



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
May 14, 2015, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 14, 2015, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Marcia Neal (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Steve Durham (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MADAM CHAIR: Item 4.01, the Assessment
2 Accountability Pilot. The next item is presentation on
3 assessment and accountability. Commissioner?

4 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. What started this
5 whole conversation was the (indiscernible) and what they
6 presented to -- we just wanted Elliot, whose been working
7 with (indiscernible) on a few things, and expand beyond
8 the discussion, and answer any questions, and then we'll
9 go on. Elliot?

10 MR. ASP: Okay, Madam Chair?

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

12 MR. ASP: It's very timely to have our --
13 our rural colleagues with us this morning. We've had a
14 number of conversations with them over the last several
15 months about their project, and we have been in
16 conversation with a number of states over the past year
17 or so, who are looking at alternative accountability
18 systems. California, Vermont, Tennessee, Kentucky, and
19 in particular, New Hampshire, who just received a waiver
20 earlier this year from the U.S. Department of Education
21 to engage in alternative assessment -- excuse me,
22 alternative assessment accountability system.

23 So we even -- as you know, in our waiver
24 application, to renew our waiver with USDOE, we included
25 some language that we intended to come forward with a



1 proposal to USDOE to get their okay to move into an
2 alternative accountability pilot. And we've done some
3 work as well with our -- our Rural Innovation Alliance
4 friends, around what is possible. In fact, the slides
5 that I'm sharing with you today, they've already seen,
6 and we had a chance to talk about some in terms of what
7 they would mean, and as we were talking about this with
8 you.

9 So basically what I would like to do is just
10 spend a little time giving you some context about some of
11 the issues that came up during their presentation, and I
12 will apologize ahead of time as a result of the
13 legislature, and also discussions with some of the folks
14 who presented. We made some changes in the slides that
15 we originally gave you, and I think you've got a new copy
16 just this morning, so I'm sorry for -- the concepts are
17 still the same, some of the language has changed a bit.

18 So I just want to take a minute to talk
19 about accountability in Colorado, and kind of how we got
20 to this place, and then provide some way of thinking about
21 how we can move to a -- a different kind of
22 accountability system. And then give you some ideas
23 about what we expect will be some of the either barriers,
24 or issues that we'll need to deal with, as we move
25 forward in this kind of thinking. And I'll obviously



1 take your questions.

2 Just quickly, to remind you here, state
3 accountability as we know it probably appeared in 1971;
4 there was an Education Accountability Act that was passed
5 then. But it was a very loose system of accountability
6 and the goals were that districts would engage in more
7 planning, using data, and so on. There wasn't much to
8 that system. The first real state accountability system
9 emerged from the development of statewide standards and
10 assessments, CSAP in particular. And but it was really
11 the Owens Administration had put together the school
12 accountability reports that were very specific, they were
13 based on some work done in Texas. Very specific about
14 what was included, and they were distributed to -- to
15 parents with an idea that they would provide a lot more
16 information for choice.

17 At the same time, CDE started to develop
18 something called a weighted index, which looked at
19 results of -- from CSAP, and also the legislature started
20 to act on the accountability system, and it became kind
21 of a -- to be quite honest about it, it became a catch-
22 all for every interest that legislatures had, and it
23 became a big checklist. So when somebody said: We like
24 contextualized learning; I didn't know what that was when
25 I was in a school district for a while. But I think it



1 means career and tech ed now. We would have to have some
2 evidence that we had a program of that, and somebody
3 would add something else, and something else, and then
4 these reports would be written by folks from -- CDE would
5 visit the district, and they'd write these reports. And
6 some of those reports are very well done, and others were
7 not as well done, it depended on the individual that
8 visited us.

9 At the same time, we had -- No Child Left
10 Behind kind of emerged from the Bush Administration. So
11 one time in Colorado we had three different kinds of
12 accountability systems. We actually had four. The --
13 the three were the school accountability reports, the --
14 these reports that were written about districts, and then
15 also No Child Left Behind. And so what happened is we
16 had schools and districts getting rated differently in
17 each of those systems. You might have a school that was
18 rated excellent on the school accountability report, was
19 failing on a No Child Left Behind, and was kind of
20 accredited, so to speak, by the review and reports.

21 So in 2009, basically -- whoops, I'm sorry,
22 excuse me. The current accountability system was created
23 to try to align those pieces and also in our waiver in
24 2012, we tried to also align federal -- ask for relief
25 from the No Child Left Behind System, so we didn't have



1 several different competing accountability systems, and
2 the one that is currently in place with district and
3 school performance frameworks, was one that systematized
4 the kinds of indicators that we were going to use to --
5 to rate schools in districts across the state.

6 Where we are now. If you count -- if you
7 think of the accountability system kind of all together
8 as accountability 1.0, and the school and district
9 performance frameworks might be 1.5; I'm not real good at
10 this software kind of numbering, but that's -- you get
11 the picture. That we're moving toward accountability
12 2.0. Right now we have an accountability work group
13 that's looking at what we can do with the system we
14 currently have, how that should be changed to make it
15 more fair. Even address some of the issues that we heard
16 around the small (indiscernible) and so on. A lot of
17 those discussions are going on with the work group of
18 about 30 people that you've heard about before.

19 But we're also in the process of applying to
20 the U.S. Department of Education for a -- a waiver to do
21 some things differently; and you might think of that as
22 accountability 2.5. And the folks that we heard this
23 morning are -- are pushing us towards maybe what we might
24 call a next generation of accountability, or a 3.0 piece,
25 even though there may be further steps there. The



1 commissioner charged Rebecca Holmes, our Associate
2 Commissioner for Innovation and Choice, to lead some
3 thinking about 3.0, and we have been doing some of that
4 in the Department and we have had some convenings with
5 various groups across the state.

6 So another way to do this, and -- is to
7 think about -- we were at revising the school and the
8 district performance frameworks now, if we have an
9 accountability pilot, it takes us a little farther.
10 There is probably some things that remain from the old
11 system, and we talked about some of those here that might
12 have to do with comparability. And eventually we moved
13 to a -- a new concept depending on how those things
14 worked, as you heard from the timeline that these folks
15 have put out today about how to take a look at the
16 system, and think about how it -- how it's working, how
17 it could be improved, and what it means for the rest of
18 the state.

19 So as we thought about applying to USDOE,
20 here were the goals of -- that kind of came up with us.
21 And they overlap a lot with what we heard earlier today.
22 I think it's critical to reduce the emphasis on state
23 assessments. We all know there's too much of it. We
24 probably didn't get much relief from the -- the law that
25 just passed. And frankly, we worked along with our rural



1 friends, at trying to create some space in that
2 legislation that would allow more of this kind of pilot
3 piece, and -- and we weren't very successful with that,
4 as it turns out, and it know some of us are frustrated
5 with that.

6 But we also saw as a goal, is to include
7 locally scored common performance estimates. That's kind
8 of the New Hampshire model as well. It's just local
9 assessments and the state assessment in the
10 accountability system. Somewhere along the lines what
11 these folks talked about; to provide a lot more timely
12 information and useful data to inform instruction. Brian
13 Henson in particular was talking about the frustration of
14 his teachers, and not being able to get information back,
15 and having to wait. And it -- and it's not very useful
16 information when it's five, six months old.

17 We also wanted to see though, a system that
18 really assesses application of student learning in real
19 life settings, so that we could do these kinds of
20 performance tasks that are engaging to kids, they give
21 information to teachers on a timely basis, and so forth.
22 A couple of other pieces there that are important is this
23 continue to ensure equity and transparency, so we can --
24 we can take a look at different gaps that are important
25 to us. But also have some comparability across schools



1 and districts.

2 Dr. Schroeder addressed that earlier about,
3 there are -- there are folks who want to know how folks
4 in Mancos are doing compared to -- to folks in Marino.
5 And -- and so on.

6 So I'm going to do this real fast, but
7 here's -- there's a lot of political and philosophical
8 backing for these kinds of systems, but there's also some
9 technical pieces that help us make an argument around why
10 we should move to a more integrated kind of assessment.
11 And then allows us to have a more, I think, robust and
12 interesting accountability system. So bear with me, I
13 will do this fast.

14 There's two big dimension of assessment to
15 think about with this: One has to do with the degree to
16 which assessments are standardized. When they are any
17 kind of large scale, you have to standardize them like
18 crazy. There is too many variables inside, and you can't
19 make sense of why there's difference. But teachers, they
20 give unstandardized assessments all the time in
21 classrooms, okay? Sometimes they do standardized ones
22 too, but they'll say: Elliot, why don't you just take
23 this home and work on it. It doesn't look like you're
24 doing as well on this as you normally would. And come
25 back, because they have all kinds of information they can



1 bring to bear. A large scale assessment person has one
2 shot at this, basically, okay?

3 And the other dimension to think about here
4 is how you answer the "show what you know". Do you
5 choose the answer; all the way over to, do you do the
6 answer? Okay? When I say: Choose the answer, you take -
7 - you answer multiple choice question about the
8 standards you're looking at, and do you answer -- you
9 actually do what you're -- what you're talking about.

10 It's hard to, in a large scale system, have
11 people perform these pieces, but you and I would probably
12 both agree that if we're flying out of DIA tonight, that
13 I wouldn't want to have the pilot that took -- actually
14 did the "do" part, not the one that took the multiple
15 choice test. Okay? So some of these things are really
16 important for us to look at. So what happens in large
17 scale tests? A whole bunch of them get put up in the
18 short answer, highly standardized place, because they are
19 cheap, and fast, and quick to do.

20 But occasionally, we've tried to move to --
21 for important outcomes, to a more of a performance piece,
22 and you've seen that in writing tests in particular. The
23 performance-based pieces of PARCC and so on. But they
24 are hard to do, and they take a lot of time, and PARCC
25 tried it, and it looks like it's taking too much time and



1 energy away from these pieces that could be done very
2 easily -- much easier as a classroom.

3 So the kinds of things that teachers can do
4 can be even more unstandardized and less obtrusive if
5 we're clever about how we put these in a system. And so
6 technically, we have to think about how that works,
7 because once you try to standardize some things like a
8 literacy portfolio, or a science fair project, and use it
9 at the state level, sometimes you kill it. That's what
10 happened in Vermont when they tried to use mathematics
11 and -- and literacy portfolios. It was -- thought it was
12 going to be a good idea, they couldn't pull it off, and
13 they had to constrict it so much that kids didn't get to
14 choose. The -- the kind of engagement that you see kids
15 display with these pieces got destroyed.

16 So if we can think about how to be clever
17 about using some of these more performance-based pieces,
18 in an accountability system that starts to get at what
19 our friends were talking about here. Okay? But there
20 are some guardrails that we have to deal with, that we
21 think are going to be in the -- in the federal waiver
22 proposal (indiscernible). We ask for permission to do
23 these things.

24 This is a list of probable ones based on
25 what we know from New Hampshire and others, but there's a



1 couple key ones that you heard come up earlier. One is
2 that they're going to require some annual reporting on
3 achievement and growth toward post-secondary and
4 workforce readiness for every student in specific grades.
5 For students that are involved in an assessment system.
6 That's probably gotta be something that some folks in
7 Colorado are going to want to see too, whether it's off a
8 specific state -- state test, or more of a body of
9 evidence kind of approach. Folks are going to want to
10 know, how's my student doing?

11 A second one that's also (indiscernible)
12 determinations for each school and district, that
13 requires some sort of comfortability across schools and
14 districts in some sort of a -- being able to see how well
15 the school and district is performing compared to others.
16 And there's probably also a continued commitment to
17 equity and disaggregated reporting, or being able to talk
18 about how different groups are doing. That becomes
19 difficult with small school districts, until that's going
20 to continue to require a lot of work.

21 The other pieces that we think are in --
22 might show up in some federal requirements, are -- they'd
23 ask us to negotiate with them, have a lot to do already
24 with what these folks are advocating. Things like
25 diagnostic reviews, building district capacity to



1 understand and use assessments in a -- in a realistic
2 way. Providing support and intervention for low
3 performing schools, and learning from the ones that are
4 high performing.

5 And what's really interesting that we saw in
6 the New Hampshire application, was that you need to take
7 a look and see if these systems work, and if they do,
8 you need to have a plan for scaling them up so that folks
9 can have -- all folks across your state can have the
10 opportunity to engage in this kind of system. It fits
11 very much with what we've heard from these folks, but
12 there are a couple of technical guardrails like the
13 comparability and annual reporting, and so on, that we
14 need to deal with.

15 So what could something like this look like?
16 We took this from New Hampshire's model and just played
17 with it a little bit, based on some language from the
18 recent state test. And basically, what you see is --you
19 might be able to say let's do local assessments, for
20 example, in some grades. Occasionally, you might have a
21 bank of common assessments that people choose from that
22 districts contributed to, and that the state was able to
23 validate as -- as being assessments of the standards that
24 we want.

25 And then occasionally -- and I left PARCC in



1 there because that's the test we have right now; that may
2 change, and we understand that. So that occasionally you
3 would give a statewide test to act as a check on the
4 results from these local, or common assessments, that
5 could provide an opportunity for comparability. Now
6 there's a lot of technical details inside of this idea,
7 but this is one way of thinking about it. They brought
8 up earlier some other ways of thinking about it that
9 might be sampling -- of every year the certain test. But
10 there is different ways to do this.

11 New Hampshire got this kind of model
12 approved. They did have to do some dual testing for a
13 little bit with the districts that were involved. When I
14 say "a little bit," in the context of accountability, a
15 little bit is probably a year or two.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Elliot?

17 MR. ASP: Yeah.

18 MADAM CHAIR: I -- I have to interrupt, and
19 point out what's missing in this. What's missing?
20 Social studies, right?

21 MR. ASP: Yeah, and I just chose these two -
22 -

23 (Overlapping)

24 MADAM CHAIR: I know, I know.

25 MR. ASP: -- as -- as what we had to do



1 under federal requirements. I'm sorry.

2 MADAM CHAIR: But it's -- it's very
3 representative of what's gone on in Colorado; the same
4 thing. You know, and I -- I continually have to bring
5 that up and remind people that that's very important. Go
6 ahead, I (indiscernible).

7 (Overlapping)

8 MR. ASP: Thank you, Madam Chair, no, that's
9 fine. I use this as a model of what we have to submit to
10 the -- the federal government, because USDOE doesn't
11 require us to test in social studies.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Doesn't require social
13 studies?

14 MR. ASP: They don't require us to assess in
15 social studies under the U.S. Department of Education.
16 So that's why I use this -- (indiscernible) is well
17 taken.

18 So the last piece are some possible next
19 steps. We've been working with the Center for Assessment
20 to draft a proposal that we could take out to -- to other
21 stakeholders. We worked with them, because they are the
22 -- they were primarily responsible for helping New
23 Hampshire get their proposal approved by the U.S.
24 Department of Education, and we wanted to learn from
25 that, and see if we could speed this process up a little



1 bit.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, I'm sorry,
3 who did you say helped New Hampshire?

4 MR. ASP: The National Center for
5 Improvement of Educational Assessment. I'm sorry, I used
6 the Center, thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's all right, I just
8 missed it.

9 MR. ASP: And so we would see identifying
10 some sort of pilot parameters. Some of this fits in with
11 what we're going to have to figure out around 13.23 as
12 well. What does it mean to -- what kind of evidence do
13 you have to collect? How can we help districts do that?
14 What would it need to identify capacity; need to provide
15 technical support, as Mr. Bissenette (ph) referred to
16 earlier? And then move forward to submit this plan and -
17 - and then try to work on the assessment cases as we go
18 along.

19 That's generally the kind of think that
20 we've been doing up to this point, and how we could start
21 to take the ideas that we heard here today, and create
22 some space for that to be -- happen here in Colorado. I
23 would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Jane?

25 MS. GOFF: Has a -- has New Hampshire had in



1 place a -- a bank of assessments? Or did they basically
2 need to start from scratch on that part? I read about
3 this for a while, but I can't remember some of the
4 details.

5 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

6 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

7 MR. ASP: They -- they developed a bank of
8 common assessments as part of this process. So they went
9 on to districts themselves, and their -- their piece is
10 more top down driven from the state perspective. And
11 they said, who's interested in this idea? And they came
12 together with about 15 districts initially; they have
13 very small school districts. Ours are small, but they
14 have almost uniformly very small districts. And folks
15 worked on developing some of these assessments, or
16 identifying some that they are using, and they worked on
17 them together.

18 And we have some -- we already have that
19 kind of activity going on in Colorado. We can build on
20 it from CDE, as well as from districts that have come
21 together to do that. And then some districts said, this
22 is all we want to do; we're just going to stick with what
23 we learned, we are going to use some of these
24 assessments. Others said, we want to push further into
25 this pilot piece. But they were able to develop a bank



1 of assessments that districts could choose from.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Angelika?

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Are you finished, Jane?

4 MADAM CHAIR: I think Jane is done.

5 MS. GOFF: Well, go ahead.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Well, Jane, you've got to talk
7 faster. That's all right, go ahead.

8 MS. GOFF: No, I don't have to talk faster.
9 I just -- I'm curious about -- and I don't know that
10 today's the time for this; about what the utilization
11 rate has been for our current resource bank? Just on --
12 in -- in everyday classroom use. You know, teachers are
13 taking advantage -- I know, I realize that's not --
14 that's not something you need to answer right now, and
15 find out. But we do -- the point -- my point is, what do
16 we already have in place that we -- that we need to keep
17 in mind, is a building block, or two, for a lot of this
18 work if we -- as we go forward with this?

19 And social studies -- you know, we are -- we
20 are at liberty, we are free to work that in through
21 however we wish as part of our state system. And there
22 was a bill that was passed that supplements any interest
23 and efforts to do that. So I just want to ease Marcia's
24 fears that we're -- we're verging on forgetting social
25 studies. But I would be interested to know -- and we --



1 I can talk with our other staff as well. I'd like to
2 know what are -- are people using what we have available
3 right now?

4 MR. ASP: I'm sorry, I can't answer that
5 question, but I will say that we have some structures in
6 place, like our content collaboratives for example, have
7 done a lot of work. And -- and a number of our BOCES
8 have also sponsored some common assessment development,
9 where teachers are working together. Some of the
10 districts that you heard present today have been involved
11 in work with other districts doing that same kind of
12 work. So there -- there are structures that we can use.

13 MADAM CHAIR: And we attended one of those
14 with Jane (indiscernible).

15 MS. GOFF: Well, yeah, we -- we at least --
16 as a minimum of us, have -- have seen some of that work
17 in action. But the aftermath, the -- since that time,
18 how much -- how much are people aware of taking advantage
19 of in the best way possible, of what we have worked up
20 already as a state? Which in my mind really is
21 applicable to sizes -- all sizes of districts. It's a
22 content-based opportunity that -- as we move forward that
23 we need to enhance, and we need to make sure people are
24 aware of what is available and accessible. Thanks,
25 Elliot.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Angelika?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: The New Hampshire model, I
3 think it was, are those all online?

4 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MR. ASP: I -- I'm not sure, I'd have to --
7 see, some of those -- those assessments are given
8 locally, so that teachers imbed them in a curriculum when
9 it's appropriate for them. That's why they -- they value
10 them so much. Some of those are -- may be online and use
11 computers to a degree, but they'll -- they are going to
12 be more larger events than we can do at a statewide
13 level. So this might be a -- a task that goes on for
14 several days, and kids have an opportunity to use a
15 variety of different resources that aren't -- may not be
16 available to them in a state test, because you have to
17 standardize what everybody can use. But I can find --

18 (Overlapping)

19 MS. SCHROEDER: See my fantasy all along has
20 been that we are not where we will ultimately be with
21 assessments, and that we will be able to use assessments
22 that give immediate feedback to kids and teachers, but
23 that somehow if they're online and secured, the state can
24 pull the information to create the accountability piece.
25 And I wish we could think about -- I mean, I know that's



1 technically getting kind of ahead of ourselves, but I
2 think there are people out there who would -- who could
3 imagine doing that.

4 Looking at the formative assessments that
5 are agreed to among the educators in the state, and then
6 finding a way to securely use those also ultimately to
7 measure student growth, and for accountability purposes.

8 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? Certainly that's
9 possible, a lot of districts use multiple choice tests
10 right now, and that way to get things back is -- it's
11 probably --

12 (Overlapping)

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I'm not -- I'm not
14 talking about multiple choice.

15 MR. ASP: That's -- that's what I --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry.

17 MR. ASP: Vermont actually is doing a couple
18 of interesting pieces like that, and they're -- as they
19 are developing, and talking about a new accountability
20 system, I referred to a visit that I had an opportunity
21 to go to several weeks ago, where they are looking at
22 what they are calling "school reviews", and they do one
23 annually that's data that's already collected from
24 schools. Some of it is achievement, and they are
25 expanding it to other areas.



1 And then every three years, they are
2 developing a -- a review process similar to what our
3 friends told us about earlier, where groups go to every
4 school, and they give them feedback. Some of it's
5 quantitative, some of it's qualitative, some of it's the
6 same for every district, and some of it's also driven by
7 specific needs that a school or district would say: I
8 want you to look for these things in our classrooms. So
9 it's an interesting idea. That's part of the group that
10 we've been working with to -- to see how these pieces
11 might work in Colorado.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Anybody else? Steve?

14 MR. DURHAM: On the waiver process, is it --
15 do you generally get one waiver for everything in a year
16 that you want? Or is it -- can you get a waiver for a
17 specific project? Or is it some combination of both?

18 MR. ASP: Madam Chair, I'm going to -- just
19 generally I would like to see if Dr. Owen would help me
20 with this. Basically, we have one waiver from the
21 requirements, and then we can make amendments to that.
22 That's what this proposal would be. But --

23 MR. OWEN: That would be right.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Owen?

25 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, that's -- that's



1 correct.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

3 MR. DURHAM: So -- so if our basic waiver is
4 somehow denied, then we couldn't get this as a sub one,
5 is that a fair statement?

6 MR. OWEN: No, not necessarily.

7 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? I -- I think there
8 could be possibilities of working directly with USDOE
9 under NCLB, that would allow you to request different
10 flexibility outside of the waiver process. We haven't
11 done that. I'm not sure how many other states have done
12 that, but I think there is a way to do it. I don't know
13 if they would be open to discussing flexibility when we
14 haven't taken advantage of the waiver process though,
15 under NCLB. So it's hard to say, but I think I wouldn't
16 close the door completely on the idea.

17 MR. DURHAM: Finally, if -- how long until
18 it becomes apparent that we'll either get away with this,
19 or we won't? Because these districts that have appeared
20 here are small and resource challenged, and for them to
21 continue down a path if this doesn't work, and doesn't
22 provide them some relief, is certainly not fair to them,
23 and it's -- it's not a good use of our staff time either.
24 So how long until we know whether we'll be able to serve
25 them appropriately by obtaining a waiver that fits what



1 they want to do?

2 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? It's hard to answer
3 that specifically, Mr. Durham. It's a great question.
4 We -- we think that we can finish our proposal here in
5 the next several weeks, although we'd like to make sure
6 that we have an additional -- folks out in the field have
7 a chance to weigh in on some of the aspects of that
8 piece. And that's part of the process that we have,
9 stakeholder support. So we can submit it, we hope within
10 the next month. And then we'll know fairly soon if there
11 are issues that we have to negotiate with. We can also
12 have some conversations ahead of time. How long that
13 negotiation process gets played out is -- is difficult to
14 determine, and I -- I defer to Dr. Owen, or the
15 Commissioner who've had more experience with that than I
16 have.

17 MR. OWENS: Madam Chair?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

19 MR. OWENS: I -- I think that's right. The
20 only thing I would add to what Dr. Asp said there, was
21 that under NCLB, and under our current waiver, is one
22 process. But if ESEA is reauthorized, which we're still
23 thinking maybe is 50/50; that's kind of the estimates
24 we're still hearing. So if that happens, there might be
25 a process under ESEA for states to just do these types of



1 activities. So that -- that is a possibility if ESEA
2 were to be reauthorized. Some of the drafts, and some of
3 the versions allow for states to design accountability
4 pilots and assessment pilots.

5 If we're operating under NCLB, then it's
6 more like what Elliot described, and that's a process of
7 negotiating, going back and forth, which is what New
8 Hampshire did to get final approval on their pilot.

9 MR. ASP: Madam Chair, just one other
10 response.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Is that all?

12 MR. DURHAM: Well, just -- I mean, maybe
13 incorporated in it, but is it -- is it at all worthwhile
14 trying to weigh in on this issue federally, to see if we
15 can get Congress to move in that direction of some
16 flexibility? Or is it a game well above our pay grid?

17 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? It's a good
18 question. I -- I think we've always been willing to --
19 when we get requests from senators and people working on
20 the revisions to NCLB, to give input, we certainly look
21 it over and -- and staff will provide their own feedback
22 on specific areas where we've seen issues or challenges.
23 Our ability as a state though, to get pieces of the
24 legislation moved forward for reauthorization, I think
25 we're being well served by our representatives, trying



1 our best to get that done. But -- and I think they
2 understand. At least our senator representatives, I
3 think, certainly understand the challenges that we've
4 been having in the state, and some of the issues that
5 we've been working through as a state, around the
6 restrictions under NCLB, and the waiver process that
7 USDOE has put together.

8 So I think they're advocating to try to get
9 that reauthorization done. Could the State Board
10 collectively put pressure, and want them to move in a
11 direction of reauthorization? I think you could always
12 help put your voice, and your weight behind what you'd
13 like to see done at the federal level as well. So I
14 would -- I would think that that -- they would take that
15 into consideration, and -- and use that appropriately as
16 well.

17 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair?

18 MADAM CHAIR: So might do a resolution or
19 something to send along with the --

20 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, I think certainly
21 the State Board collectively could take a position on
22 reauthorization, and your desire to see reauthorization,
23 and the things that you'd like to see inside of
24 reauthorization. And send that to your -- your rep --
25 Colorado representative delegation.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, Elliot?

2 MR. ASP: The other piece I'd point out is,
3 much of what these folks have asked for, and what we're
4 contemplating some of this work, is -- is they don't need
5 permission to do. They can add things to their local
6 accountability systems as they -- they feel it's -- it's
7 the assessment pieces, and how the -- the school and it's
8 performance ratings impact them, that will take some
9 negotiation. But there is some pieces we could move
10 forward (indiscernible) for example, around school
11 reviews and some other pieces to help them in that
12 regard. And we could also look at what technical
13 assistance folks may need to think about these
14 comparability issues and so on.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Commissioner, did you have
16 something to add there?

17 MR. HAMMOND: No, I -- the only thing I
18 would add is; a couple months ago back in Washington,
19 when the chiefs met with the secretary, and with Members
20 of Congress, we were unanimous, and we've got to have the
21 flexibility. We need -- we need the law passed, we need
22 the flexibility to allow pilots to (indiscernible). And
23 everybody is getting hung up with some of the small
24 details of the overall picture. I think there is good
25 consensus of getting out there and getting it approved at



1 the flexibility. But if you get down to a certain level,
2 it stops. I think that's what leads us to be frustrated.
3 I do believe once it is passed, we'll have the
4 flexibility that we want (indiscernible). But it is
5 frustrating, because I can't guarantee it's going to pass
6 or not.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair? Thank you
8 for getting us -- to speak about this issue. Can you
9 just remind me where we are in the waiver? Did we submit
10 a letter of intent that we are applying for a waiver?
11 And is this the guts of what the waiver is? Or is this a
12 follow up to the waiver we've submitted? Where are we
13 will the waiver for NCLB?

14 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

16 MR. ASP: We have submitted a waiver, but I
17 -- again, I will defer to Dr. Owen on that.

18 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, that's actually the
19 next presentation up. Is we're going to give you an
20 update on where we're at with the waivers.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've already asked for
22 a waiver, is that right?

23 MR. OWEN: We -- we -- so, Madam Chair? We
24 have requested some amendments to our existing waiver,
25 which expires at the end of June. So that's one piece



1 that we talked to you guys about in March. And then we
2 have, after you approved, we submitted a waiver renewal,
3 which is for three years, that would be effective July,
4 August, whenever USDOE gets to approving them. And that
5 would be for a three year period under NCLB. Again, if
6 ESEA is reauthorized, then that waiver becomes a moot
7 point. But we have submitted that today. I think
8 actually the next presentation is kind of an update on
9 where we're at with both of those processes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But is the content of
11 this PowerPoint what we're asking for in that waiver? Or
12 are we talking about what we're going to ask for? Or is
13 this a done deal? Or what is this PowerPoint?

14 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

16 MR. ASP: So what we did is we -- in the
17 waiver renewal process, is we signal to USDOE that we had
18 an intention of working on an assessment accountability
19 pilot, that we would be working with the State Board,
20 seeing what legislation passed this session, and then
21 coming back through the amendment process to request some
22 type of waiver, or some type of pilot project that the
23 state could move forward on. So we signaled -- it's
24 inside of the submission that we sent -- that we wanted
25 to explore this idea, but the meat of it is not inside of



1 that proposal. That has to be developed and submitted.

2 DR. SCHEFFEL: So these slides were not in
3 that request or suggestion?

4 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? No, you're -- you're
5 correct. They are not inside of that.

6 DR. SCHEFFEL: So as we talk about what is
7 inside of that request, when does that get approved,
8 discussed, or put into a presentation? In a month? In a
9 week?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Are you talking about this
11 presentation?

12 DR. SCHEFFEL: I'm saying, when does the
13 guts of the waiver happen? When do we develop that?
14 When does it get submitted to the USD?

15 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? So just to be -- I
16 will try to help clarify. If we submit -- if the State
17 Board wants to move forward with a pilot project for the
18 state of Colorado, that would be an amendment to an
19 approved waiver. So we would work on an amendment. The
20 waiver renewal has been submitted to USDOE.

21 DR. SCHEFFEL: But the content of what it
22 is, we're working on?

23 MR. ASP: The content of the amendment --
24 possible amendment -- has not been submitted, that is
25 correct.



1 DR. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. I like detail.

2 (Overlapping)

3 MR. ASP: Yeah, does that -- does that help?
4 Okay.

5 DR. SCHEFFEL: My question -- can I ask a
6 question? So I'm just looking at Slide 9, which is the
7 Potential Pilot Assessment Plan, which I think you've
8 said you signal to the USDOE that Colorado wanted to
9 propose something like that, right? So when we look at
10 this slide, my concern is, does this actually propose
11 more assessment? Because when I look across ELA, math,
12 and science, PARCC or CMAS is given every year, at every
13 grade, and at least one area. And the only grade that
14 it's not is in sixth grade. And then it's replace with
15 local assessments, common tasks, CBA -- or Curriculum
16 Based College Readiness, and so forth.

17 I mean, really to develop good common tasks
18 that follow the guardrails, which again I'd like to read
19 the actual documents that talk about what are the guard -
20 - what can we ask for, right? To me, if you're going to
21 really come up with common tasks that fulfill the
22 requirements of these guardrails, we're going to actually
23 have more assessments, and we're going to have a lot more
24 discussion around how to create common tasks that are in
25 fact common, standardized, comparable.



1 I mean, in some ways I think we've actually
2 created a lot more work, and we certainly haven't
3 uncoupled from PARCC. So I just think we should have a
4 deep discussion about what are the real guardrails based
5 on the actual language in the statute, and what are the
6 implications of the Pilot Assessment Plan, and so forth?
7 I mean, I think just coming up with tasks that -- what
8 did you call it? Authentic tasks, or something? Student
9 -- student learning tasks, or something, that are
10 meaningful. I mean, that is a huge undertaking, as you
11 know. You know, create a Lego project for kids looking
12 at, you know, volume and area and perimeter and all this
13 kind of stuff, where you actually have rubrics and -- and
14 steps.

15 I mean, I'm just saying, there's a ton of
16 work inside Slide 9, and if we're looking for economies
17 of effort, and reduction of assessment, I'm not sure we
18 purchased much for ourselves, except more assessments.

19 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

21 MR. ASP: Great question, Dr. Sheffel. What
22 I was trying to illustrate here, and it sounds like I
23 didn't do a great job, was some of what you heard from
24 our presenters earlier. In some sense, they said several
25 times: We are not asking for less assessment, we're



1 asking for -- we're probably asking for more, but more
2 meaningful. So when it says "local assessment", these
3 might be pieces they already have that they want to use.
4 And we're trying to find some way to find space in a --
5 in an accountability system that's driven by one single
6 measure now, to reduce that emphasis, so there's less of
7 that, and they can bring these assessments that are
8 useful to them, they are useful in their particular
9 locale, and important to the district.

10 So I understand your point here. Part of
11 this would be talking about how such a system might come
12 together. You're probably going to have some checks with
13 a -- with a large scale assessment in -- in some of these
14 pieces to accommodate comparability. But there are ways
15 you can try to minimize the impact of that state test, so
16 that the assessments they give are the ones that they
17 value.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so I just want to make a
19 comment: As we ask for a waiver; as we look to the USDOE
20 to ask for more flexibility, less top down, less
21 centralization, I want to make sure that inside that
22 waiver is not actually asking for more. I mean, I heard
23 the district saying they want more, but they're driving
24 what they want, not the state. This is -- this is state
25 driven, these, you know, common assessments. And to



1 really come up with common assessments that are state
2 driven, will actually multiple our efforts in assessment
3 exponentially based on that slide, if I understand.

4 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Uh-huh.

6 MR. ASP: I think Dr. Scheffel is bringing
7 up a -- a great point. And I think that's really the --
8 the issue at hand with the federal law and the state law,
9 that we have to navigate; is under NCLB and then under
10 the waiver process of NCLB, to try to get away from the
11 annual assessment requirements of NCLB, USDOE has
12 signaled that they are not willing to do that, even
13 through these pilot projects.

14 So the pilot projects like for New
15 Hampshire, yes, they actually are requiring in many ways
16 more assessments than what are currently -- in order to --
17 in order to get comparability. And so, USDOE is going
18 to want comparability before they kind of let the -- let
19 go of the reins around the annual assessment
20 requirements. At least, that's what they've signaled,
21 that's what they've told us.

22 Now, if ESEA is re-authorized, some of the
23 earlier versions of ESEA give states some of that
24 flexibility to make those decisions. So what the school
25 districts that came today are requesting, and what state



1 legislatures can do, I think, is provide some of that
2 flexibility. But even if you got USDOE to signal that
3 they would be willing to do less around annual
4 assessments, you'd still have to come back for the state
5 requirements of annual assessments, and you'd have to
6 have the state legislature remove those requirements.

7 So I mean, you've got -- you've got a -- a
8 pretty difficult path to get away from annual assessments
9 in the short term. I think that --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: And that's why I'm raising
11 the issue, because as this language goes out to the
12 USDOE, and we are looking at a PowerPoint with just
13 bulleted language, I would like to meet with staff and
14 figure out exactly what is in that waiver. Because
15 actually, we may be doing ourselves harm as a state if in
16 fact we're looking for economies of (indiscernible). We
17 may not get that at all. We may be multiplying the
18 efforts. Thank you.

19 MADAM CHAIR: And I would agree with you,
20 Deb, and I have just been informed we really need to move
21 along. We've got some people. So unless you have a
22 vital question, can we move out Elliot's --?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not a question,
24 (indiscernible)? Response to Deb. They asked for --
25 they asked to be able to use formative assessments



1 because those are more valuable. They didn't ask to use
2 less, and that's a discussion we -- I -- I agree with
3 you, that's a discussion we have to have.

4 MADAM CHAIR: And I think I agree that too,
5 that -- it's a good discussion we need to --

6 MR. DURHAM: I don't think I want to let
7 that go. I've met with these people individually, and if
8 anybody thinks they're asking for more assessments, that
9 they're -- believe me, they're drowning in the
10 assessments they have now. So let's not walk away with
11 this idea that they want more assessments.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what they said.

13 MR. DURHAM: No, it's not what they said.

14 MADAM CHAIR: They want more meaningful
15 assessments.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They want -- yeah, they
17 recognize they need more assessments.

18 (Overlapping)

19 MADAM CHAIR: Not more; meaningful.

20 MR. DURHAM: They don't -- no, they don't
21 want more assessments under any circumstance.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They said there would
23 be more. They did say that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

25 MADAM CHAIR: No, I am going to use my



1 executive privilege, and -- and thank you, Dr. -- and
2 we'll move on to the next. And we can have that -- we
3 will have more and more time to yell at each other.
4 Okay?

5 We are now moving ahead to the next section,
6 4.02; Elementary and Secondary Education, ESEA
7 flexibility waiver renewal update. Which is probably
8 more of the same, right, Dr. Owen?

9 MR. OWEN: It is, yes.

10 MADAM CHAIR: You may even get your chance
11 here.

12 MR. DURHAM: You can probably get it done
13 quicker.

14 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, please go ahead.

16 MR. OWEN: Okay, so we were able to actually
17 cover some of the information earlier, so I will try to
18 be as brief as possible. Just a quick reminder, and Pat,
19 if you could move those forward for me, great.

20 In March, we met with the State Board to
21 discuss our current waiver to NCLB, ESEA, and talk to you
22 about some potential amendments that we were requesting
23 on our current waiver; and we submitted that. And then
24 we also talked to you about submitting our waiver renewal
25 for the next three years, which we worked with -- with



1 you on, and got approval for that and got that submitted.

2 So this is a quick update on a letter that
3 we forwarded to you about two weeks ago from USDOE that
4 indicated information on our request, and the status of
5 those requests. So today what we're going to talk about
6 is our current waiver that expires at the end of this
7 school year -- end of June. We have not gotten any
8 additional information yet from USDOE on our waiver
9 renewal request, which is the three year renewal, okay?

10 MADAM CHAIR: And what did we -- remind me
11 what we waived from?

12 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

14 MR. OWEN: The renewal is a waiver from No
15 Child Left Behind, okay? So Pat, can you go to Slide 3?
16 These are the four main bullets that are on the waiver
17 submission that we sent for our current amendments to the
18 existing waiver that we have with USDOE. So we requested
19 that students that take high school math courses in the
20 middle school levels, that they don't be required to be
21 double tested. So if the students in accelerated math
22 may take like a ninth grade math assessment in eighth
23 grade, then they don't have to take that same assessment
24 in ninth grade. And that was just kind of working with
25 USDOE to get that approved, and that was taken care of.



1 Students participating in field testing of
2 third and fourth grade Spanish language assessments, we
3 want to also request that they not be double tested, and
4 with some conditions, we were able to get that approved.
5 Districts having the flexibility of waiting student
6 growth, a portion of the state educator evaluation
7 system, we requested some information around that. USDOE
8 signaled that they were willing to work with us on that.
9 We got some additional information to submit to them to
10 get that taken care of.

11 The last one that I think is most of
12 interest to you was the discussion that we had with you
13 around not -- the Department not holding districts and
14 schools liable for parent refusals. So we had a chance
15 to get that information.

16 Pat, if you could move to Slide 7. We
17 wanted to talk with USDOE about how that would work. And
18 on the surface, what we submitted, and on the directive
19 that the State Board -- the motion the State Board passed
20 on, not holding schools and districts liable for parent
21 refusals. They didn't accept it in the way that it was
22 presented, but we do want to talk with a little bit more
23 about what we've learned from some other states, and how
24 they are navigating this request, and what we maybe can
25 keep talking with USDOE about.



1 So for example, Utah passed some state
2 legislation that allowed for students and parents to
3 refuse to take the state test. For parents to sign off
4 on a refusal. And they still have been able to navigate
5 that requirement with USDOE in a way that was
6 satisfactory to USDOE. They have to impose some federal
7 consequences under NCLB to those schools and districts
8 that drop below the 95 percent threshold. It's in the
9 classification systems that were laid out in NCLB. But
10 they do not hold them for the state portion, accountable
11 for the consequences for parent refusal.

12 So we'd like to spend a little bit more time
13 trying to figure out exactly what Utah did with USDOE,
14 and come back to you and talk with you a little bit more
15 in June about what we've learned, and whether USDOE can
16 also provide information to us about the conditions that
17 they placed on Utah to get that approved.

18 And so as a last slide, I would just briefly
19 mention, when we take questions, is that again, we're
20 waiting to hear about our waiver renewal application.
21 They've indicated to us that they -- we should expect a
22 response in the next four to eight weeks. And with that,
23 Madam Chair, we're happy to take any questions.

24 MADAM CHAIR: I'll ask you -- I'll ask you a
25 quick question first this time. Wasn't there several



1 pieces of legislature that came about that addressed
2 that, but none of them -- none of them actually passed?
3 (indiscernible) --

4 (Overlapping)

5 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair?

6 MADAM CHAIR: -- parent refusal being okay?
7 I think there was some legislation on that. But it
8 didn't go anywhere.

9 MR OWEN: Madam Chair, yes, that is correct.
10 There was a specific bill around it that I -- that didn't
11 end up getting -- making its way through. But there was
12 some language that was added to the last kind of
13 compromise bill that was finally decided on, that does
14 allow for -- or requires school districts to have some
15 conditions around refusals, and the way they approach
16 them. And so we're going to make sure we include that in
17 the language that we use, and talk to USDOE about --

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Board?
19 What? No questions?

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have a question.

21 MADAM CHAIR: I was going to say, you'd
22 better escape quick. Deb?

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Remind me what we voted for
24 yesterday, Board. I mean, we voted on the waivers and --
25 there were two votes. Was one the opt-out? And how does



1 this request; not holding districts and schools liable
2 for parent refusals, relate to that? It doesn't relate
3 to it. I will pull up the exact language.

4 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair. My recollection of
5 what you voted on yesterday did not include the motion
6 that you passed, around not holding districts and schools
7 liable. So from my recollection -- and anybody can
8 correct me as well, that -- that's still in place, and
9 that -- that's what we're operating off of. So you did
10 not take any action to reverse that decision that the
11 Board made.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So this is consistent
13 with that? We haven't heard from them yet?

14 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair.

15 (Overlapping)

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: This request is consistent
17 with not having rescinded that resolution.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are two different
19 things.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I know but -- but this is
21 consistent with what -- with what is still in place that
22 we -- that we spoke to parent refusals regarding, right?

23 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

25 MR. OWEN: Yeah, we -- we are still trying



1 to get the Board's will worked through the -- the federal
2 system, and trying to work with USDOE, and we'll continue
3 to do that, and then we'll continue to update you on our
4 progress in the conversations that we have with the
5 Department.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

8 MR. OWEN: Thank you.

9 MADAM CHAIR: You get off easy. Who are you
10 pointing at? Okay, very good. We got through that in
11 record time.

12 Item number 5.01; change request for fiscal
13 year 2016-17 budget, 15 minutes. And Jeff for five.
14 (Indiscernible) and Lianne -- there she is. Change
15 request for the fiscal year. Yes, (indiscernible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
17 Good morning, nice to see you all. The good news is this
18 is the fewest change requests we've made this century, so
19 it should go quickly.

20 If you could turn to your handout, or in
21 your packet, the handout entitled Fiscal Year 2016-17
22 Budget Change Requests. I will briefly walk you through
23 the three items we have. The three of them are: Total
24 Program, Categorical Programs, and Preschool -- the
25 preschool in-service training plan.



1 The first two items on your list are annual
2 requests that the Department is required to submit to the
3 General Assembly: Total Program primarily provides
4 adjustments to state share and local share, based on
5 changes in student count, collections of local taxes,
6 things like that. And the categoricals are increased
7 annually by inflation, and this request primarily
8 allocates that increase across the eight categorical
9 programs and statute.

10 So the last one is the Department initiated
11 request, which is the Preschool In-Service Training Plan.
12 And this request is to obtain spending authority for some
13 funding that was deposited in the Public Education Fund.
14 This fund and a tax check off were created by Senate Bill
15 11.109, to provide funding to the Colorado Preschool
16 Plan. And to date, that check off has raised \$72,000
17 that we're now requesting to use for professional
18 development around best practices in early literacy and
19 early mathematics instruction.

20 Really, the plan has three components; it's
21 the training itself, there will be regional trainings
22 conducted around the state. There will be materials
23 provided at trainings, but there will also be toolkits
24 and things like that developed to disseminate to
25 districts and preschool programs around the state. And



1 then the last piece of that will be the -- the CPP team
2 coming out to provide some -- some technical support to
3 at least 20 districts around that training. And I hope I
4 can catch you up a little bit, Madam Chair, because
5 that's all I got.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Doesn't sound like there's a
7 whole lot of choice there. Any questions? Gee, you got
8 off easy, didn't you?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, thank you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

11 (Overlapping)

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me, Madam Chair,
13 I did.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead, Pam.

15 MS. GOFF: So it looks very clear; these are
16 funds that taxpayers check off for the Colorado Preschool
17 Program. But it's -- it's someone's choice to decide to
18 use them for training?

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

20 MS. GOFF: I mean, is that -- who -- who
21 decides that and --

22 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

24 MS. GOFF: Is that the best use of these
25 funds?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I won't make that
2 value judgement, but -- but the Department has elected to
3 use the funds in the fashion that you see in the -- it's
4 actually Attachment 8.03 that will give you a little more
5 detail about that. But -- but yes, this is what -- what
6 we've determined was the best use of those funds.

7 MS. GOFF: Can anyone elaborate on that?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair? Sure. So
9 when staff looked at the amount, since it's not a -- a
10 large amount, I think originally if -- if there had been
11 a large check off and a lot had been deposited to that
12 fund, our hope would be to disseminate it out to the
13 preschool programs themselves. But the number of
14 preschool programs to disseminate it would be
15 (indiscernible) kind of a thing. So we were looking at
16 where the preschools have been asking for some support,
17 and it was particularly around the early literacy and
18 math numeracy work, which then also flows to other state
19 objectives around improving literacy skills and numeracy.
20 So it was to provide training and support to areas that
21 our preschool facilities have asked for additional
22 assistance.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Deb, did you
24 have a question?

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, forgive me, what is a



1 CPP provider? Classrooms?

2 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair. So
4 Colorado preschool programming, and -- it's what that
5 stands for, and it's anyone who's receiving funds to
6 provide that program. And those are disseminated to
7 districts, and then districts determine who are there
8 preschool program providers.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So this is a voluntary tax
10 that people check-off when they do their taxes? Is that
11 right? And they contribute funds, and the funds can be
12 used for a variety of things, or -- or what -- what is
13 the stipulation for those funds? Just preschool?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair. The --
15 the statute is specific to the funds being checked off
16 for use in the Colorado Preschool Program.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Oh, so it is specific to
18 that?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is this a -- is this a
21 kind of a detail just saying, okay, that's what it's
22 stipulated for? So now we request spending authority of
23 the money? Or is it something else that it could be used
24 for?

25 MADAM CHAIR: (Indiscernible)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
2 There are a variety -- I -- I -- don't quote me on the
3 number, but there are a certain number of tax check off's
4 that can be included on the tax form each year. I
5 believe they're -- they're limited to a certain number of
6 years if they don't receive contributions of a certain
7 amount, things like that. But I think you can have 12 on
8 the tax check off form, or on the personal income tax
9 form each year. Special Olympics is often one; there --
10 there are a variety. Natural Resources generally has
11 one. And the CPP is specific in the sense that it's
12 specific on the tax form, but there are actually a
13 variety of check offs that people see when they -- when
14 they complete their tax forms.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: That are tied to specific
16 initiatives?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct, yes.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And this is tied to the
19 Colorado Preschool Project.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Program. Okay, thank you.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Any other questions? Yes,
23 Pam?

24 MS. MAZANEC: So just technically, the
25 \$72,000, is that from last year? Or is that just since



1 April 15th of this year?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 That actually goes back to the 2011 tax year, it's --

4 MS. MAZANEC: Eleven?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, yes, ma'am.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, swift. No. So this
7 number may be different year after year. Is this the
8 first time we've approved it?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the first --

10 (Overlapping)

11 MS. MAZANEC: It's the first one I remember.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I'm sorry, Madam
13 Chair.

14 MADAM CHAIR: It's all right.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the first time
16 we have made the request. It's been on the form; it was
17 renewed, I believe, in 2013. But this is the first year
18 we've obtained the balance of the fund, and -- and
19 requested spending authority.

20 MS. MAZANEC: So I'm wondering if I could
21 make a request for some follow-up after we do these three
22 things. Have some kind of a measure that tells us, this
23 was seen by our providers, or by our school -- I mean, I
24 want you -- whoever is making this decision on how to
25 spend it, make some -- expected outcomes. So that -- so



1 the -- this comes back next -- that we have some funds
2 next year.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Evaluation of it.

4 MS. MAZANEC: Just some kind of an
5 evaluation. Not that's going to kill everybody, but that
6 makes us -- makes folks think about whether this is a --
7 was the best choice, versus some other alternative,
8 because it sounds like you had some choices, and I'd like
9 some follow-up, please.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, sir. Thank you very
11 much.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 MADAM CHAIR: This was enlightening.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will look at my tax
15 returns.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Back to order. We have a
17 couple of those really good things that we do here on the
18 Board. May I?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go. Oh, we're missing
20 somebody.

21 MADAM CHAIR: No, we're not waiting. I was
22 waiting for people to quit talking. We -- we have a
23 couple of awards now: Both the Highly Effective School
24 Library Program Award, and the Online and Blended
25 Educator Recognitions. Commissioner?



1 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you very much, Madam
2 Chair. As we've done in the past, we really want to
3 recognize our libraries. And I'm going to turn this over
4 to our State Librarian, Gene Haynard (ph) and his staff
5 as we begin a presentation for the awardees today. That
6 will also involve coming forward and getting pictures I
7 understand, Gene. Thank you.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, go ahead.

9 MR. HAYNARD: Thank you, Madam Chair, Board
10 and Commissioner. And by the way, Commissioner, you are
11 the State Librarian. Read the statute.

12 MR. HAMMOND: I'm a lot of things.

13 MR. HAYNARD: Call it -- call it a field
14 promotion. I'm honored to be here today, and appreciate
15 your time in honoring the Highly Effective School Library
16 Programs for this year, 2015. Each of the schools being
17 honored today has demonstrated many innovative ideas for
18 improving learning, and they represent some of the best
19 practices of libraries in the state. They do such things
20 as collaboration with school staff, and integrating 21st
21 Century skills into the classroom content.

22 We recognize these schools because of
23 ongoing research in Colorado and across the country that
24 says there's a correlation between what goes on in the
25 school library, and assessment scores. And the practices



1 that these libraries bring to you today is exemplary
2 models of that practice. They are selected through a
3 rigorous process, competitive process, and selected by a
4 16 member peer review collaborative group in the state.
5 And the application asks them to meet the criteria in our
6 highly effective school library program rubric, which are
7 guidelines describing what a quality -- high quality
8 program is.

9 As an example of the effectiveness of this,
10 we just learned this morning that one of the awardees
11 from last year has just been named the American
12 Association of School Librarians Collaborative Program of
13 the Year.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Wow, that's very good.

15 MR. HAYNARD: So not to take the thunder
16 from this year's group, but the success travels.

17 MADAM CHAIR: We expect the same, right?

18 MR. HAYNARD: So I will turn this over --
19 and by the way, the school was Sierra Middle School, in
20 Parker, with Stephanie Mara (ph) and Jennifer Milstead
21 (ph) from last year's group as the honorees.

22 So I will now turn it over to Becky Russell,
23 our consultant with School Library Program, and she will
24 talk to you more about the implementation.

25 MS. RUSSELL: Thank you, Gene, thank you,



1 Board Chair, and the State Board Members, and
2 Commissioner Hammond. If you ask your average person on
3 the street about a librarian, such stereotypes as: I
4 love books, or shhhh...or the person who gets us stuff,
5 are what typically emerge. These teacher library leaders
6 shift what at one time was the supportive aspect of the
7 librarian's role, and they exemplify the definition of a
8 teacher leader. In your three page packet in front of
9 you, we provided you with a list of the Highly Effective
10 School Library Program --

11 (Meeting adjourned)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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