



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
January 13, 2016, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on January 13, 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: The State Board of
2 Education will come to order, and I'll do Elizabeth's job
3 this morning, and remind everybody speaking to the
4 microphones, and turn them on. So we'll try it, for a
5 while, and see how that works. Would you please call the
6 roll and we apologize for our late start.

7 MS. BURDSALL: Of course. Board Member
8 Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Here.

10 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

11 MS. GOFF: Here.

12 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

14 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.

15 MS. RANKIN: Here.

16 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

18 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

20 MS. BURDSALL: And Chairman Durham.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Here. Dr. Asp, would you
22 mind leading us in the Pledge of Allegiance this morning?

23 MR. ASP: Not at all.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Everybody please stand.

25 MR. ASP: I pledge allegiance.



1 ALL: To the Flag of the United States of
2 America, and to the Republic for which it stands. One
3 Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty, and justice
4 for all.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Asp.
6 Number one, we have? Let's see, is there a motion for the
7 approval of the agenda?

8 MS. BURDSALL: Somewhat.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved. Is there
10 second for the approval of the -- yes, Ms. Goff?

11 MS. GOFF: I would like to amend -- make an
12 amendment, if I can this time?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Certainly.

14 MS. GOFF: If we might add under the 11:00
15 session, I don't have the number right in front of me, the
16 Seal Biliteracy presentation, and as an information
17 introduction resolution in support of the Seal Biliteracy
18 in Colorado.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Is there objection
20 to that addition to the agenda? Ms. Mazanec?

21 MS. MAZANEC: Can we do the motion first,
22 and then discuss? I forget what this is?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We need a second. Could
24 you second?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So it has been
2 moved, and seconded that there'd be a discussion of a
3 resolution. Ms. Goff?

4 MS. GOFF: All teamwork, information only.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Information only? Is
6 there objection to that motion to amend the agenda? Seeing
7 that -- that motion is adopted. Is there objection to the
8 motion for the adoption of the agenda as amended? Dr.
9 Flores?

10 MS. FLORES: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh okay. Yes?

12 MS. FLORES: No objection.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there objection?

14 MS. FLORES: Oh no. No objection. I second
15 it.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Good. No
17 objection to that motion. So the agenda is approved as --
18 as amended. So now moving right along, we have.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Let's start at too much.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's see, I'm working on
21 this. Yes. Let's see, we're now on for the approval of
22 the consent agenda. Yes, Dr. Schroeder?

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I move to place the
24 following matters on the consent agenda. 14.01, regarding
25 disciplinary proceedings concerning an application, charge



1 number 2014-EC-26-88. Direct department staff to issue a
2 notice of denial, and appeal rights to the applicant
3 pursuant to Section 24-4-104 CRS. 14.02, approve Adams
4 State College request for re-authorization of early
5 childhood education preparation program as set forth in the
6 published agenda. 14.03, approve Western State Colorado
7 University's request for re-authorization of administrator
8 preparation program as set forth in the published agenda.
9 14.04, approve CDE's Office of Approved Facilities Schools
10 proposed principal/administrator induction program as set
11 forth in the published agenda. 14.05, approve the
12 University of Colorado, Colorado Springs' request for
13 authorization of inclusive elementary education initial
14 teacher licensure program as set forth in the published
15 agenda. 14.06, approve 11 initial emergency authorizations
16 as set forth in the published agenda. 15.01, appoint Alma
17 Palmer, Chelsie Ann Henckel, and Pam Christy to fill the
18 vacancies on the State Advisory Council for Parent
19 Involvement in Education, effective January 15, 2016.
20 15.02, approve the continuation of the title one, multi-
21 district online allocation pilot project -- project using
22 the established criteria for 2016-'17 school year. This is
23 the end of consent agenda.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to the
25 motion for the approval of the consent agenda?



1 MS. GOFF: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff, seconds the
3 motion. This requires a unanimous consent. Is there
4 objection to the approval of the -- to the adoption of the
5 items on the consent agenda? Seeing none, then the motion
6 is adopted unanimously. Now let's see where -- Ms.
7 Burdsall, let's see, your report please.

8 MS. BURDSALL: Of course. Good morning
9 Chairman Durham, members of the Board, and Interim
10 Commissioner Asp. I -- since Steve gave my friendly
11 reminder of the microphones, I'll just give out the -- for
12 anybody needing to log onto the CDE wireless. It is -- if
13 you do want to locate the CDE hotspot, and the password is
14 Silver, capital S. In your board packets, you have the
15 following materials. You have your quick glance expense
16 report, and your events calendar.

17 For item 11.01, you have a copy of the
18 Colorado, and the Seal Biliteracy PowerPoint. And Adams
19 14, Ill County School District, and DPS is sealed
20 biliteracy brochure, and their application form, which has
21 been placed before you on Board bench this morning.

22 For item 13.01, you have a copy of the
23 exceptional children's education act rules, both red lined.
24 And -- sorry, both red lined, and cleaned, and then a
25 crosswalk between OLLS review, and feedback, and rule.



1 For item 14.01, you have a copy of the
2 Educator Preparation, and Licensing Rules, and red lined
3 only due to the size of the document. The clean copy is
4 available on board docs. You have the exceptions
5 documents, the licensure rule alignment fact sheet, and the
6 accompanying PowerPoint.

7 For item 15.01, you have a copy of
8 Application Materials in Support of Appointments to the
9 State Advisory Council for Parent Involvement in Education.

10 For item 15.02, you have the memo regarding
11 the Title One Allocation Pilot for Multi district Online
12 Schools, as well as a briefing.

13 For Item 16.01, you have a copy of the Draft
14 Rules for the Administration of the School Bullying
15 Prevention, and Education Grant Program, a crosswalk of the
16 statute, and rule, the -- an accompanying PowerPoint, and a
17 copy of House Bill 111254.

18 For item 16.02, you have the Kindergarten
19 School Readiness for Reporting System PowerPoint, as well
20 as the -- as well as the School Readiness Components within
21 CAP4K.

22 For item 17.01, you have the -- you have the
23 memorandum regarding the updates to the Read Act Rules. A
24 redlined copy of the rules, and a crosswalk of OLLS review,
25 and the rule.



1 For item 19.01, you have the Alternative
2 Education Campuses Accountability Work Group PowerPoint,
3 and their executive summary table.

4 For item 19.02, you have the school --
5 School, and District Performance Framework State
6 Expectations PowerPoint.

7 For Thursday, for item 3.01, you have a copy
8 of the data-sharing agreement with the University of
9 Virginia, which has been placed before you on your Board
10 bench this morning. You have a copy of the categorical
11 buyback presentation from the superintendents of Genoa-
12 Hugo, Cripple Creek, and Pawnee, which have been placed
13 before you on the Board bench this morning, and they will
14 be providing you with their PowerPoint tomorrow, and that
15 concludes my report.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any questions for Ms.
17 Burdsall? Thank you very much. Dr. Asp, for the
18 commissionaires update?

19 MR. ASP: Thank you Mr. Chair. First is the
20 legislative update, and our legislative liaison, Jennifer
21 Melanie who'll provide that to the Board.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good morning. It's
23 lovely to see you all. So the legislature starts today, in
24 case you didn't know, in case the parking problems didn't
25 tell you that. So quickly, I'm just going to go through,



1 kind of, I -- I think this is a more specific prediction
2 that I was able to offer in November, and December, right?
3 We get more specific as we get closer to the session. So
4 I'll give you a sense for what I think is coming down the
5 pike, and obviously happy to answer any questions. You
6 know the funding conversation will continue, will -- will
7 continue loud, and -- and unabated until probably early May
8 when the budget will be finalized. The -- you probably
9 have all heard that several school groups did a press
10 conference earlier this week, kind of calling attention to
11 the funding issue. What I found interesting is that while
12 they certainly talked about the negative factor in the
13 proposed increase in the negative factor, they also focused
14 a fair amount on keeping -- so the local share has gone up
15 quite a bit over predictions, and -- and their strategy to
16 be able to keep that, not essentially have that. It gets
17 complicated, and Leanne Emm could explain it better than I
18 can. But it would essentially be a way for them to keep
19 more funding in their districts. So that's interesting.
20 The other thing that's happened in terms of projections
21 versus actuals, is we projected more students than there
22 actually are, which again, could accrue as a savings to the
23 state. But I think that the press conference to me, really
24 signaled that in terms of the next few months, I think the
25 school funding conversation will focus on those two issues



1 in addition to the ongoing negative factor discussion.
2 There's been a lot of talk, I know you guys have probably
3 been very interested into with, you know, we have this new
4 federal law, and -- and it's -- I'm told about 400 pages
5 long, which I don't think I've ever seen a 400 page bill at
6 the State Capitol. I'm -- I'm -- I'm glad about that,
7 because it seems like a big bill to go through.

8 Okay. Knock on wood. Is there any wood
9 around, can you knock on some wood up there for me? You
10 know, we've been asked by several legislators, do we need
11 any legislation to implement it? Staff continues to work
12 through the bill. The answer is kind of a qualified no.
13 So at this point, we don't think we need any legislation as
14 the -- as our -- as the staff's understanding of the bill
15 grows. And frankly, as the feds go forward in terms of
16 their implementation and rulemaking process, that could
17 change. But at the moment, we don't anticipate the need,
18 doesn't mean there's not opportunities for some people, but
19 there's not a need to address state statute.

20 I do think the one thing that -- so previous
21 to that bill passing, it was a federal requirement that we
22 have a high school test, and they would not count ninth
23 grade towards high school. Now they've made it clear that
24 ninth grade can count towards high school. So in Colorado
25 right now, we have a ninth grade, and a tenth grade test.



1 I think because the federal law has changed, we are likely
2 to see legislation eliminating probably the ninth grade
3 test. So again, the federal law doesn't require that but
4 it -- it provides an opportunity to those who would like to
5 reduce testing to move forward in that way. Related to the
6 ESEA, as you all -- I know have -- have been, staff has --
7 has talked to you quite a bit about the Feds now requiring
8 a non-academic measure as a part portion of our
9 accountability system.

10 I don't know that that is a statute change,
11 people don't seem to think that we need a statute change.
12 But I think it's a discussion that in addition to, I think
13 the work of the staff has done with -- with the districts,
14 and those stakeholders, will want to be including the
15 legislature in that conversation, and making sure we have
16 their perspective as we move forward in terms of
17 implementing that. I do also think --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder, do you have
19 a question?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh please.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Where there examples --
22 where there examples in the discussions in the federal
23 level in terms of what would be a measure?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, Dr.
2 Schroeder, can I turn to Allyson Pearson to answer that
3 question?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson.

6 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair. So the federal law
7 laid out some examples of what could be there, could be
8 student engagement measures, teacher engagement measures,
9 other measures of post-secondary readiness --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Such as?

11 MS. PEARSON: -- course -- course taking.
12 It just says, post-secondary workforce success in there.
13 Basically what they're saying, is it needs to be a measure
14 that differentiates school performance. It needs to be
15 available statewide, and consistent statewide. So the same
16 measure, you could have different measures at elementary,
17 middle versus high school. But for all elementaries, you
18 need to use the same measure, and you need to be able to
19 desegregate the results.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

21 MS. PEARSON: So we are looking to see what
22 data we have available currently that would might meet that
23 and get feedback on that. And then put together the
24 feedback we've gotten around the state about what other
25 measures might be useful, that maybe we don't have right



1 now, and then we can have that as the beginning point for
2 some decision making.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: But it's got to be done
4 across the districts.

5 MS. PEARSON: Yes, statewide. They want the
6 same measure.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Which we -- which means, we
8 again have the challenge of some measure that when you only
9 have what, 25 kids in your district --

10 MS. PEARSON: Exactly.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: -- has a different impact --

12 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- than a large district.

14 MS. PEARSON: It -- it doesn't mean
15 necessarily that we couldn't have some individual measures
16 to wean our system because I think that there might be room
17 for that. And the discretion the state is allowed to have,
18 if the state wanted to choose to say, "Look, we're going to
19 let schools, and districts pick measures."

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh okay.

21 MS. PEARSON: "But for the federal
22 requirement, we have to have one that's the same." Does
23 that make sense?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: No. Didn't you just say two
25 different things to me?



1 MS. PEARSON: So the federal law says, we
2 need to have another indicator that's the same.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

4 MS. PEARSON: It doesn't preclude us, as far
5 as I've read so far, and we need Tony to weigh in, and US
6 Department of Eds to weigh in. It doesn't necessarily
7 preclude us for saying, we -- we could allow some local
8 measures that are different across the state in addition to
9 having that one consistent.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: But it does sound like there
11 still needs to be one consistent --

12 MS. PEARSON: Yes. New other --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- measure other than the
14 assessments that we tend to focus on?

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. It's a measure of
16 either school quality, or student success, is how they're
17 qualifying it.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So if there are surveys for
19 example, which is one of the ways you measure any kind of
20 engagement, it would have to be the same survey?

21 MS. PEARSON: That's a good question. I
22 think that's something we can ask the US Department of Ed,
23 if we're saying, we want a survey of engagement, student
24 engagement. It doesn't have to be the exact same survey,



1 or do you let locals use their own survey. There's a lot
2 to learn, and figure out like that.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: In addition to asking the
4 Feds, I think I'm a little more interested in knowing what
5 we think about that.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So I would want some
8 staffed, and -- and the folks that you bring together for
9 these projects. I've just think about that and -- and
10 indicate, do you think it's really got to be the same, or
11 what attributes --

12 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- have to be included, or
14 what in order to -- 'cause some of these other measures
15 start getting mushy.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: I think. And uncomfortable
18 for some parents, uncomfortable for some teachers.

19 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: And so we're -- we're kinda
21 opening up a new set of discussions.

22 MS. PEARSON: Seems like they?

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Seems like, yeah.

24 MS. PEARSON: We're having a technical
25 advisory panel meeting with our growth experts, and our



1 measurement experts next week. I'm going to start talking
2 with them a little bit, and then we have a kind of ability
3 work group in February, after the February board meeting.
4 But we'll be getting more feedback then. So we'll start
5 having these conversations, we'll bring it all back to you
6 all.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. Thanks
8 for the interruption.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin?

10 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Mello, have you heard of
11 any potential bills coming through that would address this
12 issue?

13 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair -- Ms. Rankin, no, I
14 have not. I know that there's been a lot of questions from
15 legislators about it, and it came up at our JBC hearing.
16 But I'm not aware of any specific legislative proposal at
17 this point.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes Mr. -- Commissioner
19 Asp.

20 MR. ASP: I just wanted to point out
21 following Ms. Pearson's remarks that we we're -- in some
22 ways we're well poised for this, remember our rural group,
23 who's looking at accountability pilot as investing in
24 several of these different kinds of measures, non-academic
25 pieces. So we -- we'll have a chance to learn from them as



1 well as we've been having discussions already over about
2 the last nine months, just thinking about how we can
3 enhance our accountability system. So I think the state,
4 there will be a lot of folks out there that would like to
5 weigh in on this, and I think we'll have a very interesting
6 discussion before we're done.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms Goff.

8 MS. GOFF: Technical timeline question.
9 When is the guidance supposed to start coming through?

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We don't -- we don't know.

11 MR. ASP: It -- it's gonna have to be soon,
12 state plans are due on July 1st.

13 MS. GOFF: Of this year?

14 MR. ASP: Yes.

15 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions, Ms.
17 O'Neill?

18 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'll
19 just add on a few more points. Also in the kind of
20 accountability bucket, if you will. I think the impact of
21 the opt out rates that we have seen in our state and -- and
22 will -- will certainly be a topic of conversation. And I
23 think, you different folks have different opinions about
24 whether those opt out rates make the some of the measures
25 we use right now in the accountability system valid, or



1 invalid. But I expect that to be a rather vigorous
2 conversation as well. Obviously data privacy is a big
3 deal, something that you all have shown immense leadership
4 on, and -- and that has been lovely frankly to be able to
5 tell that story over the Capitol. So we are as, you know,
6 on your behalf I've been working with Representative
7 Landin, and Garnet. We continue to work, I -- I, we have a
8 lot of just conversations, and they are I think working
9 through a lot of these are difficult issues, these are
10 difficult policy issues. There are some challenging
11 political issues that surround this, and so the -- the
12 question I get asked most frequently is do you have a
13 draft? And the answer is no. Everyone out there hear that
14 too. If I had one I would share it. I don't.

15 So we continue to work hard on that. And --
16 and you know, I -- I want to reassure you that we are, and
17 I believe the legislators are absolutely committed to the
18 strongest bill possible. So they want this to be a
19 substantive real strong bill as you do. So we're working
20 on that. The final thing I thought I would note is, and I
21 think I mentioned this earlier but again, there's a lot of
22 talk, writing, things bubbling up around the transition
23 between K12, and Higher Ed, or the career tech system. And
24 I think people are really starting to think more about
25 this, and so I don't -- I think there'll be a handful of



1 legislative proposals around concurrent enrollment for
2 example, and making some changes to the concurrent
3 enrollment system. I don't know -- I don't anticipate a
4 huge amount of legislation on this -- this year. I think
5 this is the beginning of a -- of a curve, an upward curve
6 of interest in conversation in this topic.

7 So obviously, we'll report on specific
8 legislative proposals but wanted to flag that for you, this
9 a lot of talk, and noise about it. And I said it's a
10 fascinating, and very substantive issue, right? How do we
11 most effectively support our kids in making that transition
12 whatever that -- the right transition for them. It's not -
13 - it's not at all about everyone should go to a four year
14 college. It's -- the conversation acknowledges there's
15 lots of ways to be successful, but making sure we help kids
16 make that transition. In concurrent enrollment, I'm told,
17 I'm far from the expert, has shown a lot of promise in that
18 way. There are some other things. Last year there was
19 legislation around P-tech schools. Two of those have been
20 approved, and my understanding is there is just again from
21 talking to staff, there's a lot of interest in that, and
22 that's an interesting concept.

23 MS. GOFF: Excuse me, did you say P-Tech?

24 MS. O'NEILL: P-tech. That's clearly an
25 abbreviation for something, but I don't -- I'm looking at



1 my friends here. Tech is an abbreviation for technology.
2 I know that the Tech is for technology, I don't know what
3 the P's for. Okay.

4 MS. GOFF: You are secluding us.

5 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. I don't know what the P
6 is for, but -- but I mean, really I think perhaps in some
7 ways more interest than was anticipated that's a program
8 where essentially kids can stay in high school for two
9 additional years, and work to get a college certificate of
10 some sort, a meaningful one. So it's -- it's an
11 interesting approach, and just again lots of conversation.

12 MS. GOFF: IBM has led the way on this in
13 some other states.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah absolutely.

15 MS. GOFF: With kids graduating, and going
16 straight there.

17 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. So that concludes my
18 report. I'm happy to answer any questions.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Pearson, you have an
20 answer for us on P-tech?.

21 MS. PEARSON: It is Pathways.

22 MS. O'NEILL: Ahh. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Pathways Technology.

24 MS. PEARSON: And technology.



1 MS. GOFF: I heard it yesterday, probably I
2 forgot it.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you. Yes,
4 Dr. Schroeder?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: One, I'm trying to figure
6 out what we haven't done in the area, and not we, what the
7 legislature hasn't done in the area of concurrent
8 enrollment that needs to be addressed. And secondly, what
9 are the discussions about remediation, and concurrent
10 enrollment?

11 MS. O'NEILL: Mr. Chair, Dr. Schroeder. So
12 I think that there will be some legislation to clarify that
13 the courses that students take as part of concurrent
14 enrollment have to be credit courses at a college, as they
15 essentially have to get college credit for them.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So it can't be a tech
17 school?

18 MS. O'NEILL: Well, you know, it could be
19 no. So the distinction is not so much between college, and
20 tech but that there is a meaningful class that moves them
21 forward in a Higher Ed setting, right? That it would count
22 at some sort of whether it's traditional college, or -- or
23 another setting. Because I think there's some concern that
24 there are -- are folks who, students who are -- who are
25 doing the program, and they end up taking classes, and then



1 they think they're going to get college credit, or -- or
2 credit in these settings, and they don't.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Where are they finding these
4 classes then? I'm a little confused because I thought the
5 classes had to be provided through an accredited Higher Ed,
6 or accredited tech school.

7 MS. O'NEILL: Mr. Chair, Madam Vice Chair, I
8 think -- my understanding is community colleges offer a
9 variety of courses. Some of which are college level credit
10 rate, some of which are remedial courses, right? That kids
11 don't get credit for in a college setting. So, and I think
12 that's where the remediation piece ties into. And -- and
13 none of this is to say, I don't think any of this
14 conversation is saying that people had bad intentions or
15 trying to. It's I think being really clear as we -- as a
16 concurrent enrollment program to expand, what the
17 expectation of that program is, and that it is the
18 expectation is that that is used to get students college
19 credit, or career tech credit while they're in high school.

20 So I think we will see a bill in that
21 regard. Your department, and the Department of Higher Ed
22 recently undertook a lean process to look at their
23 administrative processes in concurrent enrollment that was
24 -- that's a very recent, and I'm not the expert to describe
25 it to you. But there may out of that come some



1 opportunities, for some recommendations, for some
2 administrative efficiencies to make sure that we, you know,
3 we're -- that we're not getting in the way that -- that
4 bureaucracy is somehow making it more challenging that --
5 that the departments are working together to maximize
6 access to the program. The other area of conversation I've
7 heard --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: What's a -- what's a lean
9 program? I mean a lean --

10 MS. O'NEILL: Mr. Chair, Madam Vice Chair.
11 Oh boy. It is a --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Another acronym I'm
13 guessing.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Yes. It's a process by which
15 you look at a business process, it -- it started in the
16 private sector. It has moved over to the public sector,
17 and you kind of take a process, and you pick it apart, and
18 you try to make it better. Now, that is far from an
19 official definition. So if someone wants to add something,
20 or differ.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes Dr. Asp?

22 MR. ASP: We have Misti Ruthven, who's a --
23 a -- our director of post-secondary readiness, and she
24 could address a couple of these things if that's all right.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.



1 MS. RUTHVEN: Good morning Mr. Chair,
2 Interim Commissioner Asp, and Board Members. So I think Ms
3 O'Neill did a great job at outlining the Lean process.
4 This is a process that we've partnered with the Department
5 of Higher Education as well as the Colorado Community
6 College system to put together experts from the field. So
7 folks from districts as well as Higher Education to
8 identify current barriers that may exist within the
9 administrative processes for the concurrent enrollment, or
10 the policies that currently exist. So we do have initial
11 recommendations from that group, and are working with the
12 Department of Higher Education to look deeper to see what
13 we can do.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Mazanec.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you Misti. Is it lean
17 as an L-E-A-N?

18 MS. O'NEILL: Yes. But I believe that's an
19 acronym as well.

20 MS. MAZANEC: I was gonna say --

21 MS. O'NEILL: And I'm failing my acronym
22 quiz this morning clearly. So if anyone knows what it
23 stands for. Feel free. The other thing I've seen in
24 concurrent enrollment is a -- is a, in that context is
25 making sure that all kids regardless of where they live in



1 the state have access to the program. And it is at the
2 moment, it's the district choice to participate. Most
3 districts do participate. There are some that don't, and -
4 - and some of that is because they've made a choice for
5 example to use AP courses as instead. Some of it is there
6 are some geographic issues in terms of access to campuses
7 of Higher Education. So that's -- I don't -- I haven't
8 seen a bill draft but that is something I wouldn't be
9 surprised to see legislation on in this context.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Does it cost or -- or in
12 what way does it cost districts?

13 MS. GOFF: AP, it costs training to the --
14 for the faculty.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

16 MS. GOFF: It costs kids to take -- it cost
17 students to take the test unless the district can cover it.
18 We get to the concurrent enrollment, what kind of costs are
19 districts challenged by?

20 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, Madam Vice Chair,
21 so districts get PPOR for these students, and then they
22 have some sort of arrangement with a Higher Education
23 Institution to essentially pay them for those services.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: And they decide that
25 themselves district by district it's not a standard --



1 MS. O'NEILL: Yes, that's my understanding.
2 And I'm gonna just see if Misti has any corrections for me.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Will districts decide costs?

4 MS. GOFF: Well, essentially my
5 understanding is that districts, and whatever institution
6 of Higher Ed they're working with, yeah for concurrent
7 enrollment. They work it out, and that there are different
8 arrangements in different parts of the state.

9 MS. RUTHVEN: Mr. Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please.

11 MS. RUTHVEN: This -- the statute outlines
12 that community colleges, and districts are -- that the
13 districts are responsible for at least the resident
14 community college tuition rate. Now, there are that --
15 that's different among different areas of our state
16 geographically, and that's not necessarily standard.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm trying to make sense
18 of this. For our school districts that are pretty much not
19 getting any more PPOR per kid, and our Higher Ed
20 Institutions that are raising tuition, and are trying to
21 keep tuition at a certain percentage but it's going up year
22 by year. Are we running -- is has anybody analyzed what
23 those costs are district by district if they are involved
24 in concurrent enrollment, and is this something that's



1 gonna get squeezed out based on some of the Higher Ed
2 funding, or tuition challenges?

3 MS. RUTHVEN: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

5 MS. RUTHVEN: So this is something that has,
6 as much as Ms. O'Neill mentioned, that's been outlined
7 locally. And --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: We don't know.

9 MS. ATHENS: We know this has been
10 identified Lean that is something we need to know more
11 about. We know a little but we don't know everything.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So we don't really
13 know what this, where it is right now in terms of
14 differentiating does a small district pay that much more
15 because the institution is further away, or the CU, is a
16 class at CU a whole lot more expensive than a class at
17 front range? Those kinds of things, I would think, yeah I
18 would think so. I mean, I've wondered sometimes why
19 districts hesitate, or why they set a cap on how many kids
20 can engage in a concurrent enrollment, and I'm beginning to
21 figure out now why. And maybe that's where we need some
22 help from the legislature to kind of help us figure out how
23 to make this work for our kids because we're not providing
24 equal opportunity for all kids the way this is structured.



1 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Chair, Madam Vice Chair, I
2 think that absolutely. And I think that's important that
3 the state board be a part of that conversation as it
4 proceeds. Again, I think we're just at the beginning of
5 that conversation, and I think it's not just going to be
6 something for this particular legislative session. And
7 there are other strategies it's not, concurrent enrollment
8 isn't the only strategy that addresses some of those
9 transition issues between the two systems. So I think it's
10 gonna be a very interesting conversation, and you know,
11 we'll see how it goes, and make sure to keep you informed.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: It sounds like we need some
13 data in order to have that conversation be relevant.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff, and then Ms.
15 Rankin.

16 MS. GOFF: Okay. Thank you. Just to put it
17 another way there -- there is a local agreement. There's
18 local agreement where there is between a district with the
19 Higher Ed Institutions, Post-secondary Institutions that
20 they're engaging with, or at a school level, and I think in
21 some districts it is just a school, right? But through the
22 auspices of that district there is a agreement that's
23 developed. I guess Misti, a reminder to me, there are --
24 there is a program, I think it still exists on some level
25 called CU Succeeds, in which students in the -- in the --



1 the high school -- high school students can be enrolled
2 concurrent with when they're in high school for CU courses,
3 and receive credit. The teacher, the instructor of that
4 particular course may be one of the high school's faculty
5 members, but they have to be certified, they have to be
6 licensed at the -- at the Higher Ed level in order to teach
7 this particular course. Is that -- is that also affect --
8 an aspect that's true in concurrent enrollment in general?
9 So there can be instruction delivered by a high school
10 faculty member on site, and that -- that does -- that's
11 included in the -- it is a post-secondary course level, but
12 kids are getting their high school credit along with this
13 college post-secondary course. I wish we had dropped that
14 college word from this conversation about eight years ago.
15 It's been very confusing. Post-secondary credit. But I
16 think that's the case.

17 So but going back to the point that was the
18 main one, there are agreements developed between the
19 institution, and the local school district, and that part
20 of that conversation is based in the statute. There are --
21 there are -- there are statutory language around the
22 amount, and how the tuition is relates to PPOR. But there
23 are flexibilities for the district, and the institution
24 about how that agreement is worked out at the end. So
25 correct me if I'm wrong. I agree. I think this might be a



1 great topic for us to have a little summary on where we
2 are, whether it's through the Concurrent Advisory
3 Committee, or us as part of the legislative conversation
4 would be good.

5 MS. O'NEILL: Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

7 MS. O'NEILL: We're happy to provide an
8 information item if this is something that's helpful. I
9 think I heard three questions in there potentially, and I'm
10 not sure, I'm happy to address all if appropriate. The
11 three that I think I heard mentioned were how do the
12 agreements work between the local districts, and the
13 community colleges, and or for Legal Institutions, what are
14 the differences between a program that's called Extended
15 Studies where the four year institutions participate,
16 versus concurrent enrollment as outlined in law. And then
17 I think the third one is the delivery options for
18 concurrent enrollment, and how those happen, such as for
19 example, do students have the opportunity to stay on their
20 -- at their high school, and they have that content be
21 delivered by either a visiting community college
22 instructor, or a high school instructor that's been
23 approved by the community colleges. So let me take those
24 one at a time.

25 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

2 MS. PEARSON: No. She's answering.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: She's answering.

4 MS. O'NEILL: I was going to but --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, I'm sorry.

6 MS. OKES: So first of all, so the
7 agreements are outlined in -- in Colorado law how those
8 should works specifically for concurrent enrollment, and
9 the various elements that must be involved, and very clear.
10 Two of those elements are the delivery of concurrent
11 enrollment, and if a high school instructor will be
12 approved to deliver concurrent enrollment, and how that
13 works. That's outlined in the agreement. Another element
14 is cost. So cost varies, and it's possible for a district
15 to have multiple agreements with different Institutions of
16 Higher Education to offer concurrent enrollment. This is
17 very common. And so it's -- it can also be common for each
18 of those to have a different fee structure depending on the
19 negotiated tuition if that is less than the resident
20 community college rate. So that is possible, or a
21 variation of that, the maximum that a district can be asked
22 to pay is the resident community college rate.

23 The second dearly the differences between
24 extended setting concurrent enrollment. This is something
25 that's a bit of a unique question, in that, when the law



1 was passed back in 2009, the four year institutions, and
2 their extended studies programs, is my understanding, had
3 asked to be opted out from concurrent enrollment in it's
4 form in Colorado block. So they are able to operate
5 outside of the specific concurrent enrollment program and
6 those parameters.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) extended
8 studies?

9 MS. OKES: Correct, and this new program as
10 an example of that.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Thank you,

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. For the discussion,
13 Dr. Schroeder. I'm sorry Ms. Rankin, I think you were
14 next, I apologize.

15 MS. RANKIN: I have another twist of this
16 too. Concurrent enrollment we discussed was, it could be
17 remediation, or it could be what a lot of people just
18 assumed it was college courses taken in -- while you're in
19 high school. My question is, who pays for that if it's
20 remediation? Is that the college, and how do you do
21 remediation in high school when maybe you need to be
22 remediated in high school as it is? Where -- where is the
23 line between who pays for this? I just don't understand
24 that.



1 MS. OKES: So remediation. Remedial classes
2 are courses below 100 level at the college level, are
3 permissive for high school seniors only within the high
4 school environment as concurrent -- and to be offered as
5 concurrent enrollment. Oftentimes the negotiated rates for
6 those may be a bit different than the credit bearing
7 courses, and that's again, back to that negotiated
8 agreement between the local district, and the community
9 college. We also have some districts that I believe is
10 what you're suggesting is they have said remediation should
11 be our current high school courses, right? Because the
12 students still in high school. And so there is space
13 within the law for remediation for high school seniors
14 only, and varying philosophies. There were folks that
15 approached this.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed Ms. Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: So let me get this straight.
19 It varies among districts if it's an under one 100 level
20 course as to who pays for it?

21 MS. OKES: My apologies but sure. So if it
22 is considered a remediation course that's being offered by
23 the local community college system, then that falls back to
24 the agreement between the district, and the local community
25 college, as far as what their financial arrangement is.



1 MS. RANKIN: And that can vary?

2 MS. OKES: And that can vary.

3 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: I did hear this discussion that
6 took place in the Budget Committee, and I didn't -- and I
7 didn't quite understand why would we send kids to college
8 to be remediated, when they should be in high school? When
9 that's -- that's what should happen. Is it because there's
10 not enough staff, and -- to do that because I -- I -- I
11 didn't get it. I mean, I -- that's a question that I still
12 have. Why get remediated in college, and not in high
13 school?

14 MS. OKES: So I think that's a great
15 question maybe for some of our districts as well, because
16 it is certainly is a local decision as far as how they
17 choose to offer those courses that are under the 100 level.

18 MS. FLORES: Does it mean more money for the
19 college, and less money for the district, or is it because
20 the district doesn't have enough funds, and to -- to do the
21 remediation, and, or that the community college can do it
22 better than the -- than the school? I don't get it.

23 MS. OKES: The -- I would say Mr. Chair if I
24 may. There are varying philosophies. One thing that we've
25 heard from some districts is that the instruction, and



1 content may be delivered in a different way for -- for the
2 student so it's really customized individualized learning
3 experience for the students where sometimes that content
4 will be slightly difference in remediation type of course
5 versus high school level course. So -- so that's something
6 that we've heard from districts. But Dr. Asp could you
7 have anything to add?

8 MR. ASP: Not at this point.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm going to pass my next
11 question because it's in the weeds. But I think, I hope
12 your hearing is that we're really interested in getting
13 greater detail about how this works? The specifics you do
14 have up to now based on the work that you've been doing
15 together with higher ed, and then I would guess we're going
16 to have all sorts of further things that we'd like for us
17 to be tracking it. Seems as though this is something that,
18 I mean, it is relatively new. I'm not sure that -- that
19 we've been asking all the questions until we kind of get in
20 there to figure out how to make this work best, efficient,
21 as inexpensive as possible.

22 I worry a little bit about knowing that
23 there are districts that put caps on this. I worry that
24 there are poor kids who don't have access to this, and yet
25 when they go to college they might in fact get a free ride



1 because they aren't students of need. So they're sort of
2 all these different things that are -- that I'm questioning
3 at the moment, and I think my colleagues are -- are kind of
4 doing the same. So if we could add this as either a work
5 session, or something as you have more data for us. I
6 mean, it's nice that the legislature is looking at it but I
7 worry a little bit about them getting ahead of fixing
8 something when we're still working on figuring out what the
9 problem is.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Asp.

11 MR. ASP: Thanks Mr. Chair. We will be
12 sure, and put together a information item for you on this
13 piece. The other piece I'd ask you to remember as well as
14 we're working on this with a lot of questions is, there's
15 kind of this inherent tension between trying to provide for
16 local control particularly given that the different needs
17 of districts across the state, even geographically. How
18 close am I to a -- a community college, and how qualified
19 are my teachers? Do they have the qualifications to teach
20 these things in our -- in our school? And so that -- that
21 tension there between trying to provide this opportunity
22 for kids across the state is one that I think we're still
23 wrestling with in this area.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Really quickly, and
2 Mr. Steve maybe, you know exactly, was there just recently
3 the remediation report where the state puts out -- higher
4 ed puts out a some different report about the remediation
5 rates? It has in the aggregate district -- district
6 results which kids went on, and needed remediation. I
7 don't remember what time of the year that typically comes
8 out. It's relatively new because we haven't been doing
9 this work for that long. I would encourage everyone to
10 watch for that. Put that on your radar. There is a lot of
11 this information provided in that, and the other thing is
12 too that another -- another piece of the whole remediation
13 policy body is about, what is it? Supplemental aid,
14 supplemental assistance, and instruction, and that there
15 are -- there is a higher ed agreement.

16 Part of the policy is that the higher ed, I
17 mean, community has agreed to policy around providing
18 during -- during the time a student is starting with a
19 student who's entering at the higher ed level, there is
20 concurrent, I hate to use that word. It's gonna be
21 confusing. There's concurrent opportunity, and access to
22 other courses that are -- that are considered remediation
23 but they are concurrent with the students higher ed
24 pursuits. So it's sort of a double bonus in a way for some
25 students who need that. So but all of that is in part the



1 policy, I hope. Happy to write that. I know what that is.
2 I worked on that task force as part of the remediation
3 policy task force. So this is -- this is a great area of
4 work for everybody involved including us to really
5 understanding, and it is relatively new, and we're all
6 learning some of the detail work about it but.

7 MS. FLORES: Be happy to -- I'd be happy to
8 provide assistance.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

10 MS. OKES: My understanding is that
11 remediation report from the Department of Higher Education
12 comes out in the spring. We're happy to make sure that you
13 get a copy, and then happy to also bring back the
14 supplemental academic instruction conversation, when we
15 provide you it sounds like an information item on this
16 topic. Thank you.

17 MS. GOFF: Thank you so much.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I have a couple of
19 comments. One, is are we sure we're not over complicating
20 this? The concurrent enrollment concept has been in place
21 at Colorado Springs early colleges for seven, eight, nine
22 years. And as a charter school receiving less money than
23 the students who are enrolled regularly in District 11.
24 They are able to pay the full tuition at both UCCS, and
25 Pikes Peak Community College, and I would contend this is



1 that hard. It's probably a lot more the commitment of a
2 district as to whether or not they're willing to allocate
3 the resources to do the right thing, and I think we may
4 very well just be completely over complicating that. I'd
5 like the staff not to -- not to participated in over
6 complicating this. It's -- it's something that -- that
7 districts should do willingly.

8 And unfortunately some of them will probably
9 required to be forced to do it. But they do have the
10 resources to do it. If -- if a -- if a charter school can
11 do it, and do it effectively, and do it on three campuses,
12 I'm a long way from convinced that there isn't a school
13 district in the state perhaps other than the very rural who
14 have significant difficulties with logistics, and as they
15 don't have the schools right next door. But certainly
16 urbanized districts ought to be -- ought to have this in
17 place now. And if I'm sure Senator King would be happy to
18 sit down, and give them a quick tutorial, if they're having
19 problems getting this done. So I think we ought to be
20 working in that direction as opposed to drawing up all
21 kinds of guidelines, and procedures. It's being done now.
22 There's nothing new that's been done for a long time has
23 been done successfully. So we have a model out there, and
24 I think we ought to take advantage of that model.

25 MS. FLORES: Thank you Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions,
2 discussion? Any other questions for Ms. Mellow. Ms.
3 Mellow, I think you might want to check with Senator Marble
4 on ninth grade testing bill.

5 MS. MELLOW: Yeah, I mean, I think a bill is
6 coming.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think a bill is coming.

8 MS. MELLOW: I didn't have a name to
9 associate with it.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's -- that be a stab
11 in the dark.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, on that one.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other question? Do
14 they -- do they convene at 10:00 in the morning?

15 MS. MELLOW: That's my understanding.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And would you -- I don't
17 know if Dr. Scheffel indicated she may want to attend part
18 of that so Mag you might keep her informed if you can by
19 text of --

20 MS. MELLOW: Sure.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Process because --

22 MS. MELLOW: Sure.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- when perhaps when the
24 majority leader's in a sense -- are about ready to go on
25 might just let us know --



1 MS. MELLOW: Sure.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- and see if that can fit
3 in -- in their schedule.

4 MS. MELLOW: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much.

6 MS. MELLOW: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We'll proceed then
8 to automate the Election State Board officers. Let me give
9 a quick review. In October I appointed Dr. Scheffel, Ms.
10 Rankin, and Ms. Goff as members of the legislative
11 committee. I subsequently appointed Dr. Flores to join
12 that group there's a great interest in the legislative
13 committee. I made a mistake, and perhaps exceeded my
14 authority, and presuming to appoint one from each party,
15 Ms. Goff, and Dr. Scheffel as the official legislative
16 liaisons. And so that should be -- that's an action that
17 the entire board needs to take, and so if there is a motion
18 for the appointment of two official legislative liaisons
19 then, we could proceed with that, and I apologize for not
20 following the appropriate procedure. Is there a motion?
21 Yes, so.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Has been moved.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's been moved as a
24 second for the appointment of the actual liaison positions.
25 Ms. Rankin seconds it of Dr. Scheffel, and Ms. Goff. His



1 objection to the adoption of that motion. I'm seeing none,
2 that is adopted unanimously. And I would like to thank the
3 four members who have volunteered to serve on this
4 committee because I think you're going to be
5 extraordinarily busy, and there's going to be a lot going
6 on. So I appreciate your commitment to -- to that
7 activity. We're now ready to proceed, is everybody okay
8 without a break for the moment? Good. To a public
9 comment. We're a little bit early but everyone will still
10 have a chance to sign up if they are here by 10:00. So
11 we'll take late -- late signers. Okay. All right. Let's
12 start -- let's go, and start with Deborah Cole. Ms. Cole.

13 MS. COLE: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
14 Board. Good morning. The adoption of whole language
15 reading instruction correlates with plummeting literacy in
16 the United States. John Dewey, the father of progressive
17 education would have regarded this development with
18 complacency. Dewey saw a concentration on reading
19 instruction as misplaced, even undesirable. After all,
20 reading is the gateway to a broad knowledge base, and Dewey
21 did not want students to acquire much knowledge. He was
22 quite candid about this saying quote, "The mere absorption
23 of facts, and truths is so exclusively an individual affair
24 that it tends very naturally to pass into selfishness.
25 There is not obvious social motive for the acquirement of



1 mere learning. There is no clear social gain, and success
2 there at."

3 I suspect Dewey recognized that the mere
4 absorption of facts, and truths, and essentially solitary
5 activity, the creative encounter between an individual
6 human mind, and the printed page would resist the social
7 docility he sought to make the point of schooling. A tough
8 independent-minded student might say, "Thanks, I don't want
9 to participate in a collaborative learning project right
10 now. I want to get back to reading Moby Dick, or the
11 Iliad, or Atlas Shrugged. Dewey established a lab school
12 at the University of Chicago to try out his new educational
13 model of learning by doing. Many other experimental
14 schools followed including the Lincoln School attached to
15 the Columbia Teachers College, which Dewey molded to his
16 views while teaching at Columbia." Four Rockefeller's
17 attended that school. David, Laurence, Winthrop, and
18 Nelson Rockefeller all came out dyslexics. Today we would
19 call them visual, or auditory learners capable of receiving
20 information only through graphics, or through oral
21 transmission because their neural pathways had been poorly
22 tangled by whole word -- reading instruction.

23 The eldest brother John D. III, had been
24 sent to a military school where he received a traditional
25 education. He emerged a reader. Prominent names in the



1 development, and promotion of the Common Core standards
2 have connections with John Dewey. Arne Duncan attended the
3 lab school. David Coleman considered the architect of the
4 Common Core State Standards, was a symposium speaker for
5 the Dewey seminar of the Institute for Advanced Studies
6 School of Social Science. While Linda Darling Hammond,
7 head of the Smarter Balanced consortium, was a winner at
8 the Stanford University John Dewey Award.

9 Darling Hammond incidentally ran a charter
10 school attached to Stanford University that was closed
11 because of abysmal performance. These are the people who
12 have imposed their progressive vision on the nation. A
13 vision whose current label is social, and emotional
14 learning, for the purpose of producing compliant members of
15 the global workforce. I wonder how many parents in
16 Colorado realize that social engineering has replaced the
17 absorption of mere facts, and truths in what is still
18 misleadingly referred to as education. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Ms. Cole.
20 (Inaudible).

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Apologize if I
22 mispronounced the name.

23 MS. BATES: Mr. Chairman, and Members of
24 this -- of the Board. Good morning, and thank you for this
25 opportunity to address you today. My name is Francine



1 Bates, so you were close, I am the chairperson of the
2 Cherry Creek School District Accountability Committee,
3 which in our district is a volunteer parent position just
4 elected by members of each school's accountability
5 committee. I'm here today to urge you to uphold the
6 decision by the Cherry Creek School Districts Board of
7 Education, to deny the Heritage Heights Academy Charter
8 School Publication whose appeal you are hearing tomorrow.
9 Our District's Board of Education is a highly functioning
10 board, whose elected members consider issues carefully, and
11 make decisions within the parameters of what is best for
12 kids.

13 Tomorrow when you hear the charter school
14 appeal, please keep in mind that this is a very respected
15 board, with none of the turmoil associated with recall
16 elections, or boards that are philosophically divided. At
17 the end of the day, this elected board, made a unanimous
18 decision to deny the charter school application only after
19 multiple layers of review, including district staff,
20 parents, and outside organizations. All of these reviews
21 brought up similar concerns, and risks, and those issues
22 truly preclude this charter from being in the best interest
23 of kids, or our larger community. Please respect the
24 decision of the Cherry Creek School District Board of



1 Education, and let the denial of this charter application
2 stand. Thank you for your consideration.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Sherry Keys,
4 and Bethany Drosendahl are going to do joint presentation.
5 Ladies.

6 MS. KEYS: Good morning Board. I will let
7 Bethany introduce herself first.

8 MS. DROSENDAHL: Bethany Drosendahl.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

10 MS. KEYS: And my name is Sherry Keys. I am
11 a parent from Fort Collins, and as my support pleases,
12 we're going to split our time up, we have a five minute
13 presentation, and let me go ahead to get started. So we're
14 here to speak about student data badges. It's going to be
15 a very big topic, and I am hoping that as a concerned
16 parent who spent a considerable amount of time following
17 the development of data badges, my hope is that the board
18 will consider convening a work session, or study panel, and
19 propose an extended pilot time, and even a moratorium
20 before the statewide implementation, and adoption of
21 student data patches occurs. And here is why.

22 MS. DROSENDAHL: Data patches are portable
23 data uploaded to the internet via a badging company
24 affiliated with a corporate partner. The data is
25 personally identifiable. It is evidence of the skill



1 acquired, for competency, it's the mushy stuff, and it is
2 often in the form of personal essays, or videos of
3 children, and photos of children completing a task. The
4 uploaded video and pictures can be easily determined using
5 facial, and emotional algorithms, and once uploaded the
6 data are nearly impossible to track, and delete, becoming a
7 potential Pandora's Box, and amassing a huge profile of
8 very personal information out in the cloud. Keep in mind
9 that student data is a multi billion dollar a year industry
10 alone, and it's fast growing. The badging project in
11 Aurora is still in pilot mode, they're working out the
12 kinks, and the data uploading begins as early as preschool
13 district wide. The badges so far deal with the 21st
14 century skills of behavioral non-cognitive social emotional
15 skills. These are the skills that businesses feel predict
16 student success. They're very difficult if not impossible
17 to accurately quantify hence the videos. Skills such as
18 awareness, or advocacy, or leadership, or lifelong learner,
19 or critical thinker are how children earned their badges.
20 You can visit the Aurora website to see video of 10, and 11
21 year old children explaining how they upload videos of
22 themselves to win these badges.

23 The interface of children sensitive
24 information with outside contractors like Pearson,
25 LinkedIn, Mozilla, and Crudely as well as partnerships, and



1 endorsements from private parties like Goldman Sachs, and
2 other businesses is very concerning to parents. Businesses
3 are endorsing our children based on quote skill sets that
4 are predictors of success for business. This is employers
5 cherry picking children. And to quote Mackenzie
6 Incorporated, it is a way to recruit without having to
7 physically go to the campus. How early must this
8 recruiting begin, and why do we badge preschool for
9 elementary children? Are we deciding childrens' career
10 paths, their futures, parenting a child with a business in
11 elementary school?

12 My answer would be yes we are. Which again
13 leads to the question why, and who sees this personal badge
14 information? When if ever is it deleted? Can parents opt
15 out of data badges? Can information shared via data
16 badging be misused, breached? And if so who is liable? Is
17 it the school? What's the penalty? Could the data be used
18 to label, and profile a child? Absolutely. How are bad
19 skills, and children themselves truly measured, and
20 standardized? The potential for misuse, and mis-measure is
21 huge. As for who will see the data, take for example the
22 handout I will give you from IMS Global, who is partnering
23 with US Department of Ed, and Mozilla to create K through
24 12 badges along with the 300 other Ed tech partners, who
25 read like a list of who is who in big data.



1 Or look at the privacy policy posted on
2 Credlie's website. Credlie is another data badging
3 company, and I will give you a handout on this. Credlie
4 claims the right to use any uploaded data with a worldwide
5 royalty free, perpetual right, to use, and modify the data
6 in any way even in other countries. But the contract also
7 says they take no responsibility for how third parties will
8 use the children's data, and Credlie is not liable for any
9 harm caused by data misuse, loss, or breach. The Credlie
10 website also states that badging project, their product is
11 not to be used by children under the age of 13. My final
12 note, last week the Electronic Privacy Information Center
13 also known as EPIC, filed a complaint against the US
14 Department of Education. This is not their first
15 complaint. However, I'm hoping this one will stick.

16 The complaint says that the US Department of
17 Ed is collecting, and sharing personal student level data,
18 and it is arrest to privacy, and violates the privacy act,
19 and in question with these complaints, they say the
20 collection system to gather detailed data on students,
21 let's see, has no educational purpose. And sharing this
22 personal data with private contractors appears to be run
23 for EPIC effort by the Department to Transfer Sensitive
24 Student Information to contractors without any meaningful
25 privacy safeguards. And I worry that badging will be doing



1 the same thing, and I hope that you don't take a very long
2 look at this before this gets implemented in our state.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much
5 ladies. Thank you.

6 MS. KEYS: May I address one issue?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do we have time left?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They have used their
9 five minutes, but it's at your --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One minute.

11 MS. KEYS: One minute. Okay.

12 MS. DROSENDAHL: Very quickly, Bethany
13 Drosendahl. I am an instructor at PPCC, Pikes Peak
14 Community College, I also have a background of business in
15 manufacturing. Lean as part of a process in Six Sigma. So
16 you wanna look into that because it's really more about the
17 manufacturing process, and it will be very interesting to
18 see how this plays out in the public sector, keep an eye on
19 that please. It's -- hopefully it's not another excuse to
20 do more data mining. Also concurrent enrollment is not
21 new, I did concurrent enrollment in high school, and as you
22 can see by the gray, that was a while ago. My child also
23 attended -- I'm trying to rush your sorry. My child also
24 attended Colorado Springs early colleges, with their per
25 pupil funding, they provide busing to as far as Woodland



1 Park which is west by 20 miles, and monument which is north
2 20 miles, so with -- per -- per pupil funding, they also
3 provide those services.

4 So look for best practices, and finally in
5 badging, I've asked in higher education, and you need to
6 look at the why. Why are we doing this? It's an untested
7 system, and when I ask the deans at higher education why
8 they're doing this, they say nobody can define it, and so
9 they're trying to resist it until somebody can come
10 forward, and actually define the why. Thank you.
11 Appreciate it.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Let's see,
13 George Walker, George Walker.

14 MR. GEORGE: Happy New Year, Mr. Chair.
15 Audience, and Members of the Board. Let's have a good one
16 (inaudible) Anyhow, at a meeting, combined meeting CCHE,
17 and the state Board of Education January 2009, or '10
18 Commissioner Jones came forth with the fact that Colorado's
19 last two bought last, and closing the ethnic achievement
20 gap. About three years ago we had a report called
21 minorities losing ground where it said Colorado has the
22 worst record for graduating blacks, and Latino. We have a
23 lot of work to do this year regarding core curriculum, and
24 testing, and keeping in mind last year there wasn't a
25 single black person who was appointed to the review board



1 by the legislature. Recently channel six is -- is -- is
2 regardless with four programs about Denver Public Schools
3 the largest in the state standing in the gap achievement,
4 gap between Anglos, Asians, Blacks, and Latinos runs about
5 30 to 50 percent in all areas. Anyhow, with all those
6 facts in mind, the state Board of Education appointed an
7 Anglo man who does not have a doctorate, or a terminal
8 degree, he starts next week, the week after the Legislature
9 starts. I did an Internet search, Arizona once says,
10 Arizona Republicans gladly bid adieu to Rich Crandall, have
11 a lot of respect for Republicans, I ran for governor as a
12 Republican 94. This man is not even close to being as
13 qualified as the two doctorate names I put in, one was
14 black, one was a Latino for commissioner ship. There are
15 more than a few blacks who have doctorates administration,
16 experience teaching school, legislative experience
17 available. I'm talking, and talked to several deans of our
18 school education stating what good does it do to graduate
19 black PhDs at the State Board of Education won't hire them.
20 Respectfully submitted, I strongly disagree with your
21 unanimous opinion ruling to hire a Rich Crandall as
22 Commissioner of Education. I understand he is going to
23 school for his doctorate, I understand he's going to have
24 released time, \$255,000 a year is a lot of money for a
25 student stipend. Thank you for your time, I will be



1 repeating this to the legislative committees, I wrote to
2 call key people, and am really keep it up. We need a black
3 presence, I'm here regularly, I'm the closest thing you
4 have to a black presence, and most people think that I'm
5 white. We need black people at the highest level of this
6 Board, and this organization, we need them in the audience,
7 I don't know what's wrong, I get comments that we've given
8 up like the Board just doesn't care. Respectfully
9 submitted, I'm very disappointed in this Board's action.
10 I'm very disappointed in your appointment. Every one of
11 you knows Blacks, and Latinos better qualified. I know it,
12 and you know it. Thank you for your time.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Mr. Walker. Ray
14 Trout?

15 MR. TROUT: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I know I haven't
17 pronounced that one right. Correct it if you would please.
18 State your name please.

19 MR. TROUT: My name is Ray trout. Once an
20 engineer, Board, staff. Our school was caught between some
21 unfortunate testing, last number of years on the one hand,
22 and an opt out movement on the other. There's a middle
23 ground when we think of as light touch assessments based
24 upon sampling somewhat like an NAEP, that solves my mind on
25 most of these problems, periodic objective, personal



1 assessments say four times a year using based upon actual
2 curriculum, local curriculum, and Colorado academic
3 standards to assist selected five students out of a
4 classroom while down here, Janet up -- up there. Okay.

5 We know we're different, with my both
6 personal assessment, you'll be developing five data points,
7 four times a year, what will emerge is some very useful
8 information all which can be handled within a spreadsheet.
9 First the data can be shown in the context of the teachers
10 awareness of the typical grades, a little bit different
11 measurement but must be shown with multiple integration,
12 this data can be organized in a very visible way, and from
13 that a progress through the different portions of the year.
14 You can identify the 20 percent, 80 percent little on -- on
15 the achievement of mastery of the -- of the course.

16 You can plot that in a very simple way, as a
17 single line. You can overlay it with anything else, I did
18 mine with a line from Slovenia. And you can then progress
19 to show the local, the results with local assessments, and
20 curriculum in form a standard curriculum, and the standard
21 results, all on the same graph supplemented by various bits
22 of detail like progressions, other comparisons. The
23 numbers are still there but you can have without fancy data
24 processing. (Inaudible) all up in the appropriate way if
25 necessarily. You had the chance to do oversight which is



1 required without the trial that goes with the standard
2 testing. And I hope that we can follow up on this in the
3 future, I think that personally I'll solve a lot of
4 problems open to suggestions, or anything else.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much.
6 Gladys Soto.

7 MS. GLADYS: Good morning Board, and
8 everybody else. My name is Gladys Soto, and I'm here as a
9 Board Member of the Colorado Association for Bilingual
10 Education, in support of the seal up biliteracy
11 certification for our bilingual students in the state of
12 Colorado. The purpose of our association is to support,
13 and represent both the interest of language minority
14 students, and bilingual education professionals who serve
15 them. CABE believes in high quality culturally, and
16 linguistically inclusive education for all students. We
17 advocate for enhancing the development of educational
18 policy, and programs that will positively affect learners,
19 and communities of linguistically, and culturally diverse
20 backgrounds.

21 During our Cobbett Conference in 2015, we
22 presented an award to Shelly Spiegel Coleman, the executive
23 director of Californians Together Correlation, for their
24 dedication in working on the Seal of Biliteracy in their
25 state. We value their diligence, and commitment in



1 promoting bilingual pride, and encouraging students to be
2 biliterate. We -- she inspired us to do the same in
3 Colorado. A Seal Biliteracy has already been adopted by 13
4 states, and the District of Columbia as well as several
5 districts within Colorado. And this is our motivation to
6 ask the state for approval of the Seal of Biliteracy.
7 Students, and families have greeted the measure with
8 enthusiasm.

9 According to the Colorado Department of
10 Education, we are one of the states -- we're one of the
11 states with the largest growing number of bilingual
12 students. In 2011 to --, and 2012, the percentage of
13 bilingual students has grown by 10 percent, and is now over
14 100,000. With the Seal of Biliteracy, our bilingual
15 students can become high performing bilinguals instead of
16 struggling to learn English speakers, or lose, or not
17 develop their first language. Our society has a valuable
18 resource in these bilingual students that it is not
19 developing. As a state, we should be concerned about
20 serving our bilingual population with quality, and
21 appropriate education opportunities.

22 Also, extensive research has proven the
23 benefit of bilingualism. According to Callahan, and
24 Gandhara, students acquiring English in American schools,
25 bilingualism especially in bilingual education programs,



1 corresponds with improved test -- test scores, and improved
2 attitudes toward schooling. The Seal of Biliteracy will
3 encourage students to study languages obtained by literacy
4 skills, recognize the value of language diversity, and
5 prepare students with the 21st century skills needed in the
6 labor force, and global society. For these reasons, and
7 more, Cobbett supports the Seal of Biliteracy in the state
8 of Colorado. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Jane Brandon.

10 MS. BRANDON: Good morning. Thank you all
11 for having me. And I'm grateful for this opportunity. My
12 name is Jane Brandon, and I sent you an email, but I assume
13 you've been inundated with emails this week. So I just
14 came to read it, to see your faces. So the email says,
15 Members of Colorado State Board of Education, I write
16 today, or stand here today, to strongly support the Cherry
17 Creek Board of Education's decision to deny the Heritage
18 Heights Academy charter application, and encourage
19 Colorado's Board to uphold that decision. As co-chair of
20 the (inaudible) charter schools subcommittee, I can
21 confidently say that this application, despite what the --
22 despite the allegation by the applicant, was thoroughly
23 reviewed. In addition to the subcommittee, the district
24 personnel, the Colorado League of Charter Schools, and the
25 National Association of Charter School Authorizers,



1 reviewed the application, and we came to the same
2 conclusion that this application does not meet your policy,
3 nor does it meet the high academic, and financial standards
4 set forth by the Cherry Creek Schools District. In the 100
5 plus hours of discussion, and review, I found that in most
6 areas, HHA did not demonstrate the most basic understanding
7 of how to open, run, and maintain a successful Cherry Creek
8 School. More specifically, I was shocked to read HHA's
9 level one response to the question, do you have financial
10 goals?

11 Their answer was upon charter -- approval,
12 academical work with HHA staff to prepare the annual
13 operating budget long range financial plan, as well as
14 develop financial policies, and goals. The financial
15 recommendations goals will then be presented to the HHA
16 Board for approval. I find that the answer naive, and
17 myopic at best, but evasive, and deceptive at worst. I
18 trust that like me, use the state word will accept nothing
19 short of complete financial transparency. I hope that you
20 will uphold the final decision by the elected members of
21 the Cherry Creek Board of Education, and know that it was
22 an informed thoughtful, and careful decision. Thank you
23 for your time.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Lynn Roberts.



1 MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. Good morning. I'm
2 here today as a parent, a former educator, and a licensed
3 mental health professional. My children attend Elementary
4 School in Denver Public Schools. I'm here to express
5 concerns about a service that you have provided, Colorado
6 Shines. My issues with the service are, that it is not
7 local. Neither that it is authentic to the pedagogy
8 (inaudible) or teachers implement. I have anecdotal
9 evidence that our teachers have spent nearly all of their
10 time, planning time, and much of their professional
11 preparation, and personal time complying with this new
12 educator rating system, that the issue is being piloted in
13 Denver Public Schools and -- and in other areas, I believe,
14 in the state.

15 Please take time to review the documents
16 that I sent you, that I access through various court
17 requests. Colorado Shines' claims on it's website that
18 compliance doesn't change curriculum, but there is evidence
19 that of course it does. Our teachers at my children's
20 school have masters degrees, and decades of teaching
21 experience in Denver Public Schools, however they received
22 no credit for their Montessori masters degrees, and their
23 teacher rating. And none of the teachers in our school
24 received a rating higher than a two, until they made some
25 noise about it. In a way educators have been told to make



1 PDI's requirements, or lose their jobs, when DPS installed
2 the playgrounds for us that didn't comply with Colorado
3 Shines regulatory standards, our teachers were penalized,
4 and required to take modules on their own time for the
5 discrepancy.

6 The online database into which they needed
7 to input all of their own credentials which were already on
8 file with their district, crashed several times immediately
9 prior to deadlines. Teachers have indeed registered
10 complaints with CDE, and I dare say that CDE employees
11 statement last week that teachers love the regulatory, and
12 licensing systems is a misrepresentation. I believe that
13 children are best served in educational environments, where
14 adults are tuned to children's needs, motivations unique
15 developmental trajectories, and were educators themselves
16 are nurtured as the human beings who most impact our
17 children when they are not with us.

18 As a parent to any professional, I am most
19 alarmed by the lack of regard for my teachers
20 professionalism for their focus on the children they teach
21 for the alternate curriculum that they use for diversity of
22 personal, and professional strengths. Instead, in -- in --
23 the way it is structured, and implemented, we see stringent
24 standards on behavior, and professional preparation, and on
25 use of professional time. These are micro aggressions that



1 compromise our children, and their teachers. My children,
2 and the people we entrust to them everyday are not
3 benefiting from the \$181 million being spent on this, yet
4 another top down mandate. Our children are the losers.
5 They are losing their teachers, they're losing their
6 curriculum.

7 Our schools are communities that belong to
8 families, to children, to their educators. Colorado Shines
9 is yet another race to the top mandate that will be
10 defunded for which we will have to pay. I ask that you
11 take note of the inadequacies with regards to children's
12 developmental diversity, their needs for the adults in
13 whose care they are left for the parallel process that
14 provides for children getting the best from their teachers
15 because their teachers are getting the best from their
16 support systems. I join others in asking that you
17 investigate the implementation of Colorado Shines by
18 speaking directly with educators that are impacted. Thank
19 you for your time.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me Angelica.

22 Can we just ask, when -- when was this email sent? When
23 did you send? (Inaudible).

24 MS. ROBERTS: An hour ago.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible). That's
2 why we didn't see it. All right. Thank you.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Rachel Coleen.

4 MS. COLEEN: (Inaudible) with the
5 microphone.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

7 MS. COHEN: Maybe he'll be up there in 20 to
8 30 years. You never know. Good morning. My name is
9 Rachel Cohen. I'm a mother out of Boulder County, and I'm
10 gonna sort of piggyback on a lot of things. We've heard
11 about local control, we've heard about data privacy
12 concerns, we've heard about top down initiatives that take
13 away from local control, we've talked about things that are
14 coming down from above because of race to the top, and the
15 implementation comes from CDE instead of our local
16 districts. I'm here to talk about the fact that I would
17 like to see a moratorium an examination in three areas,
18 both Colorado Shines, well no both. Colorado Shines TS
19 Gold, and the early childhood assessment under READ Act the
20 implementation of that, as well as digital badging. What
21 we see oftentimes is that the financial incentive from the
22 federal government does not cover the actual implementation
23 costs.

24 We heard from Dr. Meisinger on Monday, that
25 he's -- he believes that the amount that we've received for



1 some of the implementations is 600,000 for something that
2 will take six million. The implementations are not
3 respecting our families, and the highest at risk
4 populations when they have engaged parents. The engaged
5 parents are being kept from making important decisions for
6 their families because they're not allowed to, and the
7 local districts just don't have the flexibility based on
8 the structure in place from CDE to make any other call. I
9 know this personally.

10 My children, I have a third grader, and a
11 preschooler, I have an upcoming preschooler, and then I
12 have this guy. I worry about for a variety of reasons the
13 assessment process. TS Gold, in our case, doesn't actually
14 make any difference because we're at a focus school that
15 has a different pedagogy, and it has absolutely no impact
16 on the best practices for my teachers. And in fact, I
17 think we have a higher education than some of the schools
18 that have TS Gold curriculum. In fact, I would say, it's
19 definite. When I went to get my waiver for my children
20 from preschool, TS Gold data gathering, it took me six
21 months. It took six months because I had to go through an
22 onerous process of appeals, and their lawyer at PDST has to
23 make sure that they were allowed to give me the waiver.
24 The waiver is predicated on the fact that I don't get any
25 aid, and that I don't have children with special needs.



1 Even though I'm clearly engaged, even though I'm clearly
2 involved.

3 And I'm gonna share with you something hard
4 to share. My family's fallen on hard times. And this
5 year, the first time ever in my life I've had to ask for
6 help from the right institutions, so we can try to get
7 ahead instead of falling further, and other behind. My
8 husband has a small business. I basically stay at home
9 mom. It's a hard market for attorneys as much as that's
10 hard to believe. And if we get aid, I have to make a
11 decision, do I take it on the chin? Do I get my waiver
12 revoked because it's required that my children have TS Gold
13 data gathering that has nothing to do with their education?

14 Or do I say forget it, and I make it harder
15 for my family? And I put in that tough situation
16 regardless of the fact that I know what's best for my
17 children. These are really big problems, and I would ask
18 that there's more investigation. The TS Gold system went
19 down last year so much that they had to stop doing it, and
20 be the (inaudible) this year. We need to make sure that
21 all of the things that are problematic are being addressed.
22 We need to make sure that this is necessary. We need to
23 see that there's time for local control to actually make
24 decisions, because the way it was implemented, we basically
25 lost that.



1 They didn't have time to do something
2 besides TS Gold, the structure that was provided by CDE
3 didn't allow for more investigation, and ultimately
4 families like mine hurt, and that's not okay. So I'm
5 asking you to please look at doing a moratorium, and a full
6 examination of some of these regulatory, decisions,
7 implementations, and services that come from CDE. It's
8 important. My children need it. I don't wanna have to
9 make hard decisions. Even in my heart of hurts, I know
10 what's right for my kids. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Tony -- Sir
12 Tyson?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Tyson.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Tyson.

15 MS. TYSON: Hello. My name is Tony Tyson,
16 and I'm from the Thompson School District. I'm the world
17 language coordinator in our new dual language immersion
18 program TOSA. I -- I've taught languages for 40 years, and
19 at this point now, I'm so excited to hear about the Seal of
20 Biliteracy. I'm here to speak on the side of the world
21 languages, because not only do we have so eloquently
22 speaking reports talk about our -- our native speakers, and
23 our heritage speakers, we do have the world language side.
24 So this is the Seal of Biliteracy. So our students can be
25 linguistically, globally (inaudible) in the 21st century,



1 ready to roll in this wonderful state where 91 percent of
2 international trade really is what's happening here in
3 Colorado. So we need people that are multilingual,
4 multicultural, and ready to attack that.

5 Our speaker before -- about so eloquently
6 about this. So I'm going to leave out a lot of my words,
7 I'm just gonna encourage you that, really this is an
8 opportunity for our students, because it shows some
9 wonderful skills we see in Seal of Biliteracy that they are
10 actually literate at a high level proficiency in English,
11 and at least one other language. We really need that in
12 our state, because that is very important to grow our
13 economy, and really to take pride in the different types of
14 things we can do to make our kids successful with the --
15 the career choices that they might have. So thank you very
16 much.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sarazen Ohio.

18 MS. OHIO: Hello. My name is Sarazen Ohio.
19 Across party lines, constituents are not happy with Common
20 Core, and the testing being used to ensure that Common Core
21 is implemented. Recently, our local school Board tried to
22 address our communities desire to get rid of Common Core.
23 The discussion stopped at the legislative mandate words,
24 meet, or exceed. They concluded we cannot eliminate Common
25 Core because to do so means we would not be meeting the



1 standard. The reality is there is no local control because
2 our legislative politicians, and regulatory departments
3 have taken over the classrooms. Let's remember how we got
4 into this web of Common Core Park consortiums, data
5 collection, and the new accountability system, remember
6 race to the top. Three individuals signed a contract that
7 fundamentally changed education in this state, and
8 virtually eliminated any real local control over education.
9 They ceded the state's authority over education, and turns
10 us into enforcement arms of the federal government.

11 Just this fall, our governor made an
12 announcement of the CASBAA convention that he would do
13 everything in his power to get rid of the red tape
14 currently mandated in education. So let's challenge him,
15 hold him to the promise, ask him to join you in withdrawing
16 from race to the top. Withdrawing from the part
17 consortium. Getting out of those two agreements would free
18 our legislators to implement laws that return local
19 control. Statistics show only three things are necessary
20 to have a successful child in school, quality teachers,
21 motivated students, and supportive parents. Currently, the
22 system in place is systematically eroding each of these
23 three pillars.

24 The unfunded mandates, the mandated
25 standards combined with testing accountability measures are



1 eroding the pillar of teachers. The dehumanizing effect of
2 data collection, and data driven decision making, treating
3 our children like widgets in a factory, is eroding the
4 morale, and motivation of students. The surveying, and
5 constant measuring of our children's attitudes, values,
6 beliefs, the political agendas permeating the classroom
7 materials, is eroding parental support. I conclude with
8 some statements from our Colorado Constitutional
9 Convention, and the Colorado State Constitution reference
10 guide about why this state adopted the provision of local
11 control in the first place, "To protect citizens from
12 legislative misbehavior." And there ought to be no
13 possibility of a suspicion that politics should run the
14 schools of the territory. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you Ms. Ohio. Okay,
16 I think when we take a five minute (inaudible) five minute
17 break before we start on (inaudible) School proposal.
18 We'll stand in recess for five minutes.

19 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600