way, or don't get a lot of
2 points that way.

3 So the next slide, we separated out schools.
4 We looked at high schools versus elementary and middle
5 schools, because we know that the frameworks are
6 different in that way. So these are schools with a high
7 school level. They might be a K-12 school but they're
8 schools that had high school data in there.

9 So again, there's a slightly negative
10 impact. Twenty-nine schools would receive a higher
11 rating, 39 would have received a lower rating, and 309 of
12 the 378 would have kept the same rating. So most are
13 staying the same, overall, but there is a slight negative
14 impact.

15 And then when you look at just elementary
16 and middle, remember, that's just removing the writing
17 results from them, 70 would receive a higher rating and
18 58 would receive a lower rating, so there's a slightly
19 positive impact in terms of their ratings. The majority,
20 again, would stay the same.

21 So we wanted to look, also --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Question. If, in fact,
23 going back to the percentages in that simulated federal
24 minimum in the SPF calculation, if we were to increase
25 the achievement component and decrease the postsecondary



1 and workforce readiness component, would the number
2 reporting a worst score increase? Did you slide that bar
3 at all in the simulation?

4 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, we have not done
5 that yet but we can make calculations that way and
6 determine that.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. It's just a
8 curiosity. I'm not directing you to do that. It's a
9 curiosity.

10 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

11 MR. OWEN: So, Mr. Chair, I know we're kind
12 of running close to the end of our time, so just quickly
13 I wanted to highlight a few of those last slides.

14 So you can see, we wanted to also see,
15 across the board, how this would affect schools and
16 districts with poverty -- go ahead and move to the next
17 one -- and these are available for anybody to look at.
18 Enrollment size, so kind of the size of the system, small
19 and large, and then current performance levels. So from
20 Turnaround all the way up to Improvement, how would that
21 impact you.

22 Let's move to the last one.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you would, too fast.
24 Too fast.

25 MR. OWEN: Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go back to impact by
2 poverty rates and give an interpretation.

3 MR. OWEN: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

5 MR. OWEN: Yes. Mr. Chair?

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

7 MR. OWEN: So if you look at -- I would
8 guess I would say, cross the board with almost all of
9 these analyses, there's not a large impact of making this
10 change. I mean, when you look at this split you're not
11 seeing a massive clustering that's happening here. And
12 so there's not dramatic impact at each of these levels,
13 this analysis that was done, that would indicate that
14 this kind of a shift, with any of these groups, is making
15 a substantial impact.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But in individual
17 districts it can make a -- it does have an impact.

18 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? That's correct, and
19 especially smaller -- the smaller you get, and the
20 smaller system that you have, the more there is for
21 variance in those systems. The larger you get, the more
22 N count that you have, the more reliable those estimates
23 are.

24 And so -- and again, we're happy to jump in
25 and specifically talk about any of those, if there is a



1 desire on that.

2 Let's go to the last slide real quick.

3 So I think Allysa alluded to this, and we're
4 working with the Center for Assessment to really make
5 sure that we understand what's happening across the
6 country with states and how they're using our growth
7 model, maybe how they're using others, such as the value-
8 added model, how that plays out if they're a state that's
9 at federal minimums or they're a state that goes beyond
10 federal minimums.

11 And so we hope to have more information for
12 you specific to that. If there are things that you want
13 added to that work that we're looking at doing with the
14 Center for Assessment, this is an opportunity to raise
15 that as well.

16 We are also, in Colorado, we have a great
17 group and it's shortly called the TAP, but it's a
18 technical advisory panel that look and studies
19 longitudinal growth. These are experts around the state
20 and in school districts that really understand growth,
21 the benefits of it, how it works in our system. And
22 we've been really closely working with that group to help
23 them understand what this impact would be, why this
24 discussion is happen.

25 And again, I want to reiterate, for anybody



1 listening and for school districts and schools, this was
2 a simulation that was done for discussion purposes with
3 the State Board. This is not something that we've said
4 we're doing. This isn't something that's been calculated
5 and is official for this year or for last year. This was
6 a simulation for discussion purposes. We really wanted
7 to make sure that people could see what this does across
8 the state with some assumptions that were made, and I
9 think Allysa nicely pointed out the assumptions that were
10 made.

11 And so the last thing that we have,
12 accountability, stakeholder groups that we meet with
13 regularly. Again, we're preparing for a next version of
14 SPF/DPF, school performance frameworks/district
15 performance frameworks, to come out in the fall of 2016,
16 and with that are some changes around the way that we
17 utilize our frameworks currently, the methodologies
18 behind them. And so we've been working with our
19 stakeholder groups to really try to help better
20 understand what that's going to look like in the future.
21 And if this has a shift we definitely want to make sure
22 that we work with that stakeholder group, and all those
23 others, to continue to understand the impact across the
24 state.

25 I think what Jill said nicely at the



1 beginning of this was that it took us a long time to get
2 to the system that we currently have -- a lot of input, a
3 lot of work, a lot of schools and districts asking for
4 different component -- and it needs to be a thoughtful
5 discussion about moving pieces of it, if we're moving
6 them off, and what that impact looks like across the
7 state, to make sure that people don't see unintended
8 consequences from quick actions. But this has been a
9 great discussion for our team to really look at the
10 impact.

11 So, Mr. Chair, with that we are happy to
12 take any questions.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. Dr.
14 Scheffel?

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for the presentation.
16 Do you have any calculation or estimate of how much
17 structural time would be spared if we went to a federal
18 minimum model? Because I think the whole point is some
19 in education feel like we're spending too much time
20 testing. So if we went to this model, how much
21 instructional time do we gain?

22 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair? The answer is no,
23 we haven't done an analysis of instructional time. I
24 will say that the H.B. 1202 Task Force that was
25 commissioned at the last legislative session, they are



1 charged with a study and they've solicited a vendor to do
2 that study, and the study is to look at impact on
3 instructional time. It may not get at how does it
4 changes versus what different scenarios are applied, but
5 it's intended to look at what is the impact of the
6 current system on instructional time, and that is one of
7 the deliverables that that task force is supposed to --
8 or the study is supposed to provide to the task force.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: And are they -- because I
10 haven't looked deeply at their charge, but are they also
11 addressing, this task force, how schools are using the
12 growth data, how helpful it is to them, how closely it
13 clean lead to instructional decision in the premises of
14 if the growth data is really helpful. Is it -- are they
15 addressing that question?

16 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair? That specific
17 question is not part of the study that is commissioned in
18 the law.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Will they be breaking out
22 between elementary, middle, and high school in their
23 analysis?

24 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.



1 MS. PITNER: I'd probably feel more
2 comfortable just providing -- it's public information --
3 the scope of work and the contract that the task force
4 commissioned. I don't have all the details of what the
5 specifics would be.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: It sounds like it matters,
7 considering we're talking about something that would
8 affect largely high school. It would be helpful then to
9 know, at the various levels, what the effect would be.
10 So that might be something to put in somebody's ear.

11 I just had a question a long time ago, which
12 was when we were talking about social studies, can the
13 social studies assessment, those three different grades,
14 can those be done on paper? I know they are designed to
15 be online. Can they be paper?

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair? You are
17 absolutely correct that those assessments were designed
18 explicitly to be online. There is a paper version that
19 is available for purposes of accommodation. So we have
20 some students who cannot take an online due to medical
21 conditions that could trigger a seizure attack. If we
22 would go to a paper version we would lose some of the
23 interactivity that is available with the online
24 assessments, and there would be additional costs
25 associated and more time for scoring.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So when we're talking
2 about going to paper we're talking about math and we're
3 talking about perhaps 3rd grade, but we're not talking
4 about science or social studies. Thank you.

5 Thanks for the presentation.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine. Who wants to go?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's on --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- content and --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. You go.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm kind of at the wrap
12 -- it's my wrap. I need to have an answer to before I --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you want me to go
14 first?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You should go ahead.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'll flip a coin. Elaine
17 is going first.

18 MS. BERMAN: Dr. Owen, you mentioned that
19 we're doing the school performance framework. When would
20 the Board be seeing that?

21 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? So as we finalize the
22 2014 ratings, which you'll be seeing the district ratings
23 in November, that the Commissioner decides on, and then
24 you'll see the school ratings, which you take action on
25 in December, after those 2014 ratings are final we have



1 2015 that we'll be working through the transition to new
2 assessments, and during that time frame we have some
3 legislation that allows the Department to use prior year,
4 so this 2014 ratings, as the basis or starting point for
5 the 2015 ratings.

6 So our intent is to work on any changes to
7 the 2016 SPF/DPF starting basically after we get things
8 finalized in December. And so we'll be working with our
9 own team, working with the Center for Assessment,
10 bringing you information at the State Board level, and
11 then working with stakeholders. But our hope is by, I
12 would say -- what would you say? Maybe December of 2015?
13 -- that we would have some recommendations for the State
14 Board for the 2016 ratings, if not before.

15 MS. BERMAN: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam?

17 MS. MAZANEC: Who is the technical advisory
18 -- who is on that panel, for the longitudinal growth?
19 And also, who are the stakeholders that you say you
20 continually have conversations with?

21 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair? The Technical
22 Advisory Panel, I can send you a link to their membership
23 on the website, but it's made up of assessment,
24 measurement, and growth experts around the state, within
25 school districts. And then we have -- we can consult



1 with the Center for Assessment who have the staff that
2 developed the student growth percentile growth model as
3 well. They're not formally on there.

4 MS. MAZANEC: And the stakeholders?

5 MR. OWEN: So just quickly, a variety of
6 them. What we call is the SB 163 Superintendents
7 Advisory Panel, which is a representative group of
8 superintendents from around the state, both urban, rural,
9 and suburban, and we are looking at re-envisioning that
10 group, also with an eye towards the future of
11 accountability. And so we're actually going to retask
12 that group starting in December with kind of a different
13 focus of 2016 next-generation SPF/DPF, what that's going
14 to look like. And we're in collaboration with Rebecca
15 Holmes and her team. We hope to convene a group, again,
16 of representative superintendents, but we're also
17 expanding that to include some district staff and also
18 some other stakeholders from around the state, CASB,
19 CASE, some of the different associations.

20 We also work with the Rural Education
21 Council, which is advisory to the Commissioner on rural
22 needs, and so that's a group that we've taken quite a bit
23 of our accountability work to over the past three, four
24 years.

25 The other piece that is another group that



1 we consult with and work with around the six C's -- CASB,
2 CASE -- we generally meet with them at least once a
3 month, have conversations, and Colorado Commission on
4 Higher Education. SACPIE is another group of
5 representative parents. That's charged in statute. And
6 that's another group that regularly looks at work around
7 accountability and assessment.

8 So we have special education groups, we have
9 gifted advisory group at the Department. And so each of
10 these areas are groups that we try our best to route
11 differences and changes and forward kind of progress that
12 we're trying to make on different pieces of work, and
13 really get their opinions and attitudes towards the
14 different changes that will be coming.

15 But we can work up -- I think we even have a
16 list of kind of all the different advisory stakeholders.

17 MS. MAZANEC: I would like to have that.

18 MR. OWEN: Sure.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If, by chance, it came
20 to the point where a (indiscernible). This whole set of
21 attributes would really not -- they wouldn't look the
22 same if the social studies portion was taken out, once we
23 got to that. What would that involve, because that
24 particular set of characteristics was approved jointly?
25 So would it need to -- that's when a legal conversation



1 might have to happen. But would it need to go back to
2 CCHE or would there need to be another joint meeting? At
3 this point, no answer is expected. Just thinking about
4 that.

5 The other thing is, what's the next step
6 here? Where does this go? Who's got what responsibility
7 at this point, and is there a plan -- and I would say
8 there's complete necessity to keep communicating with
9 school districts to make sure that there's clear
10 understanding and this chart -- the yellow, red, green --
11 it's not carved in stone, that the communication about
12 this conversation and about all of this consideration
13 that we gain is accurate, as it goes out of here, and
14 that on down the road everything that happens and every
15 policy decision that's made is as clearly communicated as
16 possible with due respect for the work that was involved
17 in it, so that the rationale, and the reasonings for
18 doing things are clear to everybody, as much as we can
19 possibly do.

20 And part of that, to Pam's question about
21 where do we find this, who's on this group. To me, all
22 of that is like, how do we find the easiest, most
23 friendly, accessible way for everyone to find what they
24 need, knowing that it's right?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You might as well take



1 it.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm thinking, what's
3 our responsibility now? Where are we? What's the most
4 that the Board should be doing, would be doing?

5 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair? The way -- I'll
6 just share with the way that staff viewed this
7 conversation was a follow-up to interest from the Board
8 in exploring other options for thinking about assessment
9 systems. So we viewed this conversation as informing
10 your conversation and providing responses to questions
11 that you all had asked as you all investigate and talk
12 further about being responsive to concerns that have come
13 from the field around assessment, being responsive to the
14 WestEd study, and as Commissioner Hammond pointed out,
15 informing your legislative platform or whatever it may
16 be. So I think that's really more a conversation at the
17 Board level, and we're happy to find, through that
18 conversation, any questions that we can, you know, try to
19 answer or provide more information to inform your
20 dialogue. But that was the purpose of this conversation
21 today.

22 MR. HAMMOND: I think, from my standpoint --
23 may I?

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

25 MR. HAMMOND: -- you know, as I stated



1 earlier, this really -- if you want to take a position
2 and your supporting (indiscernible) minimums, with the
3 exception of social studies, for example, or, you know,
4 we encourage, as part of your platform, to the extent
5 that it's financially feasible, paper and pencil to allow
6 those districts that can't do it, or feel they can't do
7 it in some way, to meet their needs, we have an option
8 now, we believe, to allow them to do that on the math
9 portion, if they want to, and I suspect, from what we're
10 hearing, we'll have some interest, but not 100 percent,
11 by any means, which will allow some variability for those
12 districts that want to go (indiscernible) to do that with
13 paper and pencil or it's at the school level. We
14 budgeted so much and, you know, if that's not taken
15 advantage of, from that part.

16 I guess what we're really looking for you,
17 it really probably play out the best, from my standpoint,
18 to have this reflected in the legislative
19 (indiscernible). But what you support, what you want --
20 you've already expressed this stuff last year
21 (indiscernible). We're now down to kind of the nitty-
22 gritty, if you will, of what, as you've been presented
23 with options, where you want (indiscernible), knowing --
24 and this is the challenge here -- that there's a whole
25 legislative task force (inaudible). If not, maybe, some



1 of the aspects that you've brought forward. It's really
2 timely because as we bring this forth next month, as we
3 get the information from the fed, really, what do you
4 want reflected. And again, if that fits in the platform
5 (indiscernible).

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

7 MS. BERMAN: Well, I first want to say that
8 I really have to commend the staff, because each time you
9 come back with more information, you're extraordinarily
10 responsive to the questions that each of us have and the
11 concerns that you've heard from the field. So I find
12 these conversations and presentations really, really
13 informative. So thank you.

14 Do address what the Commissioner just asked,
15 I do think we should reflect this in our legislative
16 priorities. I also think -- and you've convinced me,
17 because I think I came here today wanting us to take a
18 stance. But I think there's more information that you
19 just said that you need to collect, and I think we do
20 need to collect it. I think is report that you're hoping
21 to do, to look at other states and how they're using the
22 longitudinal growth model and whether any of them have
23 addressed some of the -- any of them are using the
24 federal minimum assessments and how the longitudinal
25 growth model works with those states, I think that's



1 really, really important (indiscernible).

2 The whole bit about eliminating writing for
3 me, personally, is a concern, because we've heard so much
4 about, you know, graduating students that don't know how
5 to write.

6 So I'm -- you've raised a lot of really
7 important issues, so I would -- I will look forward to
8 having another conversation about this at our next
9 meeting, and I -- I mean, my hope would be that we can
10 make a recommendation perhaps to the legislative task
11 force that's meeting, but I don't think we're there yet.
12 I don't think we have enough information.

13 MR. HAMMOND: May I address that? Just keep
14 in mind the elimination of reading was used in the
15 simulation.

16 MS. BERMAN: Right. Right.

17 MR. HAMMOND: (Inaudible.)

18 MS. BERMAN: What?

19 MR. HAMMOND: I'm getting too tired for
20 that.

21 MS. PITNER: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

23 MS. PITNER: When we move to the English
24 language arts assessment, that will have -- writing is
25 embedded in the English language arts. And so the



1 federal requirement is that either you have an English
2 language arts assessment or a reading assessment.

3 MS. BERMAN: Oh.

4 MS. PITNER: So there will still be writing.

5 MS. BERMAN: Oh.

6 MS. PITNER: It's in the English language
7 arts content. It's just when we ran it we took writing
8 out.

9 MS. BERMAN: Got it. I won't worry about
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Just a quick analogy to an
13 earlier brief conversation we had about changing the
14 school schedule and having high school kids go to school
15 later in the morning, and realizing -- ultimately
16 realizing what seems like a quickie, just to flip the
17 elementary kids and the high school kids in terms of the
18 bus schedules and arrival times has --

19 MS. NEAL: And don't forget the football
20 team.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- exactly. It has all
22 these other consequences that it takes time to think
23 through, and there will be a cost to whatever decision we
24 make, whether it's staying where we are and getting
25 deeper information or letting things drop and then



1 hearing "why did we do that?" So it just is never that
2 simple, but we wish there were quickies and answers. If
3 there were quickies and answers I think we'd get there
4 quickly.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair?

6 MS. NEAL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have a
7 nature of a sort of editorial comment here that I would
8 to read, partially because, as I told the Commissioner,
9 sometimes people don't listen. No, this is a personal
10 thing, like they don't hear, you know.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Whatever it is, I do
12 think it's germane. Go ahead.

13 MS. NEAL: We all know that there are many
14 discussions going on in the state, many discussions going
15 on in the political races, many discussions going on at
16 the Capitol, all about the subject of PARCC. And so I
17 just have an editorial comment here I would like to make.

18 As we continue forward on this path toward
19 the development of the PARCC test, we're continuing on a
20 road to national curriculum. To those who would disagree
21 we only need to look back to the unintended results of No
22 Child Left Behind, in which we made the decision, as you
23 have heard me say many times, not to test social studies.
24 Therefore, the unintended consequence that people heard
25 was "not important." And so they hear things far beyond



1 just what they see and hear us say.

2 Our Colorado constitution gives us control
3 of education -- gives the control of education to local
4 communities. We didn't do that very well in the past and
5 it resulted in a shift to more of a state direction.
6 Could we have done better? I believe we had a good
7 start, but we're now moving steadily down a road which
8 will result in federal control.

9 Standards can drive instruction but we have
10 also learned that testing drives instruction and
11 curriculum. And just again, leaving social studies out
12 of testing led to the loss of focus on history.

13 For those people who have urged us to get
14 out of PARCC they need to realize that we are
15 legislatively tied to PARCC. We don't have that option
16 as a board. But there are two reasons that Colorado
17 needs to reclaim local control of instruction. The major
18 reason is the Colorado constitution, along with the
19 rights of parents to determine the best education for
20 their children. The second reason -- and this is one
21 that I think we should all be able to embrace -- the
22 second reason is the enormous cost financially of a
23 burdensome process and the accompanying bureaucracy. And
24 I believe we're just getting started on that.

25 School districts are frequently accused of



1 being top-heavy, with too many administrators and not
2 enough classroom teachers. But the paperwork burden on
3 local districts has increased dramatically. And I read
4 this recently -- since the 1950s, the number of teachers
5 versus the number of non-teachers has declined
6 drastically. Some estimate that some schools, as high as
7 50 percent of the school budget is spent on non-teaching
8 personnel, and that can only grow, as this discussion and
9 the compliance issues and all of those things cost money.

10 I think it's time for Colorado to get out of
11 PARCC. I know we're bound by legislation. I know we
12 can't do it now, and that's basically I'm saying to, you
13 know, whoever appears down the road. It's time for
14 Colorado to get out of PARCC. If we control our own
15 system of testing we maintain local control for Colorado.
16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, Marcia.

18 So I've got a few comments, and we're
19 running long on time so I'm going to edit myself. But
20 the feedback I'd give is I'd echo some of Elaine's
21 comments, I'd echo some of Marcia's comments, frankly.

22 Thanks very much for the work. I want to
23 footnote and kind of come back to the fact that it's
24 incomplete, that we need to keep pushing forward on some
25 of these things. You know my goal. You know the agenda



1 that I keep driving on, the push that I've got is how do
2 we give maximum flexibility to the districts and maintain
3 accountability?

4 But as you gave us this walk down memory
5 lane, just taking us back to the values, and Angelika,
6 you did a good job of taking us back to the values even
7 further than the CAP4K from 2008, this sense of grief
8 began to well up in me, because Colorado really was a
9 spectacular experiment. I mean, 24 states using the
10 Colorado growth model? That's wonderful. And to reach
11 back to a group that's coalesced around a growth model,
12 to understand assessments and what that process looks
13 like, to find out who might be using it just as part of
14 their relationship with federal minimum standards, or
15 federal minimum assessments, that's interesting.

16 But what has happened to us over the course
17 of these last several years is the CAP4K, the values, the
18 things that we had have been overtaken by federal
19 intrusion. And then when this federal intrusion started
20 creeping in the political leadership of the state did not
21 raise its hand and say, "You know what? We think we've
22 got a good experiment in education going here and we're
23 going to stand by that." When this Board asked, in 2012,
24 for the money to keep the assessment here in Colorado, so
25 that, in fact, this conversation we're having today would



1 be a crisis, if a crisis of our own making, instead of
2 this crisis that is now making beyond this state, we were
3 not given the support.

4 And when we went back, I mean, we took it
5 over and said, you know, give us the money to do the
6 assessment. It was pushed back. This Board, in
7 unanimity, said, "No, no. We really believe that this
8 needs to be a Colorado initiative." We were pushed back
9 again.

10 So this sense of grief and loss to
11 direction, and this sense of letting others overtake our
12 process did well up in me as I was listening. And part
13 of the reason, the individuals at this table and the
14 individuals in this building and the individuals involved
15 in education around this state need to hear me. It's the
16 brilliance and the professionalism that they bring that
17 has now been overrun, in many ways, potentially
18 unintended, potentially intended, that, in fact, grieves
19 me, because I think we were and had the opportunity to be
20 a brilliant experiment in education, and I wish that we
21 could have that freedom back.

22 So I want to pull it back to the state, and
23 I'm challenging you, you folks at the level of the state,
24 let's pull it back even further. Let's give it to the
25 districts. Let's give it to the parents. Let's really



1 keep it local, so that that education, which really is
2 about a student, at the end of the day, that's the
3 ultimate sell we're talking about, is as close to that
4 student as we can possibly get it.

5 So, sorry, I got a little bit wound up here.
6 I mean, there was honest grief in my soul, and that
7 probably brought forth more of a speech that I intended
8 to give. But that's my perspective. And I would ask
9 you, do what you can to bring us flexibility for our
10 districts. At the same time, let's honor that
11 accountability that is part of our culture in the state
12 of Colorado.

13 Okay. Speech over.

14 MS. BERMAN: I second that. I've got to
15 talk.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, Elaine. Go
17 ahead. I never get the last word.

18 MS. BERMAN: Briefly. I will be brief. I
19 will be very, very brief, very brief. I completely agree
20 we need more flexibility, but if it was true that we have
21 all this brilliance and high performance at the local
22 level we would be seeing much better student results than
23 we have been. So I happen to disagree with your comments
24 on that. But we don't want to get into a big --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're not going to launch



1 into a debate.

2 MS. BERMAN: No. But you both made major
3 statements and, therefore, we need to have some balance.
4 We obviously don't agree on this matter. I don't agree
5 with Marcia's statements, but it's absolutely her
6 prerogative and I respect her completely for making a
7 statement. But I want to make clear for the audiences
8 here that we are not in agreement on this.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, and that's fair.

10 MS. NEAL: And that's fine, but I just
11 wanted to say that when I -- that I agreed with you when
12 I said we had local control and we didn't do a good job
13 of it. So it moved to the state, which I was always a
14 little touchy with, but, you know, the state is the
15 state. Now I see us moving it on, and that grieves me
16 too.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And with that we'll wrap
18 this portion of the agenda. I think we've got one more
19 item we need to take care of before lunch, and that is a
20 discussion of higher education admissions policy as it
21 relates to PARCC. Is that accurate?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Early childhood. I see
23 a whole thing.

24 MS. NEAL: Actually --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Did I skip something



1 here?

2 MS. NEAL: No, you didn't.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was her speech.

4 MS. NEAL: You didn't. I forgot it. As a
5 matter of fact, this was just a very brief discussion
6 about, and had it brought to me that higher education was
7 also -- some people had concerns that they were using
8 PARCC as an admission standard, as one of the admission
9 standards. It wasn't the admission standard. Some
10 people had concern about that and asked me to bring that
11 to the Board, not for you necessarily to take a position
12 but just -- it's another one of those overreaching things
13 that PARCC has gone on that they have intruded into CCHE.

14 But was no big deal. So now you've got it.
15 We can move on.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Very brief break.
17 One-minute break and then we need to come back, pick up
18 one more item before we move to Executive Session. So
19 we'll take a 60-second parenthetical moment.

20 (Pause.)

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- and we're going to
22 pick up the next item on the agenda is the assessments to
23 the School Readiness Assessment Menu. Mr. Commissioner.

24 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you, and I'll knock on
25 wood. This should be a positive conversation, okay, from



1 the standpoint that we've talked about this for the last
2 couple of years. Remember the early readiness? We have
3 TS GOLD that was approved some time ago. But districts,
4 we've always said we'll continue searching for shorter
5 tests that would be easier for you to utilize, and really
6 the statute was ahead of its time. The assessments
7 weren't available.

8 But we now are bringing forth three tests
9 for you to hopefully approve, and they'll be part of the
10 assessment bank that can be used for early readiness.

11 So I'll turn it over to you, Melissa, but we
12 finally have gotten there, and in answer to what our
13 districts want.

14 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd
15 like to introduce the panel that's with me today. We
16 don't all plan on presenting. We just wanted to make
17 sure that you had representatives from our School
18 Readiness Assessment Subcommittee as part of our
19 presentation.

20 Again, my name is Melissa Colman. I
21 oversee the Teaching and Learning Unit here at CDE. To
22 my right is Sharon Triolo-Moloney. She is the Director
23 of the Office of Early Learning and School Readiness here
24 at the Department. Next to her is Carrie Germeroth, Dr.
25 Carrie Germeroth. Carrie is at the Marsico Institute for



1 Early Learning and Literacy. She is the Assistant
2 Director of Research there. She also worked on
3 Colorado's Early Learning and Development guidelines
4 which our Department of Human Services has just launched
5 formally this last year.

6 And then to her right we have Jane Walsh,
7 the Early Education Coordinator at DPS. Carrie and Jane
8 were members of our School Readiness Assessment
9 Subcommittee, which actually, as we've gone down memory
10 lane, was actually begun back in 2010, during the
11 assessment design system attributes process, and that
12 subcommittee has been the gift that keeps on giving for
13 them, in that we've continued to engage them, since 2010,
14 in this work.

15 Our purpose today is to present to you the
16 recommend assessment menu additions from the School
17 Readiness Assessment Committee. This is not a day that
18 you would vote on these recommendations. This is an
19 information item for you. But before we get into that I
20 just want to provide a brief background and legislative
21 authority for this work.

22 Within CAP4K, which passed in 2008, there were
23 requirements for the State Board of Education, which was
24 to define school readiness, which the Board did in 2008,
25 and to adopt one or more assessments aligned with that



1 definition of school readiness. And also following
2 adoption of school readiness assessment, the State Board
3 is required to adopt a system of reporting population
4 level results that provide baseline data for overall
5 changes and improvements to student skill and knowledge
6 over time. That's the one action that has not yet
7 occurred, other than the beginning an assessment menu.

8 The requirements of school districts,
9 beginning in 2013, to ensure that every kindergartener
10 has individual school readiness plan that is informed by
11 a school readiness assessment, and to administer that
12 school readiness assessment to each kindergartener.

13 The timeline and actions that have happened
14 since the passage of CAP4K was in December 2012, the
15 State Board did vote to adopt a menu of assessments and
16 approve Teaching Strategies GOLD as the first approved
17 assessment. But we know that a menu with one item is not
18 choice, we in 2013, the School Readiness Assessment
19 Committee conducted an additional assessment review to
20 identify assessment tools that would meet the statutory
21 requirements for school readiness and were unable to meet
22 -- find assessments that met that criteria.

23 As Commissioner Hammond noted, the
24 legislation is really ahead of where the assessment
25 development field was, and so in 2013, in December, the



1 State Board did agree with our recommendation to extend
2 the phase-in process for school readiness assessment to
3 the 2015-16 school year. This would allow those
4 districts that were satisfied with the option of Teaching
5 Strategies GOLD to move forward with that and allow
6 districts who would like to see what other options might
7 be available to wait to implement for that choice.

8 This last August, we convened our School
9 Readiness Assessment Subcommittee again, after a request
10 for information process to solicit additional assessment
11 tools, and the committee has been able to identify some
12 additional assessments to add to the menu. We anticipate
13 coming forward in October of 2014, which is a month away,
14 to have a vote on these additions.

15 I think that in relation to the number of
16 conversations that have just happened here in this room,
17 and have been ongoing for months, I just wanted to
18 provide a little bit context on how that's helped our
19 thinking around this work.

20 I just wanted to draw your attention to the
21 number of districts that have moved forward already with
22 implementation of school readiness assessment, to give
23 you a sense of that. So last year, which was the first
24 year of the phase-in, 88 districts have begun to
25 implement school readiness assessments, including 424



1 schools and about 12,000 children. The way that we've
2 been talking with districts is as they learn how to use a
3 tool like this that's really meant to inform instruction
4 -- it's embedded in instruction, it is not a stop-and-
5 assess type tool -- we recognize that that takes some
6 time to learn the tool and how to really use that to
7 inform instruction and to help parents understand where
8 their children are in terms of the growth and development
9 that they need to be successful in school.

10 So what we found is that some districts like
11 to implement with a few kids in a classroom, or perhaps
12 just look at a portion of the assessment with all of
13 their students. We tried to help them transition in ways
14 that really make sense for teachers, for families, for
15 schools. The second year of implementation is this year,
16 and we've seen an increase of 20 more districts that are
17 involved implementation, so we have 108 districts and
18 about 16,000 schools.

19 So what have we heard from teachers in the
20 field? Well, first of all, we've heard that districts do
21 value choice in assessment selection. The second thing
22 that we've heard, especially this year, is the shift in
23 thinking from teachers who have used a tool like Teaching
24 Strategies GOLD or a school readiness assessment tool,
25 that the notion of assessment as an activity or a stop-



1 and-do has really shifted for these teachers to recognize
2 that instead the ongoing observations of children, and
3 that is part of the assessment process, and being able to
4 use the understandings of child development to inform
5 their instruction is a huge learning for teachers. We
6 find that their perceived sense of burden of learning the
7 system is drastically diminished in year two of the
8 implementation process.

9 We also have heard general concerns about
10 assessment requirements, consistent with what we've heard
11 with the WestEd study and with the 1202 task force. And
12 we've also heard questions about how does this work with
13 the reading assessments required by the READ Act. To
14 that last point, we've produced guidance that has helped
15 districts to understand how these assessments work in
16 tandem with one another and how to avoid duplication. We
17 worked very closely with our literacy office to provide
18 that coordinated support for districts.

19 So with that background I'd like to turn
20 this over to Sharon Triolo-Moloney to talk about the
21 assessment criteria and the recommended assessments.

22 MS. TRIOLO-MOLONEY: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please proceed.

24 MS. TRIOLO-MOLONEY: Back in 2012, when the
25 Board did vote to both define school readiness as well as



1 to approve Teaching Strategies GOLD prior to that, the
2 Board also helped to approve this set of criteria that we
3 have in the slide that's on the screen right now. And
4 it's that criteria that we used to review the assessments
5 that came in for consideration. They're based also on
6 the requirements in the legislation in CAP4K, and we put
7 together the review committee as well as a review form,
8 and a way to collect the scores and comments on anything
9 that we did review.

10 This slide will show you what we actually
11 reviewed. The assessment tools that came in, one was the
12 Desired Results Developmental Profile, which was
13 developed by the State of California. Another one, the
14 Kindergarten Early Learning Scale, which Lakeshore is the
15 vendor; the Riverside Early Assessment of Learning is a
16 Houghton-Mifflin production; and Teaching Strategies GOLD
17 Survey, which is another option that we looked at folks
18 that are using Teaching Strategies GOLD could be another
19 way to use that tool, and it's a little different for
20 their first checkpoint.

21 We also did quite a bit -- spent a bit of
22 time looking at what other states are doing around the
23 country, since this school readiness assessment is
24 happening across the country, and we saw -- there were
25 two states that had tools that they could provide to us



1 that we took a look at to see if they might meet our
2 requirements and could possibly be added to our
3 assessment.

4 When we looked at the other states we
5 realized that there was a variety of things going on.
6 About 12 states are using Teaching Strategies GOLD, 3
7 states are currently using the Desired Results
8 Developmental Profile, 4 additional states are offering
9 their school districts a menu, and we have about 18
10 states that are either part of a consortium or they're
11 creating their own, just for their individual states.

12 And with that we'll turn it over to Carrie
13 who will talk about the subcommittee.

14 DR. GERMERTH: So it's been a pleasure
15 being on the subcommittee since 2010. I think I've only
16 missed maybe one meeting since then. And this last
17 round, the committee was very pleased to see some
18 additional assessments put forth by the publishers that
19 could stand to the very rigorous criteria that Sharon
20 just presented. As you saw, there's a number of criteria
21 just at a first level that are required of these
22 assessments to be put forth.

23 And so the three that the committee was
24 comfortable recommending was the Riverside Early
25 Assessments of Learning, the REAL; the Desired Results



1 Developmental Profile, DRDP; and the Teaching Strategies
2 GOLD Survey.

3 So the subcommittee found that these all had
4 sound psychometric properties, a strong research base,
5 developmentally appropriate, that they would be useful in
6 informing instruction, good communication tools with
7 parents, and were also aligned with the Committee
8 Academic Standards. So there are a number of items that
9 we were able to check off and felt comfortable putting
10 these three forward.

11 And I would also just add, again, with the
12 Teaching Strategies GOLD Survey that it's not really a
13 replacement for the currently approved Teaching
14 Strategies GOLD but is really an option for districts to
15 choose as that initial checkpoint.

16 MS. COLSMAN: So our next slide, we just put
17 together to give you an idea of some of the differences
18 among the ones that are recommended to be added to the
19 menu. Just brief information, and should they be added
20 to the menu we, of course, will continue this process to
21 do the differences between the choices.

22 We'll be using this type of information to
23 help districts make good choices from the assessment
24 menu, so that as they try to consider something that they
25 might not have had experience with they do have some



1 support from the Department.

2 So in terms of next steps for this work, we
3 anticipate coming back in October for a vote on these
4 assessment tools. We also wanted to make sure that you
5 were aware that we have a school readiness assessment
6 guidance document that we've provided for districts to
7 help them with implementation. We actually have two
8 former kindergarten teachers who are here in the room,
9 Emily Kielmayer and Amy Cameron, who are now on staff to
10 asst and provide direct technical assistance to
11 kindergarten teachers, which has been greatly helpful for
12 the field.

13 We are also able to, through the Race to the
14 Top Early Learning Challenge fund, through 2016, fund the
15 subscription cost for school readiness assessments, and
16 we're continuing to provide technical assistance and
17 support specifically for kindergarten teachers about how
18 do you use the information from the school readiness
19 assessment and the READ assessments to really provide the
20 comprehensive support for young children and good
21 information for families.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

23 MS. SCHROEDER: So if the kid doesn't go to
24 kindergarten, shows up in first grade, what happens?

25 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chairman?



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

2 MS. COLSMAN: So the statute is silent on
3 that particular issue. This would be something that
4 districts would certainly have the discretion to be able
5 to use an assessment like those that would be on the
6 menu, to help gain that information about where the child
7 is in relation to kind of age-appropriate expectations.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: And if they're in preschool
9 they may have been -- if they went to
10 preschool/kindergarten then they may well have been
11 assessed with similar assessment tools?

12 MS. COLSMAN: So within the Results Matter
13 program, which incorporate preschool special education
14 and the Colorado preschool program, we do have a menu of
15 assessments that districts can choose from and Teaching
16 Strategies GOLD is one of those assessments. So some
17 districts find it really useful to be able to use the
18 same assessment across preschool and kindergarten to
19 provide kind of the continuity conversation between
20 teachers and families.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So now I'm curious, please,
22 about -- I mean, we've heard an awful lot of pushback for
23 some different reasons. I think one of the reasons is
24 just the collection of information about your child, and
25 I don't want to go there. That's what teachers do. But



1 length, that it's uncomfortable for kids.

2 What are the ways that we are explaining or
3 identifying or helping parents know just exactly what
4 will -- the fact that we use the term "assessment" means
5 probably put your kid down to take a test on a computer.
6 I mean, I've heard that response. Give me a quick
7 example of what happens and what are we doing to make
8 sure that parents know this before it happens with their
9 children?

10 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chairman? Well, I think
11 that you actually pointed to a really important aspect of
12 the term "assessment," because it does have this implied
13 kind of, you know, sit down and bubble things in. And
14 what we would say is that what we know about quality
15 early childhood assessment is actually a better enactment
16 of assessment than what we typically do in upper grades,
17 in that what we do is it's completely embedded within
18 instruction.

19 So I'll give you an example of a teacher
20 would look at an example of -- this is under
21 demonstrating a positive approach to learning. What a
22 teacher would do is note, in terms of persistence -- I
23 think that we can all agree that persistence would be a
24 really important factor of school readiness and school
25 success. So really what a teacher would do is look at to



1 see whether or not a child is able to kind of pursue a
2 variety of challenging tasks and persist in those, and be
3 able to then -- so it's not as if we say, "Now pursue in
4 this task, Johnny." Instead --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So at the end of the day,
6 once a week, at what point -- I'm kind of trying to get a
7 sense of the process, because we get pushback from
8 teachers because it seemed to them, at least initially,
9 burdensome, that they had so much less time than
10 preschool teachers, just because of the student-teacher
11 ratio, as I recall it. How do they do that? How often?
12 How much is expected and how helpful is it actually to
13 the parents?

14 MS. COLSMAN: So I'm going to ask if Jane
15 Walsh can speak to that from a practitioner perspective.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. Thank you.

17 MS. WALSH: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, proceed.

19 MS. WALSH: So it's a very different
20 perception of assessment, and I'm not saying that it is
21 the easiest assessment because it's a new learning for
22 teachers. But what teachers find is that in group
23 instruction, in multiple settings, they're able to gather
24 the data that they are trying to assess children on. So
25 you might be doing a small group instruction. You have



1 data on the entire group that's sitting there, that
2 you've then captured in a very short time. It's ongoing.
3 There's not a specific point that you are sitting down
4 and assessing children.

5 However, that said, with the information
6 that you've gathered it's going to inform your
7 instructional practice. So you might be looking at a
8 specific objective. It's embedded in the instruction of
9 that day. You have a group of children that you've
10 gathered the data on. You make a simple note. You can
11 take a picture of it and upload it into the system. You
12 don't have to fill out a form or bubble it in.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And what are you providing
14 for parents? Thank you for sharing this at the district
15 level. That helps me.

16 MS. WALSH: So many things for parents,
17 depending on the setting. I was presenting to a group of
18 parents last week at one of Denver's schools, just to
19 inform them ahead of time what that instruction would
20 look like for their children, along with their
21 kindergarten teacher, who was in support of it as well
22 because it is authentic assessment. It's already what
23 she's doing in instruction.

24 So we were able to share with parents that
25 their children wouldn't be sitting and being assessed for



1 long periods of time. It would just be gathering the
2 data of what their learning was already creating. In
3 addition to that, we use Teaching Strategies GOLD in DPS,
4 and reports for parents that are available are very
5 informative. They give them information far beyond a
6 checklist of data points for their children.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Is it possible to create a
8 few little videos that Mom and Dad and Grandma and
9 Grandpa can look at, that kind of shows a teacher doing
10 it, both in his or her preparation, in actually doing it,
11 and then speaking to a parent later on, so that there's
12 just a greater understanding -- or is there such a thing?

13 MS. WALSH: Mr. Chair? I'm so glad you
14 asked that question. The videos that teachers create of
15 children, because that's part of our body of evidence and
16 teachers have been creating portfolios for years -- this
17 is an online type of portfolio system -- they take videos
18 of the children, which are loaded into an application.
19 So it's not held on a device. They can share that video
20 with families through giving them access to Teaching
21 Strategies GOLD, because there is a family -- there is an
22 option for families to enter data about their children as
23 well. So you've got the two-way communication, and
24 families can view their children in action, in specific
25 activities.



1 At a preschool level, if you look at the
2 Results Matters website, there are many videos that show
3 the interactions and impact on parents in our current
4 society, having an opportunity to be involved in their
5 children's education in a much different way.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, and then I'll
8 come to Deb next.

9 MS. BERMAN: So you talked -- I know about
10 Teaching Strategies GOLD but you also mentioned the
11 Teaching Strategies GOLD Survey. Is that the shorter
12 version of Teaching Strategies GOLD?

13 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chair? So the Teaching
14 Strategies GOLD Survey is meant to serve as like a first
15 checkpoint of the year. Within the full system there's
16 an option of having multiple checkpoints. The Teaching
17 Strategies GOLD Survey version would just be a first
18 checkpoint of the year. So you might think of that as a
19 shorter version in that it's only one time a year, at the
20 very beginning.

21 MS. BERMAN: Because we had talked, at a
22 previous meeting, about the length of Teaching Strategies
23 GOLD, and there was some conversation with a vendor,
24 about making a shorter version. So is this the shorter
25 version, or not really, and are they still working on a



1 shorter version if it's not?

2 MS. COLSMAN: Actually, last year we were
3 able to automatically suppress a number of objectives
4 within the Teaching Strategies GOLD version that Colorado
5 was using. In terms of having a truncated version of
6 that, there are a couple of states who have kind of --
7 have looked at that. We can continue to look at that as
8 well. However, you start to get into validity and
9 reliability issues around that. So instead what we've
10 been able to do, as I mentioned, we have been able to
11 shorten it by having fewer objectives that are kind of
12 live for teachers to use.

13 In relation to the Survey version, you might
14 want to think about that as a shorter version in that you
15 only give it one time a year. Not give it -- I'm sorry.
16 That would -- you only do one checkpoint a year.

17 MS. BERMAN: But that's not one of your
18 recommended -- it is? I had it right in front of me.

19 MS. COLSMAN: Right. So we have -- the
20 committee has recommended the Survey version as an
21 addition to the assessment menu.

22 MS. BERMAN: Okay. Which chart is that?
23 I'm looking at the chart that says additional information
24 about the recommended assessments and I see three there.
25 I see the assessments reviewed, so where is the chart



1 that lists the actual -- oh, I see. So, okay. So this
2 does not necessarily correspond with the next one, which
3 talks about additional information, which is the cost and
4 the training and stuff. Am I off here?

5 MS. COLSMAN: So the Teaching Strategies
6 GOLD, the Survey version, and the full GOLD version would
7 have the same cost.

8 MS. BERMAN: I see. So it's just not
9 mentioned here in --

10 MS. COLSMAN: Yes.

11 MS. BERMAN: Okay.

12 MS. COLSMAN: Sorry for the confusion on
13 that one.

14 MS. BERMAN: Thank you for the
15 clarification.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel?

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. Thanks for the
18 presentation. You know, when we think of a menu of
19 options it's really intuitively appealing for a bunch of
20 reason. But the reason, I think, the public, whether it
21 was teachers or parents or the (indiscernible) that
22 wanted a menu is because they were concerned about time
23 and privacy.

24 Is there something that you could share with
25 us, or put together a table or something that would



1 suggest how these additional assessment options address
2 those concerns on behalf of the public? I looked at the
3 assessment review criteria and those weren't on the list.
4 So the public cares about how long it takes. Teachers
5 have contacted me a lot about this issue. And then how
6 many data fields, how is the data encrypted, how long
7 does it last, what happens to those video clips, do
8 parents have control of the information, you know, a host
9 of issues around privacy that people are really concerned
10 about. My question is, how do these additional
11 recommendations address that concern?

12 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 MS. COLSMAN: That's certainly information
15 that we can provide in October. We can add -- we can
16 augment this list to include that. The issues around
17 data privacy and security, the Department has already
18 provided some support to the field around how to make
19 those decisions for themselves around the -- whatever
20 particular assessment that they choose. So those would
21 be things that we would want to support districts in
22 making really good choices to be able to answer those
23 questions for themselves.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, and before we vote on
25 it, so before the meeting we could look at it, because



1 I've read what the Department has put out but it doesn't
2 really directly address these data or where they end up,
3 what's done with them, how parents can control that data.
4 It doesn't really seem to address that directly. So
5 since that was the reason the menu would be helpful it
6 would be great if you could directly address this. Thank
7 you.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam?

9 MS. MAZANEC: Along that line, when you said
10 that the videos are loaded into an application, is this
11 like a cloud, where you said parents -- I'm sorry. It
12 was you -- said parents could go and look at it. When
13 you say it's in an application, does that mean it's
14 somewhere in the cloud?

15 MS. WALSH: The access to that is not
16 general access. Access is specific. So if a parent
17 wanted to have access to that data that was gathered they
18 would have to get the teacher's -- not permission, but
19 the teacher would have to give them access to that
20 specifically. So you couldn't broadly, as a community,
21 go in and look at videos. The videos I referenced that
22 are online currently with Results Matters, those are only
23 with family consent that they are there. So they don't
24 actually live in the cloud. They're uploaded into
25 Teaching Strategies.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Which sits on their
2 server then.

3 MS. WALSH: Which sits on their server,
4 which is --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- still essentially in
6 the cloud.

7 Dr. Scheffel?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I do hear what you're
9 saying, that you have to have a login and all that. But
10 the reality is it is very easy to hack into these
11 systems, and there's been a lot of work done on that. So
12 I just think that we need to look at it, and the parents
13 and citizenry and teachers say how are these data really
14 encrypted and how have we added layers of privacy to
15 these really sensitive data for very young children.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions?

17 Okay. So kind of going down this same
18 pathway, my wife's Target card is very precious to her,
19 and my Home Depot card is very precious to me, but
20 neither of those are nearly as precious to me, or any
21 other parent out there, as their child. And so this idea
22 of data that's, you know, floating out there and video, I
23 mean, it's very personal. There's very soft sorts of
24 personal things that are being gathered and it creates
25 this concern.



1 And so I need to do some reading and
2 understanding between now and October myself, to really
3 validate the underlying premise that capturing all this
4 behavioral data on a child -- which I obviously did as a
5 parent as my child was growing up, so I intuitively kind
6 of understand why that makes sense. But I didn't capture
7 it and formalize it and potentially put it at risk. It
8 was, you know, completely analog, completely within my
9 control at all times.

10 But that transition we're trying to push
11 through to, understanding why that truly is a reasonable
12 value proposition of the risk that is presented with
13 doing that. So I'm just looking for the underlying root
14 explanation of why this makes sense. That's my own
15 personal reading, so if somebody would guide me in the
16 right direction on that I'd be grateful.

17 Then I've got kind of some policy questions.
18 What happens if the level of opposition rises to the
19 point where a school or a district or somebody says, "You
20 know what? No, no." What does that do to them
21 financially? What are the consequences if it rises to
22 the level of what I'll call crisis and, you know,
23 rejection?

24 MS. COLSMAN: So, Mr. Chair, we can
25 certainly put together answers to these questions and the



1 privacy questions and have that to you all to inform your
2 discussion for October.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And, I agree, early, so
4 that I -- because I need to process on this a little.

5 MS. COLSMAN: Yes. Yes. And I think a
6 couple of things. One is, you know, right now this is a
7 statutory requirement within CAP4K that we are required
8 to assess school readiness.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Videotape is not
10 required by the statute, right?

11 MS. COLSMAN: Correct. But the domains that
12 are to be assessed are in the statute, so the various
13 domains for students' academic, social, emotional, and so
14 forth are outlined in statute. So that gears it to what
15 kind of assessments then the assessment committee looks
16 at, and then also what the market has.

17 So we'll reiterate some of that background
18 but then also provide information from the vendors, in
19 terms of the data security and privacy pieces so that
20 that piece is there.

21 It's also important to note that with all of
22 these assessments the relationship is between the
23 district and the vendor. And so they have flexibility to
24 turn of features that they don't want, and they have --
25 so that flexibility is there. A district may choose to



1 use a video tool to ease teacher data capture; another
2 district may choose they do not wish to do that, and that
3 all at a local decision.

4 Those kinds of things, when Melissa was
5 talking about guidance, we hope, from the Department
6 level, we can say, you should be thinking about these
7 things. These are questions you should have. These are
8 things you should talk with your vendor about, and these
9 are features and function that you want to be cognizant
10 of, and have conversations with your community.

11 But we'll try to bring back all of that
12 information in preparation for your October, and in
13 enough time so you can review it before that.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the question of
15 financial consequence to rejection. You know, what are
16 the restrictions, you know?

17 MS. COLSMAN: And to clarify, when you say
18 financial consequence, you mean if a district were to
19 say, "We don't want to do this assessment," what would be
20 the implications of not complying with that part?

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, absolutely.

22 MS. COLSMAN: Got it.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's exactly what I'm
24 trying to understand.

25 MS. COLSMAN: Got it.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had a follow-up. This
3 is something I neglected to ask. Are there any on the
4 suggested list that are not electronically based, that
5 are paper-and-pencil, that somebody sticks in a file
6 somewhere?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman? Right
8 now we're looking at the DRDP, Desired Results
9 Developmental Profile. That really is more of a record-
10 keeping for the teacher. What you'll find with many of
11 these systems is that because it is kind of a paper-
12 pencil task for the teacher, not for the students, that
13 teachers appreciate having an online system to hold that
14 information.

15 But actually, I believe that any of these
16 systems could be used without using the online portion
17 whatsoever. Any of these could be conducted without
18 using that online storage space. What teachers have done
19 in the past is store all of their body of evidence in
20 like little tote trays in the past, in their classrooms.
21 What this does is make a little electronic tote tray that
22 parents can view remotely.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And what I'd like to see, if
24 it's on the list of options, several options that are
25 just paper-pencil, that people can use without storing



1 data anywhere, that anybody could hack into. I know that
2 seems a little throwback as far as the nature of the
3 data, but, truthfully, it would sit really well with lots
4 of parents.

5 MR. HAMMOND: And we'll provide that,
6 because it is -- theoretically, it is an option. That's
7 the way I understand it. But we will get that all back
8 to you. Because if a district is not comfortable they
9 have every right to go that option.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No further questions or
11 comments? Thank you very much.

12 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Appreciate that. An
14 Executive Session has been noticed for today's State
15 Board meeting in conformance with 24-6-402(3)(a),
16 Colorado Revised Statute, to receive legal advice on
17 specific legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II),
18 Colorado Revised Statute, and matters required to be kept
19 confidential by federal law or rules or state statutes,
20 pursuant to 22-6-402(3)(a)(III), Colorado Revised
21 Statute.

22 Do I have a motion to convene in Executive
23 Session?

24 MS. NEAL: So moved.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No opposition?



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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