



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
January 14, 2016, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on January 14, 2016,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

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



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Welcome back to order in  
2 kind of slowly will allow everybody accumulate here, and  
3 arrive. Yes -- no, okay. So the next order of business is  
4 as Dr. Schroeder, indicated a fun part which we don't get a  
5 lot of those. So we're going to talk about the teacher of  
6 the year, and the Associate Commissioner Alyssa Pearson  
7 would come forward, if you would, and introduce the  
8 teacher, 2016 Teacher of the year.

9                   MS. PEARSON: Sounds good. Thank you. It  
10 is the fun part of the day, isn't it? Today we are here to  
11 honor Leticia Guzman Ingram, the 2016 Colorado Teacher of  
12 the Year. Each year the Colorado Teacher of the Year  
13 program honors an exceptionally, dedicated, knowledgeable,  
14 and skilled teacher to represent the entire profession for  
15 Colorado. The role of the Teacher of the year is to act as  
16 a liaison between the teaching community, and the  
17 legislature, the Department of Education, school in  
18 districts, and communities; an education ambassador to  
19 businesses, parents, service organizations, and media. Did  
20 you know you were signing on for this little tool job? A  
21 research on the state of the profession to be available for  
22 workshops, conferences around the state, and educationally  
23 involved in teacher forums, and education reform.

24                   So (inaudible) a selection committee con --  
25 conducted a rigorous selection process to choose The



1 Colorado Teacher of the Year. The selection committee  
2 consisted of representatives from the State Board of  
3 Education, Jane got served on that (inaudible) CEI -- The  
4 Colorado Education Initiative, Colorado PTA. The 2015  
5 Colorado Teacher of the Year, and other representatives  
6 from the education community. The application process  
7 included a written application, letters of recommendation,  
8 a personal interview, and the site visit. Candidates were  
9 judged on their ability to inspire students of all  
10 backgrounds, and abilities. The teacher is expected to  
11 play an active role in the community, and to have earned  
12 the respect and admiration of students, parents, and  
13 colleagues. But Leticia clearly demonstrates these  
14 qualities.

15 Leticia Guzman Ingram was named 20 -- 2016  
16 Colorado Teacher of the Year at a surprise assembly held at  
17 Basalt High School on October 26, 2015. She is a high  
18 school English language development, History and Math  
19 teacher at Basalt High School. Leticia was selected for  
20 this honor based on her experience, passion, and expertise  
21 with English learners, and their families. She inspires  
22 our students to learn, and has the respect of students,  
23 parents, and colleagues. Leticia plays an active role in  
24 the community as well as the school. Leticia also  
25 contributes to the world community when she spends the



1 summers working with teachers across borders. The  
2 selection committee heard exceptional stories about how she  
3 had not only done a remarkable job teaching, but touched,  
4 and changed the lives of students families, and staff, and  
5 I know Dr. Asp you wanted to share a story that was told  
6 that day. You want to share that now?

7 MR. ASP: Thank you. I know Joyce will have  
8 something to say about this too. We had the pleasure of  
9 being there as part of this ceremony, and first of all just  
10 to see the respect and joy for you inside the room. But  
11 then there wasn't a dryer in the house when a student from  
12 El Salvador who came to Basalt by way, moved to San  
13 Francisco at first, was living in a terrible situation,  
14 moved to stay with his uncle in Basalt. He was Eduardo I  
15 believe, am using kind of a pseudonym here that he was able  
16 to -- he just came up and read part of the letter of  
17 support he wrote for you about what a difference you made  
18 in his life. I'll go on but am going to have to blow my  
19 nose. It was just so touching in such a tribute. So  
20 incredibly proud to have you as teacher.

21 MS. RANKIN: And it doesn't hurt that he was  
22 really cute, and is he -- is a soccer player?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He does play soccer.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yes he plays soccer, so he was  
25 a sportsman, and I'll tell you the girls we're very excited



1 about him. But I -- I have to concur on that. It was as  
2 if you had a room full of parents, and they are all the  
3 parents of one child when you had a roomful of students,  
4 and they were admiring their teacher, and proud of her.  
5 Thank you.

6 MS. PEARSON: So by accepting this award  
7 you'll get to spend part of 2016 making public appearances  
8 to support all of the teaching profession, and you will be  
9 the face of our dedicated teachers in Colorado. You are at  
10 the top of your profession, respected, and incredibly  
11 knowledgeable, in April you should be honored by President  
12 Obama in a ceremony at the White House, and throughout the  
13 year you'll get to receive a number of high quality  
14 professional development opportunities, and we'll get to  
15 attend NASA's space camp during the summer. So I'm going  
16 to introduce you now, you say a few words, and then we'll  
17 do some pictures after it. Congratulations.

18 MS. INGRAM: Thank you so much. So Chairman  
19 Durham, and the Board. Thank you for allowing me to come  
20 here. Thank you for this honor. I'm so excited to be the  
21 spokeswoman for Colorado, and I can't wait to go brag about  
22 Colorado's education in Texas next week, and so I just want  
23 to tell you that I feel like this award is really award for  
24 my students because all I did was tell their stories, and  
25 these are the wonderful CDE just you know just love their



1 stories hearing their stories, and these kids are my  
2 inspiration, and I want to be their voice. Last night I  
3 got an email from one of my students, and he said, and it  
4 was actually from Edwin, and he said that, Miss Ingram,  
5 please you know, I -- I gave you my permission to tell my  
6 stories because I was you know my parents actually they had  
7 come over to United States, when he was little, and they  
8 died in a car accident in Denver, and so he doesn't really  
9 remember them, and he was telling me how their dream was  
10 for him to get an education in the United States, so he had  
11 come over and now he's a junior and he said even though I  
12 was alone I wanted students to know that they can get a  
13 great education in Colorado, and I feel like my family is  
14 the school, and so I was like wow! Edwin I want to share  
15 that tomorrow, and tell them.

16 I just want to thank you because of all the  
17 work you guys do because I feel like education is such a  
18 gift. I have a senior daughter named Savvy, and she said  
19 when I watch some of your students from El Salvador,  
20 Central America, and they come to school, and they get on  
21 the bus they go work in Aspen at the St. Regis, and clean  
22 carpets till 2:00 or 3:00 in the morning, and then come to  
23 school with a smile on their face at 8:00 in the morning,  
24 she is like how can I ever whine about, you know homework,  
25 good school. She says you know this education in Colorado





1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right! Ms. Ingram I  
2 would say as a general rule, withholding food violates the  
3 Geneva Convention. You might want to keep that in mind.  
4 (Inaudible). It's not often that I get to speak for the  
5 whole Board but I would like to, I think I can at this  
6 moment, we commend you for your dedication in helping  
7 students achieve, and for inspiring students to -- to  
8 attain high levels of academic performance.  
9 Congratulations on your accomplishments, and we look  
10 forward to working with you in the coming year as your --  
11 through your role as Teacher of the Year. So thank you  
12 very much. And we'll now have some pictures.

13                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good to see you,  
14 congratulations.

15                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

16                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You guys first.

17                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, no I think it does  
18 take (inaudible) peer pressure. Okay now we, I think we  
19 need to proceed to, one of them will come back to order.  
20 One of the items we laid over which was, a READ Act?

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, yeah. Their is a  
22 --

23                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You want to start, or  
24 where do I start? SAT?

25                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's your call.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, what did we prepare?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm at school. Let's skip  
4 school for a moment, let's do the READ Act. (Inaudible).

5 Okay, let's see, where was I at? All right, Commissioner.

6 MR. ASP: So thank you, Mr. Chair, glad to  
7 bring these revised rules to you today regarding the READ  
8 Act, got a chance, staff had a chance to meet with some  
9 Board members individually as well as to talk with folks in  
10 the field. And so I'd like to turn it over to Melissa  
11 Colzman and Alyssa Dorman, who's our executive director of  
12 Literacy.

13 MS. DORMAN: Okay. So you have -- I just  
14 want to orient you with the materials that you have in  
15 front of you today. This is simply an information item.  
16 We'll be bringing back to you next month. The opportunity  
17 for a public hearing, and a vote of consideration for  
18 adoption of the rules as they have been revised. In the  
19 memo you'll see outlined, the specific details about this  
20 particular information item. You have an updated crosswalk  
21 document, you may remember that this was prompted by the  
22 Office of Legislative legal services in their review. So  
23 we've updated that to reflect some conversations that we've  
24 had with them since we were last with you under your  
25 direction, as well as meetings with the Board members who



1 had some additional interest in talking about the rules.  
2 And then you'll see a red line copy of the rules reflecting  
3 the ongoing submission of changes that will be considered  
4 next month.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's red and purple,  
6 can you explain that?

7 MS. DORMAN: That simply has to do with the  
8 computer in which it was revised on, and the date in which  
9 that's been had edited. So there is no difference in it --  
10 it is both by time, and also by author who is working on  
11 the edits. So that --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That means purple.

13 MS. DORMAN: -- they are the exact same  
14 thing they are not to be interpreted --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well I like purple.

16 MS. DORMAN: -- different. I personally  
17 like purple too.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it was really  
19 confusing. Okay (inaudible).

20 MS. DORMAN: Yes, anybody. Anyway, so just  
21 very quickly we took all the feedback that you gave us last  
22 board meeting, and I want to assure you that we've made  
23 those adjustments. The one particular item I'd like to  
24 draw your attention to that was the first is, if you're  
25 looking at the crosswalk documents, you had expressed



1 concerns to the Board about the definition that the Office  
2 of Legislative Legal Services had recommended for teacher  
3 in your rules. We went back to them, and expressed their  
4 concern, and they are pleased to just leave as is. Your  
5 definition with the inclusion of the one underlined  
6 statement, the main instructor for a class, which was their  
7 necessary change but it keeps intact that all the things  
8 that we believe that you expressed about the specific sort  
9 of specialized training an individual would need to have in  
10 order to be working with students in the Read act. So that  
11 is stated there in the notes.

12 I want to also draw your attention to some  
13 information that you provided about the clarification of  
14 calendar days keeping that consistent, as well as making  
15 sure that capitalization of local education provider was  
16 consistent throughout. So those minor tweaks, and edits  
17 were also made through that section three. The big change  
18 that I'd like to draw your attention to is in Section 3.04.  
19 In 3.04, through additional conversations with Board  
20 members, we were able to reexamine what had been previously  
21 adopted in the spring of 2015. Around those English  
22 learners who received instruction in both -- for literacy  
23 in both English and Spanish, the language that we  
24 previously had empowered parents to make decisions about  
25 their students, and those parents were not necessarily



1 aware of that access that they had to make requests for  
2 testing in English.

3                   So as we reexamine that with Board members,  
4 and with legal counsel, we were able to honor the attorney  
5 general's opinion about the designation of a significant  
6 reading deficiency through any of your board approved  
7 interim assessments, while also adhering to request the  
8 Board members to ensure that reprograms were dual language,  
9 instructions being provided to English learners that we  
10 could also meet program outcomes for those students which  
11 would be biliteracy and bilingualism. And so you'll see  
12 that change reflected here that we will refrain your  
13 updated rules.

14                   We'll request that those children be  
15 assessed annually at least once. That will not be reported  
16 to us through the collection, they will report only one  
17 score for the identification, they get to choose if they  
18 want that to be their English, or their Spanish assessment.  
19 That's entirely up to them. But if they choose Spanish  
20 this rule would ask that they go ahead, and continue to  
21 assess at least once annually those students, and their  
22 goals for English Language Development as well as English  
23 literacy. So that's what you'll see reflected here.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So does that mean, I  
2 mean this is what I'm completely confused about based on my  
3 very weak memory.

4 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we talked about  
6 this last year it sounded as though there were going to be  
7 three assessments, two of which were, how well are they  
8 doing in English?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: That's not what this says,  
10 is that correct? There won't be a test through this fact  
11 that these students are English language learners, and then  
12 these two tests.

13 MS. DORMAN: There is a test that will be a  
14 language specific test known as the Access that will be  
15 measuring an English learners acquisition of the English  
16 language, and that has program applications outside of the  
17 READ Act. Within the READ Act, what the rules would now  
18 say is that districts have local choice on which READ Act  
19 Interim Assessment they will use for the designation of the  
20 significant reading deficiency, which is actually tied to  
21 funding for their students. So that would be their choice.  
22 Some time across that year, if they select the Spanish  
23 Assessment, they will just be asked as part of program  
24 implementation around the goal of literacy that they would  
25 also assess in English.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So we are back to three  
2 tests?

3 MS. DORMAN: They're doing multiple tests  
4 across the year for these students, yes. This would ask  
5 them to do for the purpose of literacy, and the READ Act it  
6 would ask them to do an ongoing assessment in either  
7 English, or Spanish if choosing Spanish you would ask them  
8 to once also test in English.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: And how is that? --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry. No problem, go  
11 ahead.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: How is that? Is that  
13 assessment different from the assessment that -- the  
14 access?

15 MS. DORMAN: Access is going to be speaking  
16 to components of language development. So it is not a --  
17 it's not a screener of reading risk. So it's how a student  
18 is acquiring, and progressing through the levels of access  
19 to the English language. It is not designed to, or  
20 constructed to be a screener which is what all of your  
21 Interim Assessments are. A screener for reading risk which  
22 is how we designate, and distinguish significant reading  
23 deficiency tied to the funding for intervention.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And this is something that  
2 we're adding, and that is not -- was not in the law if I  
3 say, it's our discretion to add it in.

4 MS. DORMAN: It is our discretion, your  
5 discretion to add that in. Yes.

6 MR. ASP: Mr. Chair.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Asp.

8 MR. ASP: Thank you. I want to point out  
9 that Access is a separate piece that's required under our  
10 English language, let's allow all English language learners  
11 take Access outside of the Read access as Mr. Gorman said.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What -- what we're  
13 looking at here my -- my fumbling way of trying to make  
14 sense of this is -- that the students reading War and Peace  
15 and Spanish, I'm probably not worried about their literacy  
16 development, sorry for the exaggeration. It's -- it's what  
17 I -- what I don't want to do is confuse needing to learn  
18 English with having a reading deficiency.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know, that's why I'm  
20 -- that's why I'm trying as a non-expert on this trying to  
21 understand.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What this allows folks  
23 to do I think is to say, I'm gonna have discretion locally  
24 to choose whether I assess the students reading ability in  
25 Spanish, or English depending on the circumstances but



1 because the -- the goal of this whole effort is to have  
2 kids be literate in English without asking the districts  
3 sometime in the year assess kids may receive English as  
4 well.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then what will it  
6 tell them?

7 MS. DORMAN: It might tell them if they have  
8 a significant reading deficiency in their secret language  
9 of literacy. So in other words a student who's only  
10 assessed in a dual language program in one, or the other  
11 would not have the benefit of accessing the intervention  
12 dollars to support their goal of being literate in both  
13 languages. So if you're only assessing in either English  
14 or Spanish for example in that program you might lose the  
15 opportunity to catch a deficiency for which we could  
16 remediate before they exit third grade where READ Act Funds  
17 are no longer accessible today.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we know that  
19 Elliott, read War and Peace when he was in third grade.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I've never read one of  
21 this by the way but --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Me neither.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can have an  
24 assessment on that real soon.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It'll be a test.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean we have to be,  
2 schools have to be accountable for whether they're teaching  
3 English or not.

4 MS. DORMAN: And they are. And that's what  
5 the Access is. But what I'm hearing is that there's  
6 something about the reading piece that some folks feel like  
7 it's gotta be -- if it's a dual immersion school but  
8 they've gotta be remembering to test in both languages.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, if it's dual it  
10 already is, but if it's --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what this  
12 ruling,

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- If it's just bilingual  
14 meaning, when I say bilingual, it's only in one language.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: And that's the first  
17 language then you know how that child is progressing.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that I don't  
19 understand this. I thought this option for being test in  
20 Spanish was only in dual immersion schools. Am I wrong?

21 MS. DORMAN: It is for -- it is for school  
22 systems to consider when their programming provides  
23 literacy instruction in both English, and in Spanish and  
24 there are many different program models.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are different  
2 models.

3 MS. DORMAN: That may be considered under  
4 that definition as we apply it.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Got you.

6 MS. DORMAN: So it could be dual language,  
7 it could be immersion, it could be bilingual. They are all  
8 terms that don't have --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's not just.

10 MS. DORMAN: -- really clear that it is  
11 about 60 -- 500 students present in --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

13 MS. DORMAN: -- this school year that are in  
14 such type of population.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, it's more than I  
16 thought. I thought it was a very small population.

17 MS. DORMAN: It's about sixty five hundred  
18 of students K3 that are presently reported to the state as  
19 being served.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Across how many  
21 districts? Do you remember?

22 MS. DORMAN: It is about 15 districts.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 MS. DORMAN: I have to count. It's -- it's  
25 up a little bit from last year. I think there was about 12



1 last year that reported that. I think it's about 15 this  
2 year that have reported then.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. Can you clarify  
5 why the Access is not sufficient as a -- as a reading  
6 assessment to look at reading risk?

7 MS. DORMAN: Just the nature.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's my question.

9 MS. DORMAN: As I say, the nature of the --  
10 we had it -- if I may tell you, we had this conversation  
11 with the field on Monday.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

13 MS. DORMAN: There is some interest in  
14 considering that, I'll be honest, because it is already an  
15 assessment in play in many schools for the English  
16 learners. At the end of our conversation with those school  
17 districts impacted, it became very clear that it's design  
18 and intent, it's sort of construct, is not one that using  
19 measurement tool for literacy skills specifically. So the  
20 acquisition wouldn't align to your -- to your academic  
21 standards, which was one consideration for your interim  
22 assessments. It is not a screener for risk, it's more  
23 mastery of language. It looks that different components  
24 that we consider to be language listening, speaking,  
25 reading, writing, but it is not purely a reading



1 assessment, and while we had that discussion, and told them  
2 it's never been considered, or subject to review, if the  
3 stakeholder group would wish to do so. We would be pleased  
4 to subject to the review against the criteria, or the  
5 rubric that was used for the interim assessments. I don't  
6 think that would be wise for us, because I don't think that  
7 it was designed that way, and I don't think that it would  
8 yield.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: This is an off-the-shelf  
10 test?

11 MS. DORMAN: Access? You purchase it, you  
12 mean?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Correct. Yes, it's not  
14 something we've developed within ourselves.

15 MS. DORMAN: No, It's something you  
16 purchase. It's a national assessment.

17 MR. ASP: It's -- it's developed by.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Asp go ahead.

19 MR. ASP: It's developed by the University  
20 of Wisconsin actually online, and WIDA is the company that  
21 --

22 MS. DORMAN: That does it.

23 MR. ASP: -- kind of took that over but it's  
24 -- it's a standard test that we use, and yes I know that  
25 Dr. Flores knows and Dr. Schroeder, and others. It's --



1 it's really a define -- I'm gonna venture into ground where  
2 you're much pretty the expert but there is -- there's a  
3 number of components of reading that are identified in the  
4 READ Act, and this doesn't address those components at all.  
5 It's really about academic language that students have  
6 developed in English, in Math and Science. It's a useful  
7 assessment but I don't think it would be helpful at all in  
8 trying to diagnose kids reading disability, and -- and  
9 that's a wrong word but --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Deficiencies.

11 MR. ASP: -- thank you. Deficiencies.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Let's have one more final  
14 push, and there's no way to really enforce this rule  
15 change. You're not gonna be receiving any data. There's  
16 no way that we can find out what the data looks like  
17 because it won't be reported to the state, is that correct?

18 MS. DORMAN: We -- It is not presently a  
19 part of the collection that we have established for the  
20 requirements that we report out to the legislature. So it  
21 would not be a part of any collection that we would have in  
22 place this year.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And is that anything that --  
24 that we might wanna contemplate. I don't know if it's --  
25 if Tony wanted to comment.



1 MR. DILL: Well, I -- I feel better  
2 commenting about it after I had time to sit down, and --  
3 and review on the law about whether or not what they're  
4 reporting or the numbers identifies the significant reading  
5 deficiency in each case, I don't think that it would  
6 necessarily be something I'd be reporting but another  
7 aspect of that is if they're -- if they're using that to  
8 supplement it for a deficiency in English language. It  
9 might -- it might show up what's being reported. So I have  
10 to take a -- take a closer look at that.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think that might be worth  
12 discussing just because then you can see the data, and you  
13 could see if it's still making purpose.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions? I  
15 think maybe the rest was linear because the Aengus came  
16 back largely at the request of some of the school reform  
17 groups which I think with whom, I often don't agree but  
18 there is concern that children may be able to read in  
19 English regardless of their primary language, and so we  
20 might want to at some point figure out how we could -- how  
21 we could add that data into other reports, and -- and  
22 provide that information if we could, but I don't -- I  
23 don't think we have to deal with that at the moment.

24 MS. DORMAN: Not today.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So this -- this would be.  
2 So what you're looking for is a notice of rulemaking.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's arguments.

4 MS. DORMAN: You noticed it last month this  
5 was just an update. So that you have that update before we  
6 went to public hearing.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That should be public  
8 hearing the next meeting.

9 MS. DORMAN: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And we're going to expect  
11 some testimonies that time.

12 MS. DORMAN: I would imagine so. Yes, when  
13 we've invited comments through our stakeholder group, and  
14 we hope we'll get some, and we have received none today.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you. Thank  
16 you very much. Why don't we proceed to the agenda item we  
17 had yesterday, and did not get to which was the --

18 MS. DORMAN: Integral.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Board comments and all  
20 questions about the SAT issue, and SAT, ICT issues, and see  
21 if -- see what comments. Thank you. See what comments any  
22 members of Board would like to make, and do you want to  
23 start -- start down Pam, and whoever wishes to make a  
24 comment would just go right down the row, and see Pam.

25 MS. MAZANEC: My comment would be that --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And questions. If you  
2 have questions as well staff, so I may answer.

3 MS. MAZANEC: I guess my -- my -- my comment  
4 really is that, I am surprised and uncomfortable with the  
5 way this decision was made quickly, and it was not made --  
6 made clear to the community. I mean even the school  
7 districts community, and even to the State Board. So it  
8 was a bit of a surprise that the decision was made, I mean  
9 even if we had known, I think it was poor timing to bring  
10 this out two days before Christmas, to make a decision  
11 that's -- that's going to affect juniors in April, is it?  
12 March, April. So and I wish the State Board had a little  
13 more role -- more of a role in this decision of choosing a  
14 new exam. That's it.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's right.

16 MS. OKES: The change in testing began last  
17 May at the 11th hour just prior to the close of the  
18 legislative session. House Bill 15-13-23 which is signed  
19 into law on June the 5th states that state assessment,  
20 administration rules beginning in 2015-'16 school year the  
21 Department of Education in collaboration with local  
22 education providers shall administer the state assessments  
23 in the instructional areas of English language arts, math  
24 and science. State Board of Education was not consulted,  
25 nor considered. We found out on December 23rd along with



1 everyone else. There are many questions that people want  
2 answered.

3                   Why was the announcement made on December  
4 23rd? How was the committee selected? Who are the non-  
5 voting members, and how were they selected? Why weren't  
6 more people across the state involved, or even  
7 knowledgeable about making such an important decision? Not  
8 only interested educators superintendents, and school Board  
9 members, more importantly parents and students. The bill  
10 also states that every five years the Department shall  
11 request competitive bids. If we revisit this every five  
12 years might we again be subjected to another new test?  
13 Should the Legislature take another look at this bill now  
14 before it's too late.

15                   There were four major things lacking in this  
16 decision. Communication, inclusion, education, and  
17 transition. I've heard from two people on the committee  
18 both members stated that the SAT was selected because it  
19 was better aligned with Common Core. In a chalk beat  
20 article, there was a quote, "This spring's SAT has an  
21 entirely new test. Refashioned to better align with common  
22 core state standards in English and math." State officials  
23 cited the tests harmony with the Common Core in announcing  
24 why the College Board prevailed.



1 I received a letter signed by 120  
2 superintendents many from the district that I represent,  
3 the 3rd Congressional District. Superintendent stated  
4 because of the new state of atestments (ph) -- State  
5 Assessments, PARCC, READ Act, Literacy Assessment, and see  
6 math, science, and social studies act is the only  
7 assessment the state, and school districts have that  
8 provides longitudinal data. As you know, Colorado has used  
9 the act since 2001, and changing this test means a  
10 significant lost, loss of trend data regarding the  
11 achievement of high school students in our state.  
12 Superintendents go on to say communication about the  
13 process, and the chance to provide input were significantly  
14 lacking. In the announcement made by -- made when many  
15 schools were closed, or winter break lacked information  
16 about how it all came together.

17 The timing of the change is complicated  
18 because school districts are preparing for adopting, and  
19 putting in place new graduation requirements starting with  
20 class of 2021. Last week I along with other Board members  
21 received 350 letters from parents, and I read everyone of  
22 them. They were not from -- all from people in my district  
23 but I was impressed and further concerned because so many  
24 parents took the time to write. Some of the excerpts are,  
25 "if you wanna change the tests students are taking to



1 measure standards couldn't you have set a date, well into  
2 the future for the change? You have put so many Colorado  
3 juniors at a great disadvantage."

4                   From a student, "allow the current juniors  
5 to take the ACT and choose to take the SAT, if they wish.  
6 Even better, you could set this up for next year's freshmen  
7 so they have their whole high school ca -- career to  
8 perfect -- prepare for this test. If you wanted to make  
9 such a drastic change it would only seem considerate to  
10 give a four-year warning, so parents and students of  
11 incoming freshmen could begin to prepare for the style and  
12 type of tests, that is the SAT. Families have been  
13 preparing for the SAT only to have a bait, and switch on  
14 them at the 11th hour."

15                   Aaron and Mark Mina from Cherry Creek wrote  
16 -- yeah wrote and said, "The CTE message box was full which  
17 I totally understand but if you received this would you  
18 please give me a call." I immediately picked up the phone,  
19 and spoke to these people. Colorado Association of School  
20 Executives wanted greater input, and participation from  
21 educators in order to fully understand the potential  
22 positive, and negative impacts, and financial burden to  
23 school districts on this testing contract.

24                   They added -- why not revisit the decision  
25 entirely, compare the two tests to the State's academic



1 standards? A third grade teacher wrote, she's also a  
2 parent. But it seems maybe it's forgot -- it's gotten away  
3 from our number one goal. We're here to do what's best for  
4 our kids, and it doesn't feel like that's what's going on.  
5 Superintendent from Meeker, which is a Rio Blanco County,  
6 Kriselle, said several years ago, our high school teaching  
7 staff selected the ACT as a summative exam for our  
8 students, and they have developed curriculum to ensure that  
9 the student learning in our district will be reflected on  
10 that exam. The proposed change places unnecessary burden  
11 on our teaching staff.

12 Our high school, and our juniors will incur  
13 extra costs for SAT preparation materials, required to  
14 replace ACT materials that have already been purchased by  
15 the school district and -- and students. I wanna conclude  
16 by saying I realize the decision has been made. The short  
17 term fix has been announced. The State Board of Education  
18 was not informed of such an important decision nor were the  
19 people of Colorado. I wanna thank those who wrote, those  
20 who called, and the rural superintendents who joined as one  
21 voice. Today I share their voice.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Goff?

23 MS. GOFF: My first reaction is it would  
24 have been nice to have some talking points based on what  
25 she just said. Did up to everything, and you know we are -



1 - we are -- we have a lot of common ground on the board  
2 about reading and reacting and reflecting on constituent  
3 input to ourselves. We all got the same amount of emails,  
4 and that I found striking as I do on a lot of things and  
5 step, perhaps a handful, could have been counted on one  
6 hand. We're getting letters, or questions, or phone calls  
7 from people in my Congressional District. Did have some  
8 personal conversations with several leaders in Jefferson  
9 County and -- and another parents who are very active, and  
10 keep up with not only the -- the community scene but also  
11 the academic scene, and what goes on, especially not one  
12 from Adams County, no comments whatsoever.

13 I find that interesting on a lots of  
14 friends. I will say, I'm just really very short, and I  
15 don't think it was just anything that we probably talk  
16 about, and that we have common goals around, and -- and you  
17 know strong interest in doing as long as you can, and that  
18 is communication, and the timing of it, and how it is  
19 messaged because we found ourselves in -- in these  
20 situations over the recent years where (inaudible). Maybe  
21 it's more important than getting credit for, and that is  
22 our public, our people, knowing what they need to know  
23 about who does what and why, and a little bit about how it  
24 works.



1                   Because I -- I have spent eight years now,  
2 I'm an educator so I'm gonna to do this, educating people  
3 about what the State Board does -- does basically how to  
4 describe those jobs, and authorities, and then  
5 responsibility, and what are those we cannot do, it's --  
6 those are different. It's what -- what we're authorized to  
7 do, what are our duties and what we cannot do. This  
8 particular incident will tremendously gotten out. At the  
9 same time, to come -- come forward without some thought.  
10 And simply lay it all -- lie -- lay it all with these  
11 possibility at the given legislature. Or at including some  
12 committee that this test would (inaudible) , that is not  
13 necessarily the most (inaudible) leadership way to go about  
14 it.

15                   You can't just say you know, blame it across  
16 the street but you know we all going to believe how many  
17 things that we do because of what they'll think. That's  
18 not the way this -- this should be handled. We need to be  
19 able to really -- all of us, any elected official, anybody  
20 involved in the leadership with this work, how to explain  
21 it simply and -- I'm not going to do it all along.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have to start over.

23                   MS. GOFF: Sorry, very sorry about that.

24 But we need to know how to -- how to really lay the -- put  
25 the picture out there for people about what -- what goes on



1 in the world of education policy making. And so that  
2 everybody has a little chance to think about something.  
3 That was the most distressing to me, was that we -- we  
4 ourselves, the department, the people on the selection  
5 committee, nobody had any real control of a message, and --  
6 and how they -- how to help people learn what this was all  
7 about. I personally have been around both of those tests  
8 over the years, a lot. I'm pretty familiar with both of  
9 them. Wish I was more currently familiar, I haven't been  
10 in a classroom for a while. But the test itself is not the  
11 issue. The -- the issue is what is -- the question is what  
12 is best for kids?

13                   And I just think -- I just trust, I think  
14 that whomever made this ultimate decision, and by all  
15 accounts it was a committee-wide decision with a lot of  
16 confidence placed in it, this is what was going to be  
17 measuring our students answering to what we, and the rest  
18 of the adult world, and all of this has always said, how do  
19 we know we're testing what we're teaching, and how do we  
20 know these kids are doing -- how they're doing based on  
21 what we say is happening in the classroom? And if there is  
22 an -- the overall o -- opinion, and belief in the work is  
23 that SAT is -- is the best tool for that now, right now.  
24 That's it, that's what it is. I'm -- one last thing I --



1 I've been really dismayed during this entire week because  
2 Monday was the press event.

3                   The points around this episode were laid out  
4 pretty well, thank you Dr. Asp. And -- and the department,  
5 and yet these letters are still coming, and they're still  
6 coming from the same source as the thousands of other ones  
7 did. And where has the leadership at that same source been  
8 to help the public get this straightened out a little bit.  
9 I find that very disappointing. I mean, we're all in this  
10 together, and if somebody knows exactly what is happening,  
11 and they really nothing to do except be the leader, let  
12 your people know what's -- what's up, but that didn't  
13 happen, hasn't happened yet. I find that very  
14 disappointing.

15                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: Not much sense in repeating  
17 what my colleagues have said. I really want to move  
18 forward on this. I --

19                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I am sorry.

20                   MS. SCHROEDER: But (inaudible). I do think  
21 that there is further -- we've talked about the  
22 communication that didn't occur, which is what my  
23 colleagues have talked about. I want to talk about the  
24 communication that needs to occur, which is what that  
25 criteria were? Why the decision, what were the three or



1 more reasons, which is alignment with cost, Colorado  
2 standards, the fact that students value more the SAT  
3 reports, in fact, that the cost to the State will be less,  
4 more importantly, that the cost of families will be less.  
5 I think that kind of communication would be very, very  
6 helpful. I think we should respect the transition, and be  
7 grateful for what staff, and what the vendors have been  
8 willing to provide for our kids. I do agree that the --  
9 the timing was difficult for our 11th graders, and this was  
10 a win.

11                   However, one more piece that I think that we  
12 at the department, not just communication should provide,  
13 but we need to now talk with our school district what kind  
14 of supports do they need for this transition to a different  
15 assessment. I agree with Jane that it's really not that  
16 much difference -- different although the SAT has changed.  
17 There are off a lot of supports available, most of them are  
18 free. But we need to help districts get that in their  
19 teacher's hands so that they're comfortable. The most  
20 disturbing thing that I've heard, I will mention that, is  
21 that our districts, our 120 districts said they've been  
22 aligning their curriculum to the ACT. I find that kind of  
23 problematic because number one, I didn't know the ACT had  
24 standards. But number two more importantly, I thought the  
25 state of Colorado did have academic standards. And that's



1 what I wanted our districts to be aligning their curriculum  
2 to. And if they do, and if they're able to teach the  
3 students, they'll do just fine on the SAT. So I really  
4 want to move forward.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

6 MS. FLORES: Well I'm sorry, I'm sorry  
7 Angelika that you didn't know that the curricula, that most  
8 people in this country follow is either the SAT, and the  
9 ACT. And the SAT is usually chosen by people who are going  
10 to go to Ivy League schools even though Ivy League schools  
11 are not -- many of them are not -- they don't require an  
12 aptitude test anymore. And I think that's probably one of  
13 the reasons that ACT maybe changing, who knows what ACT  
14 looks like? But I do know that it's really going to hurt  
15 the Latino community. Because Latinos have always a -- a -  
16 - aspired to go to a good -- a good state school. And  
17 because that was where, you know they -- they thought they  
18 were -- they were going to get a good education. And that  
19 Ivy League schools were just beyond, not that a lot of  
20 kids, I know I have some cousins who have gone to Ivy  
21 League schools, and we have done very well.

22 But most kids, and -- and I know, and I say  
23 this for the Latino community because I think I know of the  
24 Latino community especially in academics, I -- I taught at  
25 the University level, and such -- and -- and they aspire to



1 go to a good State school, and the ACT has been a test that  
2 they -- that is in the -- the belief system, and where you  
3 get the SAT, I don't know if you remember what happened at  
4 that school in California when those kids really did very  
5 badly on -- they were trying, and they were very good,  
6 trying to do well on, not Algebra, but what is that,  
7 Calculus, it was a Calculus exam, and actually I think  
8 those kids did well. And I remember when those people from  
9 all over the country, because I was part, ETS brought me in  
10 because I had said that I didn't want to be involved with  
11 the SAT. But that was you know, where I learned that, you  
12 know there were aspirations at that time for the SAT  
13 because most people didn't. And so I -- I think you have  
14 to kind of know Latinos.

15                   And I don't think that this body kind of has  
16 gotten into Latinos even though Latinos make up a large  
17 portion of -- of this population. The SAT has been a -- a  
18 no, no. And in fact, SAT sometimes gives it to -- in -- in  
19 some communities free, so that there is, you know people  
20 will take it. It has such a bad reputation. And so that's  
21 why we're getting what we're getting. Because I'm sure  
22 it's here too, and it's not just probably with Latinos,  
23 it's probably just elsewhere as well. Now, if you got the  
24 -- the emails, and phone calls, and you'd understand. And  
25 I don't think that students think that the SAT, maybe --



1 maybe in the circles you run in, you might -- that may be  
2 the case. But I don't think that in general, kids favor  
3 SAT, no they don't. Parents favor SAT, no they don't. So  
4 I think it was a -- a big mistake, and there should have  
5 been a -- a large -- we should have had something, and  
6 asked the public. The public should have been involved in  
7 this since it's -- it's such an iconic thing. I mean, I --  
8 I think the -- these tests are iconic, and so and there's  
9 so much a part of -- of the American dream. I think  
10 they're up there in the American dream.

11                   And it's so much a part of that -- that we  
12 shouldn't have messed with it like we did in -- in a very,  
13 well not in a serious manner. I don't think we treated it  
14 as seriously as it is. And that's why we're getting the  
15 blow back that we are getting from the public. The public  
16 is upset. They're very upset. And in fact the  
17 legislature, the Latino group you know, just had a big  
18 thing about it a couple of days ago. And they were upset  
19 about it as well. So you know, they set the rules. The  
20 other thing I think, is that we're just a punching bag.  
21 Something like this makes us just a punching bag, when  
22 we're not responsible, and we don't even know. I think  
23 that in -- in -- in -- what I think -- I was so angry when  
24 getting all these calls, and emails, and such. And I  
25 didn't know who had made the decision, and I really thought



1 it was the legislature, which I think they did. But it's  
2 another way I think of -- of cutting us -- of cu -- cutting  
3 us down. And -- and I think it's -- it may be intentional.

4 I think somebody wants to control the -- our  
5 -- our body. The Board wants to take control, and -- and  
6 are doing the best that they can to sully our name -- to  
7 sully our name. And I just don't think that's playing  
8 fair.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I, of course to have received  
11 hundreds of emails, and have read them, and know that  
12 parents, and students, and district superintendents were  
13 hurt by the messaging, and by the timing of the decision,  
14 and that the Board's reputation was significantly damaged,  
15 and I -- I really appreciate the public taking time to  
16 communicate with us, and tell us. The messaging and timing  
17 of the decision was unfair to the students, to the parents,  
18 to the educators, and how it was messaged gives the wrong  
19 impression to the public, and I guess my question is -- is  
20 that if we were so easily able to remedy the situation for  
21 this year's juniors, why was that not contemplated, and  
22 anticipated prior to the release of the decision. Because  
23 the board was out of the loop. We were not able to  
24 anticipate the (inaudible) nor address it until after the  
25 fact, and after the damage had been done. You know, I'm



1 glad that the situation is remedied for this year's  
2 students but it strikes me as too little too late, and I  
3 hope that going forward we can work with involved entities  
4 to ensure that it doesn't happen again. And that it does  
5 not -- because it does not reach our commitment to serving  
6 the public well, and that's -- that's why we're here.  
7 Thank you.

8                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Scheffel.  
9 I mean just a couple of quick observations. Unfortunately,  
10 and I'll -- I'll bear my share of this responsibility I was  
11 aware there was a bit process, and there may have been  
12 other members of the Board may have been as well. I just  
13 didn't pay adequate attention because I didn't think there  
14 was much chance there would be a change, and I think most  
15 everyone involved in the process was as surprised as was I.  
16 But I think on the flip side of that, had we -- had we  
17 fully known what we were going to face given the way the  
18 statute was structured, and -- and the state procurement  
19 processes frame, it would have been almost illegal probably  
20 certainly unethical for us to have intervened very deeply  
21 in that process.

22                   So I think -- I think we were stuck. We  
23 were stuck with the responsibility but given none of the  
24 authority. I do believe that -- that the department and  
25 staff did an outstanding job in minimizing the damage. And



1 I think that now -- now things have to shift to the  
2 legislature for them to determine whether they made a good  
3 decision for the long run or not. And -- and if they want  
4 to revisit, this year is the time to do it because once we  
5 get very far down this road we're going to be completely  
6 changing again. We'll create the same (inaudible).

7                   Just finally if there's one thing that was I  
8 think clearly exposed by this incident is the myth that we  
9 don't teach to a test, and the myth that a national test  
10 doesn't drive a national curriculum. Meaning there's  
11 nothing more obvious than the reaction to this on the part  
12 of the educators providing the education fully, admitting  
13 that they teach to this test. Which I think exposes the  
14 complete myth that Common Core is not a national  
15 curriculum.

16                   MS. SCHEFFEL: That's right.

17                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It is. And -- and I think  
18 every time we hear that we don't have a national curriculum  
19 driven by a national test in this case, the PARCC tests, I  
20 think we have all the evidence we need to debunk that  
21 particular statement. And so I hope that observation, and  
22 I hope any of the denials that people don't teach to the  
23 test, and that the t -- test does not set a curriculum or  
24 cannot be now easily rebutted by the facts circumstance  
25 with which we're dealing. So I -- I thank -- I do want --



1 thank Dr. S for your efforts to -- to fix the problem, and  
2 I think you can confirm or deny you were surprised as most  
3 of us.

4 MR. HANSEN: I could make a comment?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

6 MR. HANSEN: I'd say -- I'd start by saying  
7 what I said in the original letter they put out I believe  
8 in the process. I think the people who chose that test did  
9 it in good faith based on a very three week long  
10 deliberation. I accept full responsibility for the timing  
11 of the communication, and the lack of or the quality  
12 education that went out. We'll review that in house we've  
13 done that already, and we'll also review with the new  
14 commissioner, and take into account these issues raised.  
15 Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Hansen.  
17 Okay. Let's try, and move, and see if we can move on to  
18 the kindergarten school readiness discussion. We're  
19 getting close. And before we take the sub I want if I just  
20 might ask a couple of questions about this reporting system  
21 that we're being asked to look at. Currently we -- since  
22 we don't have an approved reporting system what is being  
23 done? Are you receiving data -- are you receiving it under  
24 an old format? What's the -- what's the situation exactly?



1 MS. EMM: Currently we're not receiving any  
2 of this information from the school districts.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How often -- is that  
4 unusual, or do you usually receive at a specific time  
5 during the year? How do you -- how do you do that?

6 MS. EMM: That's a good question. The  
7 kindergarten School Readiness Initiative kind of began in  
8 (inaudible) K. We really started implementing that in the  
9 phasing process in 2012-'13 school year. And -- and we're  
10 kind of in full implementation this year. So this is all  
11 brand new. So we haven't yet ever had any opportunity to  
12 request information in relation to this nor districts had  
13 full implementation order to provide any type of  
14 information.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So at least up to this  
16 point in time we've not previously collected this  
17 information. And -- so we're -- we're not -- are -- the  
18 districts are they prepared to report, and they want a  
19 format from us -- is -- or we need to give them a format,  
20 and then it's our job to assemble the data, and report it  
21 to the General Assembly, is that correct?

22 MS. EMM: Correct. So EDAC is the -- the  
23 body that kind of approves any data collections for -- on  
24 the behalf of districts. And so what we would do is  
25 through EDAC approve what that format would be in terms of



1 what that districts would present to us. So essentially  
2 would be an Excel file that would have the elements that I  
3 indicated on it yesterday slides.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And so if -- if it's --  
5 let's presume that we had this format available now, would  
6 the districts be prepared to report tomorrow? Or would  
7 they be prepared, or are they still in the data collection  
8 process. We're now about halfway through the year. So or  
9 have they completed the collection? When -- when would  
10 that data be com -- compiled, and ripe for submission?

11 MS. EMM: Again that's -- that's a good  
12 question. This -- this is the first year full  
13 implementation districts had the first 60 days of the  
14 school year to complete that checkpoint for Kindergarten  
15 School Readiness. EDAC needs time, projects out about a  
16 year timeline for districts to be able to build kind of the  
17 data infrastructure, and make any changes in order to  
18 instigate a new collection so there'd be no collection that  
19 we could have for this calendar -- I'm sorry this school  
20 year. What we would anticipate on the advice of EDAC would  
21 be that next year would be a pilot year. Because again  
22 we're -- we're at a place right now where we're cutting  
23 into that year timeline that districts need. So in order  
24 to -- to fully implement we'd look at probably two years  
25 out when we would actually have all districts reporting.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So one conclusion could be  
2 that we're not under enormous time pressure to do this to -  
3 - today but that we are under some time pressure. I mean  
4 how long does the EDAC process take?

5                   MS. EMM: So EDAC has indicated to us  
6 because we've -- like I mentioned yesterday we've been in a  
7 lot of communication with EDAC each month. What they  
8 indicated is if we were able to go to them at their  
9 February meeting which is I think February 5th, and  
10 indicate that the Board has adopted the system, that they  
11 would be able to initiate a pilot for the next calendar  
12 year. And that would enable us to then kind of move  
13 forward with implementation. If this is pushed out  
14 further. It would probably push us into a whole other year  
15 of waiting.

16                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Push that how much  
17 further?

18                   MS. EMM: So we would have a pilot  
19 collection in the '16-'17 school year. If the Board were  
20 adopt -- to adopt today, then we would have the first full  
21 implementation of the reporting system in the '17-'18  
22 school year. If we were to delay we may run into not even  
23 be able to pilot next year which would make the '17-'18  
24 school year the first pilot year.

25                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: When we look at slide four of  
2 your presentation from yesterday where it talks about  
3 statutory or data elements, right? In your opinion based  
4 on the statute, would we be in compliance if we were to ask  
5 districts merely to report to the state the percentage of  
6 students relevant to this data collection? That are either  
7 ready or not ready. Yes? No? For kindergarten because  
8 their preschoolers, right? Or is this the kind -- is this  
9 the first grade?

10 MS. EMM: This would be administered within  
11 the first 60 days of the kindergarten or school year.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Ready? Not ready? In these  
13 areas, yes -- no percent. So this district or this school  
14 has this number of students. There were reports in the  
15 state 80 percent of our students of this age relevant to  
16 this funding stream are ready in the areas of -- we'll just  
17 ready in general or ready in the area of Modern Development  
18 Social language? That's it.

19 MS. EMM: So --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Why (inaudible) we do  
21 something that simple. When the state can say "gee we want  
22 to get that number from 50 percent to 70 percent."

23 MS. EMM: So I think the issue that we would  
24 have with that is the desegregation requirements that we  
25 have in terms of being able to report out under the



1 different categories within cap for K. Some examples would  
2 be around gender, free, and reduced lunch school. I think  
3 that they would be -- present us with challenges around  
4 that, and that we could dive into --

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what if the district -- we  
6 ask the district? And say look, give us the overall  
7 percentage, and then you need to also give us percentages  
8 within that holistic percentage free and reduced. And  
9 again no specific student data. (Inaudible) What if the  
10 districts provided that to the --

11 MS. ANTHES: Can I ask you some technical  
12 questions so that understand your questions? And that is  
13 does -- does (inaudible) or whatever they use, do they  
14 decide what the level is? Do they set the cut scores?

15 MS. EMM: Correct. The assessment tool  
16 itself indicates whether or not the students meeting our  
17 expectations for that range.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: But wasn't there a range? I  
19 mean I don't remember seeing the scoring sheet. So was  
20 there a range or was there being your ready, being your --  
21 do you know what I mean?

22 MS. EMM: Yeah. So there -- depending on  
23 the tool there -- the -- the way that those scores of kind  
24 of aggregate up into a single score or poor rating for a  
25 particular area, there would be kind of a -- that the



1 student falls within the age expectations. So you could  
2 think of it as meeting a bird. Yes they could fall below.  
3 But there is -- there are gradations below age  
4 expectations, and there are gradations above. So by being  
5 able to have the information of like if we have a scale  
6 score with eight different places that students can be. By  
7 having that scale square we have a better sense of how  
8 close kids are to meeting age expectations, or how far  
9 above, or how far below.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thanks Deb I just  
11 didn't -- I didn't -- I don't remember what was on the  
12 format so --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions?

14 MS. ANTHERS: (Inaudible) something like I'm  
15 suggesting within the purview of the statutes requirements  
16 in your view. As far as what we have to report.

17 MS. EMM: I think actually I -- I'm not the  
18 expert obviously on statute so I would defer to Mr. Dill.

19 MR. DILL: Well and perhaps what we need to  
20 do is get together, so I'm -- I'm really understanding you  
21 know in terms of what the assessment needs to measure the  
22 statute is very clear, and it's actually very prescriptive  
23 in terms of --

24 MS. ANTHERS: The list of categories.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Collecting the data on  
2 this -- on those categories, and that makes a great deal of  
3 sense when you look at the overall statute because that  
4 then goes into calculating what needs to be in an effective  
5 school ratings plan. If we're talking about state level  
6 reporting requirements, and what has to be reported at the  
7 state level. It says first of all it's aggregate it's not  
8 for individual students, and it has to be a system of  
9 reporting population level results that provide baseline  
10 data for measuring overall change, and improvement in  
11 students skills, and knowledge over time. That's -- that  
12 sounds that -- that language sounds like what -- whatever  
13 the reporting is it's going to be fairly com -- fairly  
14 comprehensive. And -- and so I -- I think really to -- to  
15 add to your question I'll probably need a better idea of  
16 what it is specifically that you're -- you're -- you're not  
17 trying to propose for the -- for the -- for the population  
18 level reporting results.

19                   MS. SCHEFFEL: We'll just, you know, from  
20 slide four there's all these fields. Name, gender, first  
21 name, last name, and all these scores. My question is  
22 based on the statute. Can we ask districts to report more  
23 aggregated information, and percent of students in whatever  
24 categories required are ready or not ready or whatever  
25 gradations you want to put in there. It's just that all



1 this detail the public really finds intrusive for young  
2 kids. And so how -- how can we address their concerns?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You (inaudible).

4 MS. PEARSON: I will just remind, we have  
5 investigated that a little bit with this Board. We keep  
6 talking about EDAC. What we did hear really loud and clear  
7 from them, and from districts is that -- that would be a  
8 large burden on districts to do that work. It's multiple  
9 more steps for them to do the work. So just so you're  
10 aware of that piece of feedback from districts. Sometimes  
11 the districts almost prefer to give it to us in this format  
12 because it's more of a push of a button type thing, you  
13 know, to be very non-technical. But just we got that  
14 feedback very clearly from the EDAC that they would prefer  
15 not to give it to us in aggregate.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I would argue that we  
17 could make it so that it wouldn't be more work for them but  
18 that's a longer discussion about how that might get.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion.

20 MS. PEARSON: (Inaudible) frankly maybe  
21 naive about this but I thought -- I thought they always  
22 assigned the numbers. A student number rather than having  
23 the name.



1 MS. EMM: So correct. The -- the student  
2 assigned state ID number. This they said is included  
3 within this.

4 MS. PEARSON: But the name is too?

5 MS. EMM: Right. And so the reason for that  
6 is because it's possible for -- especially based on human  
7 error to input the wrong SYSID, and then have one child's  
8 information be put in for another child which comes up with  
9 some data privacy concerns. It also helps us make sure  
10 that we don't have we're not counting students more than  
11 once. So -- so the SYSID and these other key areas helps  
12 us figure out that if it's two students have the same SYSID  
13 we could look at for instance their last name, and say,  
14 okay, which student really is assigned to this number, and  
15 we can clarify any errors as part of the data kind of  
16 cleaning process that we use.

17 MS. PEARSON: That's throughout the 12  
18 years. They always have the name and the SYSID?

19 MS. EMM: When -- when data is submitted  
20 it's typical to do that as a way to make sure that --

21 MS. PEARSON: And you in the state keep  
22 that?

23 MS. EMM: I would have to have (inaudible).

24 MS. PEARSON: She's looking around like  
25 (inaudible) I see you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I apologize, is this is  
2 -- this is sort of a junior high discussion.

3 MS. FLORES: No, it's important.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At this point that I  
5 mean, I honestly believed all this time that the name of  
6 course was input at district level, but it was converted to  
7 a number for the state's purpose.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's true. I  
9 mean, we do -- we do assign a state ID, but there's always  
10 still chance of error. And our system that actually  
11 assigns those state IDs, it's you know, probably 90 percent  
12 effective, and then there's another 10 percent that we go  
13 through, and we do what we call case management. So  
14 there's sometimes, it's necessary for -- for a human to go  
15 through, and check all of those, check the files, and check  
16 the data within that, and make sure we've got individual  
17 children identified. So it's -- it really depends also on  
18 the use of the data, and the particular collection. So  
19 we're not always going to keep the exact same list of data  
20 elements for any particular child, or any particular  
21 collection. But generally, the SYSID and the names are  
22 something that we do keep just to -- just to be sure that  
23 we've got the right data, and that we can make sure we've  
24 got the right attributes associated with the right child.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, doctor.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I just want  
3 to make clear that we don't get mixed up between what's  
4 coming in on this collection. And yesterday, we were  
5 talking about or this morning about what we share with the  
6 University of Virginia with, the kids names were blocked  
7 out. I just wanna make sure.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Goff?

9 MS. GOFF: Yeah, I just, you know, as I  
10 listen to the discussion, and like you pointed out, and  
11 Angelica we've been talking about it for a while.  
12 (Inaudible). But we're not solving it. I mean, as we  
13 listen to people talk, it strikes me as astounding how we  
14 continue to prioritize the needs of the state over the  
15 needs of the kids and the parents. And I just think, we  
16 need to think again if this is a continuous drumbeat from  
17 parents which certainly is in -- in my situation.

18 MS. FLORES: I've not had a single.

19 MS. GOFF: Okay, well.

20 MS. FLORES: Not one, including my lovely  
21 Uber mom-daughter. There are some people for whom it is  
22 important but they're not --

23 MS. GOFF: It's a big deal. And I just  
24 think we need to address it on behalf of them.



1 MS. FLORES: Well, I have another question.  
2 If we were to ultimately tie any of this information to  
3 some other question that it would really matter that we  
4 could clean up our dirty data. But if in fact, we're  
5 collecting this for no other purpose than to aggregate it.  
6 I mean, I don't know if there's any hope for you in terms  
7 of your concerns.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have hope for you,  
9 darling.

10 MS. FLORES: Let me just -- let me just try  
11 something. Let me just try something. If we're collecting  
12 this for the purpose of looking big, big data, what if we  
13 drop the name? And we just -- because it -- the error --  
14 the effect of the error of having the wrong SYSID or  
15 whatever it's called, would not be critical in terms of  
16 aggregating, and preparing a report. And it might not be  
17 problematic in terms of aggregating, and having Children's  
18 Campaign, or the other folks who care deeply about  
19 improving outcomes for kids to have this information  
20 without the detail. Do you know what I'm trying to say?

21 MS. GOFF: So I think yeah, I think you're  
22 raising a good question. It is possible to not include  
23 students first name, a student's last name in this, and  
24 just have the SYSID. One of the --



1 MS. FLORES: There's a 10 percent risk here  
2 that there's a screw up.

3 MS. GOFF: -- but I think, you know, the  
4 other two -- there are other ways to clarify that. I mean,  
5 having the name helps really pinpoint an error. This is  
6 really important in a collection like with the REED  
7 collection because -- we, you know the funding is tied to  
8 it --

9 MS. FLORES: -- We're tying money to REED.  
10 We're not doing that here.

11 MS. GOFF: So having gender, and date of  
12 birth, and school, and district that can often help,  
13 because you know, it'd be less -- less likely that a SYSID  
14 would be assigned to two people, and we couldn't  
15 differentiate them by their gender, and date of birth, so  
16 that could provide some way of kind of making sure that our  
17 data isn't duplicative.

18 MS. FLORES: Does that help any? --

19 MS. GOFF: It help some. I'm still  
20 concerned about these scores, and I still would like to see  
21 if there's a way to report them merely to meet the intent  
22 of the statute. That's it. The state may want more data  
23 for whatever reason. I get that. But truthfully, the  
24 rights of the kids, and the parents? Trump that.



1 MS. FLORES: -- We're hearing from  
2 districts.

3 MS. GOFF: I'm not hearing them.

4 MS. FLORES: That data -- that data is an  
5 issue? That the providing information to the state is an  
6 issue. They are concerned about all the reporting. And so  
7 what we're talking about here now adds to their burden.

8 MS. GOFF: I think there's a way to do it so  
9 it doesn't. We haven't looked deeply at how to make this  
10 work for them. Conceptually, we're talking about which  
11 fields can we omit, so that we merely address the intent of  
12 the law. And then question, how gonna make it work, so  
13 that it isn't the big burden. But we haven't even gotten  
14 there yet.

15 MS. FLORES: It just told us that's more of  
16 a burden. They are the experts.

17 MS. GOFF: Only based not their assumptions  
18 though. I mean, I guess I have to look more deeply into  
19 why there's statement. We could simplify this data  
20 collection exponentially.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, I think the just  
22 couple bombs are raising. One, I think, we've made great  
23 progress in this. We've certainly at the vendor level  
24 reduced a lot of collection. That's a plus. Having said  
25 all that, the allegations, and I think, it may be driven by



1 this is that kid picks up a handful rocks on the school  
2 ground, and is mainly as an emotional development plan  
3 imposed on him. I think it's this kind of overreach on the  
4 part of everybody on the planet anymore. You know, I can  
5 tie this one to my personal experience because I hold the  
6 record at Kenyon Elementary for writing, "I will not throw  
7 snowballs on the school grounds." So God knows how many  
8 developmental plans I would have been a part of.

9                   So I think this is the kind of thing we'd  
10 like to stop from being done in the first place. I mean,  
11 does a kid really need an emotional plan because stand --  
12 because he picked up a handful of rocks on the playground?  
13 I eventually got cured about the 300 sentence I wrote,  
14 because they doubled every time you committed the offense.  
15 So there are other ways to deal with this without starting  
16 a data trail with -- with has potential problems. So I  
17 think, I don't like the idea of delaying this because we  
18 have made progress, but I also, until we get it as close to  
19 right and as close, and I will say one thing for sure, this  
20 education system should exist to serve parents, and  
21 children. The fact that it doesn't serve others involved  
22 in it as well is of little concern to me, that our primary  
23 objective is to serve parents and children.

24                   So if the administrators have a few more  
25 problems, I don't want that. But if I have to choose in a



1 balancing act, then I'm going to choose to serve the  
2 parents and the children. So it appears we could have some  
3 problem, you know, we may or may not need the name, I doubt  
4 their rates 10 percent, I think that's a helpful  
5 suggestion. But I think, when you get tied to things like  
6 emotional scores, the emphasizing that to the greatest  
7 extent possible is an outstanding idea, and I think pass or  
8 not, it's pass fail, either ready or not. And I don't  
9 think we need to know any more than that, and maybe that  
10 will minimize the downstream effect of some of the other  
11 implications of this. Most of the rest of this, I mean,  
12 language development score, I don't have a huge problem  
13 with. Physical and motor, a little less, a little more  
14 problem but nothing in the world.

15                   So you know, is there a way to just pare  
16 this down so that we can get rid of this. Many of the red  
17 flags as we can, and at the same time, we do have statutory  
18 requirement to assemble this debt. I really, mean, I know  
19 a legislature can speak from experience, the number in the  
20 READ's report, probably could dance on the head of a pen  
21 but we produce lots of those kinds of reports. And if this  
22 is data strictly for the legislature, I think minimalizing  
23 it, and therefore, minimizing the opportunity for mischief,  
24 leaks, hacks, misuse over collection. That's the only  
25 purpose we have for this thing, and frankly, minimizing



1 isn't going to hurt this thing. So we take one more step  
2 at minimizing this, let's see what we can get out of it.  
3 Let's definitely not bring it back with social and  
4 emotional development score, and let's bleed out, and  
5 discourage in much of the other nonsense that goes with  
6 this as we can.

7 MS. GOFF: And can we look at the statute,  
8 and what it requires, and align what we're collecting  
9 strictly with what is actually required. There's more than  
10 what we need to do on the side, I believe. In my reading  
11 them. I don't know if we need an opinion to that or not.  
12 If this is about percentages of ready kids in a certain  
13 subset funded by a certain funding stream, let's keep it as  
14 simple as possible because the schools are the ones that  
15 are gonna be implementing changes for these kids to help  
16 them get more ready. But the state does not need all these  
17 data, not unless the statute explicitly requires it. I  
18 just think it's very misguided to collect.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Excuse me.  
22 I would appreciate Mr. Dill as we believe and -- and  
23 certainly, we're not lawyers that's why we turned him, that  
24 those four components are required by -- by the statute.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I agree, they are if they  
2 are required and so, but the question is, can they be  
3 minimized, and that's passed or not passed would appear to  
4 be acceptable, I don't think the statute says you have to  
5 score.

6                   MR. DILL: Well, you have a very  
7 prescriptive test, and each of these elements is -- is  
8 required on that test. And then, you have a requirement  
9 for reporting to the department, a system for reporting  
10 population results. Perhaps, it would be useful if we got  
11 together between now and the next Board meeting, and talked  
12 about what would be the minimum state level reporting of  
13 population results that would still allow you to measure  
14 overall change, and improvement in students skills, and  
15 knowledge over time. Which is appears to be the purpose of  
16 the -- of the state level reporting.

17                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: By any good, which means a  
18 greater percentage pass, you've accomplished that. I have  
19 your answer. It doesn't make any difference where the  
20 greater percentage passed by 10 points or by 100 point. I  
21 think we would meet statute. No? Here's -- here's the  
22 problem is that I -- I would like to hear from some of the  
23 people in the education field about, you know, what  
24 improvement in students levels of skills in education, and



1 knowledge over time would look like in terms -- in terms of  
2 what type of data is necessary for that.

3 MS. FLORES: So we checked with some of the  
4 Children's Campaign folks. The Children's Campaign.

5 MS. GOFF: They were the one's who track.

6 MS. FLORES: Well, they track but they may  
7 not be experts. (Inaudible).

8 MS. GOFF: I'm not saying they're experts,  
9 I'm just saying that they are concerned about these  
10 reports. (Inaudible) the legislatures may not read but  
11 they would be really careful because that's their area of  
12 this.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's do the best we can  
15 so we minimize this down one more stretch, and we're  
16 getting toward the minimum the statute required. So we'll  
17 lay this over then. And Ms. Pearson, let's gets on the  
18 February, 2016 agenda. Thank you very much. Have I  
19 forgotten anything, Ms. Pearson?

20 MS. PEARSON: I believe there's one.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I was afraid of that.

22 MS. PEARSON: I don't think. It's a happy  
23 one though.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: A happy one. Oh, we're  
25 good. All right. I'm happy. Okay. We were happy.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 6: One minute, 60  
2 seconds.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Take your time. We'll  
4 stand in recess for 60 seconds.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 8: For 60 seconds?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Make it two  
7 minutes. Take your time. (Inaudible).

8 MS. CORDIAL: So on behalf of the staff at  
9 CDE, and the executive team, this is Interim Commissioner  
10 Asp's last Board meeting, and actually, it's technically  
11 second to last day. And so we just can't thank you enough  
12 for all you have done. You've been an inspiration to us.  
13 You are a giant in the field of education here in Colorado,  
14 and nationally, and we have all learned so much from you.  
15 And we thank you for everything you've done for the State  
16 of Colorado. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'd like to say after two  
18 days of Board meetings like this, it's probably plenty  
19 happy without the (inaudible). But I want to just, I think  
20 speak for the whole Board, we appreciate all the assistance  
21 that we've had in very professional job you've done. And  
22 we look forward to your further assistance in the coming  
23 transitions. So thank you very much, doctors.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 9: My wife got jealous  
25 of this.



---

1                           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I've done that actually.  
2 I learned -- I learned to take the card off the hard way.

3                           MS. FLORES: That was something we have to  
4 take.

5                           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other business comes  
6 with Board?

7                           UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 10: That's it.

8                           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll stand adjourned  
9 until February 10th at 9:00 a.m. Thank you.  
10                          (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