



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 10, 2016, Part 4

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 10, 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 MS. O'NEILL: Okay. And I can't find my
2 papers. Okay. If we are back on, I -- I'm Colleen
3 O'Neill, the Executive Director of Educator Preparation,
4 and Licensing. I am here to help answer some questions
5 around item 16.05, which is request from the University of
6 Colorado Denver Aspire to Teach for authorization to
7 provide a teacher preparation program in the endorsement of
8 early childhood education. So I just want to make myself
9 available to answer any questions we might have.

10 MS. RANKIN: Could you give us --

11 MS. O'NEILL: Joyce. No, I mean --

12 MS. RANKIN: I'm going real fast, I'm sorry.
13 Could you just give a little -- very brief summary of that
14 program, and -- and when it came to us?

15 MS. O'NEILL: When it came forward?

16 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

17 MS. O'NEILL: So the Aspire program is
18 actually a university, or a CU Denver program, and it is
19 the Alternative Educator Preparation Program. It was
20 approved by the State Board of Education on August 8th,
21 2012. And at that time, it was approved for elementary
22 education, and all secondary endorsements including special
23 education.

24 So today, or in the past month, what they
25 did is they submitted for early childhood education for a



1 program approval. So they are a designated agency that
2 prepares our alternative educators across the state.

3 MS. RANKIN: And did -- and -- we -- did CDE
4 evaluate what they've done so far, and how that's worked
5 before they added this additional early childhood?

6 MS. O'NEILL: That's a great question.
7 Thank you for it. The -- the authorization process is once
8 every five years so -- and not more than once every five
9 years for the authorization, and evaluation of our educator
10 preparation programs. But what we do evaluate is once a
11 program comes forward with a new endorsement, or a program.
12 We absolutely evaluate the needs analysis, so we conduct a
13 needs analysis, what program is it?

14 Why is it viable in the State of Colorado
15 for the individuals that they're serving? We do at very
16 high level look at the performance that they have done over
17 the course of the last several years, because the re-
18 authorization does not come up no more than once every five
19 years, there is not a full, and deep evaluation of the
20 accountability around that.

21 MS. RANKIN: Have we ever did -- done an
22 evaluation after five years, whatever fifth year that is,
23 and -- and said that this program is now either obsolete,
24 or doesn't do what it intended to initially?



1 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. We have evaluate
2 -- actually, in the last six, or seven years, we have
3 evaluate multiple designated agency programs, and either
4 recommended de-authorization, or disapproval of their
5 content endorsement areas because they simply are not
6 producing enough candidates, or enough quality candidates,
7 or they simply were not producing quality candidates that
8 were entering into the education profession. And an
9 example of that -- I'm not coming up with a really good one
10 off the top of my head except for TFA, that actually used
11 to be a designated agency for the State of Colorado, and
12 now partners with other individuals.

13 MS. RANKIN: And do we have a list of all of
14 those alternative licenses -- licensure -- lice teacher
15 programs?

16 MS. O'NEILL: We do have a list of all of
17 those designated agencies that are alternative educator
18 preparation programs. Those are on our website, and
19 actually, we are updating the website right now, and I'm --
20 I'm happy to say that there will be choice menus, where
21 educators can come in, and say, "I want to become an
22 elementary teacher. I am located in the San Juan valley.
23 What kind of designated agency program, or institute of
24 higher education could help me in that area?" And so that



1 will be rolling out soon, but that is all on our website,
2 and it's a place that our educators can find information.

3 MS. RANKIN: Thank you very much. You've
4 answered all my questions.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Madam Chair?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Board Member Rankin, the
8 topic you just broached is probably one the most important
9 that we will address the next 12 months. When I talk about
10 those nine traits, one of them is the very question you
11 asked. The top performing countries know exactly to
12 achieve who the highest performers are in teacher
13 preparation. Colorado is not -- unlike many the other
14 states, where it is not a very reversed, or robust
15 methodology.

16 There's outside groups that have tried to do
17 it, but I can't wait to work with Colleen because of her
18 knowledge in this area. To start to -- we're gonna -- and
19 we're gonna bring ideas to you, and we would love to hear
20 your feedback also. The very best need to be preparing the
21 very best. It is kind of a dumb way to say it but it
22 really is, and so we need to be able to evaluate not
23 definite once every five years, and the Board needs to be
24 very high around that. Colorado does have an interesting



1 problem, and that we -- we record the imports a lot of our
2 talent.

3 And so we've been talking at length among
4 the cabinet level of what's our goal to help recruit
5 teachers to Colorado, and just like -- I remember, I'd come
6 out of MBA school in Goldman Sachs, and Intel, and they
7 say, "Well, we only go to these six schools in the US for
8 90 percent of our recruits, and these others for 10
9 percent." For our outside talent, we need to be proactive,
10 and say, "Hey! For our first ever to recruit teachers to
11 Colorado to fill that gap, we need to be going to the very
12 best schools in the United States to bring talent to
13 Colorado. And then we need to make sure our internal
14 schools have the very best talent also."

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. So before we go
17 on, I have to tell folks that after my cupcake got dumped,
18 my name is Angel. Please change your records. That was
19 what my mother was hoping for when she named me 'cause my
20 name actually does mean little angel, but I'm not sure it
21 turned out that way. All right. 160 -- no, 160 --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We need to take a vote.
23 I'm sorry. We need a vote.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we have -- did we get a
25 motion?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is on the consent
2 agenda, the motion.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: That's under a whole lot of
4 icing right now, right?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you like me to
6 read?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: I would.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please read that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm serious.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The most -- for all
12 students, thank you. The emotion on the table would be to
13 approve University of Colorado Denver ASPIRE's request for
14 authorization of teacher preparation program, and the
15 endorse -- and the endorsement of early childhood
16 education, item 8.01.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: You're making that motion?

18 MS. GOFF: Sure.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane second it. Any
20 objections? Okay. Now we can go to relay?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Am I right? Do I have a
23 motion by the way for Relay?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Not a motion just yet. I -- I
2 -- we -- oh, yeah, we do have. We're going to discuss a
3 motion that we approved 1606. But should I read it?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No, that's okay. Jane, did
5 you second it? It's the Relay.

6 MS. GOFF: No, I'm not.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're just making the
8 motion.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I am. I'm seconding it.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you Pam. Okay. Val,
11 do you wanna start the discussion? This was one of the
12 ones you pulled.

13 MS. FLORES: I don't know. I -- I get so
14 many emails about -- and -- and then get stuff about this
15 program, and then I get shown articles.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Could you speak into your --
17 your microphone, please?

18 MS. FLORES: Oh, sorry. And I get shown
19 articles about the -- the Relay program. And it's -- it's
20 -- I haven't heard a positive thing about it. So I'm
21 wondering, why is it that we are supporting this program
22 that, you know, is -- I don't know, it sounds terrible.
23 And then somebody sent me which I think I sent you, too.
24 Yes. I -- I think I sent you that, or was it Engaged? No,
25 I think it was Relay.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I think it was Engaged, the
2 one with the -- the -- it seems like classroom doing the
3 (inaudible).

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, yeah. That was --
5 that was Engaged.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was Engaged.

8 MS. FLORES: But then Relay is another one.
9 So why? Maybe it's -- it's in Denver. Is it in Denver?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleen, do you wanna give
11 us some background that might be helpful, please?

12 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you Dr. Schroeder. So
15 Dr. Flores, the -- the item before us, actually, there's
16 multiple different variations of Relay. What we are
17 actually looking at today is the Relay Graduate School of
18 Education, and this is actually coming through the
19 Department of Higher Education through us. So we
20 concurrently, the Department of Higher Education, and the
21 Colorado Department of Higher Education concurrently
22 authorize programs for the institutes of higher education,
23 which Relay Graduate School of Education is seeking a post
24 back approval from the Department of Higher Education for
25 Educator Preparation. And as that process goes forward,



1 what happens is the Colorado Department of Education looks
2 only at the content for that higher education institution,
3 and then forwards it onto the Department of Higher
4 Education.

5 So our Review Authority, and our Statutory
6 Authority to review institutes of higher education, and the
7 educator preparation programs that go into them, very much
8 is only around content. And in order to do that, what we
9 do is we amass a committee of individuals, both internal,
10 and external, that are knowledgeable about the content, and
11 then we make sure that they are in alignment with our
12 Educator Preparation, and Licensing rules, and our Colorado
13 academic standards.

14 So what is before us today is really only
15 the recommendation saying that the committee has come to
16 the conclusion that the content that they produce, it has
17 nothing to do with anything else about the -- the Relay
18 Graduate School, but the content that they are seeking to
19 implement from a curricular standpoint is in alignment, and
20 appears to be in alignment with our Colorado academic
21 standards, and our standards for Educator Preparation, and
22 Licensing. From here, what happens is then it goes to the
23 Department of Higher Education, and they will have more
24 conversation around the quality of program, the quality,
25 and rigor associated with that. Does -- does that help at



1 least clarify what's in front of us today, and some of that
2 a little bit of the differentiation?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I haven't done the research
4 fully on this. Am I right that this is part of the
5 transformational centers for teacher preparation? They
6 identified five centers, or five focus points, and this is
7 one of them? Is a nationally funded through Gates, three -
8 - four million dollars. I am correct on that? Or I am --

9 MS. O'NEILL: Dr. Scheffel, I'm -- you're
10 probably into areas that I am not very knowledgeable of,
11 but we do have Katie Hox, who is a representative, and has
12 been the lead planner for the Relay Graduate School with us
13 today. Would it be okay to have her talk a little bit
14 about this?

15 MS. SCHROEDER: That'd be great.

16 MS. O'NEILL: Okay.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Like what's it's history?

18 MS. O'NEILL: Okay.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Who's behind it?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please? So actually,
21 do we have to call?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Oh, okay. So we
23 want some folks to call in? Okay. So we have some folks
24 to call in.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great, thank you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: From what I understand,
2 the folks that will be able to call in, and please, Ms.
3 Hox, make sure that I get this right, is going to be Dean
4 Hostetter, and the Chief Research Officer, Dr. Billie
5 Gastic, and I think they will help be able to answer some
6 of our questions around this.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: That's Bizy.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Welcome to the meeting
9 with Web Conferencing Services.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're very quiet
11 today.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's 4:00 o'clock.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're joining a
14 meeting in the conference room. You are the host. Access
15 is immediate. For a menu of available prom, press the star
16 key, six, and the pound key.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is it good? Do you
18 need anything?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hi. Do we have --

20 MS. O'NEILL: Hi there. Do we happen to
21 have Dean Hostetter, and Chief Research Officer, Dr.
22 Gastic, with us?

23 MS. HOSTETTER: Yeah. Hi, this Mayme
24 Hostetter.



1 MS. O'NEILL: Hi Mayme. This is Colleen
2 O'Neill from the Colorado Department of Education. How are
3 you?

4 MS. HOSTETTER: I'm well, thank you. Can
5 you just introduce yourself for me one more time?

6 MS. O'NEILL: You bet. It's Colleen O'Neill
7 from the Department of Education in Colorado.

8 MS. HOSTETTER: Colleen O'Neill,
9 (inaudible).

10 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you. You are on a
11 conference phone in the State Education boardroom with all
12 of our State Board Members, and our Commissioner of
13 Education, so you are on conference line, and we do have a
14 Board Member, Dr. Deborah Scheffel, that would like to ask
15 a couple of questions. Are you available for questions at
16 this time?

17 MS. HOSTETTER: Great. I -- I am.
18 Absolutely. Thank you all for your time.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Perfect! Dr. Scheffel?

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for talking with us.
21 I was just looking at the press release from the Melinda
22 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, talking about the \$34
23 million grants improve teacher prep, and then of course,
24 the five transformation centers, one of which is Relay
25 through teacher squared. Can you talk about who funded



1 you, what the basis of your program is, if your for profit,
2 or not for profit, how you hire your faculty, what your
3 model is? I really don't know a lot about it.

4 MS. HOSTETTER: Sure. Those were a lot of
5 questions. Let me -- let me start with a little bit of
6 history, and then I -- I hope I can get quickly to these --
7 these recent Gates' grants. So we started eight years ago
8 as a small program here in New York City partnering with
9 Hunter College, one of the city universities here in New
10 York, and that work with Hunter got the attention of state,
11 and the local school districts, and we applied to become
12 our own institution of higher education here in New York in
13 2011, and we received that approval. We then went on to
14 become accredited by both NKs, as a Teacher Preparation
15 Program, as well as the Middle States Commission of Higher
16 Education as the -- as the institution higher here in New
17 York.

18 Since that time, 2011, five years ago, we
19 have established campuses in Newark, New Jersey, as well as
20 New Orleans, and Houston, and Chicago, and starter this
21 year, and there's Delaware, and Philadelphia as well. All
22 nonprofits graduate schools of education focused
23 exclusively on preparing teachers, and school leaders fully
24 accredited in all of these states, and regions. And our
25 faculty are primarily critical faculty for people who were,



1 or that were very strong K12 classroom teachers, but
2 several of them who then went on to either school
3 leadership position without full preparation, or work in
4 education, and other fields.

5 Many of our faculty are lifelong teachers,
6 and that's -- that's the first, and most important thing we
7 look forward (inaudible), someone who is a very capable
8 teacher, and know herself, and can help new teachers to
9 become great teachers as well. The Gates Foundation grant,
10 with the recent victory, we are really excited about that
11 work. We've been in -- informal collaboration with lot of
12 institutions from our start, and then beginning with --
13 with Hunter here in New York City, where the collaboration
14 was more formal but within another organizations is --
15 along the way, learning to teach group through the
16 collaborative learning community with institutions like the
17 University of Michigan, and -- and others.

18 And I'm part of a group called Deans for
19 Impact. We're a number of deans in schools of education
20 across the country from Johns Hopkins to the University of
21 Texas to Texas Tech, which was one of the other great
22 transformation center winners. And so what we're really
23 hoping to do with that work is to learn from institutions
24 like those that I just named, and also share probably with
25 teacher preparation community, what it is that we're doing



1 here at Relay, with the whole field can get better, faster
2 for -- for new teachers, and principals. That is the short
3 version, and I am happy to elaborate on any part of that.
4 Just let me know what would be helpful.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how many students do you
6 currently have?

7 MS. HOSTETTER: In New York, we currently
8 have -- we just (inaudible) of 1,000 graduate students
9 across the entire country. We have about 1,500 graduate
10 students. So other campuses are much, much, much smaller
11 than New York. And we'd be hoping to launch with them
12 relatively modest campus in Denver next year short of
13 undergraduate.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so may I just refresh
15 myself. Are we voting on -- what are we -- are we voting
16 on this today, or is this just an information item?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd like to ask some
18 questions.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is actually up for
20 a vote today, or approval basically of the content only.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Have we seen it before?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. You have not seen
25 this content before.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: This might concern is this is
2 a completely different model of teacher prep, and the
3 entities that are part of this grant are Elevate National
4 Center for Teacher Residencies. (Inaudible) so we're
5 talking with teaching works, university partnerships for
6 the renewal of. I mean, it's a completely different model.
7 I would wonder how it affects our traditional universities,
8 UNC, CU, DU. And I -- I think it's great to have new
9 models, and certainly the clinical focus is very helpful in
10 teacher preparation. But I would need a lot more
11 information about how they function, what their curriculum
12 is because it's a completely different model. It's
13 different when we have traditional universities following
14 our state licensure standards submit applications for new
15 programs. This is completely different model. So I -- I
16 agree -- I guess I would leave it to others to ask
17 additional questions about cost, type of faculty, and --
18 and how this has affected teacher prep institutions. It
19 strikes me that they have fairly small programs but still
20 looking to grow with a lot of money from Gates.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I will also remind
22 us just very quickly that we have limited oversight over
23 the Educator Preparation pedagogical standpoint of this.
24 From a statutory authority position, we are charged with
25 the content approval in the Department of Higher Education



1 through the Colorado Commission of Higher Education is
2 actually charged with the authorization of this as a whole.
3 So the next step, this is one single step to say, does the
4 content align with our standards, and our requirements in
5 the current academic standards. The answer from that from
6 a curricular standpoint of content only, has been yes for
7 us. Now, as it goes on to the Department of Higher
8 Education, many of the questions that you just asked Dr.
9 Scheffel are definitely questions that are being asked
10 holistically. And this is one of the somewhat nuanced
11 differences between what we do, and authorizing Educator
12 Preparation Institutions at Institutions of Higher
13 Education, certainly versus our designated agencies, where
14 we have complete, and total autonomy over, and are not
15 driven by a statutory requirement in our Colorado revised
16 statutes.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: So since this is a completely
18 new model that would come into our state from an external
19 entity, do we have the report on how you align the content,
20 or did we not have it?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, the major season -
22 - the content was submitted with the Board of Education
23 packet. And we couldn't work -- again more than happy to
24 answer additional questions around that. If we want to



1 open up some of that documentation as well, and we can take
2 a look. It is in your packets?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: It isn't. I'm not sure that
4 it's in your packet, I don't think I saw in the agenda, but
5 it is on Board docs.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you. I
7 don't want to leave the person on the line. Joyce?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I do want to ask a
9 question how --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Joyce was -- I'm so sorry. I
11 already called on her.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

13 MS. PEARSON: Dr. Scheffel, I just want to
14 let it be known that I was curious about this program too.
15 And I met with Katie Hawks, and the dean for at least an
16 hour, an hour, and a half last week, and my first questions
17 were about the alignment of -- of the curriculum, and how
18 it aligned with what we have here in Colorado. And I was
19 assured that it was because this is what they're going
20 through here as far, and they also explained some of their
21 teaching techniques, and what they do that's different than
22 what we have in our regular. I love the innovation of it.
23 I think that -- I like the idea that it's going to go to --
24 to the colleges. I mean they have some responsibility to
25 see if -- if what they're teaching is -- I mean we know



1 it's aligned. But how do they teach it. And they have had
2 success in other states. And -- and again, we can for five
3 years, you know, review it, and -- and just see. I mean
4 it's not something that's -- that's forever but I'm
5 encouraged by any innovation that looks like they've done
6 their homework, and is ready to go with the program as long
7 as the colleges have accepted.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because I'd like to look more
9 deeply at its alignment with research. Which I haven't
10 seen in the documents.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: How long is the program?
12 For I -- I -- I think it's for teachers, and it's also for
13 administrators.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This particular program
15 that's in front of us today Dr. Cartas is only for
16 teachers. This is actually two year post back program. So
17 all of these folks are already coming to the program with a
18 graduate, or a bachelor's degree in some way, or another,
19 and then it's actually a two year program the first year of
20 that program. These individuals are partnered with a
21 mentor teacher. They are not teachers of record. They are
22 mentor teachers in the classroom, and so they go through
23 their courses, and they work in the classroom with their
24 mentor teachers.



1 The second tier of the program then they are
2 actually teachers of record, and continue on with the
3 support programs through the remainder of their two year
4 experience. And that's really their master's level. So
5 they graduate from this again, Institute of Higher
6 Education graduate level program that also gives them an
7 Educator Preparation Program, so that they can obtain
8 licensure at the end with a master's degree. So it is a
9 two year program as it is stated today in their
10 application.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how much does it cost?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I apologize I don't
13 have an answer to that.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's not relevant.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kay Hawks (inaudible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Our Dean Hofstadter,
17 either way.

18 MS. HOSTETTER: Yeah happy to help. It's
19 \$17,500 for the whole two years. But the code we are
20 already credited (inaudible) quadrupedal financial aid.
21 And many of our students by virtue of the school of their
22 choosing to work in are also eligible for premier program,
23 so \$11,000 so for two years. So the average out-of-pocket
24 price per graduate student is somewhere between five, and
25 six thousand dollars total over the course of two years.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And is your travel
2 involved since you are in New York?

3 MS. HOSTETTER: So one of our campuses, and
4 our main campus is here in New York, and I believe that
5 this campus here. There's another Dean, who I manage
6 directly will be starting our Colorado campus. She lives
7 in Denver, and the only reason that I'm on this one today
8 instead of hers is because she's taking her comprehensive
9 exam for her doctoral coursework.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So day, do you a little
11 bit enhance that -- that a little bit. So a requirement of
12 the Department of Higher Education is that they have a
13 physical presence in the state of Colorado. So they are
14 establishing that, or have established that, Ms. Hawks has
15 been here for a little bit over a year as a planner in the
16 state. And then they will establish their physical
17 presence as part of the Department of Higher Education's
18 review authority.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I have a question.
20 How is the -- the experience significantly different from
21 the PBC, Bettcher Program where you work with a mentor?
22 You're in a classroom. Me, I don't know. Is this
23 significantly innovatively different? Sorry I put you on
24 the spot but --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's it. (Inaudible).

2 Dean Hofstadter, would you like to answer that question?

3 MS. HOSTETTER: Is that question directed to
4 me?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Please go ahead.

6 MS. HOSTETTER: I'm -- I'm sorry to ask
7 because the speaker after one more time, and a little bit
8 closer to the microphone.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Sure. I was asking, and I
10 was actually asking for an individual here in -- the in the
11 room behind you, about the -- how this is significantly
12 different from the alternate -- to program that we already
13 have that it's called the Bettcher Residency Program.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Dean Hostetter, I
15 actually think this is a conversation that Dr. Karen
16 Martinez who is our resident senior consultant, and
17 educator preparation can help us answer with regard to how
18 is the residency model different. So I would invite Dr.
19 Martinez to join us.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm sorry, Karen I did not
21 remember -- I didn't know your name.

22 MS. MARTINEZ: No worries. Good afternoon.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Good afternoon.

24 MS. MARTINEZ: I'm Karen Lowenstein
25 Martinez, and I'm the senior consultant for Educator



1 Preparation here at the Colorado Department of Ed, and
2 there are -- there are parallels between the two I would
3 say.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: That's what I read.

5 MS. MARTINEZ: Both are in partnership with
6 schools at a systemic level in order to select teachers who
7 are right for that particular context. What I see is
8 potentially a difference is that in the Bettcher Teachers'
9 Program, the residents are matched with a mentor for an
10 entire year. And I think that relay residents have
11 actually multiple teachers with whom they will travel over
12 the course of the year in order to see multiple models of
13 practice. They are very similar in that they are post back
14 licensure programs partnering with, or as an institution of
15 high. So this is an institution of higher ed it's a
16 master's degree as well as so that's similar.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is not significantly
18 different except that they're probably going to graduate a
19 larger, and ultimately larger number of.

20 MS. MARTINEZ: I'm sorry Dr. Schroeder, who
21 is the --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Relay.

23 MS. MARTINEZ: Relay.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: It's like I mean Bettcher is
2 not like you to grow significantly to the same extent than
3 what you see in New York.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This are scholarship
5 kids.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: I think that both programs
7 are in partnership with the field such that they grow
8 according to the needs of the new field.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you. So
10 this is not that unusual for Colorado to have a program.
11 It's not the same but it certainly does online. And that
12 was what I thought when I was reading about it. That it
13 was, and I know for clarity's sake Dr. Flores, and Dr.
14 Scheffel were speaking a little bit probably about the
15 curriculum in, and of itself and -- and the differences in
16 the curriculum that are different. They are definitely a
17 different approach, then what you would see in a
18 traditional institute of higher education models. So and
19 again those are the things that I think everybody was kind
20 of talking a little bit about. But the residency piece
21 itself, very similar in structure.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So we have a motion on the
23 table should we call a vote? Bizy?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores?

25 MS. FLORES: No.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Goff?
2 MS. GOFF: Aye.
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Mazanec?
4 MS. MAZANEC: No.
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just one. When we made
6 the motion you had seconded it. I don't know if --
7 MS. MAZANEC: So now I'm -- I have to say
8 yes?
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know.
10 MS. MAZANEC: No.
11 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, doesn't she.
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Great. Board
13 Member Rankin?
14 MS. RANKIN: Yes.
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Doctors, Board Member
16 Scheffel?
17 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.
18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Vice Chairman
19 Schroeder?
20 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.
21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have a tie.
22 MS. SCHROEDER: You talk about a point of
23 order around second thing, and then voting. I've been told
24 just the opposite. At these meetings.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you help us out, and I'll
2 tell you.

3 MR. DILL: Well unfortunately I don't have a
4 copy Robert rules with me.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Easy does.

6 MR. DILL: Easy does.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Steve knows it, and
8 Steve still memorizing.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Time to come back.

10 MS . SCHROEDER: Well your name was next on
11 the vote with the relay schools.

12 MR. DILL: And Mr. Durham the quest -- the
13 question that has arisen is whether somebody who second the
14 motion could then vote against the motion.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The answer is yes.

16 MR. DILL: But I thought it was.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just telling you what
18 happens.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You're still in the middle
20 of a roll call?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. And it's a motion
23 was?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To approve --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was taken off
2 consent.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Relay.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Excuse me. I don't think
5 you've heard the discussion. I mean is it appropriate for
6 him to vote having not been here for the discussion?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you call for -- can you
9 call for -- Chairman Durham I'm sorry to intrude, and this
10 is probably Tony's question to you. Can you call for
11 additional information if it were not involved in the
12 conversation. So it is an even vote at this point in time,
13 and full transparency. You would be the deciding factor in
14 that vote without the information that -- that was given
15 previously. I don't know, and I don't have Robert's rules
16 of order sitting in front of me. Mr. Dill do you have any
17 recommendations on whether they can -- what the next
18 process is so that they can (inaudible) process?

19 MR. DILL: I actually believe that my
20 recommendation at this point may be to hold this over, and
21 take it up again tomorrow giving the Chairman Durham time
22 to familiarize himself with the issues involved. Maybe --
23 would that work?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Procedurally it's not
25 appropriate to interrupt a vote. I did come in I should



1 have just gone back to the office. But perhaps the easiest
2 way to do this is if I cast a no vote, I would be on the
3 prevailing side, and could move to reconsider that issue
4 tomorrow, or so they might work where I could abstain.
5 Okay. (Inaudible) let's see, can I leave again? All
6 right. Try vote no, and we'll make -- give notice of
7 intent to reconsider tomorrow.

8 MR. ASP: And Madam Chair, or Mr. Chair now
9 just -- just to be clear as far as the procedure goes. You
10 can pop in to vote any time.

11 MR. DILL: Yeah. Just --

12 MR. ASP: I'm not saying it's the best
13 legislative practice we ever -- we ever did as lawmakers
14 but you definitely can swing in --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: An exception is -- the
16 exception is if you're of course a judicial matter where
17 you need to have heard the testimony.

18 MR. DILL: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. I apologize
20 for being absent the motion is law number four to three.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, four to three.

22 MR. ASP: No, four to three.

23 MR. DILL: And just to be clear for those
24 who don't have, let's say a background like Mr. (Inaudible)



1 allows him to reconsider it. Bring it up because he was on
2 the (inaudible) side so you know.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

4 MR. DILL: Especially on first, and second
5 like you were -- like you were talking about. First, and
6 second thoughts motions.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm sorry. In some of the --
8 the contexts that, you know, we've all worked in, maybe the
9 variety of them, summit places it's accepted where someone
10 can just come in, and sort of chafe a vote. If they
11 haven't been a part of that conversation, it's one thing,
12 we don't -- we don't typically accept the practice of
13 voting. I think we've only been specific about it on the
14 phone -- vote phone meetings, phone situations, or
15 electronic situation. We don't have -- we don't give
16 anybody the prerogative of voting if they have not been
17 online for the whole context of that discussion --

18 MR. DILL: To that point -- to that one Mr.
19 Chair there is -- there's -- there's culture versus they
20 had asked what's allowed, and I apologize because the rules
21 allow it but culture you say does not.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Yeah I think -- I
23 think, Ms. Goff says part of the problem, and the reason I
24 did vote it, it dies either way on a 3-3 tie, or a 4-3. So
25 -- so the motion -- whatever the motion was would -- would



1 not -- would not prevail under either circumstance. And --
2 and I think part of the problem is as a general rule of
3 member press whose presence is required to vote, and from -
4 - from parliamentary procedure in last year. I don't know
5 whether it could have been allowed to abstain. I would
6 have to go back, and look at it. So I -- I apologize for
7 the inconvenience but it believes it's in the same position
8 as if I had not voted. The motion did not pass, and I
9 voted --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) labor this,
11 we've all got things to do. I just -- just, wait. What's
12 the difference between having a -- a tied vote that went
13 against a no, a tied no situation which means a tied vote
14 which means the motion fails. And it still could have been
15 brought back tomorrow to be revisited.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, there is a body of
17 evidence that says that "A tie vote there is no prevailing
18 side." So it does make a difference.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When you walked in the
20 room though, that's what to- he's not allowed to, he's not
21 allowed to abstain, he had to vote.

22 MS. FLORES: Vote.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Department rules
24 are that he had to vote once he walk into the room.

25 MS. FLORES: Oh, yeah



1 MS. RANKIN: So that'll be a lesson to us.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

3 MS. FLORES: And --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I won't do that again. So

5 --

6 MS. FLORES: And another thing, I just
7 wanted to just add that, may I?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That's just
9 (inaudible).

10 MS. FLORES: May I just add that, I wished
11 we had gotten information on the program. Even sites to
12 go, and look at. I just didn't have time, but I might have
13 had time if I had -- had a site, or maybe I had -- had
14 three pages of it, that I could read, but I didn't -- I
15 don't remember having anything.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores,
17 that was my fault because it was on the consent agenda, and
18 it was more of a table matrix. I did not have copies for
19 you all but everything is available on Board docs.

20 MS. FLORES: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it is accessible.

22 MS. FLORES: I need to learn how to use
23 that.

24 MS. RANKIN: Obviously. How to use Board
25 doc?



1 MS. GOFF: Can I ask before -- before we --

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes Miss Goff?

3 MS. GOFF: In the interest of being
4 prepared, it does really, do they operate outside of only
5 New York, is it really -- is it primarily New York City
6 based, is it state of New York, are there? She mentioned a
7 thousand students, that's -- that could be a few states
8 worth anyway. So where are they besides New York?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so right now it
10 sounds to me like they do primarily operate outside of New
11 York. They are in New York right now. And the vast
12 majority of their students are that, about a thousand
13 students in New York, and there are about 1,500 thousand,
14 or 15,000. 1,500 students, let's write that number. I was
15 an English teacher not a Math major. It is incredibly
16 obvious. So and it does sound like they are in New Jersey,
17 Houston, Chicago, New Orleans, and then there is actually
18 quite a cadre that they are working on moving into, and
19 other states mostly large urban areas at this time.

20 MS. GOFF: Is there already an established
21 sort of partners school, or partner --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are not --

23 MS. GOFF: -- is it that smart schools?

24 Have they been, is -- is there --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Different designated
2 agency.

3 MS. GOFF: -- collaborations already in
4 Colorado (inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That's it Get
6 Smart is -- is actually a different designated agency. But
7 the lead planner, Katie Hawks, who is here, has been
8 working with some other schools in the Denver metro area,
9 and has been developing partnerships with some of those
10 individual schools.

11 MS. GOFF: Okay. Thanks.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 MS. GOFF: Following, totally.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh my God.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. So the next
17 item understand is the 1607, is that correct Ms.
18 (Inaudible)?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would love to talk
21 about that.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect! 1607, Educator -
23 - Educator Preparation, and Licensing rules. Are you
24 ready?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. Thank you
2 Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, proceed.

4 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you very much. So just
5 for the record Colleen O'Neill Educator Preparation, and
6 Licensing Executive Director. I am here before you today,
7 this is a couple of times that I've been in front of you to
8 talk about the Educator Preparation, and Licensing rules.
9 So the last time I was here was January, and we had just
10 delivered kind of a draft version of the rules to you. We
11 had gotten some Board of Education feedback specifically
12 Dr. Scheffel, asked us about some literacy requirements in
13 some endorsement, and content areas across the Educator
14 Preparation Rules, collectively.

15 And I really appreciate the fact that she
16 gave us that opportunity to investigate a little bit deeper
17 because it was in fact true that we were missing some of
18 the literacy guidelines that we really needed to ensure
19 that our educators were trained at the right level. For
20 our elementary, specifically our reading teacher, our
21 reading specialist, and our early childhood education. The
22 only changes that have made, been made to the rules since
23 the January addition to today, were the inclusion of some
24 specific literacy elements that really are necessary for
25 our elementary reading specialist, reading teacher, and our



1 early childhood education -- educators. So today I am back
2 before you, bringing the rules, the next draft of the rules
3 to you for vote, and for any additional questions, or
4 insight that you would like to give us at this time.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Motion?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Do we have a motion?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move to approve the
8 updated revisions to the rules for the 1991 Educator
9 Licensing Act.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that
11 motion? It has been moved in second. Ms. Rankin was the
12 second. So any questions about this particular item? Yes,
13 Dr. Scheffel.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just wanted to make a
15 comment. I really appreciate your consideration of it, and
16 I know it strikes me that this language allows universities
17 to develop coursework which will render teachers, we're
18 talking about teacher preparation here, ensuring that they
19 have the kind of preparation that will sub-serve their
20 success in the two areas where they're highly accountable,
21 Math, and Reading. This language allows universities to
22 create courses that will have a better likelihood of making
23 that happen. Without that, there was one word that
24 referenced this really important area of literacy, the
25 Gateway skill to all the other areas. So I appreciate the



1 consideration -- reconsideration of it. It did a scan,
2 looking at other states that have very minimal language
3 versus more delineated language, and we would be in the
4 minority if we didn't add some specificity around this
5 issue. So I think it helps teachers, if universities take
6 it seriously, and create great courses around this content.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, Dr.
10 Scheffel. Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm curious if that was
12 necessary. Are there not -- are there not standards that
13 around numeracy that we would want?

14 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you Dr. Schroeder.
15 There were actually some specific standards, and numeracy
16 that were outlined a little bit more clearly, and
17 diligently, and especially in our elementary education, and
18 their math endorsement. There was not necessarily a
19 complete like to like events for that. So again it really
20 was something that I think it was missing that I talked of.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: And I'm not going to suggest
22 that we --

23 MS. O'NEILL: That's okay.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: -- go forward on that. Are
2 you saying there was a math and oh you told me the math
3 endorsement --

4 MS. O'NEILL: Right. Math endorsement --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: -- it's for higher level.

6 MS. O'NEILL: -- it had a little bit more
7 depth in the literacy side of that, Math Endorsement, and
8 the Math Criteria Associated with it, and the language
9 around the use of numeracy, the use of numbers, it means
10 more specificity around those endorsement areas. Then
11 there was in the literacy that gave us a little bit deeper
12 content for our still flexible. I do want to say that it's
13 still flexible content for our Educator Preparation
14 entities go to. To ensure that their educators are
15 graduating with the skills needed for our kids.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Great. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Further questions?
18 It's been moved, and seconded that we adopt the rules as
19 presented in the amendment, and amended is that correct?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there objection to the
22 adoption of that motion? The motions is adopted by vote of
23 seven to nothing?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It did.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.



1 MS. O'NEILL: I just have to say thank you.
2 I'm so sorry. Thank you guys so much. For all of your
3 insights, and support. This has been since May of 2014.
4 So --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ye, ye, ye.

7 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.

8 MS. FLORES: Are you suggesting that you are
9 --

10 MS. O'NEILL: Every Educator Preparation
11 entity in the state, and our kids. Thank you.

12 MS. FLORES: You're welcome. But are you
13 saying you're tired of showing up here every month?

14 MS. O'NEILL: No. Because you're going to
15 see me again in March, in April, and May, and it starts our
16 next iteration of opportunities to enhance our Educator
17 Preparation, and Licensing rules.

18 MS. FLORES: Good. What would you like to
19 see?

20 MS. O'NEILL: Anyway I will exit, so you can
21 move on with your agenda.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

23 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

24 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Are we now, do
2 we have time -- do we have time for the concurrent?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know. Do we
4 have all these?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's what I was
6 wondering. I was just getting ready to email Gretchen and
7 Misti because I wasn't sure how quickly we'd get through
8 those.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: We've all signed that list
12 out there?

13 MS. FLORES: Oh, that's a good question.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We may do that, and hold -
15 -

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just save that for
17 tomorrow.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. We'll have to see
19 what we have to hold over --

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Let's see.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- for tomorrow.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We will need to take
25 five.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, come on.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are supposed to be
3 over this --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll -- we'll try, and
5 make it five o'clock, and we'll see what, how many we have
6 signed up to testify?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we driving all
8 these (inaudible).

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We made a whole
10 (inaudible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I retract.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, ladies.
13 (Inaudible) I can't believe it, and then I did. Look at
14 this, I did all that, yeah, but you know, do this -- do
15 this.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I hate that trust.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So we used to have one --
18 one person signed up to testify. So let's try, and do that
19 real quick. It looks like Ron Tyler.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, yes, no?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Come in ladies. Is
22 Ron Tyler here? Apparently we outlasted him. So public
23 testimony is closed. Let's see if we can wrap up item 16
24 point, or I'm sorry. 18.41 the Concurrent Enrollment
25 Overview. Welcome, Gretchen.



1 MS. GRETCHEN: Well, I'm so glad to be here
2 Mr. Chair. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, and you said that
4 with -- with straight face. That's good.

5 MS. GRETCHEN: I did. I said that with full
6 sincerity.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

8 MS. GRETCHEN: So I have Misti (PHONETIC)
9 with me today, who you all remember I'm sure, who's a head
10 of post secondary here at CDE. And we just prepared a kind
11 of background overview for you on concurrent enrollment at
12 your request. Just a bit of background here. There are
13 several bills flying around right now about concurrent
14 enrollment. And so I think this is very likely to be
15 something that there's legislation on this year. So at
16 some point, you all in your legislative conversations may
17 talk about some of those specific goals. And so this is
18 meant to just offer you some background, so that as you are
19 hearing, and considering those, you should know the full
20 picture of how this works currently. So that's our goal
21 today. Just to offer you some background. Now, feel free
22 to interrupt with questions when you have them. But let's
23 -- let's get started. I already just said that. That's
24 the overview. Look how quick that can be, cool? Moving
25 right on. So what is concurrent enrollment? So this is



1 the definition from statute which is pretty straightforward
2 for us, simultaneous enrollment of a qualified student in a
3 local education provider, and in one, or more post
4 secondary courses including academic, or career, and
5 technical courses at an institution of higher education.
6 So in plain language what that means is, as the student
7 enroll in our public K12 system, who are also
8 simultaneously taking courses at an institution of higher
9 education. That can be a community college, that can be a
10 four year institution, it can be academic coursework, it
11 could be career, and tech coursework, that's the basic
12 definition of concurrent enrollment. This is a map.
13 That's obvious. I'm sorry. This is a map showing, if I
14 may finish that sentence.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are all (inaudible)
16 at the end of the day.

17 MS. GRETCHEN: This is a map showing
18 participation in concurrent enrollment. So as you can see,
19 you know, if look across the state, I know this has been a
20 specific question you all have asked us before, you know,
21 94 percent of districts, and 80 percent of high schools,
22 are participating in concurrent enrollment. Which means
23 they have one, or more students, who are enrolled, and in a
24 course -- in a higher ed institution using the concurrent
25 enrollment structure.



1 MS. FLORES: Gretchen, can you read this
2 map?

3 MS. GRETCHEN: No. No, not at all.

4 MS. FLORES: Just wondering.

5 MS. GRETCHEN: It's meant for like graphic,
6 you know, just for you to see the density.

7 MS. FLORES: The pink, and the white.

8 MS. GRETCHEN: Yes. It's --

9 MS. FLORES: It's about -- it's about pink,
10 and white. It's not about what district that is?

11 MS GRETCHEN: No. But we will have one
12 later. That is a little bit distinct, and it will be
13 irritating to you because it is also small, and very sorry.

14 MS. FLORES: Thank you. In your definition
15 -- in your definition of concurrent enrollment, Can you
16 clarify whether a remediation course --

17 MS. GRETCHEN: We are going to get to that
18 in just a bit.

19 MS. FLORES: I'm done.

20 MS. GRETCHEN: So hold it. Okay.

21 MS. FLORES: Okay.

22 MS. GRETCHEN: Misti, I'm going to ask you
23 to go to the next few slide here about just (inaudible).

24 MS. RUTHVEN: Great. Thanks Ms. Gretchen.

25 So one thing that you had asked us to address in January as



1 far as the concurrent enrollment overview, is why some of
2 the states, or the states districts, and the white color
3 were not colored, and why they weren't participating. So
4 we have reached out to all of those folks, and they've
5 responded with three primary themes about why they're not
6 participating. It's typically around geographic
7 distribution. And they are not close, or near higher
8 education partner, and they haven't figured out how to
9 offer distance education for concurrent enrollment. The
10 secondary piece is service area, which is in regulation for
11 the Department of Higher Education, and it's something that
12 lieutenant governor has signaled that the Commission on
13 Higher Education -- with the Commissioner on Higher
14 Education, that they are taking on to look at service areas
15 basically, which institutions of higher education serve
16 which school districts. It's really as simple as that.
17 And the other piece is, affordability connected with
18 teacher credentialing. So do I have qualified teachers in
19 my high school that can teach concurrent enrollment. The
20 interesting part is, we have offered technical assistance
21 within our limited capacity to these folks to help work
22 through some of their challenges around concurrent
23 enrollment, and especially on the access piece for finding
24 other ways that they could look at, and can encourage
25 enrollment, for example a distance education. We have had



1 a few districts in the past that have been nonparticipating
2 districts, but if they participated in the next year. And
3 the two primary pieces that they have cited is, they have
4 found a way to offer online courses for concurrent
5 enrollment, or have overcome some general affordability
6 hurdles associated with concurrent enrollment. And we'll
7 go in a little bit more of the financial model associated
8 with concurrent enrollment work.

9 MS. FLORES: Did you talk to them about
10 tech, opportunities for tech concurrent enrollment, so if
11 they don't have an institution of higher ed, are there --
12 are there programs nearby --

13 MS. RUTHVEN: Yes. So --

14 MS. FLORES: -- some of their students might
15 want to participate in?

16 MS. RUTHVEN: It's possible. We'll go
17 through the delivery as far as online, in the classroom, or
18 at the college options in just a second if --

19 MS. FLORES: Okay.

20 MS. RUTHVEN: -- that's what you are asking.

21 MS. FLORES: Okay.

22 MS. RUTHVEN: Dr. Schroeder, okay.

23 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I think, I just want to add
25 that --



1 MS. RUTHVEN: Yeah.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: -- career, and tech ed
3 options still are offered by institutions of higher
4 education, right? It still is community college that's
5 offering that.

6 MS. FLORES: It's still only that.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. And so that
8 geographical --

9 MS. FLORES: Okay.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: -- access is relevant for
11 those courses as well.

12 MS. FLORES: Okay. Thanks.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

14 MS. RUTHVEN: So as you can see concurrent
15 enrollment has been growing steadily, since it was changed
16 in 2009. In it's current form, and we've phased out PSCO
17 fast track for some of you may remember those previous
18 programs. So we know that student outcomes have been
19 positive over the last two years specifically regarding
20 concurrent enrollment. We've seen a significant increase
21 in the number of credentials that are attained by students
22 within concurrent enrollment. Those have gone from a few
23 hundred to almost a thousand. We've also continued to see
24 percentages of courses passed continuously increase from



1 the mid 70's to now about 90 percent of students are
2 passing our concurrent enrollment courses.

3 MS. FLORES: Wow.

4 MS. RUTHVEN: So we've seen consistent
5 improvement as we've been able to provide refinements in
6 partnership with institutions of higher education as well.

7 MS. GRETCHEN: The other thing I'll just add
8 here is that part of the political interest in concurrent
9 enrollment has to do with this data. Right? That -- this
10 is working to help kids earn college credit while they are
11 in high school, and earning college credit while in high
12 school changes the possibility, and the likelihood that
13 they will enroll in, and persist in college afterwards.
14 And so it is actually, this set of data that ha -- is the
15 reason that there is a lot of such policy conversation
16 about this right now. People wondering if there are other
17 meaningful things that can be done to expand access to
18 this, given that it is one of the few things you really
19 have found, that is especially for underrepresented
20 students, is making a significant difference in their
21 college going, and college persistence rates.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it can save parents
23 money.

24 MS. GRETCHEN: And it saves parents money.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.



1 MS. RANKIN: Great.

2 MS. FLORES: Knowing that, if we argue that
3 we want all kids to attend college, the capacity is not in
4 our bricks, and mortar college programs.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: You don't want to do that?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't want all kids
7 (inaudible)

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, there are some --
9 there are some folks who believe they want all kids to have
10 some kind of a post secondary credential degree something,
11 and we don't actually have the capacity in the state of
12 Colorado. If our kids wanted to go, and qualified, that's
13 sort of a reality.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. (Inaudible). This
16 is a good question.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what -- what is the
18 quality guarantee here, it also because APIB in Cambridge,
19 the passing grades between 40, and 50 percent, whereas
20 concurrent do is 90 percent. How do we, how do we know
21 that the record because each course, if I understand
22 correctly, the rigor level is determined by the individual
23 professor, and it could be interviewer in the course
24 assessment. How do we -- what -- what quality guarantees
25 do we have for concurrent enrollment?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have the same
2 quality guarantees that any other course being offered at a
3 higher ed institution has. Right? So there are courses
4 approved by the Commission on Higher Education which is the
5 equivalent of this board for the Higher Ed set, and once
6 they approve that course for a university to offer that
7 university offers that course, and that university is to
8 that policy. So they determine whether the syllabus is
9 adequate, whether the assessments are adequate. So it's
10 the same mechanisms, that do that for all college courses
11 that are applied to this. I you'd have to ask higher ed
12 really what they know about the degree to which the
13 variability in those who are going to be a great service.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But there is -- so
15 about AP/IB Cambridge calculus courses we're in the 40
16 percent passing rate, but among college calculus courses we
17 have a 90 to -- higher to 80 to 90, it's worth about
18 campuses with higher ed just to make sure it's a little bit
19 rigorous to make sure they are prepared for one of the
20 course follows after that calculus.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the -- that's
22 the two year school dilemma. That the expectations -- well
23 the expectations are, are not necessarily the same.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I had students that had
2 the same textbook. There was a 300 level course at Metro,
3 and they had already aced it in the junior college, but
4 they haven't. And I'd love to have somebody figure out how
5 to solve that problem. We do not want universal accounting
6 351 assessments states in Colorado, right?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will just add a
8 totally different reason actually. The Commission on
9 Higher Ed is having conversations about comparability among
10 those different measures right now because they're looking
11 at whether there should be a uniform policy across campuses
12 about whether they give credit for a certain score, and
13 like an AP exam, but they would be -- that would be
14 guaranteed right now the standards vary by institution, and
15 so interestingly, and for totally other reasons. The
16 commission is actually having some conversation about that
17 right now.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (inaudible)

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. The other
20 factor just to mention is the accrediting body for the
21 institutions of higher education themselves with the Higher
22 Learning Commission -- Commission, and they have really
23 chimed in are looking deeply at concurrent enrollment, is
24 something they're interested in, and they're studying. So
25 to be continued. This is a chart to give you deeper



1 examples of the types of credentials that high school
2 students have been graduating with over the past few years.
3 We know this ranges from certificates, and associate agreed
4 that their is applied science, whose associates degrees
5 leading into bachelor's degree work. So we know that we
6 have seen a steady increase in all of these various types
7 of credentials, and we anticipate at this point that this
8 will continue. So these are students literally graduating
9 the high school diploma in one hand, and a certificate, or
10 associates in the other. So these are the types of
11 different types of delivery options. You can see these
12 pieces as a mix, and match. So all of these different
13 three criteria are options that school districts have in
14 order to offer concurrent enrollment, and ways to plan
15 these. So for example, school districts determine
16 location, is it going to be online course, is it going to
17 be of course taught at the high school, or is it going to
18 be taught at the local community college. Is it going to
19 be taught by an adjunct instructor from the community
20 college at the high school, a high school teacher that has
21 the credentials to teach the course, and is then authorized
22 to do so by the community college, or is it college faculty
23 at the college? So there's lots of different ways to mix,
24 and match, and creative solutions to complex challenges
25 such as geographic challenges. The other piece is



1 different types of courses, general education courses,
2 career, and technical education, or mediation which I know
3 that you're interested in as well, and we can talk more
4 deeply about hold on to that coming later. So two more
5 slides we'll get through mediation.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You said to your
7 colleges. It's not just to your colleges.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the primary colleges
9 that are partnering with school districts are through your
10 colleges. Some of your colleges offer a -- a small, or
11 minimal number of courses. There are few especially based
12 on geography that have a two year, there are few colleges
13 have a two year, and a four year mission in our state, and
14 so those four year institutions are utilizing their two
15 year mission. So for example, Adam State, May scholar
16 Mason University et cetera, that are able to offer a
17 community college model as well as a four year institution.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you can get to see
19 you, you can go there, and get credit, right? And -- and
20 if you have a cost agreement that makes that (inaudible).

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's -- that's
22 what keep worrying me. Yeah.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the same I think is
24 probably true in Fort Collins, and Greeley in many of the
25 other places where there four years schools.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there is a program
2 called Extended Studies that is outside of concurrent
3 enrollment, and it specifically acts operating outside of
4 concurrent enrollment according to statute. So that
5 typically is offered by a four-year institution, it's
6 offered by their continuing education arm, other
7 institution in higher education. And so it's basically
8 offered as adults continuing community credit, that may not
9 be for credit, and is not typically transferable.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the example I'm
11 thinking of because we've had I think more than one dual
12 immersion program. Once those kids get to high school,
13 they've already had all the high school foreign language
14 courses in the foreign language they are in. So they
15 actually need to go to see you to get a higher level of
16 that second language course. And that's not the -- that's
17 not the adult education program. And the same as in the
18 arts. I mean that's been my experience that some of the --
19 maybe not since it changed, because I would no longer view
20 the district, but given a fair number of kids, especially
21 from (inaudible) high because they just have to plunk up
22 the -- plunk up streets, there were quite a few kids going
23 to these classes, but they were paying what you're saying
24 you know the district actually was paying.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that would be a
2 similar financial model then.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, this reminds
5 me of, was it last time that we met, where the courses that
6 CU taught in this we're not -- we're not credited by the
7 other universities, and I don't understand. I mean, I
8 still I didn't understand then, and I just wanted to ask
9 the question. Did I hear it correctly?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we're going to
11 come to the remedial courses in a minute, and I think
12 that's what you remember.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I don't, I don't
14 even -- it, I in fact I don't think that remedial courses
15 should be taught by a university. I thought you know, I
16 don't know why we -- why a university would think about
17 giving remedial courses in this -- in an option like this.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So just to clarify what
19 I believe you're referring to is there are mediation peace
20 is in partnership with two institutions because you're
21 correct that four year institutions don't have the ability
22 to provide mediation courses.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This one was that if
24 kids take the courses at CU, they will not be credited by
25 other universities in the state. But were -- were they



1 talking about remediation courses. So why would be -- why
2 would we be talking about kids taking remediation courses
3 at the university level.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Do they transfer?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Chairman Durham, I
6 believe well what you're talking about the last time, it
7 was -- we were discussing whether the -- it's -- it's you
8 know, you were in this meeting. Oh yes. We were talking
9 legislative liaison. It's a bill that says the high school
10 has to inform the parents if it's a full credit, or it
11 doesn't transfer. So this is totally different from that
12 particular conversation.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the conversation
14 about remedial we are going to get to it just a minute.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that I don't even
17 understand.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are the questions
19 you had asked in January was around financial arrangements,
20 and financial agreements, and how some of these models
21 work. I will say that there are some consistent practices
22 that are outlined in (inaudible) , that also districts, and
23 institutions of higher education must follow. However,
24 there is lots of room for flexibility. So I'll give you a
25 few examples, and then if you have additional questions



1 we're happy to bring in districts, or other folks to talk
2 through their financial models, and commission. What are
3 the most common models that's really specific to the better
4 area between school districts, and institutions of higher
5 education, is referred to closely as the 105 percent model.
6 So what this means is that essentially, the -- the school
7 districts get their PVR to pay for tuition, right? And
8 then institutions of higher education give the College
9 Opportunity Fund which they get for all Colorado students,
10 right, that pay the other portion of their tuition. So
11 basically what happens in this model, is it's a -- it's a
12 tuition neutral proposal for the school district, because
13 essentially the institution of higher education has agreed
14 to basically get the College Opportunity Fund, and not
15 charge additionally. That is you need to the metro area.
16 Most commonly, the agreements are around either discounted,
17 or the community college resident rates, associated with
18 any student that's a Colorado resident, that would walk in
19 the door, and what that tuition might look like. There are
20 other agreements where there are discounts, discounted fees
21 for concurrent enrollment students, because what Colorado
22 law says for concurrent enrollment is that districts must
23 pay tuition. However, that leaves books transportation
24 fees still on the table that are difficult for many, many
25 concurrent enrollment students, and their families to



1 afford. We're seeing fees that it could equal tuition in
2 some colleges.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Did -- may -- may, I just
4 ask one quick question. So the -- the -- if -- if a
5 concurrent enrollment student is, goes from Colorado
6 Springs early colleges is rolled it to UCCS which they have
7 an agreement, I know they do, then is the count -- the
8 school institution of higher education eligible to capture
9 a portion, let's say there are a role for six hours, are
10 they -- can they capture a portion of that funding that is
11 given to the schools on a per pupil basis. I would -- it's
12 not full time. So I didn't get the full 2000, or whatever
13 but they would get. So they capture that portion of -- of
14 that funding, is that correct?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think so except that
16 I don't think it's, the -- the way they determine the
17 amount. It's not a proportion, it is of course cost.
18 Right. So there's like a tuition costs. Right? And the
19 money that is the schools money that's per pupil money, is
20 given to that community college.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Why?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Based on their tuition
23 rates, and whatever their agreements are.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I -- I guess the question
25 is do they -- does the school also then capture additional



1 state funds that would be, tell me what they call those
2 funds. Well, I think (inaudible)

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Called the
4 College Opportunity Fund?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Okay. Great.
6 College Opportunity Funds, does -- does for example use
7 UCCS capture that grants. They do on some sort of pro-rata
8 basis because not a full time student. And then, there's
9 also a charge of tuition fees that they charge the full per
10 hour charge, then back to the two colors springs early
11 colleges.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's a -- that's a
13 great clarification that part the portion of per pupil
14 revenue, that school districts are kept paying is resident
15 community college tuition basically minus the COF, the
16 College Opportunity Fund.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's not community
18 college, right?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Even though it's not
20 community college. And so then, the -- the law says that
21 parents can be asked to pay the difference.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And fees, and student
23 fees which are really high (inaudible).



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Student fees (inaudible)
2 fortunately we're not in higher education of dealing with
3 it, but student fees can be oppressive.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then the students
5 of higher education are receiving their portion of the
6 College Opportunity Fund on a pro credit basis.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I believe that the
8 senators King Schools though with parents making the
9 payments there, somehow they must be able to come up with
10 entire amount.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are lots of
12 creative models that districts have put in place, or other
13 things that they're negotiating, or other things such as
14 fees, and books where they're helping students with, and
15 this is not consistent across the board by some folks, some
16 school districts have been able to cover some of those
17 costs for some students.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is what troubles
19 me. Is it a horrible task to find out what these fees are?
20 Are we sure that a school doesn't make arrangement with one
21 program, and then charge something different -- a different
22 amount if there's a kid coming from another school, because
23 they don't have a contract, then --

24 My understanding is that ESSA is going to
25 provide some additional funds, for low-income kids to be



1 able to attend, but it would be really helpful if we
2 actually knew what some of these arrangements are. And it
3 might make the parties feel a little more accountable. But
4 I don't know if this would be a test that will just be
5 overwhelming or --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do know some of this
7 through school finance, and their audits, because they
8 audit based upon the contract between the college, and the
9 district. We don't necessarily know all, but we can try to
10 do our best, and compare.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then my second
12 question is whether to what extent we've reached the point
13 with such large participation, that districts are feeling
14 like they can't take one more kid? I mean that's example I
15 keep giving that when I was in school Board we really,
16 really had to cut kids off, because we were out of money
17 for them to take the courses. And that was really
18 troubling, and I don't know whether our districts are at
19 that point, and which ones are, and which students are --
20 are getting to participate, and which ones are not.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I believe almost all
22 districts, if not all, have some type of district policy
23 where they limit the number of credits that a student can
24 take for concurrent enrollment, and then it is up to the
25 discretion of the district which students might have this



1 opportunity. So again, we can -- we can do some general
2 ask at districts about what's in those policies then.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I don't want to
4 overwhelm you guys but I just think that we wanna know, and
5 maybe -- maybe our legislature wants to know how this is --
6 this is working in terms of equity.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do think that you're
8 raising a lot of the same questions that we've heard in
9 conversations across the street about this, and why people
10 are assuming some legislation about this right? They are
11 at a high-level people understand that it's effective, and
12 then there are questions which may not be -- may not have
13 terrible answers, but there are questions about whether
14 there are any equity issues in terms of access to the
15 system, and whether something might need to be done to
16 ensure equitable access whether that's because it's rural,
17 or whether it's because it's a district of a certain size
18 that maybe isn't rural that still can only operated in a
19 limited range. I think you are asking the same questions.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They spend their money
21 differently. You know they --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- for their
24 kindergarten, so they're not going to offer as much
25 concurrent role.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean those are all
3 choices that are made of the -

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: -- if they have huge impacts
6 on kids. And if we are going to be getting some more
7 money, I'd want to think that to the extent that we may
8 have inequities, that -- that can help to address those.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, we enclosed a hard
10 stop here you guys you're doing fine good.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I may start talking
12 faster. Look out.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Making great footage.
14 It's very -- very helpful.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this is the other
16 math that you might like, Dr. Schroeder, as the others
17 storm out. This is where we start the conversation about
18 remediation. Oh, sorry.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't have that math.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. I'm might
21 happen to use yours.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Don't if I can't read it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, go ahead. Yeah.

25 Because you're nice.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is -- so we wanted
2 to give you some broader background on remediation in
3 general, right? Because there are some questions about
4 that. And then we'll talk to those issues specifically of
5 students in concurrent enrollment situations who take
6 remedial courses. So first, just in the -- in the
7 background here, this is a map just showing a percentage of
8 students per district who do enroll in post secondary in
9 our state, and do require remediation. So if they're blue,
10 it's fewer than 25 percent of their students requiring
11 remediation when they get there. If they're green, it's 25
12 percent to 50 percent, and if they are yellow orange, it's
13 more than 50 percent.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Wow.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If a district is not
16 labeled in color here, it's because the numbers they're
17 sending are so small that by our n-size rules, we can't
18 report. Okay?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. (Inaudible) just do
20 that part. Just to restate what I think I'm hearing. Of
21 the students that went to post secondary, college, or
22 university.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You've tied it back to
25 their home districts through remediation rate?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: In state out of the state,
3 two year, four year. Doesn't matter?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think this is all in
5 state.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So only those who sent
7 students in state?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So they went out of state
10 we don't know about remediation rates?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay -- okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, the --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The recording.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- National
16 Clearinghouse doesn't record.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Exactly.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So these are kids --
21 these are kids that are taking advanced classes, but then
22 they.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. This is just
24 anybody going to college. This is the big picture of
25 remediation. So not having to think --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- just the big, so
3 sorry.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the big picture
5 of remediation.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the big picture
7 of remediation.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It doesn't map.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. No. So -- in
10 this slide is actually missing a key piece of information
11 I'm just gonna share it with you. So overall for the whole
12 state, everybody going to college in 13, 14 are statewide
13 remediation rate was 34 percent. This is a decrease of 3
14 percent from -- from the year previous, and this note here
15 about SAI, so Supplemental Academic Instruction, is another
16 one of the things you'll hear the Higher Ed Community
17 talking about, as something they have implemented that they
18 think is positively impacting remediation rates. So
19 essentially this is a student in a credit-bearing course
20 who is right alongside that getting additional academic
21 supports, rather than having to take their remedial course
22 to get entrance to that credit-bearing course. Since I
23 would say along with concurrent enrollment, this
24 Supplemental Academic Instruction is like the other thing
25 that I hear the most about from Higher Ed about what they



1 are doing that's having positive impact on -- on kids doing
2 well.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Gerrard, and Creston I
4 don't know, how many of our higher institutions are for
5 SAI?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So not all very
7 handful, and this is a direction that the community college
8 specifically are going, and the four -- more, and more four
9 years of signing on.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. But they -- out of
11 our -- how many higher ed institutions do we have in state?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there are 14
13 community colleges, and then about another 13 four-year
14 institutions.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this doesn't
17 include our full province institutions, because there are
18 300 plus of those.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There're lot of those.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All the nonprofit.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of the 27, how many are
22 you using SAI?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the community
24 colleges.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All of them?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of them.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All 14?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of them.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then well, say 12,
6 and 14. And then about half of four years.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's growing. I mean,
8 this has been a real focus for the Department Of Higher Ed
9 to train, and support people in this, to research it, to
10 help them see how effective it is. You know, it is -- it
11 is a -- there are resource implications for universities
12 right, so they've been helping them work through that and
13 figure out how to do it. So but then the specific question
14 of concurrent enrollment students taking remedial courses.
15 So this is the top bullet here. In concurrent enrollment,
16 the only students who could take a remedial course are 12th
17 grade students. Right now of all the concurrent enrollment
18 courses taken each year in the states, 6 percent of them
19 are remedial courses, okay? And those are all only the
20 12th graders. And the question you asked about why would
21 someone do that? I asked Misti, and I'm going to try to
22 explain, and then Misti is going to correct me if I'm
23 wrong. But there is a situation where a student could be
24 in 11th grade. They take the ACT, or eventually the SAT,
25 and maybe they also take the Accuplacer, right? They're



1 looking at community college entrance, and they don't score
2 at a level in 11th grade that would let them into a credit-
3 bearing course. When they come back as a 12th grader, if
4 through concurrent enrollment, they take the remedial
5 course, and they pass, they will not have to do remediation
6 when they go to the college. Right? So if their test
7 scores would not get them out of remediation, taking that
8 course while being a 12th grader would allow them to not
9 have to do that remediation course, and have to spend the
10 money on a non-credit bearing course when they went to
11 college. So for the most parts, for those again 6 percent
12 of concurrent enrollment courses, which are being taken by
13 12th grade students to be remedial courses, mostly that's
14 why that's happening. Accurate?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay then, what's the
16 funding on that?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Same as other
18 concurrent enrollment courses. The district who has that
19 kid pays the cost of their participation in that course,
20 and whatever their agreement is just like any other course.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is what,
22 basically what some folks say that the high school should
23 pay for the remediation. I mean there's always this --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is that political
25 commentary.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- political context.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I've had that comment.

3 Ms. Rankin did you have a comment?

4 MS. RANKIN: That was my question.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

6 MS. RANKIN: Just to comment real quick, the
7 source of bureaucracies of universities, that just do that
8 remediation to make money. I'm thinking of a private
9 school that I worked at, a private university, and it was
10 outrageous.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think some of our
13 states here do the same thing.

14 MS. GOFF: (Inaudible). They don't have to
15 work separately. They are supposed to be talking about
16 working out plans where they can solve, actually satisfy
17 both sets of credit at the same time. Yeah, I think I
18 don't know if anybody still kicked that in yet or not.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So the SAI we
20 were talking about before, that is happening, but it's for
21 students who already have left the K12 system, right? So
22 this is K12 --

23 MS. GOFF: Yes -- yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- who are still in
25 grade 12, in their 12th year, who are taking out remedial



1 courses to basically they deal with the fact that they
2 didn't have a test score that would get them to that level
3 when they wanted.

4 MS. GOFF: It may be too soon for
5 communicate to our communities as a whole to be really well
6 informed about all that right now. If the new admission
7 standards don't start up until 21 --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, there is some
9 time.

10 MS. GOFF: -- and graduation requirements
11 tied in all that so yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin, you had a.

13 MS. RANKIN: How many students are we
14 talking about when we talk about this remediation?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, 6 percent of all
16 the courses, and you will know how many students are those.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 6 percent of 20,000.
18 So it's a few thousands students.

19 MS. RANKIN: So how many kids, or how many
20 juniors, or seniors are taking Accuplacer?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many are taking
22 Accuplacer?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know the exact
24 numbers.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You ask her already,
2 but I don't know.

3 MS. RANKIN: So what I wonder about is
4 whether we've got students who are getting college credit
5 for courses, and then they get to the two, or four years
6 school, they take the Accuplacer, and they'd be remediated.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's one of the
8 key pieces. In that, if they take an 090, or the non-
9 credit bearing courses before the 100 level, then they
10 automatically go into the 100 level course.

11 MS. RANKIN: That didn't make sense to me,
12 help me.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So.

14 MS. RANKIN: What's the 090 course?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so the course
16 before the noncredit-bearing course -

17 MS. RANKIN: The remediation course?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- Yes, remediation
19 course before the credit-bearing course, they -- if they
20 pass that remediation course, then they're automatically
21 put in 100 model.

22 MS. RANKIN: Which is freshman?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They take the
24 Accuplacer. They --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Step it up.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 MS. RANKIN: But what causes them to take
3 the 090 course?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be that the
5 most common thing that they told us. Again may be that
6 they didn't sufficiently perform on the test that would
7 have gotten them out of that course. So they take the
8 remedial course to make up for the fact that they didn't
9 get their three exam. So they would have maybe taken an
10 ACT, or Accuplacer, and it didn't get them to that level,
11 they take this course so that when they fully enroll in
12 community college later, they are given automatic entry
13 into the credit-bearing course. Independent of their test
14 scores.

15 MS. RANKIN: That doesn't keep us from
16 having kids go ahead, and take 100 level courses while
17 they're in high school.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

19 MS. RANKIN: And still come back later on
20 and have to face actually not being fully prepared in math,
21 and -- and language arts.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In that case, I think
23 you're talking about a situation where a student might in
24 high school take a concurrent, or a credit-bearing
25 concurrent enrollment course like a community college, and



1 then be given entrance into a more prestigious competitive
2 four year.

3 MS. RANKIN: No. All the community college
4 doesn't even have to be.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Recognized?

6 MS. RANKIN: Because once you enter that's
7 when they check. Right? It's when once you matriculate
8 that they have you take the assessment, the Accuplacer, and
9 you may not do well on the Accuplacer.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If they've passed a
11 credit-bearing course, they wouldn't be placed to the
12 enroll in remediation after.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think it depends -
14 -

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's a difference
16 here between math, and --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 MS. RANKIN: Remember we know that most of
20 the remediations in math. So there's lots of craft courses
21 you could take.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It depends on the area
23 of study, and content areas of concurrent enrollment. So
24 if I took a history course in concurrent enrollment, that
25 doesn't mean that -- that takes me --



1 MS. RANKIN: Your math profession.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- remediation for
3 math.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other comments, or
5 anything in conclusion? I'll close for close.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We already made this
7 quick note, but yes I said I'll speak to concurrent
8 enrollment, and there'll be some opportunities probably for
9 us to have some support, with this. Because the ESSA is
10 such a nice change. And then the last quick advertisement
11 I will give is that in partnership with the Higher Ed, we
12 convened a group of stakeholders to participate in a LEAN
13 process.

14 This is a that's an acronym that I don't
15 know what the letters mean I'm sorry. But essentially it's
16 a process you use to make processes better. And we can be
17 in this group around concurrent enrollment because we have
18 heard feedback that the registration process for this is
19 difficult, because there are these different sort of, deal
20 like student might have at different institutions is
21 different. So those high school counselors are really
22 having to broker a lot of things, and there isn't a -- a
23 unified way for that to happen.

24 And so we gathered this group of people to
25 ask about what would make it easier, and better, and also



1 it would allow us to expand. And so that group has made
2 some recommendations. At some point, NDHU will be sharing
3 those with the legislature, about it's -- it's things like
4 you know, have unified enrollment process. It's also
5 things like, 'find money for books' because that's an
6 access barrier for -- for some students in some families.
7 So I'm not going to go into detail there, but I want you to
8 be familiar with that so that if you hear about results of
9 the LEAN process and the current enrollment you know that
10 was something that we helped facilitate. We brought a lot
11 of, you know, parents, and students, and people into that
12 conversation as well as hiring folks. So you may be
13 hearing more about that as it informs the session. And
14 that's, sir, is it.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. All right.
16 We're going to -- everybody has plans this evening, and so
17 thank you very much. We're going to adjourn, and we'll
18 perhaps any last minute comments anybody want to make any?
19 We'll start tomorrow morning at 9:00 a.m. Thank you.

20 (Meeting adjourned)



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

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

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

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

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25