



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 11, 2016, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 11, 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: Okay. Why don't we, let's
2 see, we really -- I don't need a break just yet.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Are we on time now?

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're close.

5 MS. CORDIAL: We're close.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're close.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Very good.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Why don't we
9 start -- why don't we go to Item 4.01, University of
10 Virginia Data Sharing Agreement, and Commissioner, do you
11 have, say, who's gonna handle this? This looks like Marcia
12 Bohannon and Jill Stacey.

13 MR. CRANDALL: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
14 We are very fortunate that the timing worked out well, that
15 when we had questions about this particular study that the
16 author and one of the primary researchers happen to be in
17 Colorado. I'm sure he came from the Super Bowl celebration
18 two days ago and is still here, and so Professor, it's a
19 pleasure to have you here. We welcome you to the great
20 State of Colorado. Marcia, do you want to go introduce
21 your team and then, do a little bit of background on this
22 while we welcome this opportunity.

23 MS. BOHANNON: Sounds good. Thank you, Mr.
24 Chair and Commissioner Crandall. I've got Jill Stacey
25 here, who is our Data Privacy Analyst and Professor



1 Grissmer from University of Virginia, that he was just
2 introduced. He actually didn't quite make it to the Super
3 Bowl, he got -- he got here right after the celebration on
4 Tuesday luckily. Otherwise, he wouldn't have gotten here.
5 So -- so he kind of slid in afterwards. But yeah, we're --
6 we're really fortunate that he's gonna be in town this
7 week, and -- and coincidentally, when you guys were in
8 session. So you probably remember that we talked about
9 this particular research agreement last month, and you had
10 a request for a little bit more information on it. So we
11 provided that information to you in your packets, and we've
12 gone to the heart of it and invited him to give you even
13 more information. I'm gonna turn it over to Jill because
14 she's probably got a few more words to say about it, and
15 that will let our -- our guest start.

16 MS. STACEY: All right. I just wanted to
17 point out that in your packets, you should have received
18 the opt-in and opt-out consent forms that were raised as a
19 particular concern last month, as well as requested
20 preliminary studies that have been provided by Dr. Grissmer
21 that show some of the work that has been done thus far on
22 this arrangement. But that's pretty much my entire
23 comment. But I'll turn it over to Dr. Grissmer and he can
24 provide you with more information.



1 MR. GRISSMER: Okay. Appreciate the
2 opportunity to be here. I did watch the Super Bowl. I'm a
3 strong Peyton Manning fan, and the reason is that his wife
4 went to the University of Virginia and in fact, he gave the
5 commencement address at the University of Virginia two
6 years ago. Everybody thought it was a rather strange
7 choice, and he started that he had picked out students in
8 the audience, graduates and gotten up in the middle aisle,
9 and he threw footballs, and he got five for five. It was a
10 pretty good start. But he give a really nice sort of what
11 he's learned about life from football address.

12 So let me sort of give you some background
13 on this study. Let me give you a background for myself
14 first. So I've worked in about five other states:
15 Indiana, Kentucky, North Carolina, Virginia, and Tennessee
16 over my career, and let me say that the issues that this
17 parent is raising and you're raising are universal.
18 They're all very legitimate issues to sort of be concerned
19 about, and they come up in all states.

20 So I'm also on the NAEP, the National
21 Assessment, as you all probably know, the -- the National
22 Testing Advisory Board, and we're supposed to keep NAEP on
23 the State narrow path, making sure you can compare scores
24 and everything is going legitimate. So from that
25 standpoint, I've sort of faced some of these issues at the



1 national level as well. This study was funded back in
2 2009, which is a long time ago. The reason the study was
3 funded, I think it was a very competitive process. About
4 one of 15 or 20 proposals were funded in this particular
5 institute for education research.

6 I think there were probably three or four
7 reasons it was funded. The first one is -- is that the
8 Colorado, as you all know, is one of the more active
9 charter school states, and the popularity of Core Knowledge
10 Charter schools out here was just amazing. I don't know
11 what the count is currently, but at the time, it was 50 or
12 60 in the Denver-Fort Collins area. The reason that's
13 important from a research standpoint is -- is that most of
14 the research on charter schools says, well some of them
15 work better, some of them work worse. Nobody can pin down
16 what there is about charter schools that makes them work.
17 One of the hypotheses about that is, they all teach
18 different curricula. So maybe it's their charter and
19 curriculum combination that sort of make them good or not.
20 This was the only opportunity in the whole nation where you
21 could find a group of charter schools all teaching the same
22 curriculum.

23 So when we started the study, there were 24.
24 We focused on 24 Core Knowledge Charter schools. So that
25 was the first thing. It was a unique opportunity, and it



1 addressed a -- a good question and the sort of research on
2 charter schools. The second really important part of it
3 was, most of the research on charter schools has been done
4 with disadvantaged children. Very few charter schools
5 research has been done for middle income and higher income
6 areas. So whether charter schools work in that context is
7 a question that is being addressed by this -- this
8 particular study.

9 But the most important aspect of this that,
10 I think got it funded was, just one of the comments made
11 the last January meeting, why are we studying in these
12 schools because we already know they're -- they're top
13 performing in state. The question on that is, are they top
14 performing because good students go to those schools? Are
15 they top performing because the schools are doing a better
16 job of educating students? And the only way you can answer
17 that question is if you read the minds of children into
18 schools so that they all start off with the same basic set
19 of students and characteristics. Because the charter
20 schools out here are so popular, lots of charter schools
21 are oversubscribed.

22 So there's a lottery. So the lottery
23 chooses randomly the kids that get an opportunity to go to
24 these schools. That's the perfect gold standard research
25 to -- to really find out what the differences are. So that



1 was really, I think, sort of sealed the deal is that the
2 research environment for doing a random controlled study,
3 which is sort of gold standard, was present here. So we
4 got the funding, we came out, and we were working with as
5 many as 18 charter schools at the time, Core Knowledge.

6 So we tracked -- they began tracking the
7 lotteries the year before the kids got into kindergarten,
8 which was 2009-2010. We tracked every child on the list of
9 applications to these charter schools, ones that offered
10 admissions and ones who didn't, and we have tracked those
11 children, about 2,200 total, through their third and fourth
12 grade test. So that takes five to six years, just to wait
13 until you can pick up any kind of achievement outcomes
14 once. So that's why the study is so long. Once the
15 children took the test, which is, they just took the final
16 test for us, the Colorado State test last May probably,
17 takes six or eight months to get that data, once it gets
18 organized.

19 So we are now in the -- in the sixth year of
20 a seven-year study, and we have very few results, because
21 we're waiting for the achievement data. We do have results
22 from two other things we've done in the study, actually
23 three. We did for surveys of parents in our study,
24 telephone interviews. They're basically trying to
25 understand why they applied to these schools, how they



1 chose the schools they actually enrolled in, and then, we
2 follow them longitudinally to find out are they satisfied
3 with the schools that they chose for their children. So we
4 have all of that data. So we have data from parents, from
5 about 1,000 parents, on the process they used to apply to
6 schools, why they chose the schools they did, and whether
7 they're satisfied with the schools. That's where the kids
8 who went to charter schools, some charter schools, some
9 Core Knowledge Charter schools, as well as public schools.

10 So one of the reports we have here is the
11 first report from that, but we don't have to wait for the
12 achievement data, we're gonna be sort of publishing those
13 reports this year. The second data that we're currently
14 working on, we surveyed 360 teachers that were in Core
15 Knowledge Charter schools and public schools, and we asked
16 them a very large set of questions about what they were
17 doing in the classrooms, what subject they were teaching,
18 how long they were teaching, what pedagogical techniques
19 they were using, to see if you go in the classroom is
20 something different going on in Core Knowledge Charter
21 schools and in public schools. We are working with that
22 data now to understand what those differences are and can
23 they might explain the results we get.

24 So those publications are gonna be coming
25 out sort of during the next probably six months. Once we



1 get the final set of data from Colorado with your
2 permission, it will take us about six to eight months
3 before we have the achievement results, whether children in
4 the -- the Core Knowledge Charter schools have higher math,
5 reading, and writing achievement at third and fourth grade.
6 So the reason we don't have any -- any results today,
7 there's gonna be an explosion as soon as we get the data
8 that we've asked for, and our parents who have been, we've
9 had about 1,000 parents that have answered our surveys
10 every year, they've transported their child in for testing
11 during the summer, and they keep asking us the same
12 question: where's the results?

13 And so we're gonna begin feeding them the
14 results beginning with the papers we're writing here and be
15 in continuous contact with them so that we think we've had
16 a pretty good feel for the parents in our study in terms of
17 what we're trying to learn about them. So that's sort of
18 why the study is funded, what are the important questions
19 are, and when you might expect something to come out. We
20 will be happy to come brief the Board as soon as we get
21 results based on achievement scores. I would expect that's
22 going to be no more than eight or nine months from now,
23 when it'll be final results. We are giving parents
24 feedback, and the schools have cooperated with this
25 feedback as we get our publications.



1 As you probably know, researcher's a little
2 reluctant to share stuff until their peers have put their
3 stamp on it. The privacy issues are of concern. Every
4 place, I outline sort of four levels of safeguards I
5 thought were in place on this. The competitive process in
6 getting the money is a fierce one. It's a peer-review
7 process, and part of the evaluation is, is this study
8 important enough to burden parents and students in states
9 with the work that's associated with them? So that there's
10 kind of a value judgment made, you know. We're putting a
11 burden on parents, schools, and state. Is it worth the
12 results?

13 So this one was judged, yes. They have to -
14 - they have to also approve or -- or IRB sort of protocols.
15 Then, we had two Boards overlooking us, the UVA IRB Board
16 and the CDE IRB Board, and every year, we have to go
17 through the process of telling them what we're doing,
18 getting their approval for it. Whenever we change IRB, we
19 have to go back for approval, and that's a -- that's a long
20 term safeguard, and they're supposed to be the ones who are
21 looking out for parent and children interests in our
22 research, ensuring we're not overstepping our bounds on
23 that. I think in this particular study, there's -- excuse
24 me, there's another sort of touchstone here, which is --
25 that we have been in close contact with about 1,000 parents



1 in Colorado who are part of the study and who are
2 voluntarily provide information to us, voluntarily brought
3 the kids in for testing. The only complaint we hear from
4 those parents is, where are the results?

5 And so they're anxiously awaiting results,
6 and I think the sense we have is that there is great
7 interest among the group of parents we're in contact with
8 about the study, and I know on a national basis, people,
9 researchers, and policymakers know what's going on, know
10 it's important as far as sort of charter school curriculum
11 in schools. So it's a study that -- some of our
12 researchers have left has been at this for seven years, and
13 I kind of wonder myself, I'm getting a little break. My
14 hair was brown, it was -- it was brown. So anyway. So I
15 think there's kind of layers of overlook sort of people who
16 look over our shoulder. The questions that were asked are
17 completely legitimate questions and I'm hopeful that we
18 sent them, sent to the parent as well as providing the data
19 here. So I'm open to additional questions about the study.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

21 MS FLORES: Can we ask you to speak a little
22 closer into the mic. You're a little you're soft spoken.
23 Thank you.

24 MR. GRISSMER: Sure, I am soft spoken.



1 MS. FLORES: You call it a -- a study would
2 you call it an ad hoc study? Because -- and here's what I
3 would call it an ad hoc study. You say that because they -
4 - the subjects chose themselves. I would call a -- a
5 lottery here from what I have seen and witnessed as of, as
6 of a raffle, and a raffle and a lottery. And because of
7 what goes -- what goes on before and who gets elected and
8 such. So that's what happens, what I've seen in -- in
9 Denver. The other thing that I question is, you -- these -
10 - the subjects that the children that you chose were middle
11 and upper middle class kids, but what's the gist in that?
12 And -- and you have a good program core knowledge is a good
13 program. So it -- it -- it's given that middle and upper
14 middle class kids are going to do well in any kind of
15 premium program. So they're doing well.

16 MR. GRISSMER: Right.

17 MS. FLORES: And I'm just wondering why you
18 chose middle and upper middle class kids when actually the
19 -- I -- I would say that we should be working maybe with,
20 with kids that are poor, and I know you said there was a
21 dearth of information for middle and upper middle class
22 kids, but I just wonder. I mean, you're gonna have
23 positive results on this. And then you provide \$150 also
24 kind of you add to the a little kitty and say, "Well, we'll



1 give you \$150 to participate." And I don't know, that's
2 almost like, you know what I'm saying.

3 MR. GRISSMER: Okay.

4 MS. FLORES: It's -- and maybe you should
5 have offered a little bit more for, for that population but
6 --

7 MR. GRISSMER: Well, that's -- we've never
8 come offering that before. We found out through our survey
9 that that's what it would take to sort of bring in their
10 children. Let me address your questions. We had some of
11 the same questions about how these lotteries are conducted.
12 We did everything possible to oversee that process to see
13 that it was truly random, the -- the random kids were
14 pulled in a random order.

15 And when the results came in, yes I'm gonna
16 come, no I'm gonna come they chose the next one on the
17 list. We're impressed actually with the quality of the
18 lotteries. The -- we could -- and we can sort of test that
19 because the characteristics of the kids who were chosen and
20 not chosen are pretty similar. I mean, that's sort of the
21 test of it. So that in any -- any sense of when we were
22 watching for is, you know, is there anything that's going
23 on here or anything. As far as we could see the lottery
24 process was ran according to how you would like a lottery
25 process ran. The exact kids got offers if they were



1 randomly chosen, and there -- there was no tendency to put
2 any kid into a better position on that. We might have
3 missed some things but we did eight -- we got nine schools
4 involved. And we thought the lotteries are conducted very
5 well, and all of our data would indicate that -- that
6 that's the case. So that -- that's an answer to the first
7 question. The second one.

8 MS. FLORES: So it wasn't ad hoc.

9 MR. GRISSMER: It wasn't ad hoc. It wasn't
10 ad hoc.

11 MS. FLORES: That -- that you know.

12 MR. GRISSMER: That I -- that we know. And
13 you know, we were in close contact with the people,
14 principals, and the people who were commissions, directors
15 of the school. They had to make out a spreadsheet for us
16 when they did the lottery and we, you know, they wrote
17 notes on how -- how they sort of did each kid and whether
18 they talk to the parent all that kind of thing. The second
19 one is for middle class. Most -- most of my -- most of my
20 researches were disadvantaged children. This is the only
21 study I have in sort of outside that.

22 So we -- we -- we -- we focused mostly on
23 disadvantaged children. But if you look at the
24 international test scores, it's not only our disadvantaged
25 children don't do well, our best students do not do as well



1 as the best students in other nations. And so the score
2 gaps internationally are as much due to the middle of the
3 income students not doing as well as international
4 students. So I think that's -- and we've -- in research
5 we've tended to ignore that. So the question is how do you
6 raise the scores of middle income students on this? And so
7 this is sort of addresses that issue.

8 MS. FLORES: And was that your -- your big
9 focus then?

10 MR. GRISSMER: Well, in our proposal that
11 was one of the things we said. We should study this group
12 because if we raised -- their scores are a problem in terms
13 of comparison with international scores. Yeah. The third
14 question was, I'm sorry I didn't write them down.

15 MS. FLORES: Well, that you were bribing
16 them.

17 MR. GRISSMER: Oh, we are bribing them.

18 MS. FLORES: The bribe wasn't large enough.

19 MR. GRISSMER: Yeah. The I -- IRB. We had
20 to get special permission to -- usually we give them \$25,
21 right? We asked them as a part of -- part of our survey,
22 you know, we would really like to test your kids we require
23 you're bringing them in for testing, what's it gonna take?
24 And the answer is were 75, \$75, maybe half, \$100, maybe you
25 know, 70 percent, \$150, we got 85 percent, 90 percent



1 coming in. And they spent a lot of time. I mean, they're
2 they gotta go on the phone, you got to schedule them, you
3 got to reschedule them, they've got to bring their kid in.
4 So it -- it -- it works. And but -- it's -- it was more
5 than, I think, probably, the only search in the nation --
6 in the nation that got that permission there. Response
7 rates are awfully important in the research. I mean, it's
8 parts.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. If I could -- I'm
10 just gonna take one prerogative. I'm gonna have to leave
11 for a few minutes here. I wanna ask just one question
12 before I do. Can you capsulize and tell us precisely what
13 we will know once the study is completed that we don't know
14 today?

15 MR. GRISSMER: Okay. We will know first of
16 all whether Core Knowledge Charter Schools with that
17 curriculum. We will know first of all, there is -- they do
18 -- do something different in classrooms. There is a
19 curriculum being taught. We will know a lot about how
20 Colorado parents and how our choose schools a lot about
21 whether they are satisfied with the schools that they
22 chose. And most importantly, we will be able to tell you
23 whether the children taking a random set of children that
24 entered schools and didn't. The only difference is that
25 they attended different schools. So we can tell you



1 whether attending a Core Knowledge Charter Schools raised
2 their Colorado reading, writing, and math achievement,
3 above those schools where the alternates went.

4 And that's the school's got to do that.
5 That's not smart kids going to these schools. We
6 randomized the kids into the schools. So we will tell you
7 that they're working in terms of raising achievement. And
8 perhaps, a more important question, I don't wanna -- a lot
9 of research you have things that work for a year, and then
10 two years later it's gone. Charter schools continues the
11 intervention every year. It's a continuous intervention
12 over time.

13 So whether it lasts or not is another
14 question, but it will tell you the extent to which and for
15 what types of students Core Knowledge Charter Schools is
16 working from. It won't give us the really lowest income
17 kids, but we have -- do have some low income middle income
18 kids. Does it make any difference for the higher scoring
19 kids? Does it do better? Middle schools are -- are
20 initial results in court when we suggest that's the case.
21 It gets better for middle income parents as opposed to very
22 high income parents.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Dr. Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for your presentation.
25 I appreciate it. I'm concerned about a couple issues that



1 mostly relate to the data privacy issues, so maybe I'm
2 questioning more the Department of Ed. But is it true that
3 you were saying that the two IRBs oversee this research?
4 But I'm under the impression that CDE doesn't have a
5 functioning IRB as traditionally construed, is that right
6 Marcia?

7 MS. BOHANNON: That's correct. Now, when
8 the study began, CDE did have an IRB. It was -- it was --
9 it ended about a year ago, I would say. But we require any
10 research request or any study that comes as request stated
11 to already have an IRB approval from somewhere else. So
12 our research folks decided that it is probably not
13 reasonable for us to have our own IRB. But at the time
14 this started, we did have one and it -- it also reviewed
15 the requests.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So and parents had to opt-
17 out, so they were automatically in unless they opted out?

18 MR. GRISSMER: Yes. And that was -- it
19 turns out that there was legislation or regulation on that
20 issue at the national level. And there -- there it
21 happened about I don't know, 2010 maybe 2011. It basically
22 said, if -- if the achievement data that is being asked
23 for, there's no chance that it could ever be associated
24 with an individual child that is the -- the safeguards are
25 in place. And that's the only thing you're asking for a



1 parent, that you're gonna match, pick up the state records,
2 and then opt-out is sufficient. For our own testing, when
3 we ask to bring those cases with us, we have to get
4 positive. They have to sign and say, "I want, you know,
5 it's okay to test my kid." But there is a national
6 regulation that says, "If you're only asking for a matching
7 of scores in which you have no chance of identifying
8 children, the opt-out is the appropriate thing."

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: And did CDE receive any money
10 or services for this grant?

11 MS. BOHANNON: Not that I'm aware of.

12 MR. GRISSMER: No.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then did CDE give you via
14 -- some kind of a key to unmask the data or share it or how
15 does -- how does the data pass through?

16 MS. BOHANNON: We give them a file. We've
17 already masked the individual identifiers. So they get --
18 they get individual information but with no way to identify
19 who the individuals are. So it's de-identified data.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how does this relate to,
21 is it House Bill 1294? Is it Senate Bill 1294? It says
22 that we can't -- again, this is a state question about
23 providing student data where there's money involved.
24 That's why it's -- with this to be paid \$150, and then the
25 state releases the data.



1 MS. BOHANNON: Yeah, 12. I'd have to go
2 back and check, but I don't believe there was something
3 about money in that one but it did talked about --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Selling student data?

5 MS. BOHANNON: Well, that was actually HB
6 173 last year that didn't pass, but yeah. I mean, if -- if
7 we don't sell --

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: See there's Senate Bill or
9 House Bill 1294.

10 MS BOHANNON: Okay. Then it --then it was
11 House Bill 1294 but we it -- were not selling data, we
12 didn't receive any -- any funding for this. So I would not
13 consider that in the same category that, that bill was
14 really focused on vendors that collect or -- have data in
15 the process of doing assessment or some service for us, and
16 then they use that data for another purpose that results in
17 them getting paid or some kind of financial benefit.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do you review the survey
19 that the students take? I mean, since there's no IRB, how
20 do -- how do -- CDE oversee the process?

21 MR. GRISSMER: First of all, to be clear the
22 \$150 was not paid to get the Colorado achievement data. It
23 was to allow us to give our tests to students during
24 December. The -- I'm -- I'm actually used, I think three
25 to four years ago, there was one that was working with us.



1 When we designed the surveys, I'd -- I can -- I know our --
2 our IRB Board does all of the survey, every -- everything
3 we do is. I'm pretty sure your -- your Board would have
4 looked at the survey instruments, and at the same time. I
5 can't -- I don't know for sure that but we did -- we kept
6 them in, I mean, the cooperation here has been excellent.
7 Among the states. The cooperation of CDC was -- it was key
8 to doing the study. And so I would be surprised if they --
9 I know they're aware we did surveys, and teachers' surveys.
10 I don't know of the formal board how that worked but I know
11 Diane was aware of all that stuff. So --

12 MS. BOHANNON: Yeah. She ran the IRB when
13 she was here. That was unfortunately before my time. So
14 I'm not sure exactly how -- what that look like, but I'm
15 sure as -- as you've mentioned that they were involved in
16 that. I don't know if there's been any surveys to review
17 in the last couple of years.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And when CDE enters into an
19 agreement like this, do they audit on whether or not the
20 research project is adhering to the agreement such as
21 providing only de-identified data?

22 MS. BOHANNON: In this particular case,
23 we'll -- we provided de-identified data. So there wasn't
24 any way that we could actually re-identify it. So we had
25 needed to check that part of it. But as you mentioned



1 there's -- there's cooperation along the way so that people
2 are, I mean, folks from CDE, and folks from UVA are -- are
3 working together on this. So is it a formal audit? I
4 would say no. We don't -- don't do that. But we do
5 monitor results and monitor the progress that's working.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so I just have a question
7 for the vice chair, is -- or maybe for you. Is the --
8 you're saying you're in the sixth year of the study? Is
9 that correct?

10 MR. GRISSMER: We're in the sixth year of
11 the study.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so do we vote every year
13 to maintain our relationship in the study or we're
14 committed to the end of the sixth year? Or what is our
15 role?

16 MS. BOHANNON: We've never voted on this
17 thing. This is not something that we vote on. Not in the
18 seven years I've been here.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: So this is all an information
20 item?

21 MS. BOHANNON: It's an information item
22 because of concerns.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: How was this structured?
24 And I think we had -- didn't we have some families come
25 forward? To question? And I think that's basically how



1 we're doing it, why we're asking these questions and I'm
2 very grateful. Patrick has been forthcoming and explain to
3 us because it's pretty fascinating. Having served on a
4 school district where we had, I think we may have had a
5 Charter Core Knowledge but we also had District Core
6 Knowledge schools. Our community was very, very interested
7 in it and we looked very carefully, at least at the Board
8 level, we looked very carefully, the district curriculum
9 compared to the core knowledge curriculum. So I think
10 we'll be very interested. Many people in my community may
11 be very interested in this study to see what you do learn.

12 MR. GRISSMER: That's an important point.
13 That is that the curriculum can be taught in the public
14 school or a charter school and you have public schools in
15 Colorado, and they're (inaudible) --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Probably a number of them.

17 MR. GRISSMER: The -- the -- they're core
18 knowledge. So this is not a charter or public dogfight.
19 This is where the curriculum, curriculum sort of thing and
20 the -- yeah.

21 MS. RANKIN: Thank you, Dr. Grissmer. That
22 is very interesting. And I -- I have a couple of
23 questions. First one is, why did you choose seven years?
24 Is there a reason for that?



1 MR. GRISSMER: I would never choose seven
2 years if I had another choice. The lotteries were done in
3 2009 when the kids entered school. So we -- that's when we
4 have this track who got here, who got an offer and who
5 didn't get an offer. We want the third and fourth grade
6 test scores as the ultimate outcome measure. And that
7 takes six years between those two things. That's why it's
8 very -- I think this is the first kindergarten lottery
9 charter study in the nation. I mean, I certainly don't
10 like to spend seven years without reading papers. So that
11 -- that -- it was just that time. If -- if -- if they were
12 lottery children in the first grade or in the second grade,
13 then it would have been two or three years study, that --
14 that's the reason it's so long.

15 MS. RANKIN: Okay. And then, Ms. Bohannon,
16 I have a -- I have a question. You do not get paid for
17 doing any of this research. Correct? I mean, for turning
18 this in. How many -- how much time is spent doing that?
19 Providing this information.

20 MS. BOHANNON: For this particular one, it's
21 a matter of just pulling -- pulling that file extract and
22 sending it. So this is -- this very minimal.

23 MS. RANKIN: It's just electronic, correct?

24 MS. BOHANNON: Right. Right. And, you
25 know, we went through a few other -- you have a list of



1 some of our other data sharing agreements, you have the
2 total list. So there's three other ones that are similar
3 or different studies but the time involved. So we don't
4 have 20, 30 of these going on. So it's pretty minimal
5 because we don't have time.

6 MS. MAZANEC: So -- so I -- I take it we are
7 also interested in the results. That's why we get into
8 this contract. So when we get the results, what do we do
9 with them?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's probably
11 something that Gretchen could answer better but I think
12 that there's, there's different levels of people that can
13 be interested in this. The parents obviously are, the
14 schools and the districts are, and I will defer. We can
15 get you some information on -- on where CDE would actually
16 use that data because that's in Gretchen's area. But I
17 think it's mostly about the actual participants and the
18 parents may be able to make choices.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Edie Hurst (ph) might be
20 interested also.

21 MR. GRISSMER: Edie Hurst (ph) is very
22 interested. I had lunch with him. You know there's a --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Angelika.

24 MR. GRISSMER: But there's a lot of research
25 -- neuroscience research and other research that says "You



1 can teach a lot of reading and math and that exercises
2 parts of your brain that you're gonna need later on to do
3 well." There's another part of your brain which reading
4 and Math doesn't touch, and it's the part of the brain that
5 makes -- is trying to understand what's actually going on
6 in the world as opposed to how to read or what's going on
7 in your Math text, or you understand -- trying to
8 understand your social world, your physical world. That's
9 a different part of the brain. And one of the hypothesis
10 that we have in our research, I have -- I run one of much
11 bigger research group, is that this part of the brain which
12 basically is your memory and your association, we in
13 schools don't do that.

14 And therefore when kids have to start to
15 understand what they read and do more difficult stuff,
16 that's why they don't -- sort of I mean, we do well at
17 fourth grade, we don't do as well in eighth grade. We do
18 allow our kids who are not big gains in high school for you
19 know 20 -- 20 years. And the math gains are much bigger
20 than reading gains. And our explanation for that is we
21 have to have a broader curriculum at schools so that the --
22 the ability of kids to understand their world, their, you
23 know, what they're in. That's the part of the brain that's
24 gonna later be used for critical thinking and core
25 knowledge right now is the best curriculum that was



1 designed to do that. That's what they say they do. They -
2 - they don't -- they tell the schools you can teach Math
3 and reading within the curriculum you want. We wanna
4 toughen up the rest of the curriculum, so that when your
5 kids have to start to understand the wider context of stuff
6 in the Math and reading, they've got the information to do
7 that. So this is a study that really just a very
8 fundamental hypothesis about how broad versus, you know,
9 narrow curriculums are.

10 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Pam.

11 MS. MAZANEC: So I apologize. This is a
12 repeat of what I wasn't paying enough attention when Val
13 asked. The \$150 paid to -- tell me why that was done? Is
14 that normal for studies?

15 MR. GRISSMER: It is normal as to provide
16 gift cards for parents are -- they're asking for your time
17 and, you know, you sort of give it. This came about in the
18 following way. We wanted to test children at the end of
19 first grade on whether their general knowledge, their
20 science or social science really comprehending the world.
21 That's not part of the Colorado test, the world is going to
22 be, you're gonna do Social Science and Science in the
23 future, you know. So we wanted to test kids after their
24 first grade to assess not Math, reading, but whether Core
25 Knowledge was actually teaching their comprehension of the



1 Science and Social Science. The -- the way that we finally
2 ended up trying to do that is that having parents transfer
3 their kids into a charter to test their kids during the
4 summer.

5 MS. MAZANEC: So these parents did this
6 voluntarily?

7 MR. GRISSMER: They -- they did it
8 voluntarily with \$150 --

9 MS. MAZANEC: Voluntary for a \$150?

10 MR. GRISSMER: They were -- we were
11 surprised at the response rate and we were surprised of
12 their interest in the study. I mean they're -- we -- we
13 touched base on the telephone, do surveys every year, every
14 other year and we've just gotten a lot of information from
15 them. And as I say, there's answers as you all and we are
16 to find out what the answers are.

17 MS. MAZANEC: Two -- two other quick
18 questions. So how -- how many -- I know we said we are
19 talking about this because we had -- do we have just one
20 family? How many families were concerned about this study?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I only know about
22 one but there may be more.

23 MS. MAZANEC: And the -- and the other issue
24 -- ha -- has there been any other complaints? Is a follow
25 up on that, but the next -- the final question I have is



1 the data that was provided to the University of Virginia
2 was demographic data. I take it no personally identifiable
3 information. The names so -- they never saw that. All
4 they saw was the bucket that they belonged in?

5 MS. BOHANNON: Yep. That's correct, yeah.
6 Is correct. Okay.

7 MS. MAZANEC: So let me clarify. I don't
8 know whether it was a complaint. So much as a concern and
9 a question.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

11 MS. MAZANEC: What -- what kind of data are
12 we sharing? So I don't want to -- I don't wanna suggest
13 that someone is complaining about what you were doing, but
14 you know, you hear these things and so then the question is
15 what is it that we're sending to EVA?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, Val?

17 MS. FLORES: I don't wanna -- I don't wanna
18 us to become at state like Kansas where --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hey.

20 MS. FLORES: Research -- where research is
21 not done or where it's questioned a lot. And I'm glad that
22 you're doing this research. I first knew about Core
23 Knowledge because a friend of mine was teaching in a
24 program. It was a hard to serve school. They did have
25 some good things and not some good things, and then I



1 started doing research on Core Knowledge and it -- it was -
2 - it was exciting to read. And then there was other
3 research that said that it didn't work with poor kids. But
4 I think that it could work. Well, my question is that I
5 hope that the next -- that when you do this research again,
6 that you indeed, you know, I mean, because I know this
7 research is gonna work because it's gonna work with middle
8 and upper middle class kids. And I think it would be
9 worthy of doing research with hard to serve schools as
10 well.

11 MR. GRISSMER: No question about that. We
12 will get -- not definitive answers for lower income kids.
13 But we will have a -- our schools are on a curve of, you
14 know, some of -- some of the highest income schools in the
15 nation are -- are in our study. And it sort of goes down
16 into middle to partly lower class. What we're initially
17 seeing is that this effectiveness is sort of not as great
18 for higher income -- for highest income schools, but it
19 gets greater as you go down. So it'll point in that
20 direction whether it -- it may continue, if you go into the
21 lower income, we would love to have the opportunity to do
22 this. We initially had one other -- one or two schools in
23 our initial sample. Unfortunately, they -- they did --
24 they didn't have a large enough cue set of applicants so
25 that everybody got an offer, and that doesn't -- we don't -



1 - we can't -- we gotta have people that didn't get an offer
2 as part of our sample.

3 MS. FLORES: And I guess my second comment
4 is that I hope it's not studied just in this area but maybe
5 with rural kids and with other, you know, with other
6 socioeconomic level kids because I think it's, it's a --
7 it's a premium -- I call it a premium program. And that it
8 doesn't become just with the upper middle class, you know,
9 kind of separate. Thank you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Deb.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. I just had one
12 final request. Is it possible to get a copy of the -- of
13 the survey? Because those are some of the issues that I
14 heard about. And since the IRB was in place when it began,
15 you probably have it internal to CDE or perhaps Dr.
16 Grissmer you could provide it to us. That would allow me
17 to address concerns of folks today. Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.
19 We're looking forward to re -- I'm certainly looking
20 forward to -- some of my experiences with the school. So
21 this is terrific. Thanks for answering all our questions.
22 Same to staff. Thanks.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Short break guys. Yes.

24 (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