



Colorado State Board of Education

---

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO**

**January 12, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 2**

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on January 12, 2017,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

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



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
2 Yes. Thank you. I'm going to turn this over to our team.  
3 Executive Director Pat Chapman, Executive Director Colleen  
4 O'Neil, Director Jennifer Simons, and we will talk a little  
5 bit about effective instruction within the ESSA plan. So,  
6 thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much  
8 Commissioner Madam Chair.

9 So, on tap for today, our goal, as always, is  
10 to provide the State Board of Education with information  
11 related to the Every Student Succeeds Act, affectionately  
12 known as ESSA, any ESSA committee work that's underway and  
13 any ESSA state plan development activities that are  
14 underway. Specific today, to -- to today, we hope to  
15 provide you information and details related to the effective  
16 instruction and leadership requirements, decision points and  
17 recommendations.

18 Colleen and -- and Jennifer are here to do  
19 that, and then after we go through that, we'll have the  
20 other folks come up. That's Brad Bylsma, Director of ESEA  
21 programs, Morgan Cox, Director of Culturally and  
22 Linguistically Diverse Education Office, and I guess, that  
23 is -- that is it. Okay, and then our hope is to gather any  
24 feedback or director -- directives from you that you may



1 have in relation to the information we present today.

2 Just with regard to sort of general, ESSA  
3 updates, I -- I don't want to belabor it, I think it  
4 suffices to say that we're still pouring through the reams  
5 and reams of new rules, regulations and guidance that we've  
6 been receiving from the US Department of Education. There's  
7 a lot of it, and there's a lot to read and a lot to  
8 understand. And then other than that, we're heavily  
9 involved in writing the state plan and the committee work.

10 So, that's really just the update and that's  
11 really what we've been doing for the last month. So,  
12 without further ado, I will turn it over to Colleen to begin  
13 that effective instruction and leadership part.

14 MS. O'NEIL: Thank you. Commissioner Madam  
15 Chair, thank you very much.

16 Today, we're going to talk about our  
17 Effective Instruction Leadership Spoke Committee work. You  
18 have Colleen O'Neil and Jennifer Simons here to help us walk  
19 through that. I would encourage any questions that you  
20 have. Please, let us know as we go through.

21 This is the second opportunity that we've had  
22 to come in front of you to talk a little bit about the ESSA,  
23 this particular ESSA Spoke. So today, we're going to  
24 specifically walk through a few very key decision points as  
25 well as the recommendations that have come forward from the



1 Spoke and we also were able to get in front of the Hub this  
2 week.

3                   So, we were in front of the Hub on Monday and  
4 we'll be able to talk a little bit about some of their  
5 recommendations as well, so that that can feed some of the,  
6 some of the knowledge as we go forward. So today, we're  
7 going to talk about the changes in equitable access to  
8 teachers. The changes from No Child Left Behind into ESSA.

9                   There are definitely some -- some changes in  
10 there, but the essence of What Was Left in No Child Left  
11 Behind stays in many areas as far as equitable access to  
12 teachers for students. We'll talk about identifying some  
13 gaps in equity, teacher equity across the state. There are  
14 two key decision points.

15                   Actually, there's more than two key, but  
16 there are two that have been some of the largest  
17 conversations, and that will be defining out of field and  
18 inexperience. We also were charged with the defining  
19 ineffective, which has deferred to the SB 191 definition of  
20 an effective educator. And then, we'll talk a little bit  
21 about how some decision points around supporting educators  
22 with regard to CDE supports in the field.

23                   The first thing we'll talk about is the  
24 teacher qualifications in ESSA and some changes from the No  
25 Child Left Behind, some Colorado context and the actual



1 decision points that live in there. And that was  
2 particularly around the Every Student Succeeds Act says very  
3 clearly that it now requires local education agencies and  
4 states to ensure that teachers and programs supported by  
5 Title I Funds meet applicable state licensure and  
6 certificate requirements.

7                   So, big change from No Child Left Behind that  
8 had a very clear kind of secondary requirement for equity in  
9 education under the highly qualified provisions over to  
10 remanding it back to the state to ensure that an educator  
11 licensing rules that they are adhering to the definitions as  
12 defined in ineffective, inexperienced, and out of field.  
13 So, highly qualified and we'll get into this a little bit  
14 deeper in the next couple of slides but it replaces-

15                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ma -- ma -- madam  
16 Chairman, may I ask you? May I interrupt you?

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many, approximately,  
19 how many of our 178 school districts receive Title I Funds?

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- We've had this  
21 question and I -- I was going to say I think Pat might  
22 remember it.

23                   MR. CHAPMAN: All districts are now eligible  
24 and that hasn't always been the case, but we have all  
25 districts are eligible and I'm -- I'm not could be able to



1 be 100 percent certain, but we have about two that decline  
2 their funds on an annual basis. So, really a-

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Vir -- virtually all of  
4 them.

5 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Virtually all of  
7 district.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And do they -- could you  
9 characterize the amount of money received in many of those  
10 districts as being significant relative to their budgets?

11 MR. CHAPMAN: I think, I would say that for -  
12 - for quite a few, it's not significant. So, the -- for  
13 example, the range of Title I awards would be like 5,000 for  
14 a -- a pretty small district all the way up to 20 some  
15 million for -- for a Denver. So, there's a really a wide  
16 range. For some districts, that's not a lot of money.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A -- and then, these  
18 ESSA requirements apply only to Title I schools, correct?

19 MR. CHAPMAN: That's for the most part true.  
20 So, the in statute it will say school districts receiving  
21 funds under this part. I think that might be true for one  
22 or two of the Title II provisions but if -- for the most  
23 part, it's all tied back to the Title I -- the receipt of  
24 Title I funding.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if -- if they were to



1 either not accept or opt out of Title I Funds, then they  
2 could get out from under the provisions in our state plan.  
3 Is that correct?

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. So, in k -- in receiving  
5 and accepting Title I Funds as a state, that obligates the  
6 state to ensure that the requirements of the -- of the --  
7 the law are implemented, are met by all school districts, so  
8 the honors is on us to, to monitor and to, to enforce-

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, e -- even if they  
10 didn't receive Title I Funds?

11 MR. CHAPMAN: We -- Well, as a policy, what  
12 we've done is really tried to -- to the extent that we can,  
13 in many cases we can to not hold them. So, they -- those  
14 requirements do not pertain them pertai -- pertain to them  
15 because they are not receiving funds under that part. So,  
16 it does get them out of a -- a fair amount of, of  
17 requirements not accepting the funds.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But not state?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To -- to a -- No. Not  
20 state funds. Do -- so, do you think most districts are  
21 aware of that?

22 MR. CHAPMAN: You -- We certainly have tried  
23 to make them aware of that and, and we will have, a little  
24 bit later in this section, talk about the assurances and  
25 that's one of the things that we really want school



1 districts to do, is review an -- and understand the  
2 assurances and, and actively together, with their board,  
3 decide whether or not they want to accept the funds. I  
4 think we can always do more of that, but we certainly don't  
5 try to hide that fact.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Joyce.

8 MS. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman, what percentage of  
9 the school budget is a Title I in the state?

10 MR. CHAPMAN: They -- I've seen various  
11 estimates. They tend to run between 5 percent and 10  
12 percent so -- of a -- of a school district's operating  
13 budget, 5 percent to 10 percent might be federal funds.

14 MS. JOYCE: Thank you.

15 MR. CHAPMAN: That's a relatively small.

16 MS. JOYCE: Federal funds or Title I?

17 MR. CHAPMAN: I'm -- I'm talking about all  
18 federal funds.

19 MS. JOYCE: All federal funds? Can you narrow  
20 it down?

21 MR. CHAPMAN: So, that would include -- I  
22 don't know if those estimates typically include IDEA which  
23 is another that other single biggest pot of money. But for  
24 the Title Programs themselves, Title I, Title II, Title III.

25 MS. JOYCE: Is there four also?



1 MR. CHAPMAN: There is now a Title IV.

2 MS. JOYCE: Yeah. It's okay. Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, Mr. Chairman, so if  
4 you state -- state and local expenditures on K12 or six plus  
5 billion dollars correct and Title I Funds or 150 million in  
6 round numbers, is that correct?

7 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes. So it's --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's about 8 percent I  
9 think as I calculated one --

10 MR. CHAPMAN: I've -- That's the one the  
11 percentages that I most frequently see is 8 percent and I  
12 think that depends on what you included what you-

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But 8 percent of the --  
14 essentially, total funding in the state would be federal  
15 funds, roughly? Okay.

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18 MR. CHAPMAN: And just to and for ESSA  
19 itself, it's about 150 million in Title I funding. When you  
20 add in all of the other programs, it's somewhere between 200  
21 and 225 million.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, that could get --  
23 So, I think that's still under 10 percent, but I'd have to-

24 MR. CHAPMAN: Oh, I'm -- I'm sure.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I have to get my



1 calculator out. It's something less than 10 percent total.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which is still very  
3 significant for a lot of school districts. I -- I wouldn't-

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some, it's very  
5 significant-

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Very significant.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And some, it's  
8 insignificant but --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But essentially, for --  
11 just to make the point, and essentially for 8 percent of the  
12 money, it drives what percentage of the administrative  
13 workload in this building and in the districts could you  
14 estimate that?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think I could  
16 estimate it. That we -- I will say that we do what we can  
17 and, and there's -- we're limited to what we can do but we  
18 do what we can to it to minimize the administrative burden  
19 tied to receipt of these funds. But what we do say is that,  
20 you know, they have to look at how much funding they're  
21 scheduled to receive and, and then look at the requirements  
22 tied to the receipt of the funds and, and make a judgment  
23 for themselves as to whether it's worth it.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: By next summer, when



1 these transparent financial -- the website will be  
2 available, we'll be able to look district by district.  
3 Although it will be stated out as Title I -- I think it -- I  
4 think it was just federal, was it not?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do think it breaks it  
6 out. I'd -- I would have to look at it again. They did  
7 share it with us, and -- and I think it will be helpful.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it will -- I  
9 think if you go deeper than what they were showing us  
10 yesterday, I'll bet you will be able to separate between the  
11 Title I, two and the special ed, et cetera, so that  
12 information will be available, to be a -- to be able to look  
13 to see if a district has a lot of kids or -- or not so many.  
14 Any other questions right now? Please go ahead.

15 MS. O'NEIL: Absolutely. There's a couple of  
16 applicable state statutes, some of the things that we were  
17 just talking about is that this remands it back to state  
18 law, to help us identify how to define some of these  
19 elements for equitable teachers.

20 Part of that state law is really the TECDA,  
21 that is the Teacher Employment Compensation and Dismissal  
22 Act, in state law that actually identifies that a school  
23 board shall not enter into an employment contract with any  
24 person or teacher, unless such person holds an initial or  
25 professional teacher's license or authorization.



1                   So, when we started looking at ESSA and about  
2 how it remands it back to state law. These are -- this is  
3 one of the laws that we were looking at with regard to the  
4 requirement to hold an educator license. A school district  
5 may hire a person who holds an alternative teacher license  
6 to teach as an alternative teacher pursuant to the  
7 alternative teacher contracts.

8                   So, when we are talking really about  
9 remanding it back to law, we're looking at initial teacher  
10 licenses, professional teacher licenses, and alternative  
11 teacher licenses are all grouped into that category. That's  
12 been a conversation and some questions that have come even  
13 from our hub and spoke committee of when it talks about ESSA  
14 remanding it back to state law. What is the state law?

15                   And our state law is about educator  
16 licensing, not about the three decision -- critical  
17 decisions that we have in defining inexperienced, out-of-  
18 field, and ineffective. So, just that state frames some of  
19 it. In addition to that, state law also allows waivers for  
20 educator licensing as well as educator effectiveness, where  
21 our definition of ineffective educator lies.

22                   So, when work -- when we keep saying ESSA  
23 remands it back to state law, both of those state laws are  
24 in on the books, in Colorado read by statute, and they're  
25 pertinent to the way that we have to define educator



1 licensing and equitable educators in the state of Colorado.  
2 So, specifically what are we talking about? We are  
3 specifically talking about under Title I and under now ESSA.  
4 Previously, equitable access under No Child Left Behind  
5 required that our local education agencies and our states  
6 had to ensure that low income and minority students were not  
7 taught at a disproportionate rate by inexperienced,  
8 unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.

9                   That was under No Child Left Behind. ESSA  
10 now moves us over into it and says, 'As under ESSA, EAs and  
11 states or local education agencies and states must ensure  
12 that low income and minority students are not taught at  
13 disproportionate rates by inexperienced, or ineffective, or  
14 out-of-field educators.

15                   So, it's important to know that those two  
16 things, or those three things have to happen. For most  
17 states, those three items are actually defined in their  
18 state law in some way or another. For the state of  
19 Colorado, they are not defined.

20                   So, we have to go back and really define them  
21 as required by ESSA, in the ESSA plan. So, that's the  
22 critical components that we have been really working on as  
23 far as a Hub and Spoke is defining what those elements are.  
24 This is a quick side note you do have some handouts that  
25 help elicit that -- some of that information, some of that



1 background information.

2                   So, those are available to you and we've  
3 noted on the PowerPoint where you can access those. To help  
4 us really talk about educator equity or equitable access, we  
5 have developed an educator equity plan.

6                   So I'm going to stop here, and I'm going to  
7 actually let Jennifer Simons talk a little bit about  
8 identifying gaps and how do we know that our teachers are  
9 being taught -- not our teachers are being taught, our  
10 students are being taught by teachers at disproportionate  
11 rates. That's part of our equity analysis gap.

12                   MS. SIMONS: So, while -- while the  
13 calculations for the state plan have not been completed yet,  
14 we do have prior year calculations since there was a  
15 requirement to complete an educator equity plan in 2015.  
16 And so you do have a handout that has an excerpt from that  
17 related to what the gaps were.

18                   And primarily, what we found is that the gaps  
19 were in the distribution of inexperienced teachers. And  
20 just as a side note, because we were operating under  
21 different definitions that work defined under No Child Left  
22 Behind at the time, when we're talking about the  
23 distribution of unqualified and out-of-field teachers, for  
24 those particular calculations in your handout and in that  
25 plan, those were done looking at our teachers who did not



1 meet the requirements of being highly qualified as was  
2 defined under No Child Left Behind. But that is essentially  
3 what's going to be changing now.

4 As Colleen mentioned we have to define those  
5 for a state plan because they're not defined in our state  
6 statute. And this piece of federal statute defers to state  
7 law.

8 MS. O'NEIL: So, with that we're able to  
9 actually move now, kind of, to what is it that we were  
10 working on identifying. So, the decision points very  
11 clearly for us and this folk and the hub, coming to us as  
12 the state board, focus on ensuring and reporting equitable  
13 access to teachers as required by ESSA.

14 The question for us was; how should Colorado  
15 define an out-of-field teacher in that definition? We have a  
16 flowchart that gives you some information on that, as well  
17 as a handout with those options. The Spoke, I'm trying to  
18 make to make sure I do Spoke and Hub correctly, because  
19 usually I put them all together as spoke-and-hub.

20 So, the Spoke made a recommendation on out-  
21 of-field using that state law. Identifying the fact that it  
22 remands it back to state law and in state law the  
23 recommendations from the Spoke, was to use the definition of  
24 out-of-field for report -- porting purposes and there's a  
25 very clear delineation between reporting and hiring.



1                   And I will get into that just a little bit  
2 first because that's really been a conversation that we've  
3 had very deeply.

4                   So, these folk made a recommendation for out-  
5 of-field for reporting purposes for our districts, as the  
6 recommendation that we use educator licensing and  
7 endorsement as the criteria. So, we go straight back to  
8 state law and use educator licensing and endorsement.

9                   So, my example would be, Colleen O'Neil, the  
10 English teacher, has a teaching license of professional  
11 teaching license with an endorsement in English. If I was  
12 to be considered out-of-field, I would not have an  
13 endorsement in English.

14                  So, Colleen O'Neil the English teacher was  
15 assigned to teach a math class, and had no endorsement in  
16 math. You obtained an endorsement in educator licensing  
17 through one of three ways; by degree, by content assessment,  
18 or by 24 credit hours. So, if I cannot demonstrate one of  
19 those three things, I would not be able to obtain an  
20 endorsement through the Colorado Department of Educator  
21 Licensing.

22                  So, therefore, when my district reported on  
23 Colleen O'Neil as an English License -- English Teaching  
24 License, teaching math, I would be considered out-of-field  
25 for that math class. I'd be infield for any English classes



1 I had, but I'd be out-of-field for math, because I hold no  
2 endorsement in that area. The Spoke's recommendation was to  
3 do that.

4                   That recommendation came forward for a few  
5 reasons. The biggest reason is that it's equity learns for  
6 kids, so that it really aligns that you can say, "Okay,  
7 Jennifer is not teaching English. She's teaching math  
8 because she has a math endorsement. Colleen is teaching  
9 English because that's where her content knowledge lies."  
10 So, there's some equity for students.

11                   That out-of-field definition went forward to  
12 the Hub committee. The Hub committee did at that point in  
13 time, ask if there was a way to use the former provisions of  
14 highly qualified in addition to. So, there were two options  
15 stated there, and use the former definitions of highly  
16 qualified which also included letting go of educator  
17 licensing, but keeping the same criteria or similar criteria  
18 for endorsement purposes. So, there's been a lot of  
19 conversation around that. Those were the two things that  
20 were coming forward. Okay.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question  
22 please?

23                   MS. O'NEIL: Yes.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As we talk about having  
25 more and more blended learning courses available across the



1 state, particularly in the areas where we don't -- maybe  
2 don't have that many kids wanting a particular class. How  
3 does the combination of an online course with the support  
4 from a classroom teacher, which is by no means at the same  
5 level as teaching that class. How does that then relate to  
6 infield and out-of-field, have we even addressed that  
7 particular need?

8 MS. O'NEIL: We have. And -- and the answer  
9 is that the teacher of record still has to hold the  
10 appropriate credentials for the class they're teaching. So,  
11 that alignment -- still has under highly qualified at least,  
12 that alignment was still there, under ESSA it's the same  
13 requirement that you demonstrate infield. So, whomever that  
14 teacher of record is, it's a little bit like a team teaching  
15 situation. Who is the teacher of record? And that teacher  
16 of record must demonstrate competence.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can the teacher of  
18 record be the per -- be the teacher who created the online  
19 course?

20 MS. O'NEIL: It depends on how the school  
21 district wants to -- wants to identify who that person is.  
22 Little out of my field on that question completely.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, well-.

24 MS. O'NEIL: Maybe Jennifer may know.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's a topic



1 that we talk about a lot, due to shortages and the  
2 remoteness for certain offerings.

3 MS. SIMONS: This topic is also where it's  
4 important to remember what Colleen mentioned about the  
5 difference between hiring and reporting. So, to the  
6 original question, as far as teacher-

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. No, I -- I  
8 didn't talk about reporting. I do understand the hiring  
9 part. Hiring wise, districts can do whatever they have  
10 to do. So, it is about the reporting.

11 MS. O'NEIL: The way we currently-

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The equity piece.

13 MS. O'NEIL: Yes, the way we currently  
14 collect the data, it would -- they couldn't report a teacher  
15 who isn't an employee of the district. So, if it is someone  
16 just sent far away they wouldn't be reporting them. I don't  
17 know if there's any reason we couldn't change that for these  
18 purposes.

19 I think that would take some research, but  
20 currently there's no way to report those teachers who aren't  
21 an employee of the district. They would only be reporting  
22 the teacher who is the employee of the district.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, the reporting  
24 would suggest them out of -- out-of-field teaching?

25 MS. O'NEIL: Could potentially, depending on



1 the assignment. Yes, it could. Almost no matter where you  
2 -- anyway you looked at that. Did I see another hand --  
3 question? Excuse me, Dr. Faux?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wanted to -- to say  
5 that, wouldn't the screen (indiscernible) Ms. Janice did  
6 yesterday and she made presentation, and then to make it  
7 more fruitful, she brought a video and used that video to  
8 show us to make us understand better. You know, her -- her  
9 point, so I-

10 MS. GOLF: Right. We're just trying to talk  
11 about the equity issue.

12 DR. FLORES: And I am too. I'm talking about a tools that  
13 is used to teach and that a video would be -- I would  
14 consider it like a video.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are many cases  
16 where our students are given access to instructors of some  
17 sort. So where they are interacting with a person who was  
18 acting as an instructor, but they may not be the employee of  
19 the district.

20 MS. GOLF: (indiscernible) Thank you. That  
21 might be a bit of a diversion, but I -- but I've been  
22 wondering whether it's part of the ESSA conversation since  
23 it's the direction that we seek to go natio -- nationally I  
24 believe.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I also think that



1 it's -- I appreciate you bringing it forward because I think  
2 it's a point of clarity that we can provide to folks  
3 especially as we talk about the definitions going forward  
4 and the processes that we have around that. And I do agree  
5 that it's a strong movement to be able to serve our kids.  
6 So the next decision point that we act-

7 MS. GOLF: I'm sorry. Jane, sorry.  
8 Sometimes I can't see your hand.

9 DR. FLORES: I remember the hub committee's  
10 discussion accurately. There were two options that spent  
11 quite a bit of time on which is good. Which one was which?  
12 I was lis -- I was only listening, so it was difficult to  
13 keep track of that. Which one is which? Which one was the  
14 preferred recommendation of the hub committee and start th -  
15 - with that question.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. Let me  
17 check. So, this is a good question. We've actually had a  
18 kind of 50/50 split on this. The spoke recommendation,  
19 there are two options. The spoke recommendation was that we  
20 went with educator licensing and endorsement as the criteria  
21 for the definition of out of field. The hub's  
22 recommendation, again almost 50/50 split, but they did push  
23 over a little bit too. We would go with that second option  
24 that was state law, meaning licensure and endorsement as  
25 well as being able to identify at the local level similar to



1 the highly qualified provisions using endorsements or the  
2 endorsement criteria and say at the local level, "I can  
3 guaran -- I can identify an individual as infield, or the  
4 opposite, out of field, by ensuring that they have 24 credit  
5 hours, a content assessment or a degree without a license.  
6 So that would -- that's kind of the definition that we have  
7 today.

8                   So again, Pat has no teaching license. He  
9 can actually be considered highly qualified because he has a  
10 degree in English, in English educa -- or in English without  
11 a teaching license. I would still be considered infield  
12 with a license and an endorsement. Pat would be considered  
13 infield without a license, but with a degree or  
14 demonstration of that content knowledge and be considered.  
15 That is the way that the hub had made that recommendation.

16                   MS. GOLF: Okay. Now I don't want to -- I  
17 don't want to be labor any discussions 'cause I -- I heard  
18 them, they were great. The one -- the one basically they  
19 just wrapped up was in the idea to stick with state law is  
20 which one? One or two?

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One.

22                   MS. GOLF: Okay. Did that one take  
23 precedence among the hub committee?

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. It was the second  
25 one that was the choice from the hub.



1 MS. GOLF: And by a large margin, if I  
2 understand.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: By, I think three  
4 people. Yeah. Thank you. Nine to six.

5 So by three folks and th -- the spoke,  
6 remember the spoke committee had intensive conversation  
7 around it? There are functional working committee that does  
8 that work every day in their districts and there are many  
9 pros and cons to either side, but this has been the one  
10 piece of at least our spoke work that has come up over and  
11 over and over and it's a very, very split decision on it.

12 And again I just want to clarify, this is  
13 about reporting purposes. This is not about hiring. This  
14 is reporting only for equity, again, through the lens of our  
15 students.

16 MS. GOLF: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. I'm not  
18 quite following what -- what distinction you're making about  
19 reporting versus hiring. I mean, if you're -- if -- if that  
20 were the rule, every school would have to have a teacher who  
21 fit that. It is about hiring and it is about, right?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We -- well the -- there  
23 are a couple and this is, again nuance. This has been my  
24 word of the last several months is nuance.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And here is the nuance.  
2 Is that by law, which is why we kind of talked a little bit  
3 about it earlier, 'By law, everyone who employs a teacher is  
4 supposed to employ a teacher who has a license with a  
5 content endorsement.' by law. However, by law, you also  
6 have the opportunity to waive that. So, this is -- this is  
7 where we're really getting into the employment versus  
8 reporting.

9 When we talk about ESSA holistically it's  
10 still really about reporting and it is only coming into play  
11 if I see inequities between my higher, my higher  
12 socioeconomic students and my lower socioeconomic students.  
13 So this is -- the reporting is a mechanism by which we are  
14 ensuring that we have equity for all of our students.

15 So if I see a group of students that is  
16 taught at an -- at an inequitable rate by teachers who don't  
17 have a license and are out of field. So the Colleen's that  
18 are teaching math that have no -- no content knowledge doing  
19 that, and their academic achievement is down. That's when  
20 it really comes into play.

21 But if I see a large group of -- of students  
22 poverty or no poverty being taught by Colleen's who are math  
23 teachers without that content knowledge and their academic  
24 achievement is high, it's irrelevant at that moment because  
25 we're demonstrating that. So it's a measure to help ensure



1 that our students are not being taught disproportionately  
2 across that continuum.

3 That's -- that's how we're trying to nuance  
4 that conversation, so I can hire them, and if our students  
5 are achieving, that's not the -- that's not going to be the  
6 problem. The problem is going to be if they're not and what  
7 some of those baseline mechanisms that we can ensure that.

8 MS. GOLF: Dr. Flores?

9 DR. FLORES: Yes, but yesterday we -- you  
10 said it was okay -- excuse me. Yesterday I think we agreed  
11 that there were some teachers or physics who asked to give  
12 endorsement, to give you the authority to give endorsements  
13 to districts that are -- Sorry. That were not -- the  
14 districts were asking endorsement from the state for these  
15 teachers that were not endorsed.

16 We had I don't know how many dis -- districts  
17 were asking for that. So, will that stop? Will the district  
18 just on its own have it -- have the right to do that or will  
19 you still, meaning you as the head of licensing be still  
20 required -- Will the districts still be required to ask the  
21 licensing agency to -- to -- to hire them?

22 MS. GOLF: Okay. Madam Chair.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dr. Flores, I think I  
24 understand the question an -- and I think the difference is  
25 between.



1 DR. FLORES: I'm sorry for before.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I -- I think the  
3 difference is between option one and option two. In option  
4 two, the district really does have the choice of I --  
5 ensuring that that teacher has the content knowledge to be  
6 considered infield.

7 The district gets to have that choice. They  
8 als -- they bear that burden as well as ensuring that they  
9 either meets 24 credit hours, content assessment or degrees.  
10 So in option two as Ms. Golf was talking about, the hub  
11 recommendation would allow the district to make that choice  
12 and it would not be a CDE driven choice.

13 DR. FLORES: May I?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 DR. FLORES: Connected to that. So I'm -- I  
16 need to fully understand option two and I really need to  
17 fully understand why the hub came out the way they did.  
18 Option two there's -- there seems to be a connection.

19 Then the following question is, what is  
20 there, if anything, that encourages whether we're talking  
21 equity or not, that encourages districts to -- to help  
22 teachers seek out alternative or to actually work toward  
23 that ultimate, what we in Colorado say because it's in our  
24 state law for one thing, what we say we value and that's for  
25 licensure plus an endorsement.



1                   So when I'm -- when I'm hearing them, I'm  
2 learning more and more about our laws, thinking them through  
3 in a different way these days. But we have -- we have  
4 nothing in our s -- in our state policy that upholds the --  
5 the carrying out of what we say our basic missio -- mission  
6 is which is to have, I don't want to use highly qualified,  
7 but we want to have licensed teachers who have -- who have  
8 provable endorsement in a content area.

9                   I think, and I will say that I -- I -- I find  
10 it -- I find it kind of modern in a way that we are also  
11 faced with the possibility of being able to take great  
12 advantage and opportunity because there's a different way of  
13 thinking right now about how outside non-teaching experience  
14 can be a great contributor to a successful career, which is  
15 going to bring performance and achievement to kids.

16                   So I appreciate, but I -- I just, for now,  
17 need to be clear about where -- where we are with filing a  
18 plan and having general agreement that that's a good thing.  
19 So we are saying, "Yeah, that's being recognized as long as  
20 people have some knowledge about what they're doing." and  
21 yet we're not really -- we're not up to helping people  
22 understand the value of as we say a license and an  
23 endorsement.

24                   So it's -- I appreciate it. It feels like  
25 we're in a -- on a real bridge. Well, maybe loaded with



1 snow right now, I don't know. But it's -- it's a  
2 challenging time and I -- I just thanks for the clarity, I  
3 appreciate it.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just a second, let me  
5 work on that clarity for myself please. In one case, the  
6 state decides whether you're in field or not?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In one case, the state  
8 requirements drive whether you're infield -- and when --  
9 yeah

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And in -- And in option  
11 two, the district actually decides based on their evaluation  
12 of the transcript of the teacher.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so you tend to have  
15 differences possibly between districts either -- whether  
16 they would identify a particular teacher as being teaching,  
17 having the qualifications to be infield or not.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that roughly? So,  
20 it's a little more subjective-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the state to-

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. (indiscernible)

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I -- Madam Chair,  
24 can I just -- We do have a hesitate to introduce a new piece  
25 of paper, but because this all happened, the hub meeting



1 happened Monday, and we heard a lot of this confusion at the  
2 hub meeting, we did create a new document for you to outline  
3 these two options. And I think, this will help to put  
4 something in front of you, but since it all transpired on  
5 Monday, we couldn't get it into your materials. So, let me  
6 have pa -- pass this out, and then maybe while Val is asking  
7 the questions.

8 MS. VAL: I'm now asking the question of what  
9 is the validity then of a person who has such as myself, who  
10 has -- as an undergraduate a degree in English and history  
11 but not license, no education. Well, why would I go then  
12 and take all those hours to be licensed. I mean, I -- it  
13 just seems that would be very expensive. Why not just, you  
14 know, jump into teaching and not worry about you know the  
15 other but certainly, I hope that we have, I mean we could, I  
16 -- I -- I just don't see the value then of -- of people  
17 thinking, well, I'm going to go into that, which is what  
18 exactly I kind of thought of when -- when I graduated.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know what kind  
21 of statement, it's still okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought you're going  
23 to -- you're going to respond.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. I will do  
25 my best to respond.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's Okay. I -- I  
3 think Dr. Flores, that there are, again the criteria here  
4 is -- is twofold one in option two. It is still state  
5 licensure and endorsement is still absolutely accountable  
6 there. The difference really, and this is the biggest  
7 places that I see it as a former Chief Human Resource  
8 Officer for district. Here is where I see it the option two  
9 meaningful for districts as we have the conversation. Is  
10 again, I'll go back to Colleen O'Neil, the English teacher.

11 I have 24 credit hours in math in a multitude  
12 of math. My primary focus is statistics. If I don't have  
13 an endorsement, but I'm a teacher and I have four hours that  
14 I'm teaching English, and I'm in a small rural school  
15 district, and I actually have two hours that we need a math  
16 teacher, and I can show 24 credit hours that meets that  
17 need, but don't have an endorsement in it, or I'm -- I'm not  
18 able to get my endorsement at that moment, then my principal  
19 can assign me to teach those -- those two classes, and I  
20 will be considered an infield teacher, because I've  
21 demonstrated that, I still have 24 credit hours in that  
22 math.

23 So my content is still there. Now, that's a  
24 little bit different, again, from potentially a school, a  
25 charter school, and I'll use that example, because they're



1 often the ones that licensure waivers. So, I don't have a  
2 teaching degree at all, but I have very strong content  
3 knowledge in two subject areas then I can be considered an  
4 infield teacher because I have demonstrated by 24 hours by  
5 content assessment or by degree. And I -- I will go on  
6 record a little bit of saying is there's -- they're  
7 equitable.

8                   Those exact same criteria are really the same  
9 criteria that we use for endorsements, and you have a  
10 waiver, you know, in the first one to be able to do that.  
11 So, it's -- it's really an interesting conu -- conundrum.  
12 However, for this particular example that's where that  
13 flexibility lies. Okay.

14                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Steve.

15                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Madam Chair.  
16 Couple of things, one, both items, both choice one and  
17 choice two comply with existing Colorado law. Choice two is  
18 the current way and the status of our waiver, so it's  
19 current practice. The -- I think the example that -- that -  
20 - that drove the difference that was made in committee was,  
21 one of the hub committee members has a daughter as a Ph --  
22 or almost as a PhD in math, working on math but does not  
23 have a teaching certificate because she missed all the  
24 methods courses, and we can all debate the value methods  
25 courses.



1                   But, so the question is, could that  
2 individual be considered in or out of the field? If you take  
3 option two, it's infield. If you take option one, it's out  
4 of field. And so, the effect of taking option one is a  
5 limitation, because I believe reporting drives behavior, and  
6 I don't think it's -- I -- I think -- you have -- you have  
7 to keep that in mind that -- that when you start reporting  
8 on this, you'll get held accountable in some ways. The  
9 reporting is going to drive the behavior, and the behavior  
10 you're going to drive if you choose option one is to limit  
11 the supply of available teachers particularly in rural areas  
12 and the charter schools.

13                   And that's the -- that's the debate that's  
14 going on. And I believe that's why the hub committee voted  
15 to support option two. And that its current practice is  
16 compliant with existing Colorado law. It expands the pool  
17 of qualified teachers that are likely to get hired, and is  
18 not disruptive from current practice. Thank you.

19                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, just to orient you  
22 to this piece of paper. You just see the columns o --  
23 option one and option two, and then how they apply to state  
24 law, how a teacher would demonstrate what the administrative  
25 burden was, and then the consistency. And so, it outlines



1 each of those options there.

2 But, Mr. Durhams is correct in that option  
3 two gives you more ways to report, what infield teaching  
4 looks like, and that's where the hub landed.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which was it? Go ahead  
6 (indiscernible)

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was my follow-up with  
8 that re -- have read here. That CDE has always chosen to  
9 report for all schools. Well, when it comes to reporting,  
10 we -- you guys do all schools, but the -- but you also there  
11 I better ask. What's the -- what's the conversation in the  
12 so far, ending point on that report for all schools. We're  
13 just -- we're just hope that if there's an equity issue that  
14 arises, that we know about it and can address it to  
15 something. What about our reporting?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jennifer do you want to  
17 talk about the equity?

18 MS. JENNIFER: Sure. So, the question about  
19 whether or not to include all schools, that's -- to be  
20 clear, that's not related to whether or not we would look  
21 at, whether or not teachers are in field or not, and apply  
22 any sort of requirement that has to do with calculating the  
23 rates at which teachers are ta -- I mean, I think students  
24 are taught by these different categories of teachers.

25 And we raised that question because the US --



1 the US Department of Education in their template for our  
2 state plan, instructed us to look at low income and minority  
3 students in Title I schools, and non-low income, and non-  
4 minority students, and non-Title I schools. Which leaves  
5 out our low income and minority students that attend schools  
6 that don't receive Title I funds, and we know there are a  
7 lot of those students. And so, that -- that question is  
8 relation to ensuring that they're included in the  
9 calculation, so we're looking at the kinds of teachers that  
10 they have access to as well.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did that answer your  
12 question?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I'll think about  
14 it some more. I don't -- I don't want to -- I really have  
15 to think about it some more, because I've got to decide  
16 whether or not what you -- what you're talking -- what we  
17 are talking about in terms of the infield versus the  
18 disproportionality of assignments.

19 I mean, I'm -- I'll work on it. I will try  
20 to separate them, which is I feel -- what I feel I'm being  
21 you want to do. And I'll try to get there but I'm not right  
22 now. So, please, feel free to go on.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, let me just add to  
24 Steve's comments. The folks who voted differently, who  
25 voted for option one, I believe did so on the basis that



1 identifying whether a teacher has met their requirements to  
2 be identified as infield are going -- are likely to vary  
3 district by district depending on how the school evaluates  
4 that person's transcript.

5                   And so that there is very possible that a  
6 teacher would be considered an English teacher in one  
7 district, but would not qualify in another, simply because  
8 that second district has different standards depending on  
9 what courses the individual teacher had taken. So, in other  
10 words, it's -- it was mo -- more an issue of consistency in  
11 evaluating whether someone is infield or not than anything  
12 else. What -- it's not just that you took math courses, but  
13 what more math courses that might be very different district  
14 by district.

15                   And that's -- that was a value for the  
16 individual that -- that identified that. Rather than,  
17 having the state look at as it does now for endorsements,  
18 and having one set of standards for what qualifies for  
19 endorsement. Potential for inconsistency is there. Is that  
20 -- do you think that captured the discussion we had? So  
21 that's where the difference is coming from.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please proceed if there  
23 aren't any other questions. Kay do you have any?

24                   MS. KAY: No.

25                   MS. JANE: Okay. Then now that, that really



1 sums up the conversation we've been having around that  
2 subject for quite some time. So, we'll move onto the next  
3 one, the definition of inexperienced is the next definition,  
4 and that is right now the recommendation for that from the  
5 spoke and from the hub is that inexperience actually means  
6 less than three years of experience. So that really means  
7 our first year teacher who actually is a zero, because they  
8 haven't met the end of their years, so if I just start  
9 teaching in August, I'm only four months into my teaching  
10 career, so I'm still kind of about a zero year.

11 So, it will be zero, one, and two, so less  
12 than three years of formal experience. So that is the other  
13 definition that we have been having conversation about. The  
14 next one, I'm going to actually go ahead and turn it back  
15 over to Jennifer, so we kind of bounce back and forth.

16 MS. JENNIFER: So, this is actually what I  
17 spoke to when I gave the explanation to Portland  
18 (indiscernible) question about which schools to include in  
19 these calculations, so I -- I won't repeat that same thing  
20 again, but happy to answer any questions that anyone has  
21 about that process and what that entails.

22 MS. JANE: Well I guess, I would make a  
23 comment and, and, and my thoughts that I had at the hub  
24 committee was that, I served on the board of district where  
25 there were a number of schools that were -- that are not



1 Title I schools, but they do have a significant number of  
2 kids who would qualify for Title I. And I want the -- I  
3 would want -- would want the assurance -- assurances that  
4 those kids are also getting an equitable education, yes.  
5 And, that potentially this, this different way of measuring  
6 that's not has we've been doing just sort of ignores that  
7 group of teach -- of kids. I don't know whether, is that  
8 just a big district issue potentially or I don't know how  
9 Title I ends up being used elsewhere?

10 MS. JENNIFER: I would say not, because both  
11 in our large and our small and urban districts, what you see  
12 is there are not enough Title I funds to go to all schools  
13 and so they often get concentrated at the elementary level.  
14 So, even in our rural districts, you see high schools not  
15 receiving Title I funds even though they might have high  
16 levels popping-

17 MS. JANE: And that's where I saw the biggest  
18 inequities-

19 MS. JENNIFER: Yeah.

20 MS. JANE: -- in my district.

21 MS. JENNIFER: That is the recommendation for  
22 us to continue to go forward and look at all schools, and  
23 not just a subset of those schools because of those reasons.  
24 So, that is the recommendation of the spoke and the hub.

25 MS. JANE: Okay.



1 MS. JENNIFER: Jane are you okay on that  
2 issue-

3 MS. JANE: I -- I -

4 MS. JENNIFER: -- I can't touch on this till  
5 you answer or I (indiscernible).

6 MS. JANE: I -- I don't know. Is it going to  
7 come up later? Does it -- does it come in at all when we  
8 talk about inexperienced versus this?

9 MS. JENNIFER: No. There's just three  
10 distinct --

11 MS. JANE: I thought -- I thought I had a  
12 handle on this, we apologize for being such slow poke about  
13 this. I still -- tell me -- tell me what you as the former,  
14 the current, or the preferred way of CDEs reporting goes.

15 MS. JENNIFER: So currently, what we do --  
16 what we have done for a number of years is we look at the  
17 percentages of minority students and percentages of low  
18 income students in each school across the state, and we  
19 divide those schools into quartiles based on their  
20 concentration. So, you have the highest poverty, highest  
21 minority in that first quartile, and then on down into our  
22 lower. And, we include all of the schools in those  
23 calculations regardless of whether or not they receive Title  
24 I funds, this is how we current (indiscernible).

25 MS. JANE: Okay. And, for the benefit of



1 those listening and us as well. I (indiscernible). Tell me  
2 about the tours, how does touring connect to quartile?

3 MS. JENNIFER: Are you trying to make a  
4 connection maybe between accountability or accountability  
5 and our equity? There's, there's a little bit of it --  
6 there's a disconnect and that connection in some ways with  
7 that.

8 And I think the connection could be that, as  
9 we look at those equity gaps with these data specifically,  
10 it plays a role as we start to define our improvement plan,  
11 which is actually kind of our next definition because under  
12 SL, we are required as -- to make ensure that local  
13 education alle -- allegiances. I'm not sure what that is,  
14 that local education agencies develop a plan for just  
15 addressing the disproportionate rates.

16 So, when we identify those disproportionate  
17 rates, where they play a role is really in the unified  
18 improvement planning process. And so that's where the  
19 reporting comes in, when you see those disproportionate  
20 rates we ask that our districts are paying attention to  
21 those, and identifying a plan for that in their unified  
22 improvement plan in order to like -- to even that playing  
23 field back out for everyone. Does that help at least to  
24 give that connective tissue for that?

25 MS. JANE: Yes, it is and probably answers



1 other -- okay, connected part of this that's the decision  
2 about report -- I guess ultimately then this will be a  
3 question that can last for a long time from now on probably,  
4 will we -- as far as reporting and filing the plan and what  
5 is the -- what -- is there a read on it Mr. Chapman, and  
6 others about whether they're going to be willing to accept  
7 our (indiscernible) of -- our divergences a little bit from  
8 pure letter of the law and the rule and what were an  
9 alternate way can we build up rather than try to chop back  
10 from fulfilling some of this?

11                   So, if we say we'd rather have, we'd rather  
12 continue reporting as the way we're doing it now. Where all  
13 schools are looked at by our state and then we -- so that's  
14 th -- I think inherent in that is an assurance that the part  
15 they're requiring of regulating over is it will be done.

16                   MR. CHAPMAN: So I -- I do think that we  
17 certainly have logic on our side.

18                   MS. JANE: Yes.

19                   MR. CHAPMAN: So, I think for in -- to a  
20 certain degree this just may have been something that they  
21 didn't consider when they -- when they drafted the rules for  
22 calculating the equity gaps. I do think our fallback could  
23 be to calculate and report both ways. So, I'm looking at it  
24 more than just one way, I think the way that we have been  
25 doing it in the way that we are proposing to do it is the



1 best way, it makes the most sense and is the most  
2 defensible. But I guess we would have to wait and see  
3 there's no indication that they would reject looking at it a  
4 different way. So, I think we're -- we are on pretty solid  
5 ground.

6 MS. JENNIFER: Okay. Thank you all very  
7 much. So that does take us to kind of our last section of  
8 our presentation, which is really about supporting teachers.  
9 The other thing that we need to do under ESSA is really go  
10 back and take a look at how CDE is really supporting ar --  
11 around the effective recruitment and retention of our  
12 educators in the state of Colorado.

13 So, as such, its recommendations really that  
14 we've been gathering from our spoke, from our stakeholders  
15 through the listening tour from last spring all the way  
16 through today, is that the feedback around how and can, how  
17 can or should CDE support the recruitment and development of  
18 educators across the state. We mentioned a little bit  
19 earlier about educator retention and recruitment and some  
20 teacher shortages in the state.

21 So, we have collected spoke recommendations,  
22 we bring it forward for you today to contemplate what some  
23 of those are only and then any additional comments that you  
24 may have, so just a few of those off the top from the spoke  
25 recommendations have really been, focusing on educator



1 talent in the continuum around human capital and, and talent  
2 management. It is not something that our educator -- our  
3 educational systems do particularly well when other systems  
4 do it very well and one of my best examples is always,  
5 Google. So, we've had a lot of feedback somewhat from our  
6 spoke and from our field talking about how can we really  
7 develop a recruiting and retention pipeline that really  
8 supports educators staying.

9                   The fewer educators that leave the  
10 profession, the less we have to bring into the profession  
11 and the stronger our system is as a whole, so that's one of  
12 those options. Job boards for rural, rural communities or  
13 rural positions, fostering and enhancing our teacher cadet  
14 programs.

15                   And then supports to enhance our teachers  
16 ability to dif -- to differentiate their instruction,  
17 especially for our culturally and linguistically diverse  
18 students. So, those are just a few of the recommendations.  
19 We have a little, quite a list of recommendations that folks  
20 have had.

21                   So, the decision point there that we would  
22 invite more and additional feedback always around is what  
23 other supports are you hearing from the field or do you make  
24 recommendations for CDE staff to take under consideration to  
25 put into as a plan at a high level will not be at a detailed



1 level, but at a high level to ensure that we have our  
2 educator talent pipeline is truly full and we have a strong,  
3 strong leadership team there.

4                   So, with -- it would help if I was on the  
5 right side, that side on that. So, with that, that is  
6 actually the conclusion of our presentation. We're happy to  
7 talk about any additional questions or anything else that  
8 has come up, that is the gist of what our leadership team  
9 are, are effective teaching and leadership team has been  
10 working on the spoke and hub.

11                   MS. JANE: Any other comment? Yes, Dr. Carr.

12                   DR. CARR: As you say -- I'm just wondering  
13 what the higher education people are going to do, I mean,  
14 what they think about this? I mean that -- this really does  
15 kind of doesn't both -- vote well for colleges of education.

16                   MS. JENNIFER: (indiscernible) we have  
17 certainly been working in partnership with the Department of  
18 Higher Education to identify more and additional pathways,  
19 alternative preparation lives solely in the Colorado  
20 Department of Education, traditional pathways institutes  
21 higher education lives partnerships with the Department of  
22 Higher Education.

23                   So, we continue to work on that. We are  
24 garnering feedback from them as well and, and we, we are  
25 looking forward to a collaborative, collaborative effort to



1 help with our talent pipeline.

2 MS. JANE: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I just touch on a  
4 question regarding the three percent set aside for Direct  
5 Student Services?

6 MS. JENNIFER: I think that's in the next  
7 part, isn't it?

8 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. We'll, be covering that  
9 in more detail.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You want to wait for  
11 that later?

12 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Then I'll save  
14 that for the next time.

15 MS. JENNIFER: Great.

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

17 MS. JENNIFER: Thank you.

18 MS. JENNIFER: Yes, Joyce.

19 MS. JOYCE: There's a chart in, in the board  
20 desk --

21 MS. JENNIFER: Yeah.

22 MS. JOYCE: -- but I don't have it in my  
23 packet.

24 MS. JENNIFER: That's okay.

25 MS. JOYCE: And it says, "Meeting K12 teacher



1 qualification requirements, ESSA. Local imp -- implications  
2 of Colorado." It's a one page-

3 MS. JENNIFER: This is the flowchart.

4 MS. JOYCE: Flowchart.

5 MS. JENNIFER: Oh, flowchart. Oh, really.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was really helpful.

7 Yes.

8 MS. JENNIFER: The hiring -- so, as a human  
9 resources person, that is important information that it is  
10 very -- it is a somewhat complicated flowchart-

11 MS. JOYCE: I find it-

12 MS. JENNIFER: -that we developed.

13 MS. JOYCE: I find it to be very clear. It's  
14 straightforward and-

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. That was a great  
16 piece.

17 MS. JOYCE: -from what I've heard this is  
18 extremely helpful, but was this something the Hub Committee  
19 came up with combining our state law?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Spoke.

21 MS. JOYCE: The spoke? I' sorry.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Spoke came up with it,  
23 right?

24 MS. JENNIFER: No. So that flowchart  
25 actually illustrates only option one. So, where we're using



1 the endorsement as the measure of Enfield the spoke  
2 committee recommended that we put that together to clarify  
3 sort of, the considerations that a district would have to go  
4 into when they're making decisions about who to hire under  
5 what.

6 MS. JOYCE: Do we have one for option two?

7 MS. JENNIFER: No, we do not, but we can  
8 certainly put one together. It would probably be a much  
9 larger page.

10 MS. JOYCE: Yes, but thank you. I -- I was  
11 quite clear with that.

12 MR. CHAPMAN: So, Jennifer, will you be able  
13 to produce that soon?

14 MS. JENNIFER: I guess so. I would love to.  
15 I enjoy making those.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, going back to the --  
17 if I may the recruitment and retention resource bank for the  
18 self-assessment of healthy human capital systems. What I  
19 don't hear because of the terminal I'm sure that what that  
20 includes is an ex -- an extensive induction program that  
21 probably could be improved for -- from what I read from a  
22 lot of the education experts, there is not a teacher  
23 shortage.

24 There's a super -- there's a tremendous  
25 challenge in keeping our teachers and we lose half of them



1 in the first three years. And that our efforts should be,  
2 many of our efforts should be in this particular area. And  
3 I'm not meaning to be critical of the terminology but this  
4 doesn't jump out at me and said -- and says, we have young  
5 people who have spent thousands of dollars in order to  
6 prepare to become teachers and they don't feel supported  
7 enough in those first three to five years to stay in the  
8 profession.

9                   That this is probably our -- likely our best  
10 source of being able to maintain our teaching force. And so  
11 I'd be grateful if you'd flash that one out a bit more. And  
12 to the extent that you have specific suggestions on how to  
13 enrich induction. So that districts don't just have to  
14 check off.

15                   I mean, I think districts have to check off  
16 and tell the department that they, in fact, have an  
17 induction program. That's the first place that gets cut  
18 when there are budget cuts in most school districts. And a  
19 huge -- it makes a huge difference.

20                   MS. JENNIFER: Thank you.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In keeping our, our  
22 students whether they graduated from our alternative license  
23 or went through and as I said got themselves thoroughly in-  
24 depth at a -- in a graduate program or however, they became  
25 licensed.



1 MS. JENNIFER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
2 agree wholeheartedly. And we are looking at other ways to  
3 help our early career educators along that continuum. A lot  
4 of research is also coming out about the networking of even  
5 our veteran teachers and how the mentoring programs that are  
6 associated often with induction is not just a moment in  
7 time.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 MS. JENNIFER: And induction has often been  
10 associated with a moment in time. It's an event instead of  
11 a system and a continuation. And we are looking at many  
12 ways that we can do that and would welcome any additional  
13 insight. So, thank you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I don't have the  
15 solutions I just know that this is where, this is where  
16 we're losing ground tremendously. That refers-

17 DR. FLORENCE: I have another, I have another  
18 vision and that is a lot of people really think that they  
19 want to teach. I remember giving a values inventory when I  
20 was teaching a course in history and philosophy of education  
21 and know, "What do you want in life?" and it -- it -- it is  
22 an inventory. And some people wanted, you know, they wanted  
23 Mercedes and they wanted big houses and stuff. You know,  
24 "Well, then what will you want in five years and such?" And  
25 so, you know, it was to bring them to the reality that



1 teachers don't make a lot of money.

2                   Now, if we did give teachers -- if we paid  
3 teachers well and if we gave teachers the respect that they  
4 need and if we change the situation of school in such a way  
5 that it -- it wouldn't be so hard. And it is very hard. It  
6 is very hard for teachers and I think sometimes it's only  
7 three years that many of them say, "I'll only give three  
8 years. I'm going to try and get into that law school  
9 because I think this is too hard and it doesn't pay." And  
10 they're not going to get the rewards that they need.

11                   So I think that it's a reward issue that we  
12 don't pay teachers enough. The -- the work is hard and we  
13 just don't keep them. Even those teachers that are highly  
14 motivated to, to continue as teachers, who want to continue  
15 and teachers but they want a family, they want all these  
16 other things that all these other professions want, but we  
17 don't pay them. We don't reward them. Sometimes, I think  
18 some people would have stayed if they had gotten a little  
19 gold star, you know, for the work that they did. Sometimes  
20 it -- it takes a gold star, but it's rewards such as monies  
21 and gold stars and such that I think keep people.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dr. Florence,  
23 unfortunately, we don't -- we in this board don't have the  
24 capacity to provide -

25                   DR. FLORENCE: No, but I, but I just wanted



1 to bring up a different reality that I think is, is out  
2 there.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's definitely out  
4 there.

5 DR. FLORENCE: Thank you.

6 MS. JENNIFER: Mr. Chapman. We're ready for  
7 part two.

8 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. So for the next  
9 portion and I think we can make up a little bit of ground  
10 here. We're going to go through three things. We're going  
11 to go through the ESSA assurances, the two time -- types of  
12 assurances; general assurances and program-specific  
13 assurances.

14 The decision here is simply should we or can  
15 we provide the required assurances to the US Department of  
16 Education? For the next part, we'll be going through the  
17 title three, Standardized Entrance and Exit Procedures as a  
18 requirement that we establish standardized procedures and,  
19 and there are some criteria that needs to be established as  
20 part of that.

21 The decision point is does the state board  
22 approve the proposed methodology and timelines to determine  
23 identification and re-designation criteria? We would like to  
24 do that up in 2018, 2019 so we really need a little bit more  
25 time to establish the criteria. We have the procedures in



1 place.

2                                   And then finally the, the third decision  
3 point that we'll be reviewing with you now is it relates to  
4 the Title I, Direct Student Services grant. The decision  
5 point there is should CDE retain three percent of the  
6 state's Title I funds to make Direct Student Services grants  
7 available to school districts and boards of Cooperative  
8 Educational Services? So -

9                                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

10                                  MR. CHAPMAN: It's all right there in the  
11 slide.

12                                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to. You had  
13 me.

14                                  MS. JENNIFER: It's not even Friday  
15 afternoon, you know. It's only Thursday.

16                                  MR. CHAPMAN: So to begin with the, the  
17 assurances as I noted there's, there are really two types of  
18 assurances. The assurance has really simply sort of, the  
19 minimum requirements for the state. Does the state believe  
20 that it can meet those minimum requirements to receive the  
21 funding? The general assurance -- assurances are those  
22 assurances that cut across programs that are common to Title  
23 I, Title I, title three.

24                                  And they mostly pertain to administer --  
25 administrative requirements. So does CDE believe that we



1 have the proper fiscal controls, proper accounting  
2 procedures in place? Do we believe that we have the  
3 programmatic controls, programmatic reviews and monitoring  
4 and corrective actions in place that we need to meet the  
5 ESSA requirements? Do we have a complaint resolution process  
6 in place related to ESSA and are we in a position where we  
7 can agree to participate in any national evaluations of the  
8 title programs, Title I or title two and meet all the  
9 reporting requirements? We've been administering these kinds  
10 of grants for a large number of years so we do have all  
11 those procedures in place.

12                   However, we felt like this was an opportunity  
13 to revisit our accounting and, and fiscal and program  
14 procedures with the field. And we've done that pretty  
15 extensively to make any improvements, to reduce any  
16 administrative burdens tied to those procedures together  
17 with our, our stakeholders in the field.

18                   So after having those discussions with the  
19 field and revisiting our procedures, we do feel we're in a  
20 po -- position to provide the required assurances to the US  
21 Department of Education related to those general  
22 crosscutting requirements.

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chapman, does  
24 anybody ever say no?

25                   MR. CHAPMAN: So, yeah. The question is,



1 "Well, why are we bringing this sort of a yes or no? If we  
2 say no, can we access the funds?" So a lot of it is related-

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm glad you bring it to  
4 us but I'm just wondering whether any state ever says, "No.  
5 Give it to us any way or-"

6 MR. CHAPMAN: We, we did you sort of, leave a  
7 couple of the checkboxes blank here and there with the  
8 waiver and -- and they identified that we had left them  
9 blank and they came back to us to, to make sure that we  
10 check that, that box. We do have the option with regard to  
11 the, the program specific one.

12 So the general assurance is that would we  
13 really say no? We knew we need to come out and say that,  
14 "Yes. We can meet those minimum particularly, the fiscal  
15 controls, the accounting protocols." There are some program-  
16 specific assurances and we could choose to not provide an  
17 assurance if we do not want to seek and get an award under a  
18 particular program. But I think we're -- I will say that  
19 early on, based on statute, we had pulled out about 22 pages  
20 of assurances. The first round that, that the US Department  
21 of Education put out there and we substantially reduced that  
22 number of assurances and then the final copy of assurances  
23 that really is a kind of a handful.

24 Some of things disappeared as being an  
25 assurance because they're asking us to describe them in more



1 detail. So they want more than just a checkbox, but I  
2 really do feel that, that the assurances that they're asking  
3 of us are reasonable and that we're in a position to say  
4 yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: With regard to the ESSA  
7 program specific assurances, there -- a handful of  
8 assurances tied to Title I. In some cases, these are the  
9 types of assurances where we're doing two things.

10 We're giving them an assurance for putting a  
11 check in a box, but later in the plan we're happy to  
12 describe how -- why we believe that we can say yes. In more  
13 detail we'll have to describe it. The three that I'll run  
14 through really quickly, are that we -- we're asking that we  
15 have a consistent approach, in place to calculate graduate  
16 rate, calculations with the students enrolled in a school,  
17 for a portion of the year, and then later exit the school  
18 without a diploma and without transferring to another  
19 school.

20 This assurance is just saying that we will  
21 have a consistent approach. Alyssa and accountability team  
22 will describe the specific requirements regarding graduation  
23 rates and more detail with you, I believe in a couple of  
24 weeks.

25 Another is related to have foster care



1 children. Basically what they're asking is that, that  
2 school districts -- that the state work together with school  
3 districts to ensure minimal disruption, to a student's  
4 education, maximizing continuity of a child's education  
5 based on their foster care, status and then to make clear  
6 that you can use Title I funds, to provide transportation  
7 for foster children in foster care so that they can continue  
8 to attend the school that they had been attending.

9           The third, is related to teacher data that we  
10 will provide, the data, a lot of that or most of that is the  
11 data that we were just talking about, with regard to  
12 teachers on teacher equity, that we all collect, analyze and  
13 publish that -- those data annually.

14           So when asked, can -- do we believe that we  
15 can provide the required Title I program. Specific  
16 assurances, we believe and together with our spoke committee  
17 believe that yes, we're in a position to say, yes.

18           With regard to the -- the next program  
19 specific assurance from this, will feed nicely into the next  
20 portion that, Morgan and Marie Hotchin will be covering.  
21 They are asking, is this another case where we have to  
22 provide insurance and then we have to describe. Our belief  
23 that we can meet that assurance and detail.

24           These assurances relate to establishing,  
25 statewide entrance and exit criterias for English learners,



1 and their English language development program. Basically,  
2 saying laying out the conditions for the parameters within  
3 which we need to work for entrance criteria, and that, that  
4 are exit criteria are consistent with federal civil rights  
5 obligations.

6                   We believe we're in a position to say yes,  
7 but I realize that that's -- this is pretty complicated  
8 topic and that there are a lot of issues related to it, so  
9 without really, you know, going to the -- the assurance  
10 where you can loop back for the assurance. We want to cover  
11 this one in much more detail, so that leads to the Title 3,  
12 Statewide Entrance and Exit Criteria Section, and take it  
13 away, Morgan.

14                   MS. MORGAN: Good afternoon. Yes, we believe  
15 that we can provide the assurance for the standardized  
16 entrance and exit procedures for students that are  
17 identified as an English learner and then exit it from  
18 program. We currently do have those procedures in place.  
19 We do need to modify them a bend.

20                   So I just wanted to give you, an overview of  
21 some of what is in statute, and how ESSA is defining an  
22 English learner. I've bolded what -- what are kind of two  
23 areas that they must show proficiency and to be exited from  
24 a program, and so they show proficiency in reading, writing,  
25 speaking, listening sort of that social instructional



1 language, as well as the ability to meet state grade level  
2 academic standards, which gets into some of the academic  
3 grade level standards, and those -- that's relevant as we  
4 walk through the process that will set forth to establish  
5 this criteria.

6                   This is just the statute that says, what we  
7 have to do and just says its states must establish and  
8 implement statewide entrance and exit procedures. In  
9 December, I think it was December, December -- right before  
10 the holidays, they finalize the regulation, and these went  
11 final without any changes to the proposed regulations, and  
12 so it just clarifies what the state is obligated to do when  
13 setting -- when developing the procedures and setting the  
14 criteria, and the criteria is really associated with the  
15 assessment data, within a larger procedure or process, and  
16 so, it talks about the required states to, include unify --  
17 uniform criteria applied statewide, and prohibiting that  
18 local option.

19                   So if it -- if a district perhaps was using  
20 one assessment and another district was using another local  
21 assessment to be able to exit a student that -- that would  
22 be prohibited. They must include valid reliable criteria,  
23 and also include, a score of proficient on the state's EOP  
24 assessment which is for Colorado, the Access 2.0.

25                   This next piece is critical, as the



1 regulations clarify, that scores on the content assessment,  
2 may not be used as criteria. But in guidance, they want you  
3 to use that -- that data to inform students' performance on  
4 the C-MASS ELA, how that -- how those students are  
5 performing, when they have scored proficient on the EOP  
6 assessment or we did 2.0, and then that these criteria must  
7 applied to all students in the Title I subgroup and those  
8 students that may -- because it's a Title 3 requirement, so  
9 districts that may not be receiving Title 3 that they -- or  
10 maybe may not receive Title 3, both Title I and Title 3,  
11 districts and schools are -- this applies to that group. So  
12 if there is any, if a district perhaps decline Title I or  
13 decline Title 3, it still remains that same subgroup of  
14 students.

15 MS. MARIE: So as we met, and thinking about  
16 our current procedures and our transition to new  
17 assessments, we have a culturally and linguistically diverse  
18 educator, stakeholder collaborative that we meet with  
19 regularly, and so over October, November, December, and also  
20 next week, we've been working with that group of educators  
21 that represent the Colorado Association of Bilingual  
22 Education, Colorado Teachers of English Speakers of Other  
23 Languages, district representatives from -- that are  
24 Directors or Coordinators of English learner programs, as  
25 well as higher educators for linguistically diverse



1 education.

2                   We asked them many questions. I've just kind  
3 of -- I've just included their responses, as they relate to  
4 specifically the entrance and exit criteria, or the  
5 assessment. We asked them, should we use though the reader,  
6 which is our consortium, that we belong to -- for our EOP  
7 assessment; should we use their recommended level on the  
8 reader screen, which is a new screener that has not -- has  
9 not been administered currently, and so we use that, their  
10 recommended level and the initial classification stage, and  
11 are -- all our respondents said "Yes we should use that as a  
12 consideration", but we'd like to dig into the data a little  
13 bit more, and really look at Colorado data and how those  
14 students are performing.

15                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Mazick, can we --  
16 can we back up a little bit? The WIDA screener sounds really  
17 fun by the way. We should just -- the WIDA screener, that  
18 just sounds fun. But actually the WIDA is the consortium  
19 for the -- all those groups you just were mentioning around  
20 linguistically.

21                   MS. COX: Madam Chair, the WIDA Consortium.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not following you on  
23 that part.

24                   MS. COX: Sorry. I'll clarify. The WIDA  
25 Consortium is a consortium of states and US territories. So



1 it's 39 states and territories that have joined this  
2 consortium as a -- as their assessment to meet the federal  
3 requirements of the English language proficiency assessment  
4 under Title I and three. They also have standards that  
5 align to the assessment which, which Colorado has currently  
6 -- is currently operating with and has adopted. So that's  
7 our consortium of other states. Sort of like how part would  
8 be our content.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I didn't know we were in  
10 another consortium.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we've always had a  
12 second assessment. Question? Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is, is the, is the  
14 reasoning behind this the -- getting all the materials for a  
15 lesser amount of money would to have 39 states in a  
16 consortium together, is that the kind of intent of being  
17 part of a consortium?

18 MS. COX: Madam Chair, I the -- there are  
19 many re -- I mean, there's not a lot of assessments that  
20 are, that are standardized for English learners available.  
21 There are a few, and WIDA was one of the, you know, sort of  
22 the, the out front and researchers to get that established  
23 to meet the -- under the ESEA, the single instrument to  
24 determine and measure language proficiency annually.

25 So they were, they were the beginning that



1 started. WIDA initially stand for -- stood for Wi --  
2 Wisconsin, Iowa, Delaware, and Alabama. Now it means  
3 something different. But now there are 39 states. But it  
4 started with four states initially to meet the requirements  
5 under the No Child Left Behind Act in ESEA and now has them.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Fine. So Ms.  
7 Cox, when did we start using WIDA?

8 MS. COX: Madam Chair, 2009.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 2009? Have there been  
10 any other programs presented or do we stay with this because  
11 we're in the consortium? Or do we evaluate it or does the  
12 consortium evaluate it at any time?

13 MS. COX: The assessment administration or  
14 the results?

15 MS. COX: The whole program.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or the consortium  
17 itself?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Yes.

19 MS. COX: The, the assessments that -- this  
20 one -- the EOP assessment has not been traditionally under  
21 the peer review process, under the Title I requirement. I  
22 believe that that has moved under that now. But I -- I'm  
23 not sure the -- I'm not in the assessment unit. So I'm not  
24 sure exactly the -- how the -- the timelines for review of  
25 assessments.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm curious to know if  
2 there are any other programs that have come about since then  
3 that might be but, but we don't look at them because we're  
4 done this since 2009? That'd be one of my questions.

5 MS. COX: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I also have one more  
7 question. If we go back to slide 23, where it talks about  
8 speaking, reading, writing, and understanding English  
9 language, that they may be sufficient to deny him or her the  
10 ability to meet challenging state academic standards. Is  
11 that the same thing as the English? Let's see. You have to  
12 get proficient -- a score proficient on the English Language  
13 Proficiency Assessment? That, that is it. Okay.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Doctor  
15 Anthers.

16 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you Madam Chair. I can -  
17 - just want to say that we can get you some more information  
18 about the WIDA assessment, but sort of a, a different topic  
19 from this piece, but it was an assessment that we went  
20 through sort of our statewide procurement process on many  
21 years ago. But I'm hearing some questions so we can make  
22 sure you get more information about that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think I've ever  
24 heard of it before.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, whatever



1 other options, we'll, we'll also get back to you with other  
2 options.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 MS. COX: Okay. So, I'll move on to the next  
5 piece. In relation to the exit criteria, so the assessment  
6 data related to the exit criteria, we asked our  
7 stakeholders, again, should we use that performance standard  
8 English proficiency when we look at the composite and the  
9 individual language domain of reading, speaking, listening,  
10 and writing? And overwhelmingly, 100 percent said, "Yes, we  
11 should look at overall and individual language domains  
12 scores."

13 We asked again if we should set a performance  
14 standard or performance levels standard beyond WIDA's  
15 recommended level? And they varied saying, again because of  
16 a transition to a new assessment, the access 2.0 is now  
17 online, that there were many variables that we'd have to  
18 consider when we looked at the new crites -- setting the new  
19 criteria given that the transition to this new platform. So  
20 we -- they recommended that we would look at data and  
21 continue looking at that in relation to those students'  
22 performance, also on the CMAS English, Language, Arts and  
23 Mathematics.

24 This -- we did ask them this but it, it is  
25 relevant before we knew that before the final regulations



1 came out and, and said that we did have to implement in  
2 1819. At that time, we were not sure if we had to implement  
3 these criteria and these procedures in 1718. So we asked  
4 them if we should take another additional year of assessment  
5 data to make, to make a recommendation of a, a valid and  
6 reliable criteria, and they -- 100 percent said yes. We  
7 also asked them what -- when we looked at their -- the  
8 student performance on the content assessments, which areas  
9 of content should we look at and consider as we look at the,  
10 the triangulation of data between the performance on CMAS,  
11 and that on that EOP assessment? All of those respond -- all  
12 of those stakeholders responded, "We definitely need to look  
13 at English, Language, Arts." Other areas to consider were  
14 Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science. Any questions so  
15 far before? Okay.

16                   So we -- the decision points and what we  
17 recommend and what we present into the hub on Monday, and  
18 they had said, go, go forth. That our entrance and  
19 identification procedures will remain unchanged for 17, 18,  
20 and that when we have data from the new WIDA screener, that  
21 we will look at that too and, and consider WIDA's  
22 recommended guidance, as well as our own Colorado  
23 performance data.

24                   We'll look at all of that to make that new  
25 criteria Cap Point and performance standard for



1 identification. So, the decision point to Colorado entrance  
2 and identification procedures need to be modified. We said  
3 the procedures don't need to be modified. They remain  
4 unchanged. The criteria within the entrance, the entrance  
5 criteria would need to be modified based on new -- the new  
6 WIDA screener. Around the re-designation and exit  
7 procedures, similarly, as was the new assessment that there  
8 are a re-designation exit procedures would remain unchanged  
9 for 17, 18. When we have new assessment data, we'll have  
10 our second year of access 2.0 that we will use that in  
11 collaboration with assessment, accountability, and EL expert  
12 stakeholders from across the state, and look at WIDA's  
13 recommended guidance on the performance standard of  
14 proficient, and deter -- and when they have released their  
15 standard setting process, that we would look at all of that  
16 and consider all of that to set the re-designation or exit  
17 criteria within our procedures.

18 So, again, our decision point was to our  
19 Colorado rate designation and exit procedures need to be  
20 modified. They would re -- our recommendation is they would  
21 remain unchanged for 2017 and '18. That what we would work  
22 toward in '17 and '18 and take that time with our  
23 stakeholders and experts, that we would look at the criteria  
24 and look at how we establish that new criteria within those  
25 procedures. And they have also was -- agreed with that



1 recommendation.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that come back to  
3 the board? I keep looking -- I keep want to raise my hand  
4 and have somebody call on me, and so I'm really struggling a  
5 little bit.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's true.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does this come back to  
8 the board then once you get all this information next year  
9 and thereafter and then we'll have a long recap of what  
10 you've just explained to us because this is going to go in  
11 and go right back out? And then is there a -- this new  
12 screener is online, whereas the prior has been paper and  
13 pencil. Am I right? Did I understand that correctly?

14 MS. COX: Except for kindergarten. It's  
15 still a paper-pencil assessment for this screener.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we worried about  
17 that? Are we worried about the difference?

18 MS. COX: The effects?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The effects? Alright.  
20 What do we have?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Looks like we have  
22 several people willing to comment on that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. More than just a  
24 yes if you got it.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And right here when you



1 want to talk about it.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And actually might --  
3 that might lead nicely into -- Marie will be discussing,  
4 sort of, the next steps.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, then I'll just-

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we're going to go  
7 and she can address that.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. You guys can take  
9 away my (indiscernible) -- Oh, I'm sorry.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the paper and pencil  
11 and or?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well let's let them -- I  
13 think they're going to try to answer.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some of the questions.  
15 (indiscernible) and we're concerned about the difference in  
16 the two types of systems, et cetera.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The paper and pencil  
18 versus online.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, there is research  
20 that's come out. I'm sure you-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's what -- that  
22 -- okay, that's what-

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so for 2015 was the  
24 first year that we actually had the access 2.0 assessment  
25 given in the online format, and in Colorado we did have



1 about one third of our students particularly one very large  
2 urban district, who chose to continue to administer the  
3 assessment on paper.

4                   So, we have a very large sample to be able to  
5 see what the differences in scores were. And for 2015 we  
6 did see that there was a noticeable difference between the  
7 paper and online assessments, particularly in speaking.  
8 Within -- within that we accessed those four language  
9 domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. And  
10 speaking assessment, you actually have, when you're giving  
11 it in person, a human being sits and listens to the student  
12 talk.

13                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's not actually  
14 writing? It's not written?

15                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

16                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's in oral?

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's the oral part.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the problem, and  
20 we found that having a human being who can actually look at  
21 -- our guess is that a human being looking at your lips has  
22 a -- has a better chance of understanding what the student  
23 is saying than having a recorded sound bite of the child  
24 sent to a central scoring bank. And so we found that that  
25 was the biggest sort of discrepancy component, and that did



1 wind up having an impact on students' scores, and to the  
2 extent that actually for the 2015 results, we decided not to  
3 use them for accountability purposes.

4                   And we -- you know, we looked at all the  
5 information, we ran growth and we were uncomfortable with  
6 sort of the results that had come out of that for the  
7 differences between the paper and online tests -- testers.

8                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so you did what?

9                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so for -- we tried  
10 a bunch of different things decided for the moment not to  
11 actually use that data for accountability purposes. So  
12 we're not using it and we're not planning on using it moving  
13 forward. But then we are planning on working hopefully with  
14 the consortium to be able to figure out a way to adjust for  
15 that online paper score discrepancy.

16                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But there's more  
17 research than just on that issue, and the research does say  
18 that paper and pencil -- kids who take the pencil and paper  
19 do better than kids who take it on a computer.

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we actually found  
21 that there were particular language domains that the  
22 opposite was true that they actually did better online. So  
23 I would say that the EOP assessment winds up, sort of,  
24 bucking some of the trends of traditional online and paper  
25 but we have found that there are -- there are definitely



1 some differences, and that we're trying to figure out what  
2 the best way to deal with those moving forward is.

3 I think that right now the challenge that we  
4 have had is that the rest of the WIDA consortium states have  
5 the intention to move towards all online assessment so that  
6 leaves us in an awkward position.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, because? They  
8 don't -- they don't worry about it?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because it's cheaper.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's cheaper, that's  
11 right.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's cheaper.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the only thing.  
14 It's not that it's (indiscernible).

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so we'll have to  
16 make some decisions over time.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Joyce is working  
18 on this with the consortium so she can bring back more  
19 information. We can talk about it at a later date, too.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, well, when it  
21 comes back to some, yeah -- I think yeah we all enjoy a  
22 little more depth on this. Thank you. Sorry for  
23 diversions.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's good. This has  
25 actually been a lot of my life, for the past year. And then



1 most of what we are planning, sort of, I have some next  
2 steps to walk you through -- walk you through is, sort of,  
3 once we have more information and hopefully once we figure  
4 out some of these paper online, some of the other things  
5 that are happening, how do we want to move forward with the  
6 information that we have available to us to make the right  
7 decisions for our Colorado students.

8           So the first thing is in creating this --  
9 this definition of proficiency, we actually need to define  
10 proficiency like what does that actually look like for a  
11 student and what are our exit criteria. So as I said  
12 before, sort of, given the current limitations with the WIDA  
13 access 2.0, we were not comfortable doing not based upon the  
14 2015 results. We are going to wait until we get to see this  
15 year's 20 -- It's 15 and 16.

16           I keep switching them around, that this  
17 year's 2015-2016 results, 16-17? I don't even know what  
18 school year it is. The '17 results, and hopefully once we  
19 work through things with the consortium, we'll figure out  
20 how we can move forward with this new year of data, and then  
21 set the exit criteria once all of that information is  
22 available.

23           So, we'll definitely be coming back and the,  
24 sort of, the process for also ensuring that we've done our  
25 due diligence. We really do want to go and review all the



1 available literature on some of the definitions of timelines  
2 for quite acquiring English proficiency. And I'm sort of a  
3 lot of the general recommendations are five to seven years.  
4 But we all know this is a big topic of conversation so we'll  
5 definitely be coming back with it. And we also want to look  
6 at the historical CDE data including both EOP and the  
7 content assessments and to determine sort of our state's  
8 patterns of your progress over time.

9                   And then especially the question ever and  
10 always ask this in comparison to their native English  
11 speaking peers, like how do EL students do on content  
12 assessments. So we want to really dig into a lot of that  
13 and look for students who have been redesignated if they  
14 were successful after they were determined to be fluent  
15 English proficient and if they managed to succeed in contact  
16 classrooms, and so do a bit more digging on this historical  
17 data that we have available to us to then help us decide if  
18 our previous expectations for proficiency were adequate, too  
19 low, too high, you know, how they should be changed before  
20 we get our new year of the WIDA access 2.0 data and  
21 hopefully once we have the standard setting information  
22 because with the WIDA access, 2.0, WIDA has also set is they  
23 just recently finished but not yet published information  
24 about their new standard setting process where they  
25 redefined proficiency level so that they are more aligned



1 with college and career readiness outcomes.

2                   So we expect those proficiency levels to  
3 increase in terms of the rigor and what's expected of  
4 students. So once that information is available to us,  
5 we're going to dig into it really deeply and see how it  
6 aligns with Colorado values for our students, and then  
7 determine how we really want our Colorado standards for re-  
8 designation to be set. And so it's kind of what I said it's  
9 like we are actually importing had referenced was we are  
10 going to convene a panel of experts, and you know who have  
11 expertise in assessing accountability. Second language  
12 learners know all of these fields, and get everyone together  
13 go through all of this information and try to figure out  
14 what is appropriate for our students in Colorado, and then  
15 use that information for several ESSA reporting purposes  
16 actually. And then also I always want to put in the caveat  
17 that as we get additional years of data, we'll want to  
18 continue to re-review this and make sure that nothing has  
19 changed. But with this mostly, we have -- we're telling  
20 them that we have a plan to figure something out.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the other states  
22 will be in a similar situation. So this will not be unique  
23 to us?

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that we --  
25 because of because of our large population of paper



1 assessment takers are in a slightly more challenging  
2 position than a lot of other states. But yes, other states  
3 are also having to deal with this transition both in the  
4 Access 2.0 and also with the screener, like there's just not  
5 a lot of information that any of us have.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we might just be a  
7 little more laggard than they.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so being more  
10 reflective --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe not.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're reflecting, we're  
13 more careful but with control.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, teacher.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're ahead of the  
16 curve.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. On the record.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Comments, questions?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, the final thing on  
21 our agenda for today as it relates to the Title I, Direct  
22 Student Services Grants and Brad Bylsma, our Title I  
23 Director is going to take that one.

24 MR. BYLSMA: Madam Chair. So, I -- I do want  
25 to bring to your attention that this -- this is something



1 new under ESSA. This is a decision point that we have been  
2 bringing to a variety of our stakeholders beginning with the  
3 listening tour. We'll let you know what we what we heard  
4 from those folks. We did want to provide the slide to pro -  
5 - pro -- to provide a little bit of perspective of the funds  
6 that we are talking about.

7                   So, this pie represents an approximation of  
8 the -- the Title I allocation that Colorado receives on an  
9 annual basis. And then the small pie pieces represent set  
10 asides that we take off the top. Some of them, most of  
11 them, we must take off the top. But for our discussion  
12 today, we're taking a look at the green pie piece which is  
13 an optional set side which leads us to the decision --  
14 decision point whether or not we should take that -- that  
15 set aside off the top before we distribute funds to  
16 districts that have schools that will be served for Taiwan  
17 funds.

18                   So, that green pie piece that we're talking  
19 about today represents again, 3 percent of our Title I  
20 allocation which is approximately \$4.5 billion that we as a  
21 State could take off the top, for very specific  
22 opportunities for those under-performing schools in our  
23 districts that -- that serves other schools with Title I  
24 funds. Those activities that can be funded with this 3  
25 percent relate to some high school activities.



1                   So, this is one of the reasons that there had  
2 -- had been quite some interest in the possibility of taking  
3 this set aside because the majority of the districts around  
4 the State serve only their elementary schools. So, this  
5 provides an opportunity to those high schools, particularly  
6 those under-performing high schools that would -- could be  
7 identified as struggling to provide some supports for those  
8 students. It also provides an opportunity to continue some  
9 of the requirements that were under NCLB that, were in some  
10 cases popular so, that is what the school's choice.

11                   So, this would be an opportunity for  
12 districts to continue that program where students get choice  
13 into higher -- a higher performing school in their district  
14 and receive funds to support the transportation, or to  
15 provide supplemental educational services of after-school  
16 tutoring, before school tutoring, summer school, and those  
17 types of activities.

18                   So, those were some of the allowable  
19 activities for that 3 percent set aside. What we heard, at  
20 least during the listening tour was, the majority of the  
21 respondents did not favor taking this 3 percent set aside  
22 for a variety of reasons. There are some pros and cons  
23 listed on the slide and those are pros and cons for taking  
24 this -- this additional set aside.

25                   We also brought this to the committee of



1 practitioners the ESS -- ESCA Committee of Practitioners,  
2 which is a group of folks that actually administer these  
3 programs throughout the state. We also present to them the  
4 impact of the seven percent set aside. So, back to that --  
5 the -- this pie that the seven percent set aside represented  
6 by the yellow pie piece is something that we must take to  
7 support schools on improvement.

8           That set aside will have a negative impact on  
9 all districts across the state in this initial year because  
10 it's -- it's larger than what we used to have to take for  
11 that school improvement set aside. Under NCLB, we only were  
12 required to take 4 percent.

13           Under ESSA, we will be required to take 7  
14 percent. So, our grants for school department created a  
15 spreadsheet that showed an approximate impact of that 7  
16 percent set aside on nearly across the State. Of all -- all  
17 LDAs would have been, will be negatively impacted. So once  
18 we brought that to their attention, the COP voted 17 to  
19 zero. Not to take that additional 3 percent set aside.

20           Also knowing that many of these activities,  
21 not necessarily all these activities, and it's -- it's going  
22 to be basically in a district by district basis. But many  
23 of the activities are allowable with this set aside could be  
24 supported through the regular Title I allocation.

25           So, Title I's just are schools with a



1 struggling title and schools could continue to support  
2 choice activities where they're tied in one funds, if they  
3 choose to and find that as a need. Certainly, Title I's  
4 districts can continue to support supplemental educational  
5 services with Taiwan funds.

6                   Those districts that do serve their high  
7 schools could also support some of those activities that are  
8 allowable with that set aside. So, that the recommendation  
9 from all of the voices that we heard around the State, and  
10 the different subgroups that we've met with, stakeholder  
11 groups that we've met with, we are recommending that we do  
12 not take that 3 percent set aside, then that -- that green  
13 pie piece would be absorbed in the blue pie piece and \$4.5  
14 million would be distributed to districts to support their -  
15 - their schools.

16                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Mr.  
17 (indiscernible).

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
19 They -- is there enough flexibility if we elected not to put  
20 this \$4.5 million back into the pot that the board could  
21 allocated to turn arou -- to a couple of turnaround schools.  
22 There are relatively few number of schools in the -- in the  
23 turnaround category to provide sufficient resources for  
24 meaningful change and or experimentation and to -- in order  
25 to give us an opportunity to demonstrate what -- what



1 alternatives might actually work in achieving turnaround for  
2 a district or a school.

3 MR. BYLSMA: I think the -- that flexibility  
4 more lies in that 7 percent set aside as opposed to just 3  
5 percent. This 3 percent is again very -- it's very specific  
6 to those schools that are under performing.

7 We could prioritize those under-performing  
8 schools to receive a -- a larger share of this -- this --  
9 that three percent set aside. Out of the -- the activities  
10 that it supports are quite specific in the law. So, we  
11 would be more limited to those support for high school  
12 students and choice in transportation. So, there is a  
13 little bit of more of a limitation there.

14 More specific activities are iden --  
15 identified for this 3 percent as opposed to a little bit  
16 more open door for evidence based strategies in that -- in  
17 that 7 percent set aside, which is \$10.5 billion.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are some funds if  
19 we -- we elected to try and create an example or two of  
20 something that might actually work in turning around a low  
21 under-performing school. We would have some resources to  
22 hold out as a carrot for trying perhaps more difficult  
23 strategies.

24 MR. BYLSMA: Correct and that -- the school  
25 improvement scope will be speaking with you all on the 26,



1 regarding very specifically about that 7 percent set aside  
2 and some of the activities that -- that could be funded with  
3 those.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Rebecca, do you  
6 still have a question?

7 MS. REBECCA: Well, it's less urgent now  
8 because I had thought that maybe it was prior to the time  
9 that you had explained that that 7 percent pullback was  
10 mandatory. I had understood it was a tighter vote split.  
11 Well, I guess anything would be a tighter vote split than  
12 17, zero. So, I was going to ask about per pupil, the  
13 impact per pupil spending, but I'm not sure I get the  
14 impression that we would be entertaining the overturning of  
15 the Hub and Spoke Committee's 17, zero vote.

16 Now that I understand that there's a -- a 7  
17 percent, it might be interesting to know what the per pupil  
18 impact would be, but I don't want to create extra work if  
19 it's not even a decision point since it's mandatory.

20 MR. BYLSMA: We had some -- some prelimina --  
21 prelimina -- preliminary calculations and it wasn't a whole  
22 lot as far as the per pupil now.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's 25 or, I still  
24 remember as being somewhere between 25 and \$40 per student.

25 MR. BYLSMA: It varies district by district.



1 MS. REBECCA: That helps put it in  
2 perspective. Thank you very much.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions or  
4 comments?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman, this is  
6 for you. It was a few months ago, when ESSA was first  
7 presented. Remember the day when your head exploded because  
8 of all the requirements? There was one specific -

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't remember because  
10 my head exploded.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. (indiscernible).  
12 In the beginning, we were told that with the SSA we had a  
13 lot more flexibility than NCLB and that was the mantra that  
14 everybody had. Now, we're getting down into the details.  
15 Can you tell me where your head is today as far as  
16 flexibility?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do feel that, that we  
18 do have more flexibility. I -- I think that some of the  
19 flexibility can be found in the, the allowable, what's now  
20 considered allowable uses of the funds, which allow for  
21 things like concurrent enrollment, APE fees, and things like  
22 that. So, there's a broader allowable use of funds under  
23 the, the title programs. I think that, that when compared  
24 to NCLB, ESSA is certainly more flexible.

25 When compared to what we had under the ESEA



1 flexibility waiver, maybe not so much. I -- I think that  
2 what the -- the criteria that they've established or some of  
3 the rules that they've established are pretty consistent  
4 with the rules that were tied to the ESEA flexibility  
5 waiver.

6 I do think that, that some of the -- that  
7 what we come up against with regard to flexibility, in some  
8 cases now, it's more that the our state law is maybe a  
9 little bit more less flexible than what's maybe possible  
10 under ESSA. If you were to ask me for an example of that  
11 right off the top of my head, I -- I might struggle, unless  
12 I might, might have one, but I -- I do think that, that  
13 compared to no child left behind, it's more flexible, less  
14 prescriptive perhaps. It's a little bit of a, a, a tougher  
15 call on the ESEA flexibility waiver.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And also way back when  
17 there was conflict between our state law and what ESSA said,  
18 is there enough flexibility that we've been able to work  
19 within our state law and still be able to address that or  
20 did we have some difficulty?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we are really  
22 trying to. I know it's maybe it seems like, it's taking  
23 longer than it -- than it should, but I really think we're  
24 trying to come up again to come up with a list of, hey,  
25 here's where -- here's where what we would like to submit as



1 part of our plan conflicts with the rules that have been  
2 proposed.

3 I think that our understanding is, is that we  
4 should develop the plan based on what we want to do and then  
5 submit our plan and if, if the USDE wants to come back and  
6 say, "Hey, that's not allowable." or, "You need to change  
7 that." Then we would take it up at that time, but I don't  
8 know that we have like a short list or even a long list. We  
9 have -- we've got some documents that were compiling where  
10 we're looking trying to describe -- better describe the  
11 flexibility.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted your  
13 general opinion at this point and thank you for that and  
14 also I think keep us informed on how that goes because that  
15 seemed to be a question we had back-

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It -- it's still  
17 -- it's still a question.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're close to having a  
21 document that have summaries at least for the accountability  
22 areas, where I think the biggest mismatch is ready for you.  
23 Marie and our team have been combing through not just the  
24 final regulations, but the comments where the USDE responded  
25 to the feedback that people gave them and in the comments



1 it's actually illuminated some flexibility that we didn't  
2 read in the rags.

3                   So, smart Marie was smart like, we should go  
4 through these comments and see what they say. So, based on  
5 those, we think we might actually have more flexibility than  
6 we thought. So, we're just trying to get, you know, that  
7 RTs and then we'll have that for you all.

8                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, that, that concludes  
9 our ESSA presentation for the month of January or at least  
10 the -- their first-

11                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: First half.

12                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The folks will be coming  
13 back to you on the 26th for your special session.

14                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much. It  
15 does seem to be jelling somewhat in terms of where we need  
16 to make some decisions. Thank you very much, I appreciate.

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think it's recess  
19 time again. Right?

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Back to recess.

21                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Back to recess.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, it's best to  
23 adjourn.

24                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh no, we don't adjourn.

25                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or we can adjourn?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I thought we recess  
2 each month. So, that we don't have to. Did I miss that up?  
3 There it's. Yeah. It's so confusing, but we're ne -- we  
4 never adjourned. We only recess until the next meeting.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I usually adjourned.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it kind of  
7 depends on the chair. I think some chairs recess, the other  
8 chairs adjourned, so it -- it's-

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. I'm going to  
10 adjourn. I'm really done.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The more appropriate  
12 choice.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh. Yeah, I just wanted  
14 to remind you there'll be another meeting in February.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Oh, yes. That's  
16 true.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we're going to stand  
18 in adjournment until the next regular meeting of the State  
19 Board of Education, which is scheduled for February 8th, but  
20 that's not right because it's actually, the next meeting is  
21 scheduled for January 26.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The next regular,  
23 regular scheduled meeting.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The next meeting is a  
25 special meeting.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is a special.  
2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Special meeting. That's  
3 why I thought we we're supposed to recess.  
4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh.  
5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, February is a  
6 regular meeting?  
7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What? We'll read that.  
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Together we'll  
9 get through it.  
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead. Hammer away.  
11 Thank you.

12 (Meeting adjourned)

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E



1 STATE OF TEXAS )

2 COUNTY OF TRAVIS )

3 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and  
4 Notary in and for the State of Texas, do hereby certify that  
5 the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set out.

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

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
12 and seal this 5th day of October, 2018.

13

14 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

15 Kimberly C. McCright

16 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

17

18 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

19 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

20 Houston, Texas 77058

21 281.724.8600

22

23

24

25