



**COLORADO** ?  
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
October 7, 2015, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 7, 2015,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

Steven Durham (R), Chairman  
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman  
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Pam Mazanec (R)  
Joyce Rankin (R)  
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MS. SHEFFEL: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, we'll move  
3 ahead to Items 19.01, which were taken off the -- the --  
4 or taken off the consent agenda. 19.01.19.08 --

5 MS. FLORES: May I just (indiscernible)?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please do, yeah.

7 MS. FLORES: If -- if you read, it's says,  
8 "Please advised that the following waivers are -- are no  
9 longer considered automatic." Okay, so there's all these  
10 that are not considered automatic. And if you look, what  
11 happens is that there's no documentation as to why  
12 they're taking it -- taking what off. I mean, they're  
13 just sending this in. Some of them provide, you know,  
14 explanations and such, but many of these do not. They're  
15 just empty. And so I'm just kind of wondering why some  
16 do, some don't, but most done. And that's all. I mean -  
17 -

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, we'll see if we can  
19 get an explanation. Dr. Asp, help us with that?

20 MR. ASP: Yes, I'm going to let Gretchen  
21 Morgan address this, because the consent agenda waivers  
22 are ones that -- that we do have documentation on, but  
23 they're routine, so to speak. I'm going to let Gretchen  
24 talk.

25 MS. MORGAN: Sure. thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Morgan?

2 MS. MORGAN: So for all the waiver requests  
3 that are in the agenda, people did provide replacement  
4 plans. They may be on the page following the blank page  
5 that you see, simply because they were separate files.

6 MS. FLORES: Okay.

7 MS. MORGAN: So they were printed separately  
8 and attached, but they all have provided replacement  
9 plans, all of which have been reviewed by staff.

10 MS. FLORES: Okay.

11 MS. MORGAN: Waivers requested, there's a --  
12 I just want to clarify one thing. On the form that  
13 you're referring to, there's a list of those waivers  
14 which are no longer automatic. That's just reminder  
15 given from us to the field that they can still seek those  
16 waivers. They're just not automatically given in the way  
17 that we've described before, which, again, has a  
18 confusing history, which is that previously automatic  
19 waivers were ones that you delegated to us to give as  
20 staff. And then there was a change in statute a couple  
21 of years ago that said when -- when it's automatic, it's  
22 truly automatic --

23 MS. FLORES: Right.

24 MS. MORGAN: -- in the sense that as soon as  
25 someone has a contract, those waivers are granted to



1       them. And so when that change was made, the legislature  
2       also made the change to some of the boundaries around  
3       automatic waivers. So that's just a reminder.

4                   MS. FLORES: Okay.

5                   MS. MORGAN: People can seek those waivers  
6       and they do. There are probably some in your packet that  
7       are included in that list. It just means they need to  
8       provide a replacement plan and it does need to come to  
9       you as a board.

10                  MS. FLORES: Okay. That explains it.

11                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there --

12                  MS. FLORES: Okay.

13                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- any -- are there any  
14       other questions regarding the status of waivers, 19.01 to  
15       19.08?

16                  MS. MORGAN: It's 19.11.

17                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Or 11. I knew that. I  
18       was just testing you.

19                   (Overlapping)

20                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, 19.11, I can see  
21       that.

22                  MS. MORGAN: Yes.

23                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, is there -- are --  
24       is there an objection to considering these as a group and  
25       a motion for the granting of the waivers of 19.01 through



1 19.11?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Just make the motion.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores?

4 MS. FLORES: I make a motion that we agree -

5 -

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Approve the waivers.

7 MS. FLORES: Approve the waivers.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, there's a  
9 motion to approve waivers 19.01 to 19.11. Is there a  
10 second to that motion? Ms. Goff. Is there -- pardon me,  
11 is there objection to the adoption of that motion?  
12 Seeing none, that motion's declared adopted by a vote of  
13 7-0.

14 Next item is 19.12, Application for  
15 Innovation -- let's see, it's Innovation Application for  
16 Denver Public Schools Northfield High School.

17 MS. MORGAN: Mr. Chair, that --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes?

19 MS. MORGAN: That item did not get pulled  
20 from the consent agenda.

21 MS. FLORES: No.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, is that -- was that on  
23 consent? I'm sorry. Don't mind me. Okay. How about  
24 9.13?

25 MS. MORGAN: Yes.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Request for a waiver from  
2 state statutes by Woodlin School District R-104.

3 MS. MORGAN: That's correct.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So that's Item --

5 MS. FLORES: That's 103 -- 19.13.

6 (Overlapping)

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 19.13, correct.

8 MS. FLORES: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry.

10 (Overlapping)

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So away we go, 19.01  
12 through --

13 (Overlapping)

14 MS. MORGAN: So just briefly by way of  
15 introduction, you're going to hear from Rose Cronk, the  
16 superintendent from the school district to present her  
17 waiver request to you. This, like other waivers you've  
18 had in front of you recently, we provided you some  
19 background information about what they're seeking as a  
20 waiver and -- and staff input to that. In this case, we  
21 don't think there's anything they're asking for that's  
22 not within your purview to offer them. So it's just a  
23 question of whether you find their replacement plan to be  
24 adequate.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Cronk?



1 MS. CRONK: Okay, well, thank you for the  
2 opportunity --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

4 MS. CRONK: -- to address the Board. And --  
5 and just to clarify, it might be more for your audience  
6 than it is for you all, but Woodlin is not Woodland Park.  
7 So if you --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I knew that.

9 MS. CRONK: If you headed straight east of  
10 here and you kept driving out on the plains till you  
11 couldn't see the mountains anymore, you're getting  
12 closer. So picture yourself around an area where there  
13 is no towns or used to be towns. And you look one way,  
14 you see a bunch of cattle, you look the other way, you  
15 see a wheat farm. Now drop a school there. You're  
16 pretty close to where we are.

17 So Woodlin has about 100, 110 students in  
18 it, pre-K through 12. And we definitely serve multi-  
19 generational families in this area. We have food  
20 service, transportation, and water treatment are all  
21 necessary in that area in order to provide the services  
22 that we need for our students. So there are many things  
23 out there that we couldn't cut or get rid of, as you can  
24 look at different areas up in the urban areas.

25 Our local -- our nearest school neighbor is



1 a little over 30 miles away and we are doing a co-op with  
2 them with athletics this year that has nothing to do with  
3 the waiver, but just putting it in perspective. Our  
4 free-and-reduced lunch population run about 50 percent.  
5 So it's a different type of a poverty, I would say, than  
6 what you all are familiar with, because we serve a vast  
7 majority of agricultural families and in that right there  
8 lies the reason for poverty, high poverty levels.

9 But that being said, now that you've got  
10 that historical perspective, the very unique thing about  
11 Woodlin is that almost half of our students come from out  
12 of district. And our district encompasses 700 square  
13 miles. So our students travel or find ways to travel to  
14 the school probably the equivalent of somebody living  
15 perhaps in southern JeffCo. going to Boulder. That's the  
16 distance that they travel to come to our school,  
17 preschool included.

18 So that being said -- and the history that  
19 we have for our families that choose to send their kids  
20 to Woodlin, we have quite a strong family ties there. We  
21 see these people in the summer, we see them at the  
22 grocery stores. They are us and we are them.

23 We have seen some changes over the 14 years  
24 that I've been there. I'm now serving 11 years as their  
25 superintendent. Before that, I was there for four years





1 as the math teacher. In those days, we saw the students  
2 traveling to Woodlin in the secondary area, because they  
3 liked the strong academic challenge. When the prices of  
4 oil changed drastically, that's when we really started to  
5 see the dynamics of the school change. We didn't get  
6 driving the farm trucks to come to Woodlin as much as  
7 people were carpooling, putting families together, and  
8 coming.

9           Nowadays there is a separate organization  
10 that provides that transportation services from other  
11 districts. So we do have a much higher enrollment in the  
12 elementary levels than we used to in the old days. And  
13 that's quite a shift for us. So preschoolers all the way  
14 to secondary travel those busses. Okay.

15           We are pursuing this waiver because of our  
16 preschool lays literally right next to the kindergarten  
17 room right down the end of the hall from all of the  
18 elementary. The staff know these students, which there  
19 is five or six of them and that we have -- are heavily  
20 supported with some aids due to some high needs that are  
21 in those areas. So we find that our local data provides  
22 a good replacement for the teaching -- or TS Gold.  
23 That's the whole purpose for our waiver is to present to  
24 you guys just that piece of early literacy waiver.

25           I am trying to be very respectful of the



1 fact that you all are running a little later tonight, so  
2 I shortened this up. But I'm willing to take any  
3 questions.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any questions for Ms.  
5 Cronk? Questions of staff? Dr. Schroeder?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So tell me how many  
7 kindergarten students have you?

8 MS. CRONK: Kindergarteners, we have running  
9 around eight this year.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And how long do the  
11 TS Gold -- you've been doing them up till now, is that  
12 right? You are doing them?

13 MS. CRONK: Yes.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: How long do they take? I  
15 mean, I'm trying to figure out what the effect would be.

16 MS. CRONK: Excellent question. I'm glad  
17 you brought that question up. I would say the biggest  
18 impact that we're finding is the redundancy of the  
19 information that we already know, gather, collect. And  
20 then therefore the additional burden of having to enter  
21 that data on the TS Gold process. So for us, it's not  
22 that it's --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Redundant from preschool --

24 MS. CRONK: Our local --

25 MS. SCHROEDER: -- or redundant from some



1 other instrument?

2 MS. CRONK: Yes, both. Because we do the  
3 teaching strategies in the preschool and we have most of  
4 the kids for two years. We have three -- three-year-olds  
5 and four-year-olds in the preschool. And then they --  
6 the vast majority, probably about 80 percent or so, are  
7 in our kindergarten.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: So are you asking to just  
9 give the kids that assessment once?

10 MS. CRONK: Exactly.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Rather than twice?

12 MS. CRONK: Exactly.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: So if you have a student  
14 that's coming that's not been part of your preschool  
15 program?

16 MS. CRONK: He'll get the TS Gold, just so  
17 that we have that uniformity of the data.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is extremely similar  
19 to what we had --

20 MS. CRONK: Absolutely.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: -- recently. And generally  
22 I believe I was fine with that and I approved it.  
23 However, seeing what's coming down the pipe from other  
24 school districts, I am worried that I don't understand  
25 enough about the assessment -- how long it takes, how



1 much does it really help, and what are good substitutions  
2 for that? And that has me kind of worried.

3 MS. CRONK: Okay.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: And there's a part of me  
5 that would like to say could you come back after we have  
6 a work session so that we have a deeper understanding of  
7 this instrument? I have a colleague who thinks it's way  
8 too much and we should shorten it, which would help  
9 anyway. I have so many different measurements of how  
10 long it actually takes and how much it actually takes.  
11 I've got folks who are saying it's 25 percent of the year  
12 to do a -- to do a TS Gold and then others who say it's  
13 just a couple of hours each year per kid.

14 MS. CRONK: For one-time assessment.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: For one-time assessment.  
16 You don't use it in second and third grade.

17 MS. CRONK: No, not that one.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So do you understand  
19 what I'm saying? I don't know that we really know well  
20 enough, based on the multiple descriptions that we have  
21 of this assessment from different individuals that  
22 worries me. Philosophically, I agree with what we did  
23 last time. If you have such a close relationship between  
24 your preschool teacher and your kindergarten teacher and  
25 your first grade teacher that you know what the measures



1 are, because you've already given it once and you could  
2 talk about it and you could communicate effectively with  
3 your parents, which I don't know that I saw enough of  
4 that in there, in your appeal, about the interactions  
5 that you have with parents to share with them student  
6 readiness.

7           There's a part of me that's -- that wonders  
8 whether we shouldn't wait and actually get a little more  
9 in depth about this whole process, partly because of  
10 what's coming up next. I'm worried about it, even though  
11 my inclination is to say you guys are doing it, you just  
12 don't want to do it twice.

13           MS. CRONK: Exactly.

14           MS. SCHROEDER: For eight kids or six kids.

15           MS. FLORES: Angelika? We just approved it,  
16 approved all these charter schools not giving it. That's  
17 what we approved. I realized that. And so why wouldn't  
18 we approve it for them? I mean, these people aren't even  
19 (indiscernible).

20           MS. SCHROEDER: Because we have a  
21 legislature that told us that they wanted this to be  
22 given to kids and they also want some reporting. So we  
23 have another challenge, which is that as we do the  
24 reporting across the state on are our kids more and more  
25 school ready, we won't be able to include the data from



1 your district and make a comparable, because your kids  
2 will not have been a part of that kindergarten  
3 assessment.

4 (Overlapping)

5 MS. CRONK: They do it once, yeah.

6 MS. MAZANEC: They are doing this. They are  
7 doing it.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: It's preschool level.

9 MS. MAZANEC: So maybe not -- yeah, yeah --

10 MS. FLORES: But they (indiscernible).

11 (Overlapping)

12 MS. MAZANEC: So they already know what were  
13 these children are.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: They do. I'm talking --

15 MS. MAZANEC: They're next door.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm talking about what was  
17 the intent of the legislature for this and are we being,  
18 at least philosophically, honoring that, knowing that for  
19 very, very small school districts, it's not necessary. I  
20 mean, I could just think that's a deeper conversation --

21 MS. MAZANEC: (Indiscernible).

22 MS. SCHROEDER: -- deeper conversation we  
23 should have.

24 MS. MAZANEC: (Indiscernible).

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Because I don't really want



1 to undermine the legislature's intent. Pretty soon they  
2 going to tell us we can't grant waivers and I will be  
3 very uncomfortable with that, because there are  
4 situations. It's not about one size fits all.

5 MS. MAZANEC: Let's do the --

6 (Overlapping)

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel I think was  
8 next. Dr. Scheffel?

9 MS. SHEFFEL: Thanks for coming. Have you  
10 been in the district quite a while or are you somewhat  
11 new?

12 MS. CRONK: Yes, this -- I'm on my 15th  
13 year.

14 MS. SHEFFEL: Oh, you've been there quite a  
15 while.

16 MS. CRONK: Yeah, I've been the  
17 superintendent for over ten years.

18 MS. SHEFFEL: Excellent. Can you say this,  
19 because this is helpful to think to us, how is it that  
20 you chose TS Gold in the first place?

21 MS. CRONK: Because it was mandated.

22 MS. SHEFFEL: And it was mandated because,  
23 and I recall when that occurred, because of the  
24 legislative language saying that we have to assess all  
25 these areas.



1 MS. CRONK: yeah

2 MS. SHEFFEL: And then subsequent to that,  
3 it was, well, there need to be a menu of options. And so  
4 as you look at the TS Gold and contrast to other  
5 assessments that are much more truncated in the number of  
6 items and the time it takes, have you considered other  
7 assessments?

8 MS. CRONK: Absolutely. And actually, the  
9 Easy Bosely (ph) does a great job. There's one called  
10 Stages that we use for them. And when you asked about  
11 questions that they're doing, you'll find that survey  
12 eerily similar in a lot of the areas that they're asking  
13 about. I think because we're the education facility,  
14 it's easier to think of the educational ones, but gross  
15 motors are things like can they skip? Can they jump?  
16 Are they fine motor? Are they holding their pencil and -  
17 - and can rearrange it the right way? You know, a lot of  
18 similarities.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: But Dr. Scheffel's talking  
20 about the ones that we actually approved that are much  
21 shorter.

22 MS. SHEFFEL: So I'm just -- yeah.

23 (Overlapping)

24 MS. CRONK: Oh, oh, I'm sorry.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: (Indiscernible) you don't





1 need a waiver, then you just pick a different  
2 kindergarten readiness assessment.

3 MS. CRONK: Oh, and I'm glad you brought  
4 that point up too, because we are part of and Easy  
5 Boselies (ph) for service providers. Then when we're  
6 able to use what the service provider brings and is  
7 familiar, that data is shared locally and we have it so  
8 that we kind of have not only how are we doing with, you  
9 know, our six or eight kindergarteners and our preschool  
10 kids, but how does that compare with -- with early ready  
11 -- school readiness in our eastern Colorado area?  
12 Because they're familiar with 22 other schools besides  
13 just our own.

14 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah, I'm just wondering if  
15 you've considered shorter assessments that also don't  
16 have the data privacy issues that TS Gold does and if  
17 that's a concern for your area and if --

18 MS. CRONK: It was the recommendation of our  
19 staff and our Easy Bosely and our service providers that  
20 is the route that we go. And I think just there again on  
21 what's best instruction using the resources that we have  
22 for that time and effectiveness and efficiency level to  
23 it that that's the purpose for going this route.

24 MS. SHEFFEL: Continuing, you mean, with TS  
25 Gold, but giving it once?



1 MS. CRONK: Once a year, and then using our  
2 others as they're outlined in the waiver process, to just  
3 kind of do that benchmarking and make sure that they're  
4 continuing on with their early literacy and school  
5 readiness process.

6 MS. SHEFFEL: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: So follow up, when you  
9 report to us on school readiness, what data will you use,  
10 since you won't be using the assessment again. Would you  
11 continue --

12 MS. CRONK: But --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Will -- will you monitor  
14 that? Or how -- in other words, there's an expectation  
15 that there is a report on school readiness for  
16 kindergarteners. And if you're not using an instrument,  
17 how will you be reporting that to us? So in order that  
18 is comparable with the rest -- students in the rest of  
19 that state?

20 MS. CRONK: So we are talking areas that are  
21 outside my waiver, because I liked Mr. Durham's example  
22 of a yes or no, are they ready or are they not type  
23 situation. That's the data that we could be reporting  
24 just from TS Gold. But then as you look at the read, we  
25 are using information that's already there, been approved



1 for early literacy. We do the star reading, we've got  
2 maps in some of those other measures as well.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is the READ Act  
4 (indiscernible)?

5 MS. CRONK: No, this is -- the one that I  
6 have for you right now is just early literacy and asking  
7 one time is all that we're required to do for the TS  
8 Gold. But your question, I -- maybe I misinterpreted  
9 your question -- I thought your question was kind of  
10 opening it up to how will the State know what our data  
11 is? And my answer is --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: How will you be comparable  
13 to --

14 MS. CRONK: Yes, because they do --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: For Denver, for example.

16 MS. CRONK: Yes.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Because they will be using  
18 TS Gold in kindergarten. And you will not.

19 MS. CRONK: Sure, but we'll have -- if the  
20 student is proficient and ready, we'll have that data,  
21 because we'll always have one assessment for every  
22 student. Now, we have the option in here. And for those  
23 students that we really feel we need that information,  
24 we'll continue to do it. But for the vast majority of  
25 our students, we just simply see that it's so redundant,



1 that those are going to be isolated cases. So we have  
2 the data. We've given the assessment.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me. So are you saying  
4 you would provide the data for your preschoolers when --  
5 when you give them the TS Gold assessment, you will  
6 provide that data to the State?

7 MS. CRONK: Yes, if it's at that proficiency  
8 -- are -- are they ready for school?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder?  
10 Scheffel?

11 MS. SHEFFEL: I just -- I just wondered  
12 about the Stages assessment. Did you mention that, the  
13 Stages?

14 MS. CRONK: No, I did not.

15 MS. SHEFFEL: Okay, sorry.

16 MS. CRONK: Is there any --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Indiscernible) did you  
18 have another --

19 MS. SHEFFEL: No, it's okay, I was --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

21 MS. SHEFFEL: -- thinking of another  
22 assessment.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm just a little flummoxed  
24 that your question isn't -- I think it's really important  
25 that there are --



1 MS. SHEFFEL: There's options.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: -- approved assessments that  
3 are options that do not require a district to come for a  
4 waiver. And I'm not understanding why that's not a part  
5 of this discussion, that there are two other assessments  
6 that are shorter that either you haven't looked at that  
7 are approved by the Board that are a part of the system,  
8 that would be part of the reporting system. Either  
9 you've not looked at them or you have looked at them and  
10 they're not adequate. And I think that's my question.

11 MS. CRONK: Oh, okay.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: And I don't mean to jump  
13 this on you, but I'm wondering if there's a  
14 misinformation out there that says TS Gold is all there  
15 is.

16 MS. SHEFFEL: Well, that's why I was  
17 bringing up the point that --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

19 MS. SHEFFEL: -- we originally mandated it.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

21 MS. SHEFFEL: Which is why 90 percent-plus  
22 of the state uses it. And then everyone just continued  
23 to use it as though it's our only option. Now, I haven't  
24 looked deeply into the privacy issues for the others that  
25 are on that menu, but my sense is that we need to surface



1 those options for schools, because I -- I know at least  
2 that they're shorter and less burdensome for teachers. I  
3 don't know if they're better as far as data privacy  
4 issues. They may not be.

5 MS. CRONK: So to go back to answer your  
6 question, I would say that -- and I'll reiterate it again  
7 -- it's not that we haven't looked at other options. And  
8 you've got to remember we're part of like a co-op with an  
9 Easy Bosies. So it was the familiarity and plus we  
10 really do like the Ages and Stages Easy Bosies --

11 MS. SHEFFEL: That was my question.

12 MS. CRONK: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. Yeah, it's  
13 Ages and Stages, yeah.

14 MS. SHEFFEL: Right, so I didn't have it  
15 correct.

16 MS. CRONK: Okay.

17 MS. SHEFFEL: So I wondered --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So why --

19 MS. SHEFFEL: -- if you could speak to that?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: -- did we not use that one?

21 MS. SHEFFEL: I don't know. I wonder if you  
22 could speak to that assessment, Ages and Stages? Is it  
23 all in the cloud again? Is it all --

24 MS. CRONK: Yeah, okay, so the original --

25 (Overlapping)



1 MS. SHEFFEL: -- protocol and all of that?

2 MS. CRONK: Yeah, the original survey is  
3 online.

4 MS. SHEFFEL: Right.

5 MS. CRONK: And then a lot of it -- it's  
6 different stages depending on which one of these five  
7 areas that you're identifying. So it can be some  
8 questions for the family to fill out. There's some  
9 observations, just like the other ones are. And then  
10 there will be some check boxes. So it's a collection of  
11 data too.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Again, colleagues, I would  
13 say this is something we wouldn't --

14 MS. SHEFFEL: Detail.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: -- detail and understand so  
16 that we don't undermine the intent, but that we also  
17 don't burden our school districts.

18 MS. MAZANEC: I would just say we have just  
19 got to stop treating small rural districts as though  
20 they're Denver, Jefferson, or --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I agree.

22 MS. MAZANEC: -- DougCo (ph) or --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I completely agree.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Well, we just got to provide  
25 some flexibility.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: But that's our job. And we  
2 apparently haven't done it well enough that we've given  
3 districts enough instruments that we can honor the intent  
4 of the legislation, but not have it be (indiscernible).

5 (Overlapping)

6 MS. MAZANEC: But I don't they're even  
7 asking for extra -- they're using an instrument that's  
8 proofed.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: But not at kindergarten.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you -- at the  
11 kindergarten level, do you use --

12 MS. MAZANEC: But do we (indiscernible)  
13 kindergarten?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you use those  
15 alternative instruments?

16 MS. CRONK: It -- until they're shown to be  
17 -- meet all of the requirements that need on all of those  
18 areas.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Once they're -- once  
20 they're ready, you just don't want to do it again, and  
21 that's essentially the waiver request. And if they have  
22 not demonstrated they're ready, then you continue to  
23 administer and instrument, whether it's TS Gold or one or  
24 the other approved or -- do you use -- does your Bosies  
25 have only TS Gold?





1 MS. CRONK: I have no idea about if that's  
2 the only thing that they -- I don't know what they use.  
3 For us, the service providers have been using Ages and  
4 Stages. So that's what we're trying to use. It's just -  
5 - because they're (indiscernible).

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So I mean, the real issue  
7 is you just want to do it once and --

8 MS. CRONK: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- that's the essence of  
10 the waiver request. We're talking about a relatively few  
11 number of children. So the impact on aggregate data, if  
12 any, would be --

13 MS. CRONK: Yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- minimal. So -- yes,  
15 Dr. Flores?

16 MS. FLORES: Can I make a motion?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

18 MS. FLORES: I make a motion that we accept  
19 the recommendation by Mrs. Cronk.

20 MS. CRONK: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So motions to approve  
22 Woodlin School District's R-104 waiver request from the  
23 statute as -- as set forth in the public agenda would be  
24 your motion, Dr. Flores?

25 MS. FLORES: Yes.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Is there a second to  
2 that motion?

3 MS. RANKIN: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Ms. Rankin. All  
5 right, it's moved and seconded. Is there further  
6 discussion on the adoption of this motion? Is there any  
7 objection to the passage of Dr. Flores' motion? Hearing  
8 none, that motion is adopted by a vote of 7-0. We now  
9 have 19 point --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: 14.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And thank you very much.

12 MS. CRONK: Okay, and in closing, I just  
13 wanted to bring to you all, I'd like to commend this  
14 Board and some CDE offices. My original waiver request  
15 included many more areas than what you've just heard.  
16 And thank you to this Board for updating graduation  
17 requirements and thank you to CDE's education evaluation  
18 system for understanding our request and finding ways to  
19 provide flexibility for what we were asking for in these  
20 waiver processes. I appreciate the work that you do.  
21 Thank you very much.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

23 MS. SHEFFEL: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. All right,  
25 let's see, we're now at 19 -- 19.14, Request from a



1 Waiver from State Statutes by Academic School District  
2 20.

3 MS. FIELD: Hi. Susan. (Indiscernible).

4 MS. MORGAN: So I just, quickly by way of  
5 introduction, I'll let them all introduce themselves  
6 here, but they, again, are bringing a -- a waiver request  
7 to you under the district waiver process. And you have  
8 already in front of you their replacement plan, as well  
9 as staff feedback on that plan. Staff feedback on -- on  
10 this, just as a quick summary, is that they're not  
11 seeking the ability to do something you don't have  
12 authority to grant. There's feedback in here about the  
13 degree to which staff believes that their replacement  
14 plan aligns with components of statute.

15 The only thing really that's different about  
16 this request versus others that you've seen, really, is  
17 size of district, which I'm sure there will be some  
18 dialogue about today. But that's the only significant  
19 difference in terms of the sort of context around what  
20 they're bringing to you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We welcome, and who would  
22 like to start the presentation?

23 MS. FIELD: Hi, good afternoon. My name is  
24 Susan Field and I am the assistant superintendent for  
25 Learning Services in District 20.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, go ahead, Dr. Field.

2 MR. MAXON: My name is Clark Maxon. I am  
3 the director for curriculum instruction for Academic  
4 District 20.

5 MS. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon, my name is  
6 Pat Richardson. I'm the director for legal relations.  
7 Thank you for your time today.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Are you going  
9 to start then --

10 MS. FIELD: I am.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- Dr. Field? And if you  
12 can, make sure you in the presentation, I -- I think one  
13 of the things would be very helpful for the Board is some  
14 estimate of the amount of time involved in assessments  
15 using TS Gold and/or -- or similar instrument and the  
16 time or changes you believe that that would deliver to  
17 the classroom teacher and if you think that's an  
18 important element for your request. And finally, I'm  
19 going to apologize, I have to attend another meeting, so  
20 I'm going to turn the gavel over to Dr. Schroeder. And  
21 so I will be walking out before you finish your  
22 presentation, and I apologize.

23 MS. FIELD: Okay, thank you. We're here on  
24 behalf of approximately 1,200 kindergarten students and  
25 60 kindergarten teachers in 11 -- I'm sorry, in 18



1 elementary schools in Academic School District 20. As  
2 you read in the materials, we submitted to CDE Academy  
3 School District 20 is seeking a waiver from the state-  
4 required school readiness assessments.

5 We understand the important purpose  
6 underlying the state law and already have in place a  
7 reliable strategy to meet the intent of the law in a  
8 manner far better suited to our community. Our board of  
9 education, after consultation with our district  
10 accountability committee, unanimously and  
11 enthusiastically adopted a resolution to proceed with  
12 this waiver, which will help restore the faith and  
13 confidence of our community regarding state educational  
14 and assessment policies.

15 As you are aware, in September you granted a  
16 comparable waiver to the Classical Academy, a public  
17 charter school in our district. Our district enjoys a  
18 close, collaborative relationship. If the waiver is good  
19 for the kindergarten students in the charter school, why  
20 wouldn't it be good for the kindergarten students in the  
21 rest of our school district?

22 Academy 20 kindergarten teachers monitor  
23 each student's progress throughout the year using a  
24 combination of direct observation and data received  
25 through standardized testing and locally developed



1 assessments. On a daily basis our kindergarten teachers  
2 assess their student's growth in academic and  
3 developmental domains and plan instruction accordingly.

4 The district's research-based, standards-  
5 based report cards are used to regularly report  
6 kindergarten students' progress toward these domains.  
7 Performance levels on the standards-based report card  
8 indicate relative strengths and weaknesses that are  
9 highlighted by the teacher and communicated with parents  
10 on an ongoing basis. These report cards are used to  
11 guide and personalize instruction through the studying of  
12 individual student goals in the implementation of  
13 research-based strategies. They also communicate domains  
14 or areas where students are performing below, at, or  
15 above grade level expectations.

16 Granting the requested waiver would afford  
17 kindergarten teachers more time and opportunity for daily  
18 planning and instruction. Administering TS Gold requires  
19 approximately 65 hours of additional instructional and/or  
20 planning time for each class above and beyond regular  
21 responsibilities.

22 Granting the -- excuse me -- granting the  
23 waiver also permits us to continue to offer the same  
24 standards-based report card in kindergarten, which is  
25 also used in grades one through five. Our original plan



1 this school year would have been to replace our  
2 standards-based report card with the TS Gold report so  
3 teachers would not be burdened with two reporting  
4 systems.

5 The waiver will allow our kindergarten  
6 teachers to continue using our District 20-developed  
7 standards-based report card. Our current report card  
8 allows for K-5 articulation within each school to ensure  
9 students are ready for success at the next level.

10 Because we've met all the legal requirements  
11 and because granting the waiver will enhance educational  
12 opportunity and quality within Academy School District  
13 20, we respectfully request that you exercise your  
14 authority to grant the waiver. What questions can we  
15 answer for you at this point?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleague? Do you have any  
17 questions? Do I have a motion?

18 MS. RANKIN: This is Joyce Rankin. I make a  
19 motion that we grant the waiver request.

20 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: No comments? Well, I will  
22 make a comment, which is that, first of all, could you  
23 tell us, looking at the other two assessments that we  
24 have approved --

25 MR. MAXON: Yeah, we did --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: -- tell us about them.

2 MR. MAXON: We did look at -- we did spend  
3 some time looking at that. As you can imagine, beginning  
4 training for setting up the data collection systems for  
5 one of these types of systems is a very intensive  
6 process. We had spent a fair bit of time getting our  
7 teachers trained for some pilot work with the TS Gold.  
8 We had our informational technology people spend quite a  
9 bit of time setting up the data structures that would  
10 allow us to report to TS Gold. We had spent quite a bit  
11 of time already down that road.

12 Either way, the -- regardless of which  
13 assessment system, we see this for our teachers as a  
14 redundancy. We -- we believe that our standards-based  
15 report card does contain all of the information that's --  
16 that is useful and required to meet the intent of this  
17 statute.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Can I ask you why you might  
19 not submit that to the Department to be evaluated in the  
20 same way that we evaluated TS Gold? I mean, you  
21 understand my frustration? We've got a legislature that  
22 has asked us to evaluate whether kids are kindergarten  
23 ready and we've struggled to find more and more  
24 processes. And you're convinced that you have a very  
25 good one. Why would you not submit that for an





1 evaluation to ensure that it contains all the  
2 expectations that the other ones have?

3 MR. MAXON: Yeah, thank you. We -- we  
4 consider this is the beginning of a partnership with the  
5 Department of Education. We've had some great  
6 conversations with them. We've done some work about  
7 crosswalking, that is validating the indicators of our  
8 report card with some of the other systems, for example,  
9 TS Gold, to find a way that we can be sure that we have  
10 adequate data to meet -- meet those -- those five areas  
11 that -- that Dr. Colman pointed out earlier today.

12 So we see that as the beginning of a  
13 potential partnership. We're happy to work with -- with  
14 the Department to -- to consider -- to consider further  
15 collaboration in that area.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Deb?

17 MS. SHEFFEL: So do you find that one of the  
18 feedback pieces that we get on TS Gold is the privacy  
19 issues. And I see looking at your report card in all the  
20 various categories, do you feel that the way you collect  
21 the data would address that issue for parents in your  
22 district that have that concern?

23 MR. MAXON: Very much so, because this data  
24 is -- is all behind our firewall and it's all collected  
25 by our staff for our students. There are no sensitive



1 types of information that -- that some of the things that  
2 we've heard about and -- and some of the things that  
3 we've heard about, for example, with TS Gold about  
4 uploading different types of data pieces. We know those  
5 are requirements, but we can assure our community that we  
6 are not collecting those types of information. And we  
7 also have our parents invested in this process over the  
8 course of many years, because this is our K-5 reporting  
9 system and we've worked heavily with our community, with  
10 -- we've had focus groups and we've had informational  
11 opportunities with our community. So it's -- it's  
12 something that they know and trust. It's -- it's data  
13 that is private within our student information system  
14 that's behind our firewall. And we feel very confident  
15 with that.

16 MS. SHEFFEL: (Indiscernible) I think these  
17 are good examples that we could socialize to the other  
18 districts options for meeting the requirements that the  
19 legislature intends.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I'm a whole lot more  
21 comfortable with that than granting waivers one by one by  
22 one and having 178 different systems. I think that's  
23 essentially what the legislature did not want us to do.  
24 So I'd rather be approving their system, per se. And  
25 we'll have a staff look at it piece by piece to ensure



1 that the intent of the legislation is what you are doing,  
2 as opposed to just granting waivers, granting waivers,  
3 and not really having an understanding of --

4 MS. SHEFFEL: Of the problem.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Of the problem.

6 MS. SHEFFEL: I think that when we look at  
7 governance by waiver, it means there's something wrong  
8 with the way we're governing, you know, if everyone needs  
9 a waiver.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Exactly.

11 MS. SHEFFEL: Because of a common problem.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: And that's why I'm  
13 suggesting --

14 MS. SHEFFEL: And I think you --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that we need to have a  
16 conversation --

17 MS. SHEFFEL: Right.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- and either go back to the  
19 legislature or clarify --

20 MS. SHEFFEL: Socialize options.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, clarify what are  
22 things that have to be in it and then letting districts  
23 develop it themselves in order --

24 MS. FIELD: Right, and you had talked  
25 earlier about the -- your staff had been talking about



1 below, at, or above age-level expectations. We can  
2 easily take our report card and all the assessments that  
3 are aligned to it that our teachers have created and a  
4 teacher could easily tell you if a student was below, at,  
5 or above grade-level expectations or ready for  
6 kindergarten.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: And have you been doing that  
8 for a while? Have you been using this for a while?

9 MS. FIELD: Yes. I would say close to ten  
10 years.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So can you tell me, has  
12 there been a change in the -- so what we're looking for  
13 in the reports, to whether there are more and more kids  
14 at grade level at kindergarten. All right, what --  
15 what's the data telling you about whether where kids are?

16 MR. MAXON: So --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: But over time.

18 MR. MAXON: We -- we really do in our  
19 district enjoy a high -- high degree of success. And we  
20 are very fortunate and grateful for that. We have seen a  
21 consistently high level of readiness in our district.  
22 The implementation of our standards-based report card  
23 frankly has allowed us to -- to move in an area where  
24 cognitively our students and in terms of their academic  
25 preparation are moving well beyond the limits of



1 something like TS Gold measure.

2 And one of the pieces that our educators  
3 talk to us about is in just in terms of the academic  
4 readiness pieces. There's a level of rigor for -- for  
5 our teachers that they were afraid that they would lose  
6 if we went to one of these other systems. So I -- in  
7 answer to your question, our standards-based report card  
8 has -- has gone a long way to enhance the academic  
9 readiness of our students. We've seen a consistent level  
10 of developmental readiness across the years. And -- and  
11 we've enjoyed a very high level of that in our district.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Has there been a change?

13 MR. MAXON: Change in the academic --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Change in readiness?

15 MR. MAXON: Change in the academic  
16 readiness, absolutely.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So I guess one more  
18 thing. I'm wondering if you -- if we can have a work  
19 session on this, if you would be willing to join in and  
20 help us with a conversation? I really don't want to go  
21 against what districts want to do. I also am very  
22 reluctant to have the legislature believe that we don't  
23 believe in their legislative intent, which is to have  
24 some kind of consistency across the state in measurement.

25 MR. MAXON: And thank you for that. We --



1 we have spent a bit of time just working to make sure  
2 that -- that we could satisfy with valid and reliable  
3 data the -- the very area and the indicators that are  
4 required by legislation. And I've we've crosswalked and  
5 mapped our system, our standards-based report card  
6 system, we feel that we could contribute in a very  
7 meaningful way to that -- to that data set it -- for  
8 aggregated data.

9 One of the pieces of this, and we appreciate  
10 this, is that the CDE has -- has not worked to have the  
11 same kind of standardization, for example, that we saw  
12 with TCAP or Park (ph). It wouldn't be developmentally  
13 appropriate for small children. So but given that range,  
14 we -- we have a high degree of validity and reliability  
15 just through our ongoing processes. It would be hard for  
16 us to speak to how that works in other districts, but we  
17 feel very confident in ours.

18 MS. SHEFFEL: So a follow up?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Go ahead, Deb.

20 MS. SHEFFEL: So I -- and I don't -- I  
21 didn't look back at the exact language in the statute,  
22 but I don't know that it does require us -- us to have  
23 standardized assessments, because I think that's why we  
24 have the menu.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: That's right.



1 MS. SHEFFEL: So I think that the -- the  
2 thing about your approach is I think it defeats some of  
3 the problems that we've seen with some of the assessments  
4 that are currently out there that were initially required  
5 that are now people are seeing the concerns with the  
6 data. So it would be interesting to -- to think through  
7 the kind of data that's reported through TS Gold, where  
8 it ends up, if it's disaggregated or not and how that  
9 occurs and as opposed to the type of data that you have  
10 to say this percentage of our students are ready. So I  
11 appreciate the -- that care of what you've done your  
12 program and I think we can learn from it.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. But we would want --  
14 we would want to add something like this to the menu as  
15 opposed to just saying 178 districts will continue to do  
16 what they've always done, which was maybe yes, maybe no,  
17 maybe great, maybe not, and not have a plan. I mean, I  
18 think that's the --

19 MS. SHEFFEL: Yeah.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: -- challenge that we're  
21 going to have and if we don't get on the stick on this,  
22 we're going to just have everybody get a waiver. And I  
23 think that's -- that can be very problematic. Yes?

24 MS. MAZANEC: First, I appreciate what  
25 you're saying. I -- I'm not sure that we're really in



1 danger of 178 districts asking for waiver, because I  
2 think we already have a high number of districts who do  
3 use TS Gold and like it. Okay, so but again, I think,  
4 remember that the -- the requirement of the statute is  
5 that districts be able to report whether their students  
6 are ready in those three areas.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Five or six.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Five or six, whatever. They  
9 are telling us they can report that. So I see no reason  
10 --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: But based on a research --

12 MS. MAZANEC: -- to request --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- based assessment. That's  
14 the problem.

15 MS. MAZANEC: And I -- but I see no reason,  
16 Dr. Schroeder, to say you can only tell us that based on  
17 these assessments, you know? It may be a great  
18 guideline, but this is again another -- another example  
19 of where we need to -- to allow these districts who they  
20 know what they're doing, they've been doing it a long  
21 time, to -- to tell us what they know in a -- in a form  
22 they are -- are comfortable with. And maybe we need to  
23 be more flexible about taking that data on.

24 MS. FLORES: And humans are better.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce?





1 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

2 MS. FLORES: At assessments.

3 MS. RANKIN: I just --

4 MS. FLORES: It's just that they cost too  
5 much.

6 MS. RANKIN: I think that when we come here,  
7 like you come here, I mean, we're all working for the  
8 best thing for the children. And what I see online, what  
9 I see about Academy 20, I think you should be able to  
10 whatever you want. And I appreciate what you do. And  
11 it's -- it's for the children. And I -- I think  
12 sometimes we get caught down in the weeds when we should  
13 take an aerial view and just say thank you for what  
14 you're doing.

15 MS. FIELD: Thank you.

16 MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Call that vote?

18 MS. BURDSALL: (Indiscernible) over here.  
19 Dr. Flores?

20 MS. FLORES: Aye.

21 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

22 MS. GOFF: Aye.

23 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

24 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

25 MS. BURDSALL: Joyce Rankin?



1 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

2 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

3 MS. SHEFFEL: Yes.

4 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Thank you very much.

6 MS. RANKIN: Thank you for what you do.

7 Great.

8 MS. FIELD: Thank you.

9 (Meeting adjourned)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 5th day of February, 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