



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 9, 2016, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 9, 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: We will call the meeting
2 to order before the roll call. Let me mention that Dr.
3 Schroeder is recovering -- I'm sorry to be Dr. Schroeder is
4 recovering from surgery at home and is expected to return
5 in time for the next meeting of the Board of Directors of
6 the Board and I'm sure we all wish her a speedy recovery.
7 So with that we'll start and Ms. Cordial would you please -
8 -

9 MS. FLORES: She still --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, you're still -- you're
11 -- you're trying to make sure we're on. I see. And well
12 all -- reminded you all speak onto your microphones and
13 answering the roll. If you would call the roll please.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you Mr. Chair. All
15 right. Board Member Flores?

16 MS. FLORES: Here.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

18 MS. GOFF: Here.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

20 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

22 MS. RANKIN: Here.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder is out.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Excused, excused.

2 MS. CORDIAL: And Chairman Durham.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Here. Quorum is present
4 and will proceed now to the Pledge of Allegiance and Dr.
5 Scheffel if you would mind leading us in the Pledge of
6 Allegiance.

7 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the Flag of
8 United States of America and to the Republic of which it
9 stands. One Nation under God, invincible, with liberty and
10 justice for all.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Now, we'll proceed with --
12 yes let's see. Now, we'll plead to -- to the approve the
13 agenda. Is there a motion to approve the agenda?

14 MS. RANKIN: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Rankin.

16 MS. RANKIN: I make a motion to approve the
17 agenda.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And moved the agenda
19 approved deserve a second?

20 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mazanec has been moved and
22 seconded is the objection to the approval of the agenda.
23 Saying none the motion is adopted by a vote of six to
24 nothing. Next item would be the consent to agenda, Ms.
25 Rankin.



1 MS. RANKIN: I move to place following
2 matters on the consent agenda. 16.03 regarding
3 disciplinary proceedings concerning a license charge number
4 201-5-EC 795 direct department staff and the state attorney
5 general's office to prepare the document necessary to
6 request a formal hearing for the revocation of a license
7 holders professional teacher license pursuant to Section
8 22-4-104 Colorado Revised Statutes.

9 16.04 regarding disciplinary proceedings
10 concerning a credential charge number 2015-EC 1501 direct
11 department of staff, and state attorney general's office to
12 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing
13 for the license pursuit -- for the revocation of the
14 credential holders professional teacher license pursuant to
15 Section 22-4-104 Colorado Revised Statutes.

16 16.05 regarding disciplinary proceedings
17 concerning a credential charge number 2015-EC 1729. Direct
18 department staff of the state attorney general's office to
19 prepare the document necessary to request a formal hearing
20 for the revocation of the credential holders professional
21 teacher license pursuant to Section 22-4-104 Colorado
22 revised statute.

23 16.06 regarding disciplinary proceedings
24 concerning unauthorize -- authorization charge number 2016-
25 EC 109 direct department staff and the state attorney



1 general's office to prepare the documents necessary to
2 request formal hearing for the revocation of a holder's
3 authorization pursuant to Section 22-60.5-108 Colorado
4 Revised Statutes.

5 16.07 regarding disciplinary proceedings
6 concerning an application charge number to 2016-EC 983.
7 Direct department staff to issue notice of denial an appeal
8 rights to the applicant pursuant to Section 24-4-104
9 Colorado Revised Statutes.

10 16.08 appendix 6 initial emergency
11 authorization request as set forth in the published agenda.

12 16.09 approve Western State Colorado
13 University's request for reauthorization. As a provider of
14 traditional and alternative Educator Preparation programs
15 as set forth in the published agenda.

16 17.01 approved Denver Public Schools
17 innovation application on behalf of Bear Valley
18 International School as set forth in the published agenda.

19 17.02. Approve Denver Public Schools
20 innovation application on behalf of Kepner Beacon Middle
21 School as set forth in the published agenda.

22 17.03 approved Denver Public Schools
23 innovation application on behalf of McAuliffe Manual Middle
24 School as set forth in the published agenda.



1 17.04 approve the Charter School Institute's
2 request for waivers on behalf of GVA North plan as set
3 forth in the published agenda. This is the end of the
4 consent agenda.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second motion
6 to approve the consent agenda? Dr. Scheffel second's the
7 motion. Any discussion? Saying none is objection to the
8 adoption of the motion proving that consent agenda. Saying
9 none motion is declared adopted. We will now proceed to
10 public comment to Ms. Cordial. Oh, right in front of me
11 here. Let me say we got three minute limitation and -- and
12 Ms. Cordial will be the official time keeper. We'll start
13 with Katy Anderson from Strive, Katy if you identify
14 yourself and who you represent please.

15 MS. ANDERSON: (Inaudible).

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please speak up.

17 MS. ANDERSON: I'm Katy Anderson. Mr. Chair
18 and members of the State Board of Education, thank you for
19 the opportunity to present for you today. My name is
20 Kathleen Anderson and here representing myself. I've been
21 teaching for Colorado for five years. I have a bachelors
22 degree in (inaudible). To include teachers in the revision
23 process of the Colorado academic standards as they are the
24 ones on the ground steeped in teaching the standards day in
25 and day out.



1 This past March I was hired as a founding
2 sixth grade teacher at Strive Prep Kepner in Southwest
3 Denver. We began year one of our turnaround initiative
4 this past August. Our students and families in the
5 Southwest Denver Community have been underserved for more
6 than 20 years as Kepner has been ranked in the bottom one
7 percent of middle schools in Colorado for over two decades.
8 I am a teacher who enters my sixth grade English Language
9 Arts classroom every morning knowing that many of my
10 students are reading well below grade level. Of the 27
11 students in my first grade either class 19, of these
12 scholars are reading at or below a third grade level. Five
13 of my sixth grade students cannot read.

14 As these pieces of data swam in my mind all
15 day long, I can honestly say that I am oftentimes
16 terrified. Terrified that I'm not going to give absolute
17 best instruction during every second of every minute of
18 every instructional hour we have together. However, I can
19 promise you that this fear of doing any of the students
20 wrong for any second of our learning time together is
21 something that motivates me to spend hours writing,
22 revising, and editing my lessons. Since the first week in
23 September I have spent nearly eight hours every Saturday
24 crafting English language arts lessons for me in English
25 Language learners constantly wondering these questions. Do



1 my objectives aligned to a particular standard? As my
2 guiding question align with the standard? Does my exit
3 ticket align with the standard? Do my text depending
4 questions truly get it higher standard that my students
5 need to master? Some of you hearing this may ask yourself;
6 why bother aligning everything to these standards if it
7 takes so much work. I'm here to tell you that while the
8 bar is high and some of my students are low, I know that my
9 kids deserve every -- deserve high expectations and are
10 capable of reaching them.

11 I know that while the standards should be
12 continuously revised and improved, the fact that we move
13 from the old reading and writing standards to reading
14 writing and communicating will better prepare students for
15 success in life. As you consider the process for reviewing
16 the Colorado academic standards, it is imperative that
17 teachers have a seat at the table, and I urge you all to
18 ensure that happens. Thank you for your time today.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Next item
20 should be and be person signed up to testify or to speak,
21 okay. Very good. We'll move on to Ms. Bert -- Ms. Cordial
22 the -- your -- your director's of report please.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you Mr. Chair. Good
24 morning, Mr. Chairman Durham, members of the Board and
25 Interim Commissioner Anthes. As another reminder please



1 remember to turn your microphones on, if you turn them off
2 when you are not speaking. For those of you needing to
3 connect CDEs, I guess wireless locate CDE hotspot and the
4 password Silver capital S and your Board pockets. You have
5 the following materials, your events calendar and quick
6 glance expense report. Also in your pockets or available
7 onboard docs are the following materials: for 9.01 you
8 have the draft 2017 legislative priorities.

9 For 10.01 you have a memo regarding the
10 standards review revision process plan accompanying
11 PowerPoint draft proposal for the standards review and
12 revision plan. The technical assistance response document
13 and Colorado Revised Statutes document for 22-7-105 CRS.

14 For item 12.01 you have of a memo regarding
15 the accounting and reporting rulemaking hearing or
16 redlining clean copy of those rules, or rules to crosswalk
17 statute in response to comments document.

18 For items 12.02 and 12.03 you have a memo
19 regarding the college entrance exam. Once you see R30-1-46
20 and the administration of the ACT assessment on a national
21 testate 1 CCR 301-54 rulemaking hearings to be combined
22 into one rule. A red line and clean copy of those rules
23 and the rules to statute crosswalk.

24 For item 12.04 you have a memo regarding the
25 administration, certification and oversight of Colorado



1 online programs rulemaking hearing, a red line and clean
2 copy of those rules and the rules to cross -- rules to
3 statute crosswalk.

4 For item 14.01 you have a memo regarding
5 Pete's Plateau waiver request. Pete's Plateau's revised --
6 revise rational and replacement plan. Their stakeholder
7 communication assigned local board resolution. Their
8 revised kindergarten assessment and kindergarten
9 instructional plan, and CDE staffs response document to
10 Pete's Plateau waiver request.

11 For item 15.01 you have a memo regarding the
12 read Act Budget planning update. The accompanying
13 PowerPoint in a summary of the Read fun usage and reporting
14 requirements.

15 For item 16.08 you have a memo regarding the
16 six initial emergency authorization requests. For item
17 16.09 you have two memos regarding the Western State
18 Colorado University's request for authorizations for its
19 preparation programs.

20 For item 17.01 you have a memo regarding
21 Denver Public Schools innovation application request on
22 behalf of Bear Valley International School and supporting
23 materials pertaining to their request.

24 For Item 17.02 you have a memo regarding
25 DPS's Innovation application request on behalf of Kepner



1 Beacon Middle School and supporting materials pertaining to
2 their request.

3 For Item 17.03 you have a memo regarding
4 Denver Public Schools innovation application request on
5 behalf of McAuliffe Manual Middle School and supporting
6 materials pertaining to their request.

7 For item 17.04 you have a memo regarding the
8 Charter School Institute's request for waivers on behalf of
9 GVA North plan and supporting materials pertaining to their
10 request.

11 For tomorrow Item 4.01 you have a memo
12 regarding the Every Student Succeeds Act update. The
13 accompanying PowerPoint, the SSA Spoke and Hub committee
14 report, and updates for standards from September 29th --
15 I'm sorry August 29th, September 8th, and September 22nd.
16 And then you also have the title program fact sheets in the
17 title program's table. And for item 5.01 you have a
18 district by district 2016 to '17 to 2017, '18 of the
19 Governor's November 2016 budget request. And that
20 concludes my report.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Any questions,
22 Ms. Cordial? Seeing none. Thank you very much Ms.
23 Cordial. Commissioner Anthes your report please.

24 MS. ANTHERS: Yes. Good morning, Mr.
25 Chairman, members of the Board. Nice to be here. I have a



1 quick commercial update today. We are mostly focused on
2 the accountability request to reconsider process as we've
3 been talking to you all about over the past several months.
4 The final request to reconsider we've been working with the
5 districts over the last several weeks on their drafts that
6 they provided to us that we could give them feedback and
7 provide any guidance to them as necessary.

8 The final request to reconsider is were due
9 yesterday. We received 144 of them, so we will now be
10 reviewing all of those it'll -- it'll be quite a heavy
11 workload. And so that's -- that's a large part of our
12 focus right now. As you know we continue to be focused on
13 the development of the ESA plan, hosting all of the Spoke
14 committee hearings, starting to draft plans, having the Hub
15 committee meetings and-- and so forth. Lastly, I've been
16 starting to visit all of the districts that are on the
17 final year of that turnaround clock, and spending the day
18 with them so that I get to know them a little bit better as
19 well. So have -- I have just started that. I've also been
20 visiting the ones that have just come off the clock to --
21 to learn a little bit there as well. So we want to -- we
22 want to see what we can do in terms of learning from those
23 that have been successful. So with that, that's all I have
24 today Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions of Commissioner
2 Anthes. Saying none we will proceed then to item nine.
3 Legislative priorities and Ms. Mel is not yet here.

4 MS. ANTHES: I just sent her a text, so
5 hopefully she'll be over shortly by but we can --

6 MS. CORDIAL: Would you like to just take up
7 your Board reports at this time?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can correct one thing
9 I said actually.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm good.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I got a text from
12 Scheffel.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It won't take a half
15 side. It will be really quick. We actually had 144 drafts
16 for request to reconsider but we have not tallied the final
17 number that -- that submitted. So it'll be around there
18 but we're not exactly sure.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, before we proceed --
20 do proceed, I'm not sure but we have Sarah who's a board
21 member in District 38 and I did get a text from her saying
22 she was caught in traffic and would like to engage in
23 public comment. Is that correct? Why don't you come up
24 and introduce yourself as long as we had a schedule we'll
25 go back to that particular item. And thank you for the



1 text and you arrive just in the nick of time. Please
2 proceed and introduce yourself.

3 MS. SAMPAIO: Thank you. My name is Sarah
4 Sampaio. I'm from Monument. I have three kids in school
5 there and I'm not a School Board Member. I'm here not on
6 behalf of the School Board but on behalf of my constituent
7 that elected me and my children. I'm here to comment on
8 the standards survey that you have out currently for people
9 to participate in. We have encouraged our community to
10 participate and I've had some feedback I'd like to share.

11 Personally, the other day I got online to
12 take the survey you have out and I was disappointed with
13 the survey questions. I don't know if you've had an
14 opportunity as members of the Board to take a look at it
15 but I think it exemplifies the problem with data-driven
16 decision making. Surveys are only as good as the question
17 and answer choices. So let's look at a couple of the
18 questions from the survey I just did a screenshot.
19 Question number 6, in your opinion taken together, the
20 Colorado academic standards in all 10 content areas are
21 relevant to the students college and career readiness and
22 then you get to choose disagree, strongly disagree in the
23 scale. Relevant? Of course they're relevant. Are they
24 conducive too? No. And so the way you answer the question
25 is going to give a false impression and I've had people say



1 to me that they don't wanna do the survey because the
2 answer choices are not giving them an option that reflects
3 their views about the standards. Comprehensive, what's the
4 next thing you could choose? Well, they're way too
5 comprehensive.

6 That's the problem but that's not an option
7 here. They're detailed enough? Yes, they are too detailed
8 but that's not one of the answer choices. So I think you
9 get an idea. How rigorous are they? That's part of the
10 problem. It's assuming that the people answering the
11 survey buy into the premise altogether of the academic
12 standards. So it's not gonna be a helpful result from the
13 get go. Those of us who aren't happy with the standards,
14 it's not going to be reflected in the survey. In my
15 personal opinion after consulting with teachers and
16 experts, the standards are too prescriptive.

17 They dictate curriculum too closely and
18 several subjects are embedded with a social engineering
19 ideology that are designed to shape the attitudes, values,
20 and beliefs of the next generation. I have a print out
21 from the English Language Arts Standards and it says under
22 the nature of reading, writing and communicating, number 1,
23 readers like to read multiple perspectives because it
24 causes them to think about their own thinking and be clear
25 about what they really believe. So our kids are supposed



1 to like questioning their core values. Is this our state
2 standard?

3 In America, the freedom to shape this
4 according the -- the -- the standards of the values of the
5 next generation is according to each individual's religious
6 or political persuasion. It's fundamental to our
7 constitutional freedoms, top-down mandating of educational
8 standards that shape how the next generation thinks about
9 topics under the guise of critical analytical thinking
10 strips this country of the cornerstone of freedom, the
11 freedom of thought. Please allow free market competition
12 in education and do not mandating control what the next
13 generation learns. I'll stop there because I know my time
14 is up. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Sampaio.

16 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, we generally
18 shouldn't Dr. Flores for --

19 MS. FLORES: May we have a copy of that?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. If you could just
21 provide it to Ms. Cordial and she'll copy it and we'll get
22 it distributed.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which part? What I
24 read was --

25 MS. FLORES: The whole thing.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Both of you have.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, thank you very much.
4 Thank you, Dr. Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, let's see it. Now
7 we're still ahead of schedule. So what -- what else could
8 we do? We could do Board reports. That's the item 18 we
9 are ahead.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're almost done with
11 the day.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Let's start
13 down Ms. Mazanec, you're here first.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Well, first I had the
15 opportunity to attend an event sponsored by the Rural
16 Alliance in Burlington couple of weeks ago, that was a very
17 nice affair, it was very nice to get to meet a lot of
18 people there. And I guess the only other thing I would
19 like to say is congratulations to our members, Chairman
20 Durham, Director Rankin, and Director Scheffel for their
21 successful re-election.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

23 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Caught me off guard I
24 was planning to think through this all day. Thank you.
25 Highlights, I think I've -- I attended the Adams County



1 Youth Initiative. It's called a catalyst for change
2 breakfast. This is their first annual event to start
3 publicizing all of the joint community, and business, and
4 school district activities to bring kids through school
5 years cradle to career with the supports that let them --
6 let everybody know families as well what's available to
7 students with the goal of making sure that kids are well
8 prepared to start school, that they have the resources and
9 supports they need during the regular school years, and
10 that they're prepared to go to college. It really is
11 they're following our -- our state's mission for that.

12 Very well attended higher -- higher than
13 expected attendance. This was primarily from Adams County
14 folks and activists and elected officials and other --
15 other organizations. So it was -- it was delightful,
16 everyone's quite enthused. That's the main highlight. I
17 think -- I don't know whether we reported a lot on it.
18 Angelika and I did attend Naseby's last annual meeting. I
19 believe that was after our Board meeting and got state
20 Board perspectives from all over the country, another well
21 attended event.

22 Primary topic was -- was ESSA and some of
23 it's ramifications. So I will be dispersing throughout our
24 time some information that other -- that other states have
25 been considering and -- and some of the reactions to that.



1 Also Adams County and both JeffCo only in different ways
2 are starting to -- to look at courts budgets which are hot
3 topic now but how to -- how to continue what kinds of
4 innovative activities and goals they have but also is
5 looking at some different ways of going about it. I had a
6 long conversation with a parent recently about changing,
7 the word change can be an off putter but I don't think it
8 is in this case, to really look at some ways when we're
9 particularly high school and we are encouraged to look at
10 ways high school can change.

11 So I -- I find those kind of conversations
12 interesting and interesting because there's still a lot of
13 opportunity to think about things but we also have a
14 timeline. So we're looking at some -- some crunch times on
15 what -- on the one hand but time to consider as well as we
16 can on the other. So those are mainly what -- what I've
17 been experiencing on -- on our work level that proceeded.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Goff. Dr.
19 Scheffel.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I've just been out
21 meeting the public and just doing a lot of attending events
22 speaking and it's just been a great opportunity really to
23 hear from the public to be engaged in this work. I don't
24 think they formally called my race yet but feeling really
25 good about it and just appreciate the opportunities to



1 serve on the State Board of Education for all the great
2 support I've gotten. And so thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: Thank you. I have visited a
5 couple of schools. One of which was Hope Online. I
6 visited during their (inaudible) activities day when they
7 were working on art -- art projects, especially they were
8 decorating a skull, sugar skull. They were also dancing.
9 I think that they had the Clio dance group coming in to
10 help the kids dance. So that was very, very enlightening.
11 I like the arts and I'm glad that Hope Online is doing
12 this.

13 Also, I attended the CTE annual equity
14 conference and I was impressed with all the subjects and
15 the people who were very knowledgeable and were explaining
16 new rules and regs. So I hope that it's -- I really hope
17 that kind of the public maybe gets a little chance to
18 participate next year because I think it's a great
19 conference. And so I hope we continue that. Also, I have
20 been attending the Hope committee meetings and I think
21 that's an interesting process that we're going through.
22 And we -- I've been learning a lot from, you know, what the
23 community and reports from the Spokesman and such. I've
24 also I have been getting calls about, you know, some of
25 these issues as -- as well. Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Flores.
2 Ms. Rankin.

3 MS. RANKIN: One of the jobs that I believe
4 we have as Board Members and I -- I embrace this job is
5 getting out in the community and educating them as to what
6 the State Board of Education does and their
7 responsibilities within the state. With that in mind, I
8 visited with Matt Hamilton, a School Board Member in
9 Roaring Fork School District, he wants to set up a meeting
10 with his whole Board and include me in that to pursue some
11 of these educational ideas that I'm talking about. I also
12 attended the West Slopes superintendents meeting, where
13 they talked about the supplemental online blended learning
14 opportunities and a lot of them enhanced by House Bill 16-
15 1222 last year for rural students to be able to access some
16 of the advanced courses or courses that their school does
17 not offer in a blended learning situation.

18 Right now there are 664 course offerings and
19 they expect to have at least 1,000 by the end of this year.
20 So that's -- that's pretty exciting. And they gave me
21 copies that Mrs. Cordial just passed out to all the Board
22 Members about these courses that anyone can access from any
23 school but it's through the BOCES and you don't have to be
24 a member of BOCES to do that. Routt County, I met with Tim
25 Corrigan, he's a newly elected county commissioner. I just



1 briefly spoke to him about the Peabody resolution, the one
2 million dollars that the state gave because of the Peabody
3 closure there.

4 They now have gotten some of the money back
5 from Peabody for taxes and they are in the process, I'm
6 sure Leanne Emm can talk to us further about that of
7 returning them to the state so that CDE, so that other
8 schools that might be in the same situation will have a
9 fund there that we can grant awards to. I attended a
10 Carbondale Trustees meeting and updated them on upcoming
11 decision making in January from the Board including
12 turnaround in commissioner turnout's status and
13 commissioner selection. I also visited Hope Online. I was
14 invited to their literacy day to read a book on my favorite
15 book when I was five years old as a churken duoose (ph),
16 part chicken, part turkey, part duck, and part goose, yeah
17 and that was a lot of fun, I enjoyed that.

18 I met with CDE directors last week for
19 further explanation of various waivers in turn around
20 schools and what we have to do next year. I find myself
21 continually in the education process to learn what it is my
22 job responsibilities are and to go in-depth with them.
23 With that in mind, I met with Joyce (inaudible) and was
24 able to review Park ELA tests in grades three through nine.
25 Also math was three through nine available, I only got



1 through grade three. Rep Rankin heard that I was going to
2 do this and he joined me but he got through algebra. So he
3 is little smarter than I am in that. I also wanna bring to
4 the attention that I read online about school funding
5 Independence Institute, Ross Izzard has an excellent
6 publication out. If anyone wants to learn about school
7 funding in-depth, it's an excellent manual for that and I
8 really appreciate all the work that went into that.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Ms. Rankin. I
10 would just like to say a couple of things. One is that I'm
11 honored to have the opportunity to serve for a term on the
12 State Board as a result of this election and I'm
13 appreciative of those who showed confidence in me last
14 night with the election returns. I had the opportunity to
15 visit Ellicott schools which are about 45 minutes east of
16 Colorado Springs and are still in El Paso County. It's a
17 pretty good sized county and me with their superintendent
18 and staff Dr. Patrick Colleen. Every time I go to one of
19 these smaller rural schools, you get -- renews your faith
20 in what's getting done out there, people would have more
21 than their share of challenges, everything from
22 transportation issues to critical mass issues of enough
23 students to be able to offer a wide -- a wide range of
24 courses, that how they meet and deal successfully with



1 those challenges and how committed those people are it's
2 gratifying to watch that in action.

3 And I think maybe one of these days we ought
4 to maybe have a State Board meeting in a small rural
5 school, so everybody gets the opportunity to just take a
6 look and see -- see how these schools do and what they're
7 able to accomplish under certainly difficult circumstances.
8 So I appreciate the invitation from Dr. Colleen and I very
9 much enjoyed that opportunity. So thank you. Now I think
10 Elizabeth, we're ready to start with -- we're ahead of
11 schedule still but we could move on to legislative
12 priorities. Which I know that -- I know I had something
13 about that, I can't find it. But so --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just turning it over to
15 Jennifer Okes.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, I -- I know I had
17 the -- there was a document.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The draft of the
20 legislative.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, the draft of our
22 priorities is in here. Yeah, okay. But I don't have the
23 minutes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No problem.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I wrote all over mine
2 turned in. Not well, it's all right. So Ms. Mellow,
3 please proceed.

4 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair. Members of the
5 State Board. First, congratulations to those of you who
6 were reelected last night. They were -- there are few of
7 you. So we've had this legislative priority discussion
8 several years in a row now. The document that I sent you
9 reflects only what I would consider to be kind of technical
10 changes relative to things that like, for example, if you
11 said we want such and such to happen and such and such
12 happened, I took that out. So that is all I've done here.
13 This is your document. This is an expression of your
14 priorities and policies. Happy to participate in the
15 discussion and -- and answer any questions or simply take
16 your feedback and make the changes.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions of Ms. Mel? I
18 have a couple. To start with, would you give us a quick
19 recap of what you know about the election results and just
20 a quick summary of how Chambers will lay out and what
21 changes you might anticipate in terms of education
22 committee leadership, that sort of thing.

23 MS. MELODY: Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to.
24 I won't obvious talk about national results because I'm
25 assuming none of you live under a rock, and you don't need



1 me to tell you what has happened at that level. I think
2 the actually interesting kind of buzzword at the state is
3 status quo. If you look at -- so the Colorado Senate, I
4 believe will remain in Republican control. It will
5 continue to be under Republican control by eight -- by one
6 vote, 18 to 17. I think it is likely that Senator Kevin
7 Grantham will be elected president of the Senate.

8 I don't have a prediction on who will be
9 elected majority leader. That is a -- a hotly contested
10 race. The leadership elections, I'll- I'll refer to this
11 as I go through this, will all be held tomorrow. So we'll
12 know more about that tomorrow and -- and it is the members
13 themselves who get to vote and that it is a secret vote.
14 So we'll know results but that's about all we'll know. The
15 House will continue to be controlled by Democrats. I think
16 that they will have expanded their margin in the house.
17 For the last two years, they have had 34 seats to the
18 Republicans 31.

19 I believe the -- the Democrats will be at 37
20 seats, and math is not my strong point, but I believe that
21 means Republicans will be at 28 seats. I think that adds
22 up to 65. I think Representative -- Representative
23 Crisanta Duran who's currently the majority leader will --
24 is very likely to be elected speaker tomorrow. I mean none
25 of this is actually official until January, but you know



1 for all intents and purposes, again a very hotly contested
2 race for majority leader. So I don't know what that will
3 look like. I think in the House Republican caucus, there's
4 also a lot of -- a lot of conversation happening and I
5 don't know who will be -- who will lead that particular
6 caucus at this point. In terms of committee because the
7 status quo is kind of the buzz word, I don't expect huge
8 change on the education committees.

9 You know, you never know right, because
10 leadership -- that is absolutely prerogative of leadership,
11 it's one of the reasons why you want to be in leadership as
12 you get to make those decisions. But I think it's a --
13 there's a pretty good chance that Senator Hill will
14 continue to chair the Senate Education Committee, and Rep
15 Paterson will continue to chair the House Education
16 Committee, and we will keep you updated on all of that as
17 it changes. We'll, definitely see some changes over the
18 Joint Budget Committee as well, just given, you know, where
19 things are right now. I don't know exactly what that would
20 look like but -- but we will report all of that as quickly
21 as we get it. We will know the leadership stuff tomorrow,
22 the committee stuff sometimes takes longer again completely
23 in the prerogative of leadership. So sometimes it takes a
24 week, sometimes it takes a month. But rest assured that
25 the minute we have that information we'll share it.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions of members of
2 the Board, from members of the Board? I'm seeing none.
3 What schedule would you suggest that we try to meet in
4 order to if we have proactive legislation to push that
5 forward? When -- when should the Legislative Committee,
6 the Legislative Committee of this body plan meet to start
7 to formulate that and give you time to find sponsors and
8 that sort of thing if we have proactive solution?

9 MS. MELODY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I -- I
10 will as soon as possible. I mean, honestly and I don't
11 mean to be dramatic about that but things are going to move
12 very quickly here. I think, you know, the rest of this
13 week will be kind of just digesting election results and
14 figuring out leadership. Starting next week, we will be
15 off to the races in terms of bills, and bill deadlines, and
16 making decisions about sponsors, and I -- I'm a firm
17 believer and -- and one of the best ways to make sure
18 legislation passes is to get the best possible sponsors, to
19 get the right sponsors, and so we can talk specifics
20 whenever you'd like. But I just I'd love to get that
21 moving in the next week or two.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Ms. Cordial,
23 based on that would you -- current members of the
24 Legislative Committee mind convening then at the earliest
25 possible convenience for those members, so that they can



1 have preliminary -- preliminary discussions of some length.
2 We've talked about and particularly the waiver issues and
3 some of those. And if you drop an agenda for them and the
4 items we've kind of collectively talked about considering
5 and -- and see if we can be in a meeting before
6 thanksgiving certainly because I know the pressure that the
7 sponsor will be under to reserve bills will be growing very
8 quickly. And then that's a good question Ms. Rankin asked,
9 our legislative priorities are probably due to be revised,
10 Ms. Cordial is that a fair statement?

11 MS. CORDIAL: I'm sorry.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Legislative priorities, we
13 haven't adopted these for.

14 MS. CORDIAL: No. This is information for
15 you all to discuss them today and see if you have any
16 changes. And between now, and the December board meeting
17 is when you would take action on your 2017 priorities. And
18 then, I believe -- and we can do it sooner. But I believe
19 normally at the January board meeting is when we select the
20 following years legislative contacts, or legislative
21 liaisons, my apologies, but for the time being, but for
22 thanksgiving I'll work with Board Member Goff and Board
23 Member Scheffel.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you we might move
25 that process forward a little bit, and I think we'll try



1 and talk about these legislative priorities either later
2 today. If you would remind me, we should add this back
3 into the agenda, or after there's a chance to kind of
4 digest this and maybe you can find my notes. And -- and if
5 we don't get it done, we do have some extra time tomorrow.
6 So you would help us make sure that this gets on the --
7 make sure we don't overlook having this discussion, I'd
8 appreciate it. Further questions. Ms. Mel? Yes. Ms.
9 Goff.

10 MS. GOFF: Well, no. Not really but sure.
11 I -- well, I was -- I was going more for the technical
12 course around the calendar.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

14 MS. GOFF: I wonder if -- I know we can get
15 it and I'm sorry for starting this out as a request, but it
16 doesn't have to be. But the calendar of The Hub Committee
17 and the calendar of the meetings that have been set up for
18 January around the ESSA work and how that- that calendar
19 lines up with legislative things. I -- I am thinking
20 toward the session in integrating this work on the ESSA
21 because I'll just kind of feel com -- more comfortable if I
22 know where the channels come together. Because if there's
23 -- if there's something proposed in the legislature, or
24 there's a bill floating around that's related to that now,
25 I feel- I would find that helpful to us as well.



1 Because some of- there are some of these
2 things in here through the discussions about ESSA, we're
3 still trying to sort out how that falls or it was, what
4 kinds of other things we might expect to be working on.
5 And as far as the new ed committees, should the -- should
6 there be any great changes as far as you know Jennifer,
7 will they remain the same size. We've had years where the
8 size, the actual size of the whole group has changed.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mel?

10 MS. MELODY: Mr. Chair, Board Member Goff, I
11 -- yes that is prerogative leadership to set the size of
12 the committees. I don't think the House Committee will
13 change in size, that's what has been fairly consistent,
14 it's the Senate committee that has kind of grown and shrunk
15 over the years. I wish I could tell you but I honestly
16 don't know, and I would point out that. So the interim
17 committee of the legislature looking at ESSA has three more
18 meetings, those will happen between now and the December
19 holidays.

20 Additionally, the Joint Budget Committee
21 will have the briefing where the staff brings issues to the
22 committee will occur at the hearing where the Board and the
23 Department kind of respond and/or put what issues they --
24 you would like on the table will occur. And the Smart Act
25 Hearing in front of the Joint House and Senate Education



1 Committee will occur. I don't have dates for any of those.
2 I wish that I did. I've asked. I promise you I did ask,
3 and I was told what I thought I would be told which is, we
4 don't know that until after the election. So obviously, as
5 soon as we get better information we'll -- we'll share it
6 as well.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions before
8 you leave. Mr. Chairman could you join us for just a
9 second to talk about this ESSA issue? Is a little out of
10 order, and I apologize for putting people on the spot but
11 we're trying to kill 15 minutes.

12 MS. MELODY: Lucky us.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Glad I can help.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. I have been known to
15 filibuster that long myself, but I might meet with some
16 resistance. Since none of us live under a rock, and are
17 perhaps likely to be some changes in this Department of
18 Education, that could affect the interpretations of and or
19 the rules currently surrounding ESSA. In your judgment,
20 would it be helpful this -- this board is put on a very
21 tight time frame to submit a state plan? Would it be
22 helpful in giving you an opt -- to give you an opportunity
23 to review or speculate about some of those changes to
24 change that deadlines and move them back a little bit.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I didn't mean to you on
2 the spot --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, no.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But what the heck we're
5 all here.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm anticipating that
7 there may be a change that would change in timeline that
8 would emanate from the U.S. Department of Education, but
9 anything is speculation. I know the -- the committees that
10 are working to develop the drafts of the ESSA sections are
11 working very hard, and -- and any -- any additional time
12 would be helpful I think to them in clarifying and -- and
13 clarifying the decision points with their stakeholders and
14 discussing them and get -- getting recommendations to the
15 Hub Committee and to the -- the State Board. So yes,
16 additional time would be helpful.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The current deadline we're
18 under is that we've imposed on -- on the department is
19 what? For submission.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We -- is a March
21 submission but we have been discussing possibly requesting
22 from -- from the board an additional month to submit in
23 April. We hope to get begin posting drafts of the -- of
24 the sections of ESSA state plan on our website for public
25 comment in mid-December. There is some concern about that



1 because a lot of opportunity for folks to review the -- the
2 drafts and make comments would be occurring over the
3 holidays and we don't want to -- we want to give an
4 adequate opportunity for everybody to access this -- the
5 state plan and -- and comment. So we would like additional
6 -- we'd like to be able to extend to or alter our timeline
7 and push it back basically by a month.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So I think as I recall,
9 the board essentially as a group imposed by consensus that
10 March submission deadline given a number of the changes
11 we're all going to be dealing with, will there be any
12 objection from members of the board to directing staff to
13 take until at least April, and April 30th for that
14 submission giving them additional time to react to any
15 changes and make your current federal level, and allowing
16 the board to have more -- to have a more extensive review
17 of our options. Is there objection to that change and
18 we'll just take it as a policy question, Ms. Goff?

19 MS. GOFF: No objection to considering it
20 changed. And I'd add that there, there's been talk at the
21 nation -- among states about the possibility of -- if the
22 U.S. Department even wants to suggest another extension
23 possibility. In general that suggestion was May, seen as -
24 - seen as a midpoint between the two dates. So it's not
25 that a lot of people aren't considering trying to make that



1 work. So I just wondered if that -- if -- if we choose
2 April, we set April as our goal is to have something that
3 indicates we have -- that's a -- that's a carved in stone
4 decision as well. Or we just need -- we need a goal day,
5 but -- but how firm does that have be?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think it's obvious that
7 this board can work those changes. We do meet regularly,
8 and changing circumstances should dictate changing results
9 on occasion. So as Chairmen, if we agree right now to
10 April 30th, does that eliminate the necessity of everybody
11 working over Christmas and providing those comments before
12 January 1st?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. That would
14 be very, very helpful in trying to make good news for all.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We are try to make friends
16 and so why don't we -- why don't we plan on that. Wish
17 everybody a Merry Christmas and we'll let those deadlines
18 slip until the end of -- the end April if there's no
19 objection from members of the Board.

20 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms Rankin.

22 MS. RANKIN: I would just like to ask Mr.
23 Chairman, if -- if anything new comes up between now and
24 then, not to wait a Board meeting, I -- I'd like an e-mail



1 on things that are coming down that may be blindsiding us
2 somehow and -- and address this right away.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. We do have a
4 couple of upcoming calls scheduled with the U.S.
5 Department of Education as part of their Office of State
6 Support process, and we hope to bring up the topic of
7 what's the status of the rules? Is there any reason to
8 believe that the timelines may be altered?

9 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Great. Okay. Any other
11 questions or comments or direction? Ms. Melody, did you
12 have a comment?

13 MS. MELODY: Mr. Chair, if I could just add
14 something to that. I -- I understand your discussion is
15 about implement, you know, how the Department of Education
16 will continue to implement ESSA. Talk about blindside, I
17 had to use your word, Board Member Rankin, I think it's
18 also possible that the Federal Government could reconsider
19 the law in its entirety. I mean, you know, that's -- we
20 can't rule that out either. So there could be even more
21 changes contemplated.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We can bet they would take
23 place slowly.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So the -- I think we'll
25 start with this. And then when -- what are the dates of



1 the legislative committee hearings? The remaining ones on
2 the SSA do have those?

3 MS. CORDIAL: Mr. Chairman, I -- I do not.
4 I -- I -- I -- because they're not available.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you make sure the
8 board is informed and we may wish to just fit in or -- or
9 attend or participate if requested by the committee
10 members.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Absolutely.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Anything else for
13 Ms. Mello or Ms. Jebb? Thank you very much.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We're have
16 schedule.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not a bad 15 minutes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. We're actually
20 getting a little bit Merry Christmas --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: For everyone and then so.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's Thanksgiving.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Or thanks and Happy

25 Thanksgiving, whatever. Let's see, what could we do next?



1 What's -- what is next here? Standards review is due at
2 11:30 a.m.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's here now.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do you want to start that?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can start that.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you like to -- Let
8 me find standards (inaudible). Okay. Dr. Anthes, would
9 you please introduce the standard review process, please.

10 MS. ANTHERS: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chair. I'm
11 going to turn this over to Dr. Melissa Colzman, Executive
12 Director of Teaching and Learning and Carol Gates, Director
13 of Standards and Instructional Support. Today is -- is
14 really just another opportunity for you all to give
15 feedback on the standard (inaudible) process. This is all
16 draft and -- and open for discussion. So this is just kind
17 of an update to the process and we've tried to take into
18 some of that -- in some of the considerations that you all
19 have brought up in past board meetings. So with that, I'll
20 turn it over to Dr. Colzman.

21 MS. COLSMAN: So good morning, State Board
22 Members, and Mr. Chairman has stepped away for a moment but
23 good morning to you Mr. Chairman. Thank you for this
24 opportunity to begin the conversation about the upcoming
25 standards review and revision process. As Dr. Anthes,



1 noted. I'm Melissa Colzman, Executive Director of Teaching
2 and Learning unit. And today, I'm joined by Carol Gates
3 who is the Director of the Office of Standards and
4 Structural Support. Not all of you know Carol, so I want
5 to introduce her to you. Carol is a fourth generation
6 Coloradan from the Pikes Peak Region as a homegrown
7 graduate of Colorado Springs District 11. She has been in
8 education for 25 years teaching first and second grade, and
9 fifth, fourth and fifth grade as well as serving in the
10 roles of assistant principal and principal.

11 Carol came to CDE in 2008 where her pro --
12 where prior to her current role as Director of the Office
13 of Standards Instructional Support, she served as a State
14 Arts Content Specialist. While in this role, she was part
15 of the 2009 Colorado Academic Standards development process
16 for all four of the arts areas. Today, we are here to
17 begin a discussion for the plan for the standards review
18 and revision process. Over the past months, we've been
19 developing a draft proposal for the standards review and
20 revision process based on the requirements of state
21 statute. Learning from the processes the state used in
22 2009 to develop the Colorado academic standards and
23 research into successful practices from other states.

24 I'd like to draw your attention to a
25 document titled proposal Colorado academic standards review



1 and revision plan. Our intention is to bring aspects of
2 this plan forward to you over the next two to three months
3 for your feedback in order to co-develop a final plan which
4 reflects the wishes of the state board. Today, we're gonna
5 to be asking for your feedback in two of the areas of this
6 plan. As this is the first of a number of discussions
7 regarding the standards review and revision process, today,
8 our primary purpose is to get your feedback on two
9 important components of the proposal.

10 The initial review and revision process
11 proposal design and principles to guide the standards for
12 review and revision process. Earlier this year, as the
13 board discussed, the standards review and re- revision
14 processes as Dr. Anthes noted, members requested that CDE
15 beyond the process that followed in 2009 when developing
16 the current Colorado academic standards. To that end, we
17 will also share with you what we've learned by researching
18 the review processes of other states have utilized which is
19 inform some of the aspects of the proposal we have before
20 you today. Finally, we will share some information with
21 you about what is happening now and what is on the horizon
22 related to this work. Just as a quick orientation to your
23 materials in addition to the presentation that you have.
24 As I've already noted, you have a -- a draft proposal that
25 will be again we'll be presenting to you multiple times.



1 You'll see multiple iterations of this until
2 we re -- until the board is pleased with the proposal.
3 You'll also find a new excerpt from Cap for K which relates
4 to statutory requirements for the standards review or for
5 the standards as well as one of the reports that we've
6 commissioned about the review process these other states
7 have undergone, so that you can see that report in its
8 entirety will be referencing it later.

9 To set the context for today's discussion,
10 we'll provide some background information for Board Members
11 regarding state statutory requirements related to the
12 standards. So why are we reviewing the standards? Well,
13 Senate Bill 212 Colorado's Academic Plan for kids or Cap
14 for K requires a regularly -- a regular process to review
15 and revise the standards. The first review in a revision
16 cycle is set to conclude on or before July 1 of 2018 and
17 then every six years thereafter. This is a state driven
18 process and is not related to the ESSA state plan
19 development process. The reason I emphasize that is
20 because there is a standard Spoke committee related to the
21 ESSA state plan and because these are happening at similar
22 times.

23 They -- there can be a little bit of
24 confusion but this is driven entirely by state law. So
25 now, I'm going to have Carol present some background



1 information again on what's asked further requirements
2 about the standards because not all board members were here
3 in 2009 and 10 when this process was first conducted.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just -- Let me ask. Ms.
5 Gates, are you going to kind of give us a quick update of
6 the legislative re -- mandated requirements of these
7 standards?

8 MS. GATES: Yes, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

10 MS. GATES: So the next few slides are going
11 to provide grounding for what standards are and what the
12 legislative requirements are of the standards. So we
13 define standards as what students should know, understand,
14 and be able to do at the end of a grade level or a grade
15 span. Know is defined as refers to facts, dates, places,
16 people, definitions. So using a mathematics example,
17 addition and subtraction facts would be the knowledge.
18 Understand refers to the theories generalizations which is
19 often referred to as big ideas. So that understanding if
20 we stay with that mathematics example, addition and
21 subtraction is really understanding the general premise of
22 what addition is. It's adding to putting things together,
23 subtraction is taking something apart, taking something
24 away and do is where students demonstrate that knowledge
25 and understanding through skills such as communication,



1 reading, computation. Moving onto that example for
2 mathematics on addition and subtraction using that
3 knowledge and understanding to demonstrate a skill of
4 solving one or two word step word problems, two-step word
5 problems.

6 So it's when we discuss standards, it's
7 always helpful to delineate the difference between
8 standards, curriculum, and instruction. Standards are
9 those broad goals articulating what students should know,
10 understand, and be able to do over a given period of time.
11 Curriculum is an organized plan of instruction which can be
12 a sequence of instructional units. It can be a purchase
13 program scope and sequence. It can also be something that
14 districts have developed. Instruction are those learning
15 experiences that are designed to meet those needs of those
16 students in the classroom. Colorado revised statute gives
17 the state board authority to set the state standards and
18 Colorado revised statute gives the local education agency's
19 authority to implement curriculum and instruction.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Gates, I have a
21 question. In your -- in your judgment, do our existing
22 standards deemphasize what someone should know and place
23 greater emphasis on what someone should do?

24 MS. ANDERSON: So Mr. Chairman I think I'll
25 take that. Keep in mind that we have standards in 10



1 different content areas and so that answer could depend on
2 which content area we're talking about. I think you might
3 be referring to some of the criticisms perhaps of the
4 English language arts standards from the Common Core that
5 has been a -- a criticism of the Common Core State
6 Standards and that they don't include the amount of content
7 that some would like to see. And when we refer to content
8 in that context --

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: In your judgment, how hard
10 would it be to correct? Let's just presume for a minute
11 that criticism is valid. How difficult would it be to
12 correct that problem?

13 MS. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman that is exactly
14 what this review and revision process is about. It's about
15 taking a look at our standards seeing if there are some
16 areas of weaknesses and making those necessary revisions.
17 So that -- that wouldn't necessarily be difficult. It
18 would just be a matter of pulling together the process that
19 would enable that.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you for -- Yes, Dr.
21 Flores?

22 MS. FLORES: And how big is -- how -- I
23 mean, competency based education, how -- how big is that?
24 I mean, I would say that given my experience with
25 competency based education, it kind of lowers things,



1 lowers standards, and we may not get the -- the breath so
2 to speak because we get it kind of to the middle. We don't
3 go as high and we don't catch possibly those at the bottom
4 end. And -- and so in relation to curricula and to
5 competency based education, I think that -- that state has
6 been pushing. Would you say that that is still a big push?
7 The competency based part given the problems that I've seen
8 through competency based education and this is an area
9 where I really have looked at it for many years.

10 MS. ANDERSON: So Mr. Chairman. So -- so
11 we'll distinguish between competency based education and
12 kind of standards based education if that I -- is okay with
13 you.

14 MS. FLORES: Yes.

15 MS. ANDERSON: I think you're referring to a
16 system that allows for advancement of students based on
17 demonstration of competencies. And there are a number of
18 districts in our state who are either in -- in an ex --
19 extended year implementation of competency based education
20 in some districts who are just at the beginning of that.
21 The way that that really is a local decision about --

22 MS. FLORES: Okay.

23 MS. ANDERSON: -- about how to implement the
24 standards. How to address the standards? So what the
25 state does is define academic standards. If you think



1 about that as a floor for- for what students should know,
2 understand and do at a grade level. It's up to districts
3 to determine how they would like to implement that and how
4 they would like to have advancement decisions based on
5 their judgment of how students demonstrate competency or
6 meeting those particular standards. So I think you raise a
7 good point but I would -- I would separate out competency
8 based systems from the standards.

9 MS. FLORES: But wouldn't you say that
10 developing a whole curricula on competency based would be
11 very difficult for a district especially given that there
12 are a lot of resources out there and that it could put some
13 kids in jeopardy if that competency based program was not
14 in place? So I'll give you an example. I went through a
15 competency based master's program.

16 The professors didn't have the curriculum
17 ready. So I suffered in that because they didn't have the
18 end goal of what a standard was. I didn't get a grade
19 until the end of two years for all my work which was very
20 disappointing and I think that we're seeing that. I'm --
21 I'm hearing that from some -- some districts you know where
22 the competencies are not yet there. The curricula is not
23 that there yet. So on a -- I guess on a formative where
24 teachers you know form the curricula in such an angry,



1 they're kinda confused about h -- how that's going to
2 happen even at this date.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions account. Please
4 proceed, Ms. Gates.

5 MS. GATES: Okay. So we're moving on to the
6 legislative requirements first standards. It's helpful to
7 walk through a bit of a timeline of what we've been doing
8 under this current statute of cap for K. So in 2008 cap
9 for K was passed. In 2009, the standards development to
10 occur in 10 core content areas. In 2010, the assistant
11 assessment system attributes were defined and the State
12 Board of Education adopted Common Core State Standard-
13 Standards which led to a reissue of the English Language
14 Arts in Mathematics Content Area Standards. In 2011 and
15 13, that was set up as our transition phase. 13 and 14 was
16 full implementation of standards and adding that final
17 assessment transition, and our next milestone as you know
18 is July 1st 2018, which will be our very first review and
19 revision cycle of the Colorado academic standards.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Now is it -- This revision
21 review supposed to be complete by the date or underway by
22 that date?

23 MS. ANDERSON: So the -- the state law
24 requires that it occur on or before July 1, 2018.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.



1 MS. GATES: Okay. So in your handouts, as
2 Melissa suggested to you earlier, you do have a copy of the
3 section of statute that defines the requirements of
4 standards. On this slide, we've taken the liberty of
5 defining some of the key highlights you'll find within that
6 document. The Colorado academic standards must minimally
7 include the listing of content areas you see there. And as
8 of our last legislative session 1198, will require the
9 addition of optional secondary computer science standards
10 by that July 1st, 2018. The second bullet is that the
11 standards must be comparable in scope, relevance, and rigor
12 to the highest national and international standards,
13 meaning, we need to have our standards benchmarked against
14 the highest performing states and nations. They must
15 require the development of skills, as you see listed
16 directly in statute as well as in our slide here. They
17 must also include the last three bullets that are really
18 around the bridging idea of Pre-K through 12th grade
19 standards. They want students to be at the standards to be
20 able to be aligned with career and technical education.
21 Student -- the -- standards need to be aligned with the
22 state's post-secondary workforce readiness definition, and
23 ultimately result in students that graduate as post-
24 secondary and workforce-ready graduates. So hopefully,
25 that gives you a bit of grounding on the history of where



1 we've been so far under a CAP4K as well as the requirements
2 of the standards. Melissa will share with you now some of
3 the initial research we've been doing in our initial
4 planning phase.

5 MS. COLSMAN: So thank you, Karol. As I
6 noted in my opening remarks, we appreciated the Board's
7 suggestion to not just follow the process CDE conducted in
8 2009 when the Colorado Academic Standards were developed.
9 In response to this request, we've commissioned some
10 research into the processes some other states have
11 utilized. To assist us in broadening our perspective of
12 how Colorado could approach the standards review and
13 revision process, we initiated a two-phase study. First,
14 we commissioned a scan of all 50 states to get some
15 information on the status of standards or revision
16 processes conducted since Colorado adopted its standards in
17 2009 and 2010. From this, we learned some basic
18 information about which states have reviewed and revised
19 their standards, which you will see is almost all of them,
20 and in which content areas.

21 A small summary of this information is
22 presented on the slide. But in addition to this basic
23 information, we learn some general process information
24 related to engagement of stakeholders and how the actual
25 process was conducted. From here, we can commission the



1 second phase of the study where we looked at 13 states
2 processes, so we could learn from the successes and
3 failures of other states to inform the plan that you have
4 before you today. We call the second phase of the study
5 Our Peer Profiles, which was a deeper dive into the
6 specific processes states utilize and how those processes
7 worked. You have a copy of the full report in your
8 materials and that is the -- oop -- that is the -- the
9 technical response request from the American Institutes for
10 Research. What we do here is summarize the key highlights.

11 So there were three key themes that emerged
12 when we looked at successful practices of other states.
13 One was in stakeholder engagement, stakeholder engagement
14 was -- was noted as a fundamental component of standard
15 revision processes. States use surveys and online feedback
16 processes to gain the information needed for decision
17 making. Communication was also noted as a critical piece
18 of the standard's revision processes for states. And
19 states regularly disseminate the information about the
20 process itself, what the next steps are, and regular
21 progress reporting to the public.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please. Please
24 proceed.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just have a quick
2 question.

3 MS. COLSMAN: Yes?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In terms of the survey,
5 somebody just inquire recently --

6 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- just testified about
8 the survey questions. And do they really -- do they allow
9 the right information to be surfaced? Could -- would you
10 like to comment on that since that's part of the hourly
11 community feedback?

12 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. Absolutely.
13 Absolutely. I'm really glad that you brought that up.
14 Because one of the things that we learned is that states
15 would often -- some states use just a survey. Other states
16 use like an online feedback system. What we're doing is
17 actually using both because there are limitations for both.
18 So the limitation that you heard from the survey is that
19 you can only have some broad- broad perceptions noted.
20 What we're actually going to be able to demonstrate for you
21 today is an online feedback system where I think it's at
22 exactly what the -- what are our public commenter was
23 noting, which is, "I want to get in and say something very
24 specific about the standards."



1 So one of the things that we learned from
2 other states is that -- and we modeled the system based on
3 -- on, I think it was three different states who did this,
4 which they allowed a -- a system for any individual in the
5 state to go online, open up any and- any and every standard
6 if they would like, click and leave a comment, so that we
7 would get very specific feedback about what it is that
8 people are finding problematic and then also suggestions
9 for how to remedy that.

10 So we're gonna be able to demonstrate that
11 to you today. I think between the two things, the general
12 perception survey, we can -- you have some high level
13 information about what do people think. You wouldn't get
14 that type of information from an online system. You could
15 only say, "Wow, there were a lot of comments in fourth
16 grade math." Or a lot of comments in eighth grade science.
17 So I think between the two, we'll be able to have some
18 really good information for you as the Board of what do
19 people think about the standards and what do they think
20 needs to happen with the standards.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what happens with
22 the information that's already been submitted? I mean,
23 I've gotten calls from constituents saying they submitted a
24 letter to CDE, but then the link came up and I don't know
25 if that all got into the link or should they resubmit? And



1 then, as you know, we had lots of letters delivered to the
2 Board in the last, probably a year-and-a-half or something,
3 before we started the revision process. Is that feedback
4 somewhere? I'm not sure how that kind of cumulative
5 feedback where that sits.

6 MS. COLSMAN: So that's also a very good
7 question and -- and much of that is within the- the State
8 Board kind of email. And so -- so we do have that at our
9 disposal as well. We've set up a specific email address
10 for the review and revision process in addition to the
11 survey and this online system. The -- the -- the email
12 address will enable, kind of, ongoing information to come
13 to the- come to the Department for this process. So we do
14 have the opportunity to kind of take all of this
15 information and provide that to whether the Board
16 determines that we would like to go with a committee
17 structure and provide that information to committees, so
18 that they're hearing directly from constituents versus
19 basing any of their own -- basing their recommendations
20 only on their own opinion and own experience.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if people have
22 submitted letters, we'll say to them also go to the link
23 and resubmit or we just get those letters? It's a question
24 for Bizy but I just -- hearing from folks who say, "Well, I



1 did send in information, but I don't see it." So we just
2 have to think about where is it.

3 MS. COLSMAN: Right. I would -- I would --
4 I would hesitate to ask people to now go -- go do it again.
5 Because I know that -- that people have already taken their
6 time to submit information and we can absolutely make sure
7 we get all of that information to the committees. I think
8 what we get from the survey and the online system is
9 something that can't be just sent in the letter, which is,
10 with especially with the online system. If -- if you have
11 some specific areas of concern, show us where that is, so
12 that the- the committees can make whatever changes they
13 would like to recommend based on feedback from the public.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And I have one
15 final question?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So as we look at the
18 standards, I mean, I've talked to so many teachers about
19 this standard. And- and people will say, "Well, I really
20 think in fifth grade, this set of standards really is
21 great." But then there's this other issues. So there's in
22 some other grade or some other subject or whatever, it is
23 very, kind of detailed. And then from a broad perspective,
24 as we look at critiques of the standards, you know, one
25 might conclude, you know, there's really more of a focus on



1 writing as opposed to reading. And I've actually seen that
2 played out in classrooms, so that students are expected to
3 have mastered writing before they've really mastered
4 reading, which is almost impossible to have happened.

5 And so it's like the big picture pieces, I -
6 - I think we need a mechanism to really look at that. And
7 they really come out of critiques of Common -- of our
8 standards, and that the Common Core portion of it as well
9 as our distinctives looking broadly. What do we -- how --
10 what are the themes that coursed through these standards?
11 And then of course, teachers have specific feedback on
12 their grade, based on their grade and so forth, but we need
13 a mechanism for looking broadly about a big picture item
14 like, does it focus so much on writing that students are in
15 some respects set up not to do well because they haven't
16 had enough instruction in reading, that's a -- a great kind
17 of common theme. So thank you.

18 MS. COLSMAN: So Mr. Chairman?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please, yes.

20 MS. COLSMAN: You bring up a really, really
21 important point and I think that the -- the -- we have to
22 be thinking about how we're getting the right information,
23 not just detail of like is, you know, fourth grade. You
24 know, what -- what specifically is needs to be adjusted in
25 fourth grade, but then what are those broad themes. We do



1 have a place on our online system, we'll actually be able
2 to -- we have some screenshots to be able to show you that
3 a little bit later. But there is a place for -- for those
4 broader themes and comments. But I think we could probably
5 do, we can even be thinking of some other ways to -- to
6 have perhaps some comments that are specific to content
7 areas that I think could be useful.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so another example
9 is this 50-75 percent expository text. I mean, people --
10 that was put in place based on the premise that it teaches
11 vocabulary better. And vocabulary is a great predictor of
12 reading comprehension. But is that right? And then you've
13 got the other piece of it which is great literature, hasn't
14 really been able to be addressed as it once was just
15 because we've been focusing on expository or nonfiction
16 text. So that's the kind of thing that might not show up
17 from a fourth grade teacher looking specifically at math
18 standards or English language, arts, because they're
19 looking at their particular area. So those broad areas are
20 great news for this Board to really consider in-depth.

21 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: Hi. And when we think of a
24 well-educated person as a renaissance person, but yet, you
25 know, we have -- it -- it -- it is so -- skilled space that



1 the content really suffers. Did you hear me? I think -- I
2 think we -- we need to think about an educated person as a
3 renaissance person, you know, who knows a lot about
4 different -- different subjects, music, physical education,
5 dance, literature, music. But you know, when we're cutting
6 out some of these areas that I think are so important, like
7 art, and music, and physical education, dance and such, I
8 don't think we're gonna have the type of individual that we
9 need. I mean, it seems as if we're honing in on computers.
10 And we think computers are the future, they are the future.
11 And so we have all these tech people, all these people
12 going into banking and such. But we don't have history
13 majors, language majors, and such. And we need to, you
14 know, have all of those individuals, it's just so
15 important. And -- and we can't just go on the technical.
16 Although, it is important.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other caveat Ms. Goff?

18 MS. GOFF: I beg your indulgence on a little
19 clarification. Is the intent over the next two years on
20 our standards review to -- to bring in -- to consider all
21 10 contents?

22 MS. COLSMAN: So our understanding is that
23 when the -- the state statute requires a revision of the
24 standards in 2000, by 2018 that includes all of those that
25 are listed in state statute which does include as Dr.



1 Flores noted, all of the content areas including the arts,
2 physical education. And a really nice thing about CAP4K
3 and the legislative declaration as they'd note the -- a --
4 a need for a rich and balanced curriculum for students to,
5 I think, achieve what you're talking about.

6 MS. GOFF: Thank you for that.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anything else?

8 MS. GOFF: I've one more.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

10 MS. GOFF: The -- I think what we're going
11 to find, we've -- we've known -- we've known it for a
12 while, but we're gonna find more is the need to really help
13 people understand the difference between standards
14 curriculum and pedagogy. I think there's a difference. So
15 I guess, I'd be intent that one of our goals be helping
16 that understanding along. All of the things we've been
17 talking today are absolutely standard skills, knowledge,
18 behaviors, displays, etc. But the -- how -- how specific
19 do the -- do the standards need to be in delineating
20 between those content areas that are included in general
21 thinking or not. And I -- I -- I just felt that having
22 been here since the beginning of these conversations, it
23 has always been a challenge to -- to foster the
24 understanding of what it -- what makes an aspirational
25 statement different from a strategy statement.



1 You know, if you take the standard idea
2 versus the curriculum idea, it's just- we- we need to make
3 sure folks understand them and feel comfortable.
4 Ultimately, we need to understand it. So in our
5 conversations, I think that's something that we -- I would
6 suggest we make the goals, are we on the same page here
7 with what's -- what's necessary to make the aspirational
8 statement, and what has to be added to -- to contribute to
9 the ways and means of meeting that aspiration. I'm not
10 gonna use strategy, except it can be different too. But I
11 just -- I appreciate this effort. And -- I -- I am -- I'm
12 personally glad, it does include all 10. Because I think
13 that's the only way to get the integration going which
14 applies to whether we have the type of text. What -- what
15 does it mean to -- to be -- to do close reading and
16 consider that.

17 So I'm -- I just -- I'm gonna make it my
18 own, you know, my personal goal to help people- help draw
19 people's attention back to the -- some of the finer points
20 about doing this work. And I think that's gonna help us
21 clarify for our constituents and all the groups that we do
22 want to participate in this and have the voice out there.
23 I think it's gonna make it a little easier if we are at
24 least, I hope we get there, on a common path to
25 understanding what the difference is, what we're doing.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Scheffel.

2 MS. COLSMAN: And I appreciate your comments
3 Jane. I would just say though that when publishers looked
4 at the common core standards and aligned their curricula
5 with those standards there were substantial changes. So I
6 think we also have to really look at the relationship
7 between curriculum and standards, it's substantial, and it
8 influences what teachers teach, and also how they teach.
9 So it is very relevant to grassroots what goes on in
10 classrooms.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anything else? I have --
12 have one comment Ms. Colzman and it's not directed at you
13 and -- and staff, but it is directed at the education
14 reform community. Several months ago we simply made the
15 announcement that we were going to consider as a board,
16 standards and the park test where are not to -- whether we
17 had to continue with park test and whether we ought to be
18 looking at revising standards. Mysteriously at the next
19 meeting apparently those comments of the chair were
20 disseminated far and wide and lots of just individual,
21 ordinary people paid attention. And they traveled from the
22 corners of the state to read well-prepared, very well
23 thought out comments about keeping park and keeping the
24 standards.



1 Now, it could be that they all materialized
2 on their own after just hearing we were gonna talk about
3 it. I also believe in the Easter Bunny and Santa Claus,
4 and the Tooth Fairy. And I'm really tired of the education
5 reform community salting the public comment periods with
6 people to promote their points of view. The public has
7 every right to participate and every right to do that. I
8 would have a lot more respect for the education reform
9 community, if they'd have the guts to come up here, put
10 their names on it, stand in front of us as representatives
11 of those organizations, and tell us what they think. And
12 if they wish to bring a representative sample of teachers
13 and others who support their positions they're certainly
14 welcome to do so.

15 But they may -- they may think all members
16 of this board were born at night and some of us probably
17 were, but it wasn't last night, and it's not hard to see
18 through -- it's not hard to see through this and I would
19 just simply suggest an honest approach on the educate -- on
20 the part education reform community would be appreciated.
21 Let them promote and justify what it is they want to do
22 without using the tactics with which they're currently
23 engaged. And secondly, I do think that teachers and other
24 professionals who have a different point of view are very
25 likely discouraged, by their colleagues and peers and those



1 in power who are politically correct from voicing their
2 concerns about these, and I think it may behoove us to seek
3 out those individuals and conduct randomly selected
4 scientific focus groups of randomly selected teachers at
5 various grade levels, and subject matter areas.

6 And in a -- in a scientific method to see if
7 we really were getting a spoon fed set of responses or
8 whether those- and whether or not those responses really
9 reflect what's going on out there in the education
10 community. And I think I'm going to speak with staff about
11 how we go ahead and afford to do that research, and get
12 that research done, so we bleed out the undue influence of
13 those groups that have what appears to be an endless amount
14 of money to spend on these projects. So I appreciate the
15 work you're doing but I would admonish all of you to
16 recognize that you may- the feedback you may be getting
17 maybe more contrived than real. Thank you. Please
18 proceed.

19 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Durham. So
20 what are the key learnings that we summer -- we just
21 summarized is that some states have found that it's useful
22 to identify principles that guide the standards review and
23 revisit -- revision process. Guiding principles can
24 articulate the values of the state board and set parameters
25 for decision making throughout the review and revision



1 process. To that end, we're bringing for you today the
2 first of two feedback discussions. So we're gonna invite
3 feedback, because apparently you don't need invitation for
4 feedback. By the way that's a -- that's a joke. That is
5 what -- so our question for you.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Inaudible) for humor.

7 MS. COLSMAN: Yes. Our question for you is,
8 what principles should guide the review and revision
9 process? We have some considerations for you on your slide
10 and these are some drive from other states and some of them
11 actually were from our first process. The reason why we
12 think this is important is because it makes a difference
13 for decision making. So for instance, if -- if we would
14 like to be research informed then that does mean that we
15 would do certain things like perhaps conduct focus groups.
16 So if that's a guiding principle or a value of the board,
17 then that tells us which direction to go. So we're asking
18 for your thoughts on what principles should guide this.
19 And again we have -- we have a few up here for
20 consideration. Transparency is -- is about decisions made
21 in public. Inclusive means that this would involve
22 stakeholders, research informed, consistent that would be
23 consistent with what's required by statute, substantive
24 meaning would focus on the substance of the standards, what
25 the standards actually say. Improvement oriented, focus on



1 improving what we have. Or there could be others that we
2 would like to suggest, we would find that helpful to know
3 your values when we conduct this process which is why we're
4 asking you this question.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Dr.
6 Flores. Did you have a question?

7 MS. FLORES: Well, have you considered --
8 have you considered asking university people? I know in
9 this state, you know, sometimes intellectuals are not
10 highly regarded but you know, there are some experts and
11 they may not be all at the university but we do have a
12 center for policy. National policy education here in the
13 state, and I think they write interesting papers, and
14 provide interesting information on the issues in education
15 that are, kind of, being talked about not only here but in
16 the country.

17 And then we have Jane who is also part of
18 the National Board of Education and they consider. So I --
19 I'm just wondering if, if these individuals are also -- I
20 mean, if we asked someone from the University of Colorado,
21 you know, any of the branches or did you or any of the
22 other private schools, you know, people that are studying
23 these that could be included, and not just, you know, these
24 nonprofits that I think most of them are- most of them are
25 very -- they wanna reform. They wanna push the reform



1 agenda. And I'm not -- just can't -- looked at the people
2 that we have on the hop committee, and I can just see that
3 all of them come from, you know, those reform communities.
4 And so I --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. That's all, Dr.
6 Scheffel.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, just when we're
8 thinking about these considerations, I would add to that,
9 you know, the common core standards which comprise 85
10 percent of our Colorado academic standards. We're informed
11 by a number of white papers and entities, and they base
12 their, their work on assumptions. And that's what needs to
13 be looked at as we review the standards. We can look at
14 details and we should, but we also need to look at, were
15 the assumptions that inform the drafting of this language
16 are they right? Do they hold true? Do we agree with them
17 as a board? And that work needs to be done. And you know,
18 I've just raised a couple of different examples of that, so
19 if we could add that to the list I think that would help us
20 think conceptually about is this about the work?

21 MS. COLSMAN: Right. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Sorry we keep
23 interrupting please proceed.

24 MS. GOFF: This -- this is exactly what
25 we're learning, so I guess what if there -- if there are



1 some other thoughts we can bring back these, you know,
2 revise these guiding principles based on what we've heard
3 today, and we would anticipate coming back in December with
4 some decision points. So would -- would you want us to
5 move forward with our, our next discussion Mr. Chairman?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

7 MS. GOFF: Okay. So the next discussion
8 that we would like is -- is -- is about the, who, how, and
9 when of this process. We'd like to hear your feedback. So
10 we're going to discuss, kind of, the who, how, and when
11 that are part of our proposal, and get your feedback so
12 that we can then revise that planning based on your
13 thoughts. So when we talk about who, we've, we've thought
14 about four, kind of, major roles and responsibilities that
15 would be included in the review and revision process at the
16 center at the State Board of Education, who would play a
17 decision making role to guide the process and ultimately
18 review and approve any recommended revisions?

19 At the top, the proposal identifies the role
20 of stakeholders as writing feedback on the process itself,
21 and on any proposed revisions to the standards. On the
22 lower right the plan identifies the role of content area
23 committees to review that stakeholder feedback, and make
24 recommendations and move -- and revisions based on that
25 feedback to you for consideration. And finally, in the



1 lower left the plan identifies the role of the department
2 as just facilitating this process, and staffing the content
3 areas. The next --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

5 MS. MAZANEC: So when you say CDE facilitate
6 the review and revision process and staff would Content
7 Area Committees. So are you saying that you will find the
8 educators et cetera to be on those committees?

9 MS. GOFF: So that's a very good question.
10 Actually in December what we plan to bring forward to you
11 if, if this is, you know, based on your feedback here, if
12 there's a committee structure that you would like what we
13 would bring forward to you as a process for how we would
14 facilitate the selection of the committees. So we see our
15 role throughout this is facilitating meaning we bring
16 forward decision points for you to help to conduct the
17 process based on what you say. We go and do that on your
18 behalf and we, we basically keep everything moving.

19 And by staffing the committees we would mean
20 that for instance, I was on the -- I was the math
21 specialist back in 2008 and '09 when we reviewed- when we
22 created the Colorado Academic Standards in math. So what I
23 did is I staffed the committee. I was there on behalf of
24 the department. I made sure the committee was set up. We
25 had a chairperson who -- who actually ran the committee and



1 who conducted all of the decision making processes for the
2 committee. I was there if there were questions about
3 content, I just helped the committee run. But the, the
4 actual committee was not run by CDE, it was staffed by CDE.
5 So that's what we mean by staffing, means we're there just
6 to make sure that the coffee is there, the notes get taken,
7 that we follow up and send out, and put things up on the
8 web so that people can see meeting notes and so on.

9 MR. DILL: So the members of the -- the
10 actual committee where would those be?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How will they be selected.

12 MR. DILL: How will those be selected?

13 MS. GOFF: That's- that's a good question we
14 have. I, I believe we have is a little bit of information
15 in your proposal for that but we would come forward in
16 December with a, a full proposal. One of the things that
17 we -- that other states have found successful, and that
18 happened here in 2008 and '09 when we selected committees
19 for the original process was, we had a blind application
20 process, meaning folks would go online, submit their, their
21 qualifications. They, they did submit all of their, you
22 know, their name and contact information. They submit
23 their qualifications and the rationale for why they would
24 like to be on the committee.



1 But when those applications were reviewed
2 they- their names were stripped off so that it was based on
3 the quality of the application for the committee. So
4 that's- that could be how this next process is done. In
5 2009, '10 there was also an external stakeholder group for
6 the whole process. I came to the Hub committee right now
7 for ESSA, and they actually kind of, kind of, function the
8 way they Hub committee is now. They were the ones who
9 actually reviewed those applications. So -- so we can --
10 we would love to hear your thoughts on how, how to conduct
11 that process, and what you would like to see happen.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I'm just concerned that
15 this makes total sense these various circles and you know,
16 who comprises each. But I'm just concerned that if we take
17 this approach we may just get tweaking around the edges,
18 and not really consideration of the nature of standards are
19 they guardrails? How detailed are they? When you really
20 pull out the standards which I printed all of them off and
21 bound them for myself, It is so much language and much of
22 it vague and some of it, I mean it's like the language
23 itself needs to be defined and -- and so it's like the
24 nature of language to drive instruction. What is the
25 nature of the standards?



1 What should they -- at what level of detail
2 really should they be? And I feel like if we set it up
3 this way there won't be any room to examine any of those
4 underlying assumptions. And I know I served on the reading
5 writing and communication focus groups, you know, when we
6 did this in 2009 or before. And -- and I it, it felt like
7 it was a great process in the sense that there were
8 wonderful people doing the work. But because of the
9 process itself, there really didn't seem to be time to
10 examine underlying assumptions. And you know, of course
11 they were informing documents brought to those committees,
12 you know, we had the Finland standards and all that.

13 And just implicitly the way it was set up
14 the process and the documents informing the process, of the
15 tide of what the conclusion would be was, was very much in
16 place just because the process. So I -- I -- I can get
17 concerned that if we adopt this process, we'll tweak the
18 edges of our standards and we won't ever get to step back
19 and really hear what is- what is the nature of our
20 standards? And how can we really make them better. And
21 how can we really get.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great feedback from the
23 public. I don't know I just, I think we should re-examine
24 this process because is -- is kind of replication of what
25 we did before in -- in many ways.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Anthes?

2 MS. ANTHES: Yeah, thank you for that. I --
3 I think we are truly open to a different process. And so
4 you know, we may be limited by our own imagination and --
5 and the processes that have -- have come before us because
6 that's what we know. So -- so truly if you all have some
7 suggestions for a totally different process, we -- we --
8 we'll put that before you and -- and put the documentation
9 together. So you know, definitely open to -- to those
10 ideas.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can I just respond
12 to doctor?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead doctor.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think one thing we
15 could do is really look at the assumptions underneath the
16 white papers that inform the development of the standards
17 in the first place five, six, eight years ago whatever it
18 is, because 85 percent of our standards were developed in
19 that manner. And if we look at those documents, and unpack
20 the assumptions, and sit as a Board with the language, and
21 the white papers.

22 We then can decide as a Board, do we still
23 embrace these assumptions, and are we still moving along
24 this path or do we wanna adjust, and change? And I think
25 without that deep work on the part of the Board, the



1 language in front of us, the -- the white papers that
2 informed the standards development in the first place, the
3 assumption sitting under -- under those, that's three
4 levels of analysis, we can do that. If we allocate a day,
5 or so and have the documents before us, I -- I think that
6 would launch the work in -- in a way that provides the
7 opportunity for real change if we decide that's a direction
8 we want.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff?

10 MS. GOFF: Refresh my memory, was there not
11 integration, and then like we use that word intern work
12 we're working between the content areas through the content
13 collaboratives. Was there some interchange of ideas,
14 discussions, research exchanges? Because you know, we had
15 the Common Core Group, we had our standards complete, and
16 then the Common Core was worked into that, so that vice
17 versa. Did science, and math because science not being a
18 part of the Common Core Group, were those two sets of
19 teachers, or even, or experts any of our -- any of our
20 content collaborative members in any content area, did they
21 work together at some point?

22 That's it, you know, it's either a yes, or
23 no, and I don't -- I would not know I don't remember you
24 guys would. Do you any other pairings of content areas get
25 together to work on the final body of arts standards for



1 the state of Colorado? I -- I just wonder if that would be
2 maybe a tweak, or two we could refocus on, make a little
3 more prominent in the -- in the discussion because perhaps,
4 there would be a -- a strong possibility of getting to a --
5 a little bit broader look at whatever the assumptions may
6 be. I mean, I have -- I have a thing today right now I'm
7 experiencing. So what are a bunch of people gonna end up
8 doing including us possibly, is assume what assumptions
9 are? And how do we know there -- there is a solid base of
10 reasoning for saying this is an assumption that happened?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because we could read,
12 I'm sorry, we could read those informing documents, and I
13 think they're -- they're fairly clear.

14 MS. GOFF: Yeah, good. I mean, I hope so
15 because I wouldn't -- I wouldn't want to encourage any --
16 any of our people, or us really from jumping into something
17 where we don't have a good solid base of -- of something we
18 can accept. I think maybe that's my issue today. How long
19 is it gonna take for us to accept something that we can
20 use? Or are we going to be kind of stringing things out
21 here, and there because we've got disagreements on what to
22 accept?

23 And I'm -- I'm just I'm thinking about what
24 is the best way to involve people who'd -- who'd have a
25 variety of experiences with this work, and with -- and --



1 and pertain -- particularly people in school buildings who
2 do this every day? Well, we've -- we've got to -- to make
3 sure that they've got a place to grab on. And the only
4 other -- right now the only other thing about the process
5 itself I -- I would hope that whether it be focused groups,
6 online feedback, or surveys whatever it is, there is a real
7 attempt to include both sides of what I think has become a
8 silent majority, or minority. I -- I really couldn't tell
9 you right now any thing solid about the number of -- of
10 consumers of this work which are teachers, kids, and
11 schools right now.

12 How many people have withheld their true
13 reactions to this -- to the implementation we've been out
14 for a long time now? And how many have been -- have felt
15 comfortable, and free, and unrestrained in voicing their
16 support for it? I don't know. I would just like to think
17 that this has been -- this has been a pretty hard issue for
18 us over the years up, and down, and I'm not sure what kind
19 of voice we're hearing on either side. If there is a -- if
20 there's a strong consumer-based constituent base, pinyon
21 are feeling one way, or the other. Do we keep going down
22 this path? Or is there a need to really turn it upside
23 down? Or is it ok -- is it okay for us to stop and
24 consider carefully what are good solid adjustments,
25 modifications? Because I'm -- we don't have as much time



1 as it might be like, it's less than two years, and to do
2 this right takes a little bit more time than jamming it all
3 into two years. That's all, I'm done.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

5 DR. FLORES: Well, I think you think that
6 it's all that because the standards are out, the curricula
7 is out too but I don't think that's the case. I'm -- I --
8 I'll just give --

9 MS. GOFF: I wasn't thinking in terms of
10 curricula, I'm sorry but I -- I -- I'm just thinking in
11 terms of the whole process of how do we approach basically
12 our state's necessary about what's important for kids to
13 know while they're in school?

14 MS. FLORES: Well, there's a large majority
15 of people out there that may not be saying much but I don't
16 think -- I don't think they -- they accept these standards.
17 And I think that, let me give you an example of Houston --
18 of Houston, I'm sorry, Denver. Denver is having a --
19 they're taking five years. They started two years ago
20 looking at textbooks for Common Core standard. They're not
21 using it on all schools, they've limited it to a few
22 schools as far as materials.

23 So let's say that they started last year,
24 and they're just beginning to take selected some, and are
25 using it here, and there. I don't know what the other



1 teachers are doing. I think everybody is just confused
2 about, you know, what they're gonna teach. They don't have
3 any tools because you know, they're basically saying well,
4 they're good -- some of -- some of them we're good, and I'm
5 just also thinking about other friends that I have across
6 the country, and some of them in districts are thinking
7 well, it may -- these are not good, they're already making
8 assumptions.

9 What the publishers are -- are looking at is
10 it's not good, or it's good, it's the quality isn't there.
11 And so what are we teaching? I mean, what are we using as
12 tools? And we think of curricula, you know that's already
13 out there, and I venture to say to you that there are a lot
14 of districts that don't have a curricula because either
15 they don't understand or they don't have the capacity, you
16 know, to start creating curricula.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just I guess what I would
19 think would be a good way to start this work possibly if
20 the Board would agree is for us to sit down with a copy --
21 copies of the standards, and actually read them. I would
22 ask ourselves have we actually read the standards? I mean,
23 I'm quoting from the math standards Grade six, understand
24 the concept of a ratio, and use ratio language to describe
25 a ratio relationship between two quantities. I mean, the



1 nature of the language infused into mathematics, and met
2 with a parent recently who said they as my -- my third
3 grader to explain something, and that they had done in
4 math.

5 And -- and their ability to mete
6 linguistically analyze the operational process in doing
7 math developmentally really didn't make a lot of sense.
8 Just like the child got the right answer but he, or she was
9 asked to explain. Now we know in terms of child
10 development that our ability to reflect on our ability to
11 accomplish a task is developmentally related, and -- and
12 it's difficult to step back, and explain something all the
13 time depending on one's level of development
14 linguistically, and a host of other issues. There's an
15 example of an underlying assumption that could emerge if we
16 would sit down, and actually read the standards, and the
17 assumptions that have driven the way they're written, and
18 that's one example.

19 So I guess I would ask as we start the
20 process, could we take a day? And could we print out in
21 hard copy the standards, and really read them, and then
22 examine the assumptions that have driven the way they're
23 written, and the way they function? And then we can begin
24 some of these other processes. If we don't do that, we're



1 just going to tweak the standards. And I guess I think we
2 should examine them holistically.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The answer I think to your
4 question Dr. Scheffel, is yes we can, and we will take that
5 -- that time, and will -- will serve as staff for what
6 would be the most appropriate opportunity schedule there.
7 And I think it's I've said before that the -- the
8 fundamental problem with Common Core math standards is that
9 the write answer is less important than the way you get it.
10 And as I noted that my son in law who has a master's degree
11 in engineering had a hard time helping his third grader
12 with his math homework. That's unacceptable. And I think
13 that's driven by these standards that -- that -- that
14 reward process over result. So we will take time, and we
15 will do that.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Yes, Ms. Goff?

17 MS. GOFF: You know, they technical but I
18 really don't wanna get into that this time. The -- the
19 notebooks that we've got prior when they were adopted, are
20 those still the same as far as the -- the main content of
21 them?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

23 MS. GOFF: So I don't know that we all need
24 to have everything we reprinted. That is a huge amount of
25 writing.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We would be happy to
2 print out as many as are needed.

3 MS. GOFF: Well, they -- they are online.
4 So I -- I mean, you all are look it out, it's -- they can
5 be done in small chunks I suppose if that's what would
6 work. But when -- I have to make one last comment here.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

8 MS. GOFF: We're talking about assumptions
9 here, assumptions, assumptions. You know, I guess one
10 thing that will probably need to have a conversation on is
11 who should be -- who is assumed to be the target for the
12 way those standards are written. Now, you know, a set of
13 standards is for -- for I would say my first reaction is
14 teachers. This -- this is the -- the person, the group
15 that we're gonna -- we're gonna look at these aspirational
16 things, and we're going to design, implement model our
17 curriculum which brings in all the materials, and
18 everything after this. So as a former teacher I can't help
19 but think I better understand and identify with what that
20 says. I need to be the first one to do that, and I don't
21 know that a huge volume of standards is gonna be set down
22 in front of a third grader, and say tell me what you see,
23 and what you understand your mission is.

24 I think that's the job of the classroom
25 teacher. So my concern would be that teachers are first



1 familiar, and truly, and own, and buy into what that means,
2 you know. Then they make the decision of how am I going to
3 implement that in my classroom. That connects changelings
4 to parents to understand what the purpose of this, and how
5 that goes, and what's meant to be the outcome of that, and
6 -- and what -- what it looks like if you wanna do that. I
7 just -- I'm just -- I think our assumptions about who's --
8 who starts this process? We wanna keep it in a rotating
9 system. So who is it most important to at the very
10 beginning? I'm not gonna say, you know, there's a definite
11 answer to that. I'm just as my experience in sitting in a
12 classroom, and doing these standards for several years
13 before the final ones were even existing, I'd say that --
14 that the key person in this is the teacher.

15 And if -- if we -- if we come out with a
16 product, and whether it involves tweaks, or major
17 (inaudible), that's really not an issue to me right now
18 right today. I just think a teacher needs to understand
19 and feel comfortable in what this is asking them to teach.
20 And -- and that suggests the manner by which that is done.
21 So that's, you know, I appreciate. I -- I know Deb, I --
22 we've all had conversations out there with people, and
23 there's still a lot of fuzzy, fuzziness about it, and some
24 have come around. They are kind of enjoy it. They're
25 learning about how it's done. Others are still struggling.



1 I do think that one of that if we can accomplish, and a
2 clearing of misunderstanding now on this -- this point in
3 time, that's a really good thing to look forward to for
4 everybody sake. But we've got -- we've got to get in, and
5 where -- what is the -- where's the starting point to this
6 little this diagram, where does it start? That's -- that's
7 my point.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores?

9 MS. FLORES: You know, when I was running a
10 couple of years ago, I had a call from an engineer who was
11 very concerned. This is a practitioner who was very
12 concerned -- who was very concerned about some friends that
13 he had, and he wanted me to meet with his group of -- of --
14 of engineers, and I did. And their big problem was that
15 how could, I mean, these were engineers work they couldn't,
16 they were working engineers. They had jobs. They were
17 doing supposedly a good job, and I take that because they
18 hadn't been fired, and they couldn't help their kids with
19 their homework, and they were all of the opinion what are
20 you teaching out there? So I mean, something is wrong when
21 you have engineers in their 30's, you know, probably maybe
22 some 40's, who -- who cannot help their kids with -- with --
23 - with -- with the math, and I'm talking about elementary
24 math.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Any other
2 questions? Ms. Colzman?

3 MS. COLSMAN: Mr. Chairman, members of the
4 Board, this has been extremely helpful to hear your
5 thoughts on this work. To Dr. Scheffel's point, I think
6 what the first phase that we show on this slide just is
7 around research, and information gathering. I think you're
8 suggesting to -- to add more to that phase which is that
9 deeper dive, looking at some underlying assumptions as
10 absolutely something that we can work into this process,
11 and then determine what do we do with all of that
12 information, I think would be the next question. So you
13 know, whether, you know, that the suggestion the proposal
14 would be to have some committees that would then take the
15 direction from the Board, and what they see from the
16 feedback from the field, and be able to start making some
17 recommendations back to you for revisions.

18 A few things that I would suggest for the
19 Board is to consider is recall that we have 10 content
20 areas right now, and two of them have the include the
21 common core. So we have science, and social studies
22 standards, all for the Arts areas. A comprehensive health,
23 and PE, and those standards do not have there -- there is
24 no common core in those areas. So there could be a
25 different level of revision for different content areas,



1 and there could be a different level of revision needed at
2 particular grade levels. So I think those are things that
3 we are very much aware of. So the -- the basic process
4 than what we're saying is that we would involve public
5 feedback along the way, this would be driven by the state
6 board. The general timeline that we're looking at is that
7 the '16-'17 school year which is now, as all in the
8 planning research on resource development phase of just
9 getting ready for this.

10 And with the idea that, ideally we could
11 actually start convening, and getting some, start this work
12 during the school year, and it might be towards the end of
13 the school year. But that process would continue through
14 the '17-'18 school year, with a July 2018 kind of endpoint
15 for the process. Districts would have two years to review,
16 and revise their standards, and this is a process set into
17 statute with the first year of implementation which would
18 coincide with a state assessment revision. As we've
19 discussed this with Joyce Zurkowski, this fits with a -- a
20 timeline what it would take to make any type of revisions
21 to the state assessment system as well. Please, do not ask
22 me too many technical questions about that. I'd like to
23 leave those to her.

24 So we've already mentioned that there is a
25 perception survey which is providing broad level feedback,



1 this opened through this coming Sunday. Today, we are able
2 to demonstrate, we actually have some screen shots of our
3 online standards review system because we had a little bit
4 of some technical difficulty being able to display the live
5 site for you in here today, and we thought rather than
6 watch technical difficulties because we all know how much
7 fun that is, we have kind of three screenshots just to give
8 you a sense of what this is, but we'll send you a link so
9 that you can actually go in, and look at this.

10 So we'll ask now to flip over to the
11 screenshots, and this is only 58 more slides, so I think
12 we'll be good. Yes, another joke. And so the first -- the
13 first thing that you'll see, and again you're not going to
14 read the details you're looking just kind of holistically
15 at this. This is what you would see if you were to select
16 like fourth grade social studies, and you would click on
17 history. So you would see the actual like instead of like
18 you have in your big binders of the standards, you would
19 see the pages of the standards laid out here. Looks very
20 similar to the actual standards lay out. I want to thank
21 our -- our Web Management Team, Michelle Gephart, and
22 Marcus Johnstone. They worked very, very hard on this, and
23 have done an amazing job to get this to be very, very user
24 friendly.



1 So as you navigate into it, what you'll see
2 is there's a couple of little icons which you can't tell,
3 at least I can't, even have my progressive lenses on I
4 still can't see. But in the upper left hand corner next to
5 each of the components of the standards like the prepared
6 graduate competencies, there's a little I, which is a
7 little information icon that says if you don't know what
8 that means because you might not have been into the
9 standards. If you click on the I, what it will do is it
10 will tell you what a definition of that component is. So
11 just help it be more user friendly.

12 The next pieces, and I'll go back to the
13 screenshot, and to the right of every single statement
14 within this what you'll see is a little, a little quote
15 balloon which is a place if you click on one of those quote
16 balloons you will get a pop up box which will say please
17 provide feedback on them. One thing is to say to revise
18 it, and there's a comment box to say, this is what it
19 should be revised to say, or it should say this is very
20 complex language. This is really hard for me to understand
21 or my students to understand. Please, simplify this. The
22 other option is to move it, so move it to another grade
23 level. So the idea of wow this was inappropriate for
24 fourth grade. This is either too high or too low.



1 So you can say this really should be in
2 fifth grade, or this should really be in third grade. And
3 then the other is remove, meaning this is something that we
4 just don't think needs to be in the standard. So there's
5 that option there. So through this online feedback system
6 we'll be able to collect that. So what do we do with all
7 of that. Well, what we'll be able to do is create a
8 database such that we can be able to filter by grade level,
9 by content area every single comment so that we can start
10 to look for some of those trends, so we can say is there a
11 trend happening at a particular grade or a particular
12 content area, so that any revisions that we'd have would be
13 based on the feedback of the -- the users of the standards,
14 or the people who care deeply about what -- what kids are
15 learning.

16 So this -- this system will be open through
17 the end of -- through the end of this calendar year, and
18 what we'll have then it starting at the beginning of
19 January, beginning of the new year, will be a survey
20 feedback results to present to you. So you'll be able to
21 see what is the general perception survey, and we'll begin
22 to at least start to say we won't bring you every comment
23 that's provided, you're welcome to look at them all. But
24 we will be able to note some beginning trends of what we're
25 seeing. So in essence that -- that is what is coming next,



1 and if we could flip back to the original presentation,
2 what we have on the horizon? We have anticipated coming in
3 December with talking a little bit about the committee
4 application process. We can still do that.

5 I'll defer to the chairman about the focus
6 of that, but we can also come forward, and talk a little
7 bit more about the proposal that Dr. Scheffel brought
8 forward, and talk about ways that we can achieve that
9 opportunity of looking at some of those deeper assumptions.
10 In early 2017, as we get closer to -- to a plan for the
11 revision process that the board is comfortable with, will
12 then begin to have a communication process because we know
13 that it's important to the field to know what's happening,
14 and when will it be happening. And monthly through July
15 2018, we plan to bring forward updates, and decision points
16 for the process. So we've asked lots -- you've have
17 questions comments, and feedback throughout this. I just
18 wanted to end with any -- an opportunity for any final
19 thoughts, if Mr. Chairman, or any of the Board Members.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any last comment? Yes,
21 Ms. Rankin?

22 MS. RANKIN: These are -- these are Colorado
23 state standards, correct?

24 MS. COLSMAN: Correct.

25 MS. RANKIN: According to state law?



1 MS. COLSMAN: Correct.

2 MS. RANKIN: And they differ from ESSA
3 standards?

4 MS. COLSMAN: That's a really good question.
5 Tomorrow, we'll get into this in a deeper way, but the ESSA
6 requires believe it's four components for our standards for
7 our academic standards one that they be, and I'm going to
8 put this quote challenging, it's in air quotes on purpose
9 because there's -- there's not really a definition for
10 challenging. They need to be aligned with career, and
11 tech-ed standards. Well as Carol noted, our standards
12 already are because that's required by state law. The feds
13 required states have standards in math, reading art, and
14 language arts, and science. You saw that our state exceeds
15 that, our state law. So we already meet that component of
16 the feds, and the final requirement is that they apply to
17 all schools, our standards do.

18 Now, there are requirements for English
19 language proficiency standards from the feds as well as
20 alternate achievement standards for students with
21 significant cognitive disabilities. The bottom line in
22 this will be the spoiler alert for tomorrow is our state
23 law already ensures our standards meet what the feds
24 require, and so are our state plan for standards is quite
25 minimal, we say we already meet your requirements.



1 MS. RANKIN: So we're just duplicating?

2 MS. COLSMAN: No, because actually we don't
3 need to do anything we don't need -- in fact, the Congress
4 specifically prohibited the Secretary of Education from
5 asking to see our standards. So -- so really for our state
6 plan, all we're doing is writing an assurance that we meet
7 federal law, and they can't ask us to -- to show what their
8 standards -- our standards, to show that they're
9 challenging. We just provide the assurance of yap, we meet
10 your -- your requirements.

11 MS. RANKIN: So when you started out today
12 you mentioned that you had other state standards. Are they
13 somehow linked to this evaluation thing because I can see
14 some constituents that are extremely concerned about these
15 issues. Saying, I'm not technical enough to rewrite it,
16 but I know it needs to be rewritten. There may be other
17 states that have it written in the language that makes more
18 sense. And as Dr. Scheffel said, you know, some of this
19 gets very convoluted, and very difficult to understand are
20 you -- are you looking at math or looking at -- at language
21 arts when you're writing a word math tests let's say.

22 So we can say yes -- yes we did, we looked
23 at other states, but how does anyone that's interested have
24 that kind of link off of this evaluation to what some other
25 states are doing, or do you know this already, and say hey



1 there are some states that are very similar to ours just
2 maybe a little different wording, and can direct people to
3 that. How does that work?

4 MS. COLSMAN: So that's -- that's a very
5 good question, and we'll -- we'll actually have some
6 reports to share with you in the near future, but as part
7 of this research process as -- as Carol noted, our -- our
8 standards need to be comparable in scope, and seek rigor
9 with the highest performing states, and nations. So we
10 have looked at, and commissioned some studies to help us
11 look at what is what, for instance, for science is there
12 their state that we to look to for a -- a high achieving
13 state. So you know, Massachusetts comes up as one of those
14 states.

15 So what we'd create, we've commissioned some
16 reports that help us know where could Colorado's standards
17 be adjusted to meet those required, or those the rigor of
18 other states. So we -- we have that available as those
19 reports are ready, those will go up on our website. How
20 interactive they would be for the general public. I think,
21 you know, they be more technical I think than -- than the
22 general public. But if it's something that we can do is
23 say here's -- here the a link to those actual state
24 standards that's very easy for us to do on our website.



1 MS. RANKIN: And another -- another question
2 about that. I mean, I don't believe we should reinvent the
3 wheel if somebody has a better way of doing it let's just
4 take theirs, but shouldn't these be pretty close to each
5 other. I mean a second grader should have similar
6 standards here as in Massachusetts. I mean, they shouldn't
7 vary that much, probably they might vary a little. But
8 what is your broad view of that?

9 MS. COLSMAN: You know, there tends to be
10 some sort of general consensus I would say often like one,
11 or two grade levels as to where some content is across
12 states, and I do think that there is kind of that desire to
13 say, you know, how do we make sure we're hitting the right
14 content at the right grade level. So there is often that
15 adjustment that can happen. I think that's what the
16 benchmark kind of force can help us do is start to first of
17 all say, you know, how do we stack up with those, and is
18 our level just right? So I think that, you know, given
19 committees the right information like here is what's a
20 bench marking report says about your standards. Here's
21 what the public says about your standards, here's very
22 specific feedback on each, and every element of the
23 standards giving them all of that good information as well
24 as taking a look at the underlying assumptions and starting



1 them off on the right path, I think we can set them up for
2 -- for really good success.

3 MS. RANKIN: And we also have to parallel
4 those with our tests so that we're not teaching one thing,
5 and testing something new.

6 MS. COLSMAN: That's a great point on,
7 because really the sequence is always first develop your
8 standards then develop your assessments. So whether the
9 adjustments would be needed to the standards come, I'm
10 sorry, to the assessment comes after any adjustments are
11 made.

12 MS. RANKIN: Thanks very much, that's very
13 thorough. I really appreciate your report.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Any other
15 questions? Thank you very much very helpful. I appreciate
16 it, and Ms. Gates thank you for your assistance in this.
17 Ms. Cordial, would you care to read executive session
18 notice, please.

19 MS. CORDIAL: An executive session has been
20 noticed for today's state board meeting in conformance with
21 24-6-423(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific
22 legal questions pursuant to 24-6-423(a)(II) CRS in matters
23 required to be kept confidential by federal law, or rules,
24 or State statutes pursuant to 24-6-423(a)(III) CRS.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. Is
2 there motion for an executive session?

3 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin has moved an
5 executive session, Ms. Mazanec, makes seconds. It's been
6 moved, and seconded, is there objection to the motion for
7 the executive session? Seeing that motion is adopted by
8 vote of six to nothing, those who are not entitled to stay
9 for the executive session please leave. We will take a 10
10 minute break, and we'll reconvene at 12:15 p.m. for the
11 executive session.

12 (Meeting adjourned)



1 C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
11 and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25