



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
April 14, 2016, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 14, 2016, 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 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So let's start with Item
2 four which is the consideration of the high school CMAS and
3 COOP Science CAT scores. And so before we start this
4 discussion is there a motion on the table? Dr. Schroeder.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I move we adopt (inaudible)
6 I move I find the right sheet.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's in number four.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry. I know it's just
9 things got moved in here. I move to extend the adoption of
10 the 2015 CMAS and COOP -- COOP high school science CAT
11 scores through Spring 2017 for the purposes of producing
12 individual student level reports. Those reports will also
13 include descriptive statistics for comparative information
14 only.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So who second to that
16 motion? Dr. Scheffel will second. It's been seconded for
17 the purpose of discussion, Commissioner will introduce our
18 staff to this. Okay. How about it? Ms. Kausky, why don't
19 you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible). The media
21 is out.

22 MR. ASP: Yes, it's him. Okay. All right.
23 Ms. Kausky, you're on.

24 MS. KAUSKY: Thank you. I appreciate that.
25 And last year as you may recall being called a CAT score



1 student's (inaudible) with the panels of educators. We
2 brought you their recommendations in March. You ask that
3 we go back. And we consider those recommendations and give
4 you some options. We came back in May with some adjusted
5 recommendations. And at that point in time, you adopted
6 the CAT scores for use for last year. And for purposes of
7 producing individual student reports and as the motion
8 indicates what we're asking you today is to extend that
9 adoption through 2017. So that we can continue to produce
10 those individuals to reports for our students who are
11 testing. Just as a piece of information, we do have 25,000
12 11th graders who have started the Science test. The window
13 opened to about three days ago, opened on Monday. So we do
14 have students who are testing and I encourage you to
15 provide them results based on their efforts.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Questions for Ms.
17 Kausky? Any discussion I think -- I think we've already
18 received several letters from a number of districts and
19 superintendents in support of this and in -- in retrospect
20 I think it's important that students be given if they take
21 the time to take the test. We ought to give them results.
22 We can quibble about how whether we think they're accurate
23 or not but they are the standards we're going to who we
24 have in there. The only standards we have to live with.



1 So I would encourage my vote on the motion if there's no
2 discussion. Yes.

3 MS. RANKIN: I have a question.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Rankin?

5 MS. RANKIN: When do they take the test?

6 And when do they get the results?

7 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

9 MS. KAUSKY: So they are literally taking
10 the test as we speak. This morning when I checked earlier
11 we had about 10,000 students who had started testing not
12 just in 11th grade but across our grades. For the Science
13 and Social Studies, that window for this year is from April
14 11 until April 29th. And we are working with our
15 contractor to be able to provide what we're referring to as
16 rolling results starting at the beginning of June.

17 MS. RANKIN: Can -- can they ever be any
18 quicker than that? I mean --

19 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

21 MS. KAUSKY: So Colorado historically, has
22 had a commitment to having what we refer to as constructive
23 response items on the test which are the expected response
24 which require the students to be able to write their
25 answers. So that it's not just a straight multiple choice



1 test. If we had a straight multiple choice test we would
2 be able to get results out much more quickly. However,
3 historically Colorado has deemed that ineffective and
4 doesn't meet the expectations for students to be able to
5 demonstrate their higher order thinking skills and their
6 critical thinking skills. So really the duration of the
7 extended duration is because we have to actually go through
8 and we have to hands for those written responses.

9 MS. RANKIN: Who does that?

10 MS. KAUSKY: So that is done by our
11 contractor. Pearson hires the scorers, the scorers are
12 required to have at least a bachelor's degree. And that's
13 just the credential to walk in the door. Then they go
14 through a training process where they are exposed to papers
15 that have been previously scored by Colorado educators. So
16 what does this 0 look like, what does a 1 look like, what
17 does a 2 look like, what does a 3 look like. After they
18 are trained. They have to pass a test that demonstrates
19 that they are scoring consistently with what the Colorado
20 educators expect.

21 MS. RANKIN: And -- and -- Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Proceed.

23 MS. RANKIN: Do they roll out the results
24 like if some take the test on the 11th do they get their
25 scores first?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Kausky.

2 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair. So there's some
3 technical pieces that have to happen. And so we have to
4 have a certain number of tests submitted in order to do
5 what we call equating. And that's what allows us to make
6 comparisons from one year to the next. Once that level is
7 met then we will start doing those rolling results. To be
8 completely honest with you what we're expecting to see is
9 that we will have and I -- wait -- I'm back stepping for a
10 second. Apologies Mr. Chair and the rest of the Board. I
11 just completed our ELA Math with our Science and Social
12 Studies.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Shame.

14 MS. KAUSKY: I apologize profusely for that.
15 I don't know how I could have done that. I keep arguing we
16 should have a single system. So the rolling result --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) and the
18 rest of us.

19 MS. KAUSKY: Okay, so for -- let me go to
20 the English Language Arts and Math first. And I apologize
21 for that we'd really have the rolling results and those
22 results will start coming to us at the beginning of June.
23 And the rationale for rolling those results this year is a
24 couple of different things. One is we know that we have
25 students who started testing for that test even earlier



1 than April 11th. We also know that we're gonna be able to
2 return results for our online testers frankly faster than
3 we can return results for our paper testers. We also know
4 that for some of our tests we have 60,000 students who are
5 taking the test and so we can do that technical piece much
6 more quickly when we start looking at our high school Math
7 assessments.

8 Our numbers fall way down and we're gonna
9 essentially have to have almost all of those tests back
10 before we can do that technical piece and we didn't think
11 we wanted to wait to give the third through fifth grade ELA
12 and Math results until we had the integrated three results
13 for the 150 students who are taking integrated three. So
14 that is the rationale. The rolling results for English
15 Language Arts and Math. For Science and for Social Studies
16 for our fourth and seventh graders, they won't be rolling
17 results. We expect all those results to be solid by the
18 middle of June.

19 MS. RANKIN: So I have one more question
20 then I won't ask anymore. How does a student get the
21 results?

22 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair. So the districts
23 are the ones who received the results from the vendor and
24 then it is the district responsibility to distribute those
25 results to the parents.



1 MS. RANKIN: Do they do that via email or?

2 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair. Different districts
3 have different procedures set up so there are some
4 districts that have secure connections with their parents,
5 those districts yes. Some of those just send them out via
6 email. For our districts who don't have that kind of a
7 system or for parents who are not set up on the internet,
8 then they are just to do it by hand.

9 MS. RANKIN: Every student can get those
10 results in June, they don't have to wait 'til --

11 MS. KAUSKY: So there are a variety of
12 results. There are the electronic and student level files
13 and those are the first results that we'll put out there
14 for schools and districts. And schools and districts can
15 talk about those results with parents. The individual
16 student level reports because they contain the comparative
17 information. So it has the school comparison the district
18 comparison, the state comparison, and historically for ELA
19 and Math, the part comparison in order to produce those
20 individual student reports. All reporting has to be
21 completed. So conversations can happen as early as June.
22 The hard copy reports will come July-ish.

23 MS. RANKIN: Was the June part for students
24 to be able to receive that as soon as possible. It sounds
25 like it's -- it's being done. Thank you.



1 MS. KAUSKY: We have -- Mr. Chair, sorry.
2 Historically, Colorado has had an earlier testing window
3 and a later reporting window and we have been working very
4 hard to try to continue every year to reduce that span in
5 between and we continue, we're committed to trying to do
6 that even more.

7 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So these CAT scores have been
10 in place for one year? Is that right? So do we have any
11 metrics that show what percent of students are in which
12 proficiency level based on the one year data?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Kausky.

14 MS. KAUSKY: So -- Mr. Chair. Last year the
15 direction from the Board was that we not aggregate results
16 and we provide results to the individual on the individual
17 student level reports without doing -- putting out
18 aggregated results. So we have not put out officially from
19 the state aggregated results. With that said I will be
20 honest with you that -- that comparative information by
21 default has that in there. The results look very much like
22 what you saw back last May. So what we predicted to see is
23 what frankly result. But this is the first time that
24 that's been set openly.



1 MS SCHEFFEL: Right. And so the students
2 got individual feedback but the bucketing wasn't reported,
3 the -- the data wasn't reported in terms of categories.

4 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

6 MS. KAUSKY: We did put out the complete
7 individual student level reports. On those individual
8 student level reports, there's a variety of data. One is
9 the scales (inaudible) , the second is the performance
10 level. But that comparative information is school average,
11 district average, state average. And that's what allowed
12 for those comparisons to be put into place. So for last
13 year, again, the state we did not release school level,
14 district level, state level. High school Science results
15 but schools and districts by default could look at the
16 individual student level reports to see that information, I
17 will share with you that -- that was frustrating to some
18 schools and districts because instead of just being able to
19 get a very clean list of here's our schools performed.
20 They actually had to create that themselves.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So do we have an example of
22 what students are receiving?

23 MS. KAUSKY: Yes. Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You don't need to go
2 through the Chair when you're answering questions unless we
3 yell at one another and then -- we're trying to avoid that.

4 MS. KAUSKY: Habit. So in terms of an
5 example of a report I shared those with you last year and I
6 can quickly get that to you as soon as we're done talking
7 here they are posted as well.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: And in a Board docs? I
9 didn't see.

10 MS. KAUSKY: So they are posted on our
11 website. Yeah. If you don't mind.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we could just look
13 at it because that's the same report they're gonna get this
14 year which is exactly the same CAT scores report.

15 MS. KAUSKY: The same report that we get
16 this year.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great thank you.

18 MS. KAUSKY: And I'm just pulling in support
19 to help find where we have things posted. It is -- it is
20 actually a four page report. The top of the first page has
21 like I said the overall scales work and the performance
22 level for the student. It also has the distribution of
23 students from across the state in each performance level.
24 At the bottom, it is where we break it up by the standards.
25 So there is a scale score for Physical Science, for Life



1 Science, for Earth Systems, as well as for Scientific
2 Inquiry. Those scores are scaled so that they can be
3 compared from year to year.

4 The second page, we break those scores down
5 further into the declared graduate competencies. And those
6 scores cannot be compared from year to year. But they can
7 be compared from student to school to district and their
8 percent correct. So you can break down and look at
9 Physical Science in -- into a smaller kind of a segment.
10 On the third page of the reports, there are two additional
11 scale scores. One is a scale score for those constructed
12 responses. Those open ended questions that parents can get
13 information and teachers can get information about how kids
14 did. When they have to actually create their own
15 responses, how did they do? Versus the more like the
16 multiple choice selected response items. And we do know
17 that there are some kids who perform better at selective
18 response multiple choice and there are some kids who
19 perform better on the constructive response. But that
20 helps schools and districts determine what they may need to
21 target.

22 So that is up the third page. On the fourth
23 page is the description of each one of the performance
24 levels. So what does a level one mean, what does level two
25 mean, what does the level three mean and what does the



1 level four mean. This happens to be a Social Studies
2 report, they're very similar to the Science reports. Like
3 I said until at the -- on this last page. There is a
4 description for Artist English command, at (inaudible)
5 command, at modern command, at limited command. And that
6 is the language that was adopted last year by the Board.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further, excuse me.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. That was
9 helpful.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: For the further question
11 or discussion. Last year I think I was -- was not and I
12 think many members of the Board were not pleased with --
13 with the way that CAT's scores were set. Having said that
14 after watching Watters' World a few times and determining
15 that apparently, majority of college students cannot
16 identify who won the Civil War, maybe they're not as far
17 out of line as one might think. But I think more
18 importantly, I -- I will probably when the results are
19 released have my own comments as to the what I think of the
20 efficacy of this test and other Board members may wish to
21 join in those comments would disagree, but the information
22 should -- should be available and that's a conclusion I've
23 reached that -- that probably not going to fully
24 (inaudible) with a mistake. Like Mr. (inaudible) don't



1 make a lot of them, but on occasion that occurs so he'll
2 start shuffling.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I -- I -- I agree except
4 that I think that what's underneath. Whether or not how
5 the scores were released has to do with help with the
6 tests. I think we didn't wanna create the conditions for
7 narrative or failure based on a test that doesn't test
8 content and that with respect to students knowing about the
9 Civil War. I would -- I -- I would -- it'd be interesting
10 to review the items on these tests and really look at the
11 blueprint and the number of items that represent the
12 contents. So I think that's our next step, to really look
13 at these tests and how efficacious they are for gathering
14 the information that the public cares about.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel I didn't
16 actually --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right, we didn't --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I didn't actually read the
19 test. I don't know if you had that opportunity.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: We did, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And my -- my opinion of --
22 of the content of that test measurement of content of
23 whether or not anybody actually learned anything is very
24 negative and very low and -- and frankly, you could pass
25 that test without knowing who won the Civil War.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Correct.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Because it's not included
3 in the questions. So --

4 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair, can I just make one
5 clarification?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

7 MS. KAUSKY: If that's all right. All of
8 you looked that, all of you who were here last week. I did
9 review the PARCC or pieces of the PARCC English Language
10 Arts and Mathematics assessments. Mr. Chair, you did
11 review the Social Studies assessment up to this point and
12 none of you have reviewed the full Science assessment.
13 Keep in mind that we do have sample questions posted.
14 Actually, it's the Pearson website, we'll gladly share that
15 link with you. I am not saying that you won't still have
16 some of the same concerns that you have had historically
17 about the concepts and skills approaches but you will also
18 see more what I'll term fact based questions. Can students
19 identify kinetic energy versus potential energy? Can
20 students identify osmosis and what that looks like? So I
21 do encourage you to take a look at that when you have a
22 chance or if you have the desire.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I would love to have an
25 opportunity to do what we did with PARCC which is actually



1 look at the items on the test. I have looked at the sample
2 items on the website but it will be much more helpful to do
3 as we did before which is do a more deep look at the
4 content of the Science and Social Studies test so perhaps
5 you could set that up.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, I think -- I think
7 make an appointment with Mr. (inaudible) at something that
8 fits your schedule and would -- I would encourage members
9 to review the test and hopefully at least from my
10 perspective improve because it -- it -- it is just in my
11 judgment failed to do the things that are major things that
12 I think should be measured. So and I -- but I -- I think
13 my opinion of that is not overly relevant unfortunately in
14 this discussion. It's you know, what are we gonna with the
15 data? We may individually or collectively choose to
16 characterize that data once it becomes available. But I
17 think before we do that we should probably look at the new
18 tests and draw our own conclusions and get back together on
19 it. So if there's no further a do, yes. Ms. Goff.

20 MS. GOFF: Well. Thanks. I -- so according
21 to this requested action, that's what -- we just basically
22 went through that. I guess my clarifiers are I'm -- I'm
23 looking at two letters. And whether or not they are --
24 they're real clear on what exactly they -- they want and
25 what they're expecting. I'm wondering if that's the same



1 thing because when one of the letters says our students
2 have diligently invested time to demonstrate their learning
3 they deserve to know how they perform. Likewise teachers
4 deserve the information they need to improve and adjust
5 instruction to assist students in meeting the standards.
6 Families use the information from state assessments to
7 gauge the progress of their students and to better
8 understand the performance of their school in comparison.

9 So I guess I -- I just wanna make sure that
10 parents and students, do they or do they not? I think that
11 the answer is yes. But do they have access to a school
12 wide picture? Do families have that access? Do they have
13 access to some sort of comparison whether it's their
14 school, with another, well, within the district and within
15 the state or not? Because I feel -- my feelings from a
16 year ago whenever we did this last time was the only
17 information that was going out whether or not the opinion
18 by the person, me, in this case makes that really valuable.
19 Is that's not really the issue if what if -- what they're
20 expecting and what they're gonna get is not clear to -- to
21 the people who made the request in these letters that would
22 be a concern to me.

23 MS. KAUSKY: So two different pieces. One,
24 let's talk about just the 11th graders who are taking the
25 test. When they get their individual student level



1 results, they will be able to see that school comparison,
2 that district comparison, that state comparison. But only
3 the students who are receiving those reports will get that
4 information. So the ninth and tenth graders who are coming
5 up won't have that information. Those families won't have
6 that information unless a school or district has chosen to
7 do something with their individual student level data. I
8 will as I mentioned earlier share with you that we have
9 heard from frustration from schools and districts that they
10 were not provided with the school and district level
11 information in an easily accessible manner -- accessible
12 manner. And also, what happens is they don't have any
13 information about schools outside of their district or how
14 other districts are doing. So we have heard that concern
15 expressed. What I think you received in the letters today
16 is please at least extend what you did last year. So at
17 least we get those individual student reports. I think
18 what you mentioned is that there are some who would
19 appreciate also getting those historical school and
20 district and state level results to use in a variety of
21 ways.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let me ask the Board, is
23 there any objection to by inclusion in this motion treating
24 this, the release of results the same way we treat -- treat
25 the release of all other results of PARCC and that sort of



1 things so that those comparisons can be made from -- from
2 district to district and school to school? And I know that
3 there are a number of groups and organizations from the
4 Independence Institute to stand for children like to use
5 those results. So is there objection to allowing the use
6 of those results in that fashion? Any Board member?

7 MS. FLORES: May -- may I ask a question?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Is it -- is it valuable because
10 these people can show, I am talking about these entities
11 that give reports and such, can show partly that they're
12 doing their -- their job and they can get their -- their
13 money or their work result or show in some -- in some sense
14 that they are doing their work or are -- are we really just
15 kind of creating a show, a culture of a failure I mean to
16 show a culture of failure of those who don't do well? And
17 don't we even here make so much about giving awards to
18 those highest of people who do well and -- and we commend
19 those people who do well. But you know, I am very
20 concerned about those kids who don't do well and we should
21 be spending most of our time really worrying and dealing
22 with those kids who don't do well. And if well, some -- do
23 you want to answer to that?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you -- you would object
25 is that --



1 MS. FLORES: I would.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- their characterization?

3 MS. FLORES: Yes, I would.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could I just give clarity --
6 clarity on what you're asking. I think what we were saying
7 is the PARCC results are released in a certain format that
8 aggregates across schools and districts.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: The way we decided on CMAS
11 last year was not to do that students get the information
12 and the districts can aggregate if they want to. And some
13 would prefer the state do it for them. Others haven't said
14 anything. And I think the reason we did that is because we
15 were trying to when we looked at the number of students
16 that fell in the categories that would be acceptable, they
17 were so low. We were trying to avoid creating data that
18 communicates failure in these areas for districts. So in
19 some ways it was an indirect approach to say somehow the --
20 the way the cut scores were set and so forth really creates
21 the conditions for having very negative things to say about
22 public education in these kinds of areas. So what we were
23 hoping to do is be able to look more deeply at the tests
24 themselves, figure out what they're testing, why these
25 scores are so low in terms of the -- the higher categories



1 that are acceptable. That was the purpose. So now we're
2 saying we should aggregate it for the schools so that they
3 can only set comparable data so that it's analogous to what
4 we do with PARCC. Is that what you're saying?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That -- that would be the
6 -- that -- that was the question paused. So we wanna --
7 Dr. Schroeder, would you -- if you want to offer an
8 amendment to your motion to do that. We can vote on that
9 and then we can vote on then the list of the scores. Do
10 you wish to do that? I don't know. Do you want to?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I do. I -- I do. And
12 I -- and I -- I think I wanna save why also. What I've
13 heard not -- not by cast of thousands but I have heard that
14 -- look teachers didn't get back what they need.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: I haven't heard that so
16 that's (inaudible).

17 MS. SCHROEDER: They haven't -- they,
18 because we -- we're not transparent about this whatever
19 reasons, whether there are good reasons or not at least
20 because we said so little. They got so little information.
21 And I'm frustrated that I hear that. That they don't have
22 the information, that they would like to have in order to
23 improve outcomes. So I'd like -- I would like that to be
24 the focus apart of the reporting. Facing the truth, yeah,
25 it is hard.



1 MS .SCHEFFEL: If the tests --

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Wait a minute. If we're
3 getting the same results from every other assessment
4 including the name, what are we doing? By -- by not
5 sharing the assessment we have -- the results are the same.
6 But we're not sharing it in aggregate. Right.

7 MS. FLORES: And you know this is the first
8 time. And I have a clear --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. I don't hear much in
10 my community, I'll have to admit that, but that is --

11 MS. FLORES: I didn't hear it at all. And
12 this is the first time.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: This is one of the few
14 things especially Social Studies.

15 MS. FLORES: These two letters.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: But --

17 MS. FLORES: I've never heard it from Denver
18 public schools or our public schools. And I do speak with
19 those.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Anyway, what's the motion?
21 Let me think. I --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, let's go ahead
23 (inaudible).

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you want to have motion?

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I just want to ask.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Go ahead and ask the
2 question.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I wonder if other Board
4 Members had heard from constituents because I haven't. My
5 concern is (inaudible).

6 MS. FLORES: I didn't even hear from them.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just saying -- what --
8 what I was saying is if the test -- if we were clear and
9 agreed that the test -- test was supposed to test which is
10 content knowledge and Science and Social Studies. Then I
11 would feel comfortable giving data. And we are given the
12 data, they are, the school districts and the kids and the
13 teachers are getting the data. The aggregation of it I
14 think creates this narrative of negativity which I hate to
15 see happen for public education and teachers. And the
16 problem is if we're not testing the right thing, then it
17 sends the wrong message. So I'm asking other Board
18 Members, have you heard from constituents, teachers, others
19 that say we wish we would aggregate the status so that we
20 can be able to say that in our district 2 percent of the
21 students are distinguished? I mean the -- the metrics are
22 very negative.

23 MS. FLORES: It's a little more detail, what
24 the teachers want -- that they want.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm asking other Board
2 Members, have you heard from (inaudible).

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores would -- would
4 take this around, if you like Dr. Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: At a town hall meeting, dealing
6 with this -- with PARCC and just testing in general. The
7 negativity in Denver was unbelievable. You could cut it
8 with a knife. It was so negative. And I don't think that
9 --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I ask?

11 MS. FLORES: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What negativity? I
13 mean the negativity about the --

14 MS. FLORES: Negativity against the test,
15 the questions. Kids came, boy scouts came. And it -- it
16 wasn't positive at all about how -- what a horrible test it
17 was.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The test itself or the
19 --

20 MS FLORES: All the testing that we -- we --
21 we are doing. The time that it took to take the test, it
22 was very, very negative. So I -- and I didn't hear it from
23 anybody saying I want, you know, I didn't hear anything
24 from teachers saying that they wanted more -- more
25 information.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff?

2 MS. GOFF: When I heard at the time, and --
3 and as far as now, I don't have no idea whether I'm right,
4 I'm guessing, that the reason we got some correspondence
5 now is because people happen to look and see that this
6 topic is on the agenda --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

8 MS. GOFF: -so they write to us. But as far
9 as last year, I heard from several Jefferson County people,
10 they could not understand. At -- at the beginning of our
11 discussion, we weren't gonna release anything. That ticked
12 them off.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We did release.

14 MS. GOFF: Well, it -- it, Science teachers,
15 two of whom were actually part of writing the test and
16 composing the test, so they were not real happy. After the
17 decision was made to let out the individual scores, that --
18 that appeased them a little bit, at least they got some
19 information. But that's why I'm concerned about what are -
20 - what are districts hearing as the thing they're gonna
21 get, I mean, for sure if they understand that this is a
22 continuation of what we did last year, or if they're
23 thinking something else, and, you know, and Joyce has
24 already answered it fully.



1 So I appreciate that. But that's my
2 concern. I -- I, as far as adding to the motion, we can
3 add anything we so choose, so we all decide how we want to
4 go with it. I'm kind of thinking if this is the second
5 year, the second round of this thinking, and we're still
6 young in baseline information, and we have a different
7 testing schedule now with the change from 13-23 last year.
8 I don't know -- I don't know. I'm thinking about it. I
9 don't know whether we should change right now or not. I'm
10 not sure.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin, excuse me.

12 MS. RANKIN: I wasn't here last year, so and
13 I haven't heard anything. But I do have an opinion.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

15 MS. RANKIN: I think we have reported the
16 test scores consistently to the districts just because it -
17 - it's easier, it's simpler, it's easier for them to
18 understand. It's easier for the parents to understand. I
19 don't think we should have different reporting for
20 different test. And until we change the test, I think we
21 have what we have and -- and --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec, any comment?

23 MS. MAZANEC: I tend to agree with Ms.
24 Rankin. And no, I haven't -- I haven't heard any



1 complaints. Yeah, I really look forward to changing the
2 test. I think the results are the results.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think -- I think the --
4 the results are -- are the results and I think -- and I
5 agree with -- with Dr. Scheffel. I think it does create a
6 narrative of failure, which is perhaps deserved, perhaps
7 not. We'll be better judge of that once we read these
8 tests. If I have the same conclusion then, I think the
9 better way to combat that narrative of failure is to attack
10 the test for what it is. If we believe it's inadequate, we
11 carry a better message either individually or as -- or
12 collectively as members of the Board making a strong
13 statement that we simply think these tests are seriously
14 flawed. My guess is, the public's gonna have a hard time
15 buying those cut scores of SAT. But I think -- I think
16 perhaps if we're going to make progress and return to a
17 more facts based, what did you learn, kind of test, we're
18 gonna have to demonstrate the failure, and I think the way
19 we essentially masked the results if they continue to be
20 the same, then we have an opportunity to speak out more
21 effectively. So did you have a motion to forward?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I guess I want to
23 add.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The amendment?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I want to -- like
2 to amend my motion to add that we disclose in an aggregate
3 manner the inform -- the consolidated information the same
4 way that we do for the other assessments as they were
5 taken. Is that close to right?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That sounds like a motion.
7 Is there a second to that motion? Second? Ms. Rankin?

8 MS. RANKIN: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there objection
10 to that amendment? Anybody like to be recorded as voting
11 no on the amendment? Seeing none, and the amendment's
12 adopted. We're now back to the motion as amended. Do you
13 have that Ms. Burdsall that you're thinking understandable?

14 MS. BURDSALL: I do. Do you like me to read
15 it?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure .

17 MS. BURDSALL: So with the addition of the
18 amendment it is -- the motion is to extend the adoption of
19 the 2015 CMAS COOP high school Science class course through
20 Spring 2017 for the purposes of producing individual level
21 reports. Those reports will also include descriptive
22 statistics for comparative information and disclose the
23 information in an aggregated manner -- in an aggregated
24 manner to consolidate the information the same way that is
25 done for other assessment test.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That's motion
2 before.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible), right?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So it be. Very -- very
5 artfully phrased. Thank you. Is there objection now to
6 the adoption of that motion?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we having a
8 discussion?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, certainly.
10 Absolutely.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So my sense is, I
12 understand that the -- the value of reporting the scores
13 now in this way across the various areas. But I would just
14 like to say that I think the content of the test, the way
15 the cut scores are set politicizes education, creates a
16 narrative of failure for teachers, kids, and parents. And
17 I hope we do a deep dive on this tests soon, because we're
18 releasing these data and parents are gonna have -- and
19 teachers are gonna be seen in a very negative light because
20 of the way the cut scores are set.

21 MS. FLORES: And the test.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the content of the
24 test.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. I think -- I think
2 Members of the Board has six -- we really have 60 days to
3 take the time to review this test, formulate our opinion,
4 wait for the results and then we'll bring it back and see
5 if we have individual commentary or commentary to make as a
6 Board. Is there objection to the motion as adopt or as --
7 as amended? There is not? So that motion's score adopted
8 on a vote of seven to nothing. Thank you. Well, she has
9 one quick follow-up question.

10 MS. FLORES: Which isn't related to this.
11 Can you respond to the comment we heard yesterday. No,
12 that's -- that's -- that's what I'm asking to you. Have
13 you heard from school districts a concern that we have made
14 the window too narrow? Last year, all we heard -- all I
15 heard was that, all we're doing all spring is testing and
16 that was largely because the perception -- because the
17 window was so wide, the perception was that every day we
18 were testing those kids during that window. And so, I
19 thought that we, CDE, heard from district saying, "We don't
20 want this great big window, we want a narrow window, do it,
21 get the job done, and then we go back to teaching and
22 learning." So now, have you heard -- had different
23 responses from districts that say, you know, you didn't
24 give us enough -- as those parents said, "You didn't give
25 us enough time."



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I just do a little
2 quick historical dive into what happened with the testing
3 window?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just make sure that
6 we're all kind of on the same page. So you're absolutely
7 correct. Last year, the field was very vocal about the
8 number of days the State was intruding upon their schools
9 and districts, and they requested us to minimize the number
10 of days that we were intruding on what they were doing. So
11 once we were able to combine the two different windows for
12 our ELA and Math test, we looked very carefully at the
13 number of test sessions -- the number of test sessions that
14 happen in a typical school, and we started to build out
15 calendars and schedules. Not that the schools and the
16 districts had to follow, but we just started to look. We
17 did not build a schedule that would have a student testing
18 from 8:00 in the morning until 4:00, right? So we looked
19 at reasonableness from a kid perspective and reasonableness
20 from a school perspective and determined that a three-week
21 window --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's by age? Did you
23 actually go by age?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We did -- what we did,
25 yes -- yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we determined that a
3 school that has three different grade levels, so four,
4 five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10 or 11 could complete the
5 testing in a three-week window with cushion for a snow day
6 or two, with cushion for make ups and not requiring a
7 student to have to test in one -- more than one area per
8 day. One test session per day. That window works for
9 schools and districts who have chosen to test via paper.
10 It also works for schools and districts who have a
11 technology that al --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Adequate.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can say, yeah.
14 Thank you. So I'll say adequate technology. What we did
15 at that point was say, "This is our official state window.
16 If you need to extend that window for your students who are
17 testing online due to technology capacity, let us know."
18 And schools and districts were able to extend that window
19 by one, two, or three weeks.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many do you
21 roughly?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there -- what we got
23 was information from the district level, not the school
24 level, and so we know that there were districts who signed
25 up to start early, but they were starting with just a



1 school or two, not necessarily all of their schools. I
2 will share with you that the majority of districts did have
3 at least one school that started early. When we looked at
4 JeffCo and Denver, they chose to start early. Our smaller
5 schools who are giving just one session, they didn't need
6 to extend that window. We were pretty flexible about that.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We didn't ask them to
9 submit to us major technology plans and to prove to us that
10 they needed to do this. We trusted them. When they said,
11 "We need to extend this," we said, "Fantastic."

12 MS. FLORES: Is it -- should I ask the
13 Commissioner this? Would it be impractical to go back near
14 the end of the year and ask the students whether this
15 worked?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: About the windows?

17 MS. FLORES: Yeah. Because, I mean, we --
18 we -- we heard -- we heard not only concern from a parent,
19 but also saying that other states were doing it
20 differently. So I think, and are we driven in fact by
21 their needs, not, I mean, I don't think it affects us.

22 MR. ASP: Yeah. Absolutely, add to that
23 point. But know that our districts are not shy and timid.
24 We need to work on that. We would have -- they -- they
25 have no hesitation to communicate with us if something is



1 not working for them that we mandate them. But we -- we
2 can easily go back (inaudible) and talk about this.

3 MS. FLORES: You know, no news is no news
4 sometimes, because they're really busy. I just -- I just
5 want this tips to kind of get where it needs to go, to see
6 if there's huge variation between districts, that that may
7 be the case. But --

8 MR. ASP: To that point, we do have -- so we
9 have a field staff of three, John, Joan, and Tina that
10 you've met, who every week are somewhere in the State of
11 Colorado.

12 MS. FLORES: Rural folks, yeah, but --

13 MR. ASP: Not -- not just rural, they hit
14 all the (inaudible), so you get your urbans, they are at
15 the same time, and then they send a report to me every time
16 they get back. So I'll get two to three of those a week on
17 those. I have not seen this issue in their reports back,
18 but like you said, let's don't take anything for granted,
19 let's reach out, and see exactly what they feel.

20 MS. FLORES: Commissioner, I think what
21 happened last year was that a form was -- was sent out,
22 asking how many people took the test, how many people
23 didn't take the test, and ask questions such as this. That
24 was -- I talked to -- to Commissioner Hammond about --
25 about that.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I just think we
2 followed doing that, something -- something on that order.
3 Not to complicate it again.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Might help.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Kausky. Excuse me.

7 MS. KAUSKY: Mr. Chair. So every year, we
8 hold some debriefing sessions with our District Assessment
9 Coordinators, and we do have questionnaires that go out to
10 our DACs and our test administrators, and we can be sure
11 through a variety of avenues to be sure to ask this
12 question. With the set three weeks, with the flexibility,
13 did that work for you? What would you like to see?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Don't ask the students
15 because then we'll get accused of having a survey.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. No, no, no, we
17 won't -- we won't ask them (inaudible). But also we wanna
18 be sure that in that creation, we didn't miss something,
19 right? I mean, so we do need to hear and make sure that,
20 you know, it would -- it worked for the folks and they
21 don't need adjustments, and if they do need adjustments,
22 we'll make 'em.

23 MS. FLORES: Okay. I think what I heard
24 from -- I think there were two comments, but I think one of



1 the comments included the notion that for students who
2 needed accommodations, that was part of their concern.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I -- if I understood
5 that.

6 MS. KAUSKY: So for students who need
7 accommodations, they still have the same number of
8 sessions, so we're talking about depending on the grade
9 level, seven or 10 sessions. No student should have to be
10 doing more than one session in a day. Now, schools and
11 districts may choose to do that, right? I mean, there are
12 some folks who are saying, "You know what? My kids, they
13 can do that, right? I can give my kid more than one
14 session a day with my eighth graders, they can plug
15 through, and they can choose to do that." But schools and
16 districts really have a lot of flexibility in determining
17 what would in the window their schedules look like.

18 MS. FLORES: Thank you very much. I just
19 wanted to not let that one right from the wrong.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel, I think
21 we'll take whatever time is necessary on this, because this
22 testing is a very important issue.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm receiving feedback that
24 whatever adjustments were made last year legislatively,
25 that it hasn't reduced the amount of hours of testing, and



1 we had a member of public yesterday come and speak to us
2 during public comment, talking about kids' testing with
3 three minute breaks for hours. So I'm wondering -- I mean,
4 so I'm getting anecdotal feedback that there really has
5 been very little relief and that -- that it's not the case
6 that, you know, this is -- that the testing windows are
7 allowing students to have the kind of breaks they need and
8 that instruction isn't being interrupted and so forth. So
9 I think that reaching out proactively is really important
10 because I -- I don't -- the anecdotal feedback I'm getting
11 is not that they've gotten relief, and they're still very
12 impressive.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further comments?
14 Committee -- that's maybe could -- could, if you know the
15 answer to that question, Ms. Kausky is it in the testing
16 policy, I mean, the story we heard about the three-minute
17 break after for fifth graders for, however -- how many
18 hours of -- of testing, is that a testing policy of
19 Pearson's and was that inaccurate? Or?

20 MS. KAUSKY: So -- I'm -- I'm gonna, I -- I
21 wrote a note here. I'm gonna suggest or ask if you would
22 like to actually have a study session that will look at
23 things like the actual Science test.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 MS. KAUSKY: Look at some of the
2 administration procedures. I know some of what you heard
3 yesterday was talking about the testing time and what
4 happened, and frankly, it is more complicated than I would
5 like for it to be. For the typical student, testing time
6 was reduced by about 90 minutes. For students who need
7 extended time, that -- the amount of change may not have
8 been as significant. So we can look at that to make sure
9 that we're really clear about it. The other piece that's
10 coming into play is the field testing that occurs. Last
11 year there wasn't field testing. This year, there is field
12 testing.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Which field testing?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So that is -- before we put
15 an item on a test live, we wanna make sure it's a good
16 item, and so that goes through field testing to make sure
17 that it's actually assessing what we expect it to assess to
18 make sure that we haven't interjected some unintended bias.
19 And then once we have done that field testing, we can
20 review an item and we do that with educators. They can
21 kind of say, "Yeah, it's ready to go. Put it on a live
22 test." So for ELA, there wasn't that field testing last
23 year. There is that field testing this year, so some of
24 our students are engaging in that. And I think that has



1 complicated how do we interpret the amount of testing
2 that's going on.

3 MS. FLORES: And so how much more field test
4 -- I mean, how much does it take for the field -- the field
5 portion of the testing?

6 MS. KAUSKY: So for students who are
7 participating in that field test, it varies by grade, but
8 about 110 minutes is what's allotted within a school. And
9 what we asked for was not to have more than one grade doing
10 that per year. So it's not that third, fourth, and fifth
11 graders are doing that it's one of those grade levels, and
12 then the kids should get relieved the following year.
13 Conversations are happening with the PARCC states about how
14 to do field testing in the future. Colorado, I will share
15 with you and I'm going to guess that in the commissioners
16 heard once or twice. We've been relatively vocal about
17 need to be sure that we come up with the most effective,
18 efficient, and least burdensome field testing plan as
19 possible.

20 MR. ASP: Mr. (inaudible) and just to be
21 clear, field testing is not a -- is not a part of smarter
22 balance. It is -- it's a concept of quality test
23 development prep. You need to try those out before you --
24 you go wide with them so.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.



1 MS. RANKIN: Is the field testing done for
2 every subject area that we test or is it different each
3 year?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's the beginning.

5 MS. RANKIN: I'm not even close to beginning
6 the thought. Are the parents part of the determination as
7 to whether their student is field tested because I can see
8 a parent getting very confused and adding all of this
9 together which gets worse as with time.

10 MS. KAUSKY: So as Commissioner indicated,
11 field testing is very much a part of a typical testing
12 program. It happens. What is different with our ELA field
13 testing is that it is very distinct. So frankly, there is
14 also Math field testing occurring. It's a couple of items
15 embedded within the rest of the test. We do the same thing
16 for Science, we do the same thing for Social Studies. We
17 would do the same thing with any tests that we created on
18 our own. With the ELA the issue is -- is that you have
19 those passage based items, so by default one item for Math
20 may only take three minutes, but those ELA sessions are
21 extensive.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

23 MS. KAUSKY: So it's much more identifiable
24 and frankly much more impactful and this is not -- it --
25 it's a struggle always to try to figure out how to do this



1 and how to do it well and make sure that we're putting in
2 front of kids items that we're confident about.

3 MS. RANKIN: So because you field test, the
4 next year, is the test changed because of the field
5 testing?

6 MS. KAUSKY: Every year the test is changed.
7 Every year there's -- there's a refreshing of items, and so
8 if you didn't field test you would have the exact same test
9 year after year and then you'd run into other issues.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. So yes, so Dr.
11 Scheffel then -- Elizabeth has reminded me that we are
12 behind schedule so.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: What do you mean by
14 impactful?

15 MS. KAUSKY: I'm saying that when I -- when
16 you asked the question how long is that field test? And I
17 had to say to you 110 minutes, I would suggest that that's
18 impactful.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes, thank you.

20 MS. KAUSKY: Whereas when you're --

21 MS. BURDSALL: Three minutes.

22 MS. KAUSKY: Exactly.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's a lot.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.



1 MS. KAUSKY: Just being ridiculously honest
2 with you guys.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think the -- I think the
4 answer to the question about the -- about the study session
5 is that we should schedule that. I -- I think this is one
6 of the two or three most important issues that we will deal
7 with and -- and we should. We need to deal with a lot more
8 effectively than we have as a Board and hopefully we'll get
9 that scheduled in between now and then. The Board will
10 review the -- the -- the Social Studies and Science tests
11 on an individualized basis. Thank you very much. Okay.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, we are behind
14 so why don't we proceed directly to the recognition, United
15 States Youth Program. We have people waiting and I will
16 apologize to them when they come in.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're here.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, they are here.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh they're fast, in the
20 assessment.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh yeah. They just
22 couldn't help themselves away.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They have a field test
24 to go back to. Yeah.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Let's see. Okay,
2 Commissioner on the United States Youth Program.

3 MR. ASP: Members of the Board, we are
4 pleased to be honoring both the United States Senate Youth
5 scholarship winners. At this time I'll call Interim
6 Associate Commissioner Alyssa Pearson to come forward. Ms
7 Pearson.

8 MS. PEARSON: Thanks. Good morning. Today
9 we would like to honor DeAnna Christensen and Se Young
10 Cheong, the Colorado delegates for the 54th annual United
11 States Senate Youth Program. Selection for the US. Senate
12 Youth Program is based on a student's outstanding abilities
13 and demonstrated qualities of leadership in an elected or
14 appointed high school student office. In addition to
15 outstanding leadership abilities and a strong commitment to
16 volunteer work. Two delegates are chosen from in each
17 state the District of Columbia and the Department of
18 Defense Education Activity.

19 The student leaders gathered in Washington
20 DC from March 5th to 12th for a week of intensive study of
21 the federal government, and in particular the US Senate.
22 Speakers for the Washington Week program included the
23 President of the United States Barrack Obama, US Senators
24 including Senator Cory Gardner from Colorado, Congressional
25 representatives, ambassadors, Supreme Court justices, and



1 NASSP administrators. In addition, each delegate was told
2 they would receive a \$5,000 college scholarship. The
3 scholarship in addition to the program week in Washington
4 DC is made possible by a grant from the William Randolph
5 Hearst Foundation.

6 While attending one of the events during
7 Washington Week the delegates were notified that the Board
8 had voted to increase the scholarship amount to \$10,000 for
9 each delegate to surprise them all while attending. Of the
10 applications received DeAnna and Se Young rose to the top
11 in demonstrating high academic achievement, leadership
12 ability and a commitment to public service.

13 To give you a little background on each of
14 the awardees, DeAnna Christensen is a senior at William J.
15 Palmer High School in Colorado Springs, Colorado and is
16 ranked first in her class. She's currently the President
17 of the Colorado Springs Teen Court Student Advisory Board,
18 Co-chair for the Colorado Youth Advisory Council, and Vice
19 President of the National Honor Society. Following
20 graduation, DeAnna plans to earn her law degree, become a
21 prosecuting attorney, and then a judge. Her ultimate goal
22 is to be appointed as a US Supreme Court Justice.

23 Se Young Cheong, a senior at the D'Evelyn
24 Junior/Senior High School, serves as the student body
25 president. With an interest in youth governance, he is



1 also on the Colorado Youth Advisory Council and the State
2 Farm Youth Advisory Board. He found an interest in public
3 service as an intern for Habitat for Humanity of Metro
4 Denver. He's also an all state swimmer and an attorney at
5 Vermont trial. Next year he will be studying in the
6 Huntsman Program, an International Studies and Business at
7 the University of Pennsylvania where he will be actively
8 searching for opportunities to engage himself in public
9 policy and diplomacy.

10 Both Ms. Christensen and Mr. Young epitomize
11 what our nation needs for the next generation of leaders.
12 A person who challenges themselves academically, cares
13 about people, serves their community, and is willing to do
14 the hard work required to make our world a better place.
15 Please help me recognizing DeAnna and Se Young as they come
16 forward and say a few words.

17 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Good morning.

18 ALL: Good morning.

19 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Chairman Durham, am I
20 saying it right?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, ma'am.

22 MS. CHRISTENSEN: And Board Members. I just
23 wanted to say thank you for everyone involved in affording
24 me this opportunity. This was such an amazing experience.
25 Going into Washington Week, I didn't know what to expect.



1 I was a little nervous. I was excited, but it was one of
2 the best weeks that I have ever experienced. It was just
3 such a week that was marked with positivity. I can tell
4 you listening to President Obama, I don't -- I didn't know
5 what he was gonna say, I didn't know what he was gonna
6 feel, but he just had such optimism that I didn't expect.
7 And that's what I saw throughout the week, from Senator
8 Cory Gardner, to just all of the different people we
9 listened to.

10 There is such an optimism and positivity,
11 and it just really inspired me and makes me have, you know,
12 a lot of faith in my future and in the future of this
13 nation and Colorado. And I met so many wonderful people
14 and I, you know, I'm just so excited to go off to college
15 and take what I've learned. You know, take my Colorado
16 pride and you know, just further this passion that I have
17 for public policy and everything that you do. And I just
18 appreciate everything, and thank you so much for everything
19 that you had to do with allowing me to go. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

21 MR. YOUNG: Good morning Mr. Chair and
22 members of the Board. I'd like to begin by thanking you
23 all and the entire Colorado Department of Education for
24 selecting myself and my fellow delegate -- delegate DeAnna
25 Christensen to represent Colorado at the United States



1 Senate Youth Program. It was both an honor and a privilege
2 to be in our nation's capital representing our beautiful
3 state. My time at Washington Week was a surreal experience
4 that I even now had difficulty articulating. Simply would
5 put, it was a life changing experience. In fact, I want
6 nothing more than to have that week last forever.

7 From the moment that I stepped into the
8 Mayflower Hotel to when I said my final farewell, there was
9 a constant sense of belonging and overwhelming joy. I was
10 surrounded by 103 of the most interesting and welcoming
11 students in the country. The debate sometimes got out of
12 hands and discussing and dissenting political views sparked
13 controversy, but these moments just added to the excitement
14 of knowing that there was constantly discussion be hand and
15 sometimes a debate to be won.

16 In fact, one of the first people that I met
17 was a delegate from New Mexico, David Rivero, who owned and
18 operated a food truck in a couple states while also
19 engaging in student government and following local
20 politics. It amazed me to see the diversity and
21 versatility that each of the delegates possessed. No one
22 person was the same. Everybody was unique. One of my
23 closest friends there was actually a delegate from Oklahoma
24 who preferred to only communicate through rhetorical
25 questions and adamant uses of the word 'suck'.



1 Yet the same individual was constantly at
2 the center of debates drawing in his experiences from local
3 campaigns that he had managed. Additionally, it was an
4 honor to have had the opportunity to be in the company of
5 so many public officials, but not -- including not, but not
6 limited to, Justice Ginsburg, President Barrack Obama,
7 Senator Bennet, Senator Gardner and Secretary Ernest Moniz.
8 The knowledge that I have gained from these individuals is
9 invaluable. Although I wish to relive the moments I spent
10 with these inspiring individuals, my memory of them now
11 exists as an accumulation of quotes and notes that I took
12 during their speeches and Q&A sessions.

13 For -- for example from Professor Herbst,
14 scaling criticism of the media as he said, "It's not
15 surprising that our national conversation is deteriorating.
16 To President Obama's statement that bipartisanship for the
17 sake of bipartisanship is not effective. There are many
18 lessons to be learned and thoughts to be chewed upon."
19 However, through meeting these speakers, I did not just
20 learn about the central government and its surrounding
21 entities, but about myself as well. Secretary of Senate
22 Julie Adams affirmed for us that public service is a noble
23 calling. Senator Gardner installed a sense of belonging as
24 he told us. "You don't need to act like you belong because
25 you do belong. You didn't -- you belong in DC, you belong



1 in your school, you belong in this nation. Not as passive
2 observers, but as active participants who will solve these
3 great challenges."

4 My United States Senate Youth experience was
5 clearly life changing. However, it did not end with the
6 conclusion of Washington Week. It continues in the form of
7 relationships that I've developed with both the public
8 officials that I have met and the delegates that I have
9 met. In fact, I've had the opportunity over the past few
10 weeks to be reunited with delegates from all across the
11 country, as I've traveled from Arizona to Pennsylvania to
12 New York. It's reassuring to know that wherever I am in
13 the country, there is a USSYP delegate a couple hours away
14 from me at most.

15 And finally, I would like to thank Ms. Lynn
16 Bamberry for accompanying DeAnna and myself to Washington
17 DC. And constantly serving as a resource both when I was
18 applying to the Senate Youth Program and when I had been
19 chosen as a delegate. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. On behalf of
21 the State Board I would like to extend our congratulations
22 and thanks for the work you do to be an advocate and a
23 voice for youth as well as the leadership you demonstrated
24 to your fellow students. Congratulations. And then we're
25 gonna take a 10 minute break for pictures and -- and a



1 short break. So Ms. Christensen, if you'd like to join us
2 up there, we'll get these chairs out of the way and --
3 (Meeting adjourned)



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 October, 2018.

/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