



Colorado State Board of Education

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

February 8, 2017 Meeting Transcript - Prt. 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 8, 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 MADAM CHAIR: So good morning ladies and
2 gentlemen. I'd like to call the board meeting back to
3 order. Ms. Cordial, would you please call the roll?

4 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham?

5 MR. DURHAM: Here.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

7 MS. FLORES: Here.

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff?

9 MS. GOFF: Here.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

11 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan?

13 Ms. McCLELLAN: Here.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

15 MS. RANKIN: Here.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder?

17 MADAM CHAIR: Here. Please stand for the
18 Pledge of Allegiance. Ms. Goff, would you please lead us?

19 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the
20 United States of America, and to the Republic for which it
21 stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and
22 justice for all.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Is there a motion
24 to approve the agenda, please?

25 MS. FLORES: So moved.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. So I would like to
3 point out to all of us, that we have a very full agenda
4 today. And as well, we have a commitment this evening. So
5 that we are going to need to drive in traffic across town.
6 So I'm going to ask that or suggest that, we very carefully
7 limit the amount of time we spend on questions and comments,
8 and maybe commit to two minutes or something of that order.

9 What do you think, colleagues? Do you think
10 that's a reasonable way to get through this agenda?

11 MR. DURHAM: Commit to -- I'm sorry, two
12 minutes for?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Two minutes of questions for
14 each of us, and then we can go on to the next person.

15 MR. DURHAM: Isn't this like the US Senate
16 where we can speak unlimited? No, I'm just kidding.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Well, no.

18 MR. DURHAM: Just thought I'd point that out.

19 MS. FLORES: Well, there are some important
20 issue.

21 MR. DURHAM: There's a precedent for that.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

23 MR. DURHAM: I will do my best to limit my
24 comments.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. We'll be very grateful.



1 Consent agenda. May I have a motion, please, for the
2 consent agenda?

3 MS. McCLELLAN: I move that we approve the
4 consent agenda.

5 MADAM CHAIR: It has to be read.

6 MS. McCLELLAN: Oh, I beg your pardon.

7 MS. FLORES: And I have a couple of issues.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Could you just wait a sec?

9 MS. FLORES: Sure.

10 MS. McCLELLAN: I'll put the motion on the
11 floor. I move to place the following matters on the consent
12 agenda.

13 I move 40 -- item 14.01 regarding
14 disciplinary proceedings concerning an application, charge
15 number 2014EC1315. Direct Department staff to issue a
16 notice of denial and appeal rights to the applicant, to
17 pursuant to Section 24-4-104 Colorado Revised Statute.

18 Item 14.02 regarding disciplinary proceedings
19 concerning an authorization, charge number 2016EC29. Direct
20 Department staff and the State Attorney General's office to
21 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing
22 for the revocation of the authorization holder's career and
23 technical education authorization, pursuant to Section 24-4-
24 104 CRS.

25 Item 14.03, approve five- approve five



1 initial emergency authorization request as set forth in the
2 published agenda. Item 16.01, approve Cherry Creek School
3 District's request for a waiver on behalf of Heritage
4 Heights Academy as set forth in the published agenda. Item
5 17.01, appoint Wendy Fenner, Eryn Kaiser, Lisa Jarvi Nolan
6 and Jennifer Passchier, hope I got that right, to fill the
7 vacancies on the State Advisory Council for Parent
8 Involvement in Education, SACPIE effective January 15, 2017.

9 This is the end of the consent agenda.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. That's a proper
11 motion. Do I have a second?

12 MS. MAZANEC: Second.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you Pam. Any changes?

14 MS. FLORES: Well, I would like to go over
15 the accountability clock.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Flores, can you
17 speak into your microphone.

18 MS. FLORES: Oh, forgive me. Is it possible
19 to just go over the account -- accountability clock?

20 MADAM CHAIR: That's not -- that's not on the
21 agenda.

22 MS. FLORES: We aren't doing that?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

24 MS. FLORES: Okay.

25 MADAM CHAIR: This is just for the consent



1 agenda.

2 MS. FLORES: And the legislative priorities,
3 that's on the consent agenda?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. That is an action
6 item that we will discuss and then take a motion on.

7 MS. FLORES: Okay. So if it's not on the
8 consent?

9 MR. DURHAM: It's not on the consent.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham.

11 MR. DURHAM: Well, unfortunately, I see the
12 things have been renumbered since I read the agenda. So
13 someone will help me get the proper numbers. I apologize.
14 But the agenda this morning was different from the one I
15 picked up yesterday or day before. So I would like to
16 remove from the consent agenda what used to be item 15.03,
17 which is -- or was at the time the emergency authorizations.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. That's item 14.03
19 now.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 14.03.

21 MR. DURHAM: 14.1

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 0.03.

23 MR. DURHAM: Okay. I'd like to remove that
24 from the consent agenda and I would like to remove item 18
25 or what was 18.01, appointments to the State Advisory



1 Council.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is now 17.01.

3 MR. DURHAM: Which is now 17.01. Then I have
4 a question regarding what is now 15.01 for 15.03, and it's
5 just an informational thing that may -- may not want that
6 off the consent agenda, but I -- I think I read these is all
7 simply the repeal of rules that are in conflict of statute,
8 is that accurate?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 MR. DURHAM: Then I have no motion on those.
11 I'd just like to have those two items removed from the
12 consent agenda.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Board member, Durham, the
14 notice that (indiscernible) items were -- were not on the
15 consent agenda.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are not on consent
17 agenda.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we'll have those as a
19 brief presentation and then -- and then you'll vote on those
20 items.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 MADAM CHAIR: So do you have questions about
23 those that you want to be answered or do you want to have a
24 vote, a separate vote on the emergency authorization?

25 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, I want to have a



1 discussion on the vote. So I just want them returned to the
2 -- to the agenda whatever numbers they are now for me.

3 Pardon me.

4 MADAM CHAIR: I'm asking colleagues if there
5 are any concerns with that etc. So we are approving the
6 consent agenda with the removal of 14.03 and 17.01.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Any objections to that,
9 colleagues?

10 MR. DURHAM: I think consent agendas require
11 unanimous consent.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Right. That's why I asked if
13 there are any. Do I have unanimous consent or is anyone
14 objecting?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You do.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So we will
17 put those probably on at the end of the day.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we'll pick up.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Unless they're sneaky and
20 easily somewhere else. Would you be kind enough to let
21 staff, the appropriate staff know that we're going to talk
22 about them.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would do that Madam
24 Chair.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So the next side it



1 moves to report from the Director of Board Relations. Ms.
2 Cordial?

3 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good
4 morning Madam Chair, Members of the board, and Commissioner
5 Anthes. Like to get my friendly reminder of speaking into
6 your microphones clearly and that be sure they're on when
7 you're speaking. For those needing to connect to CDE that's
8 wireless locate CDE hotspot and the password is still
9 Silver, capital S.

10 In your board packets you have the following
11 materials, you have your events calendar and your quick
12 glance expense report. Also in your packets and or
13 available onboard docs are the following.

14 For item 8.01, a memo regarding every student
15 succeeds act update, the accompanying of PowerPoint, flow
16 chart option one and option two from the effective
17 instruction and leadership spoke committee, as well as their
18 out of field minority position.

19 For item 11.01 you have a memo regarding the
20 kindergarten school readiness, assessment, solicitation
21 process, accompanying PowerPoint, a summary of the school
22 readiness initiative within a cap for K and the draft
23 request for information document.

24 For item 12.01, you have a memo regarding the
25 contingency reserve request and accompany it PowerPoint.



1 For item 14.03, you have a memo regarding the
2 five initial emergency authorization requests.

3 For item 14.04 ,you have a memo regarding the
4 Colorado English language learner educator professional
5 development and a accompanying PowerPoint.

6 For items 15.01 through 15.03, you have a
7 memo regarding the three notice of rulemaking hearings, a
8 red line copy of each rule, and the accompanying rule review
9 summary.

10 For item 16.01, you have a memo regarding
11 Cherry Creek School District's request for waivers on behalf
12 of her hitchhikes Academy and the supporting materials
13 pertaining to their request.

14 For item 17.01, you have the state advisory
15 council for parent involvement and Education member
16 solicitation process as well as their applicant --
17 applications and resumes.

18 And for item 18.01, you have a memo regarding
19 the state Board of Education Accountability Clock actions,
20 the accompanying PowerPoint and innovation plain rubik --
21 rubric, and management plan rubric for priority improvement
22 in turnaround schools and districts.

23 For item 19.01, you have a copy of Senate
24 Bill 114.

25 And for item 20.01, you have the draft 2017



1 legislative priorities. That concludes my report.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Commissioner?

3 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you, Madam Chair, members
4 of the board. Good to see you all. Just a few updates for
5 you on some housekeeping issues. Ju -- just wanted to give
6 a quick update. Many of you were aware in our JBC hearing
7 that we had been asked some questions about our salary
8 schedule and the classification of employees.

9 And I just wanted to get a quick update that
10 we are working very closely with the attorney general's
11 office on this matter and reviewing going through the whole
12 process and procedure on that. It's taking a little bit
13 longer, so you will be briefed on that a little bit later
14 today. But just wanted for the public to know that we are
15 working on that, we're diligently moving forward on that
16 issue.

17 I also wanted to note that, I give you some
18 background on a story that you had heard about possibly in
19 the media and some of you have been hearing from your --
20 your teacher constituents on this matter regarding the need
21 to have some fingerprints on file as educators come and
22 renew their license.

23 So just wanted to give you a little bit of
24 background on that and some progress update on a solution to
25 that. So in 2015, we undergo sort of our regular routine



1 audits of our all of our files and my licensure division and
2 during this routine audit there were found to be some
3 records that were missing, the fingerprints on file.

4 So there's been a lot of back and forth
5 trying to determine, you know, how those were missing. We
6 think this occurred many years ago, we think that it was in
7 some way a data transfer issue, either the files were
8 overwritten or somehow got lost in the file transfer between
9 CDE and the Colorado Bureau of Investigation. So we have
10 been working on this issue for some time, but it did require
11 in -- in getting advice from the attorney general's office
12 and others. It does require us -- we have to have a
13 complete file on -- in our files for all fingerprints for
14 educators.

15 We did ascertain that there are fingerprints
16 for those educators, so we do have files it's just who --
17 who is keeping the files and who has complete records. So
18 we know that we need to have a complete record on file, so
19 the issue we are working on to solve this how do we get
20 those complete files, without burdening educators.

21 We are very close to a solution on that but
22 we are not at a solution where I have all the details on it.
23 So I'm just giving you an update that we are working very
24 collaboratively with the Colorado Bureau of Investigation
25 and the FBI. They have been very supportive of this and we



1 are -- we're very close to a solution that helps our
2 educators not have to -- have incur additional costs in this
3 -- in this really -- really a file clean up.

4 So we will have -- we will have a -- able to
5 have to you a detailed memo on this next week. We're just
6 not quite at the put a bow around this just yet for your
7 information. So you will have a full scale memo on that
8 next week with our detailed solution in agreement with CBI
9 and FBI. With that, I think I just was going to you know,
10 reiterate some good news.

11 I think you all saw we all like a little bit
12 of good news, so it's kind of a -- kind of end on that note.
13 But I think you all did see our news release that happened
14 after the last board meeting, so just wanted to highlight
15 that our Colorado graduation rates have reached the highest
16 March 2010.

17 And so while we still know that we have work
18 to do, we did see a nice uptick there and our dropout rate
19 decreased. So that was good news around that bad news
20 release went out on January 19th. So it's just always good
21 to report a little bit of good news there and I know you all
22 are. Just want to thank you all for the additional time and
23 effort you're putting in with the ESSA work.

24 We know that -- that's a huge additional
25 heavy lift to be reviewing information and preparing for.



1 And also your continued engagement as we work through the
2 accountability Clock process which we've never done before,
3 so we're all doing that. So thank you so much there. You
4 will get additional updates from the ESSA group today but
5 there was -- you may have seen in the news that -- let's
6 see, was it the house?

7 Yesterday, under the Congressional Review
8 Act, the House did vote to pass a resolution to repeal the
9 U.S. Department Regulations on ESSA. It still needs to go
10 through the senate and we -- they don't expect a vote on
11 that until early next week. What I will say is all of the
12 advice including most likely guidance coming from the U.S.
13 Department of Education is that we should continue on our
14 path because the law is still in place.

15 We still have to submit a plan in order to
16 receive our federal funding. So we are, you know, we are
17 tracking this very closely but we're not changing our
18 process in any way. We're gonna keep moving forward on our
19 planned development, but I just want you to be aware of that
20 latest update from yesterday, so with that, Madam Chair.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any questions for
22 the commissioner? Mr. Durham?

23 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Thank you Madam
24 Chair. I mean, the ESSA Plan, as I've had the chance to
25 observe is a most Herculean effort on the part of the staff



1 consuming lots of time and energy. But I guess part of the
2 question we may still have to submit a plan but if these
3 rules are repealed, and you -- we shouldn't do anything on
4 the presumption to their appeal but if repeal.

5 But should they be repealed? I think would be
6 appropriate for the board to have an explanation of what --
7 of the difference between simple statutory compliance and
8 what is absolutely required by the rules. So that we, at
9 least, have the opportunity as a board to strike anything
10 that is not required.

11 MS. ANTHES: Thank you.

12 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Believe on that. Is
14 there an example?

15 MR. DURHAM: I don't -- no, no. I have an
16 example that's what I asked.

17 MS. ANTHES: Yeah. We'll look into that --

18 MR. DURHAM: Right.

19 MS. ANTHES: -- around the details.

20 MADAM CHAIR: That's been part of our
21 discussions at hub. Is it in the law, or is it in the
22 rules? And I'm confident that staff is, where -- aware of
23 which is which. The next item on the agenda is the update
24 on the SS State Plan. Commissioner I will turn this over to
25 you, but first I wanna -- would like to say that I would



1 like to thank the many, many folks on staff in particular.
2 They not only worked for us last month to approve 230 --
3 some odd appeals. They've been working on this
4 as well as other items and I'm not sure the lights even go
5 out in this establishment. In addition to that we have so
6 many volunteers who have worked on Spoke on the Hub
7 Committees and I wanna express my gratitude and I believe
8 the gratitude of my colleagues for all the work that you all
9 have done. Now you can have it.

10 MS. ANTHES: Thank you so much Madam Chair.
11 I, I really do appreciate that, and our staff really
12 appreciate that. I do feel like part of my job right now is
13 just to keep the staff. I'm not doing a very good job but
14 just keep them moving because this is all on top of their
15 workload already, for both the accountability work and the
16 ESSA plan and it is, it is a Herculean effort.

17 So if they look a little tired, or sick, or -
18 - you -- you know why, yes. So I am gonna turn it over and
19 there's a -- there's different sections of this plan, so
20 I'll just ask our staff members instead of me introducing
21 all of you right now. Just -- just for the millions of
22 public listening to this just introduce yourself as you --
23 as you present your section of the plan. But I believe, I'm
24 turning this over to Pat Chapman right now to kick us off.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. Thank you



1 Commissioner, Madam Chair, members of the board.

2 MS. ANTHES: Yes, so sorry madam chair. You
3 do have some updated materials because the hub meeting was
4 on Monday. So again we know that you don't usually like to
5 get updated materials but because the hub made some
6 decisions, and we made some changes based on that. So throw
7 away the old one and here's the new one.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can make notes on
9 the old one.

10 MS. ANTHES: No. Sorry.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: All right. Thank you
12 Commissioner, Madam Chair, members of the board.

13 Today, we wanted to provide you with some
14 updates related to Every Student Succeeds Act, cover some of
15 the remaining decision points related to accountability
16 school improvement and effective instruction and leadership,
17 then hopefully if there's time to talk a little bit about
18 the next steps for posting a draft of the plan for public
19 comment and a time line attached to that.

20 There are just a couple of quick updates and
21 then we'll get right into the accountability section as the
22 commissioner noted the house did vote to repeal the
23 accountability reporting and state plan rules tied to the
24 Every Student Succeeds Act that goes to the Senate hopefully
25 next week. And -- but that's only for those particular



1 rules, the rules that were proposed related to assessment
2 and accountability assessment demonstration pilot, those
3 still are in place.

4 The U.S. Department of Education did
5 withdraw the rules proposed related to supplement not
6 supplant. In addition, the President Trump released an
7 executive order basically saying that if you intend to
8 create any new regulations, you have to plan on eliminating
9 two regulations for every one that you propose. So there is
10 a little bit of uncertainty related to the status of the
11 rules and the requirements tied to state plans.

12 We plan to move forward as the commissioner
13 mentioned just based on statute, what's in statute. And
14 that's really what we've been doing all along. Because of
15 the uncertainty of the rules, much of the impact of the
16 rules might come with implementation. So once we move from
17 sort of the state plan and working with our stakeholders to
18 develop a plan for implementation hopefully we'll have some
19 clarity in the rules by then.

20 In addition, we still have no solid
21 information related to the appropriations, the amount of
22 money that Colorado will receive, tied to Every Student
23 Succeeds Act. So that's a little bit of a difficulty in
24 working with our stakeholders, the school districts in both
25 cities as to exactly how much money they will receive. So



1 from a budgeting standpoint that makes things a little bit
2 difficult.

3 And then finally, as I think most of you
4 heard we do have a new Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos -
5 - and hope to be you know working with her moving down the
6 road towards implementation of ESSA. With that, I will turn
7 it over to Alyssa and Rey Hutchson to talk about the final
8 recommendations related to accountability.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks. Good morning
10 everybody. This is all a surprise. Today, we wanna kind of
11 give you an update on where we've gotten with the Hub and a
12 spoke, talk about the final recommendations that we got from
13 the Hub on Monday, and share with you that input we receive
14 from the Hub about the participation decision.

15 We know time is limited today so we -- we
16 streamlined these slides a lot, and are trying is to give
17 you the -- the high level where we landed on it. If you
18 want more detail, we've got that, we can stop and talk about
19 it, if you'd like but we -- we wanted to be able to honor
20 the fact that there's a lot of contacting them to be able to
21 keep moving. So since the last time we talked, which was
22 January 26, we've done a few things.

23 Marie, and Tina, and Josh Pradeau have been
24 sitting and running analysis over and over on a different
25 ways that we could look at the race ethnicity groups and



1 really seeing the impact of that, so we're gonna share that
2 today with you that we shared with the Hub on Monday.

3 We attended CCS, so meeting with other states
4 on the 27th of January which was actually really helpful,
5 there are some good ideas there. Just creative ways people
6 were reading a lot of seeing and things that we hadn't
7 thought of. So was a helpful time and we got some good
8 feedback on our drastic plan as well from that. We had our
9 final presentation to the Hub on Monday about and got their
10 recommendations for decision points, and we have drafted the
11 state plan all ready to go.

12 It's all ready for any updates that you all
13 have for us today and then ready for release end of this
14 week, early next week. So that's what we've been doing
15 since the last time we talked. Again, if you want more of
16 the detailed information, all the research and kind of the
17 analysis that were done behind, the recommendations today,
18 you can get them all off the Hub website at that link, we
19 can also send them to you.

20 If there's something specific you'd like,
21 just let us know. And then, on those remaining slides, the
22 green font that you'll see represents where the decision
23 points are, and the blue font is the recommendation that we
24 receive from the Hub. And then we tried to flag, there's
25 some yellow flags on there of what was going to get updated



1 because of the Hub and now what was updated and kind of the
2 results of that update. So these are the recommendations
3 the decision points that we have left.

4 Marie is going to talk about the English
5 learner assessment policy for -- recently arrived English
6 learners, the English learner progress indicator. We'll
7 talk about the major racial and ethnic groups, that decision
8 point where the Hub landed on Monday. The long term goals
9 and interim measures, and then the long term plan for that
10 other indicator we talked about short term plan on the 26.

11 We're gonna talk about that long term plan
12 today briefly, and then we'll share a little bit of input
13 that we got about the participation rate at the Hub meeting
14 with you all today. Okay? So I'm gonna turn it over to
15 Marie now.

16 MS. HATCHIN: Thanks. So this is Marie
17 Hatchin. Sorry, I have a cold, it's okay sneeze or cough,
18 forgive me. So why don't you bring forward to you guys some
19 information that we have the -- the Hub recommendations for
20 assessing English learners in their first year in the US.

21 So the decision point for the feds is how
22 should first year in US English learners be included in ELA
23 content of assessment testing, accountability, and
24 reporting. So the recommendation that we have received from
25 stakeholders and which was approved by the Hub is that if a



1 student has been enrolled in a US school for less than 12
2 months and is classified as Non-English Proficient or NEP,
3 and that classification can be made based upon the WIDA
4 Screener or local body of evidence, and then that student is
5 exempt from taking the CMAS Parcc ELA Assessment.

6 And then, if a student's parents choose to
7 opt their child into testing, that is a possibility and then
8 the score results will be used for accountability and growth
9 calculations. So in essence, students who don't have any
10 English language proficiency at all are exempt from testing
11 the first year that they are in the United States, unless
12 their parents choose otherwise. The second part of the
13 recommendation is that for students who are limited English
14 proficient and who have been in the US for 12 months or less
15 or also fluent English proficient, that these students would
16 be assessed on the CMAS Parcc ELA Assessment.

17 So once they have enough English language
18 proficiency to be able to access the content assessments,
19 then they would be given the content assessment.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And So how is that going
21 to be determined after -- after the 12 months or before the
22 12 months?

23 MS. HATCHIN: So it's before the 12 months.
24 So when students initially come to the United States and
25 enroll in a Colorado school, they are given a screener to



1 determine their level of English language proficiency. And
2 So based upon that information and then also their teachers
3 that they're working with the EOD professionals, can
4 determine if the student is not English proficient or
5 actually has enough language to be considered limited
6 English proficient and therefore to be tested.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And that's for
8 the first year?

9 MS. HATCHIN: Yes. So federal law is very
10 clear that this is only allowable for the first 12 months
11 that a student has come to the United States. There really
12 is no allowance for students who have been enrolled longer
13 than 12 months to be exempt from testing.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

15 MS. HATCHIN: And So and we did find that we
16 had very strong public support about 88 percent of survey
17 respondents, were in support or strongly support this
18 recommendation. Most of the comments, were supporting
19 exempting the Non-English Proficient newcomers.

20 There were varying opinions expressed about
21 testing the limited English proficient newcomers, though
22 there was general support for testing students once they had
23 acquired adequate proficiency in English to be able to
24 access the content assessments.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question on



1 page 11.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The backup loop? On that
3 test, that's where the student's parents -- cannot the child
4 in do testing.

5 MS. HATCHIN: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that in English? Is
7 that exempt?

8 MS. HATCHIN: Yes. So the ELA content
9 assessment is the English Language Arts content assessment.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that would be the
11 third year. I mean, that would be grade -- grade three.

12 MS. HATCHIN: Yes. So that would be in --
13 newcomers in grades three through nine, and then potentially
14 also in 10 and 11 depending on that college entrance exam
15 and precursor to college entrance exam and assessment state.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you. All
17 right.

18 MS. HATCHIN: So the next decision that we
19 had under essay is around the English learner or progress
20 indicator. And, the decision is how will Colorado
21 incorporate progress in acquiring English language
22 proficiency for English learners into our state
23 accountability system.

24 Just one -- again, it's a two part
25 recommendation. So the first recommendation that we have is



1 to continue using our existing sub indicator for English
2 language proficiency growth, which is the median student
3 growth percentile on our ELP assessment. So we have had
4 that for several years and -- and has been generally well-
5 received by the field.

6 This is an NGP metric, that provides
7 information on how much progress. Students with two or more
8 consecutive years of ELP assessment scores have made in
9 acquiring English language proficiency in comparison to
10 their other English proficiency peers. So -- So really this
11 is an apples to apples comparison in all of EL students and
12 how much progress they're making in acquiring English, and
13 the Hub and the public have been generally very supportive
14 of continuing our use of this metric.

15 And, the -- the less concrete decision point,
16 their recommendation that we have is that we need to add a
17 sub indicator for English language proficiency
18 accountability that measures growth to a standard on the ELP
19 assessment. So we have -- we have our current growth
20 measure but this is growth to a standard, so getting to the
21 -- the definition of fluent English proficient can get in
22 getting students ready to move into mainstream content
23 classrooms is sort of the end goal with these kids.

24 So we were posing to, you see the east
25 current six year stepping stone time line with potential



1 modifications and those modifications really depend on the
2 transition to access 2.0 and the revised standard setting
3 results, and that we are hoping to be getting this spring
4 and sort of digging into enjoying a little more analysis to
5 help us determine, what's appropriate. And, so this is how
6 we will set up this six year stepping stone time line to
7 determine students progress towards achieving English
8 proficiency, and how long those expectations are and how
9 much progress students should make in each of those years.

10 So one of the things that we did talk about
11 was that, if at any point a student did not make the
12 progress expected on the stepping stone trajectory based on
13 their prior year proficiency level, they would be considered
14 off track. So that is different from our previous stepping
15 stone out of grow -- growth methodology around English
16 language proficiency. So but that is in alignment with the
17 SS statute, and what it requires in terms of in -- in --
18 initial entry point for students and then in a defined exit
19 point and be expected amount of time that it takes for
20 students to get there.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So is that going to be
22 determined by an oral measurement or is that going to take a
23 reading measurement?

24 MS. HATCHIN: So the Eng --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On or both or?



1 MS. HATCHIN: -- the English Language
2 Proficiency Assessment actually includes for the content
3 domains of -- of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
4 So it includes both of those components for students to
5 prove that they having this proficiency.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And So is the -- we
7 don't want to be used or other measures to determine that.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what we're
9 currently using as a state right now, that's our state
10 English Language Proficiency Assessment. And So there are
11 some changes to it last year so we -- we need to look the
12 use the data from the new results to inform this measure and
13 that's why we are not as far along as we'd like to be.

14 We'll have more data this spring and be able
15 to start looking at some calculations. And with the -- with
16 that assessment, what makes the most sense with state and
17 form, so that we can have ambitious and attainable targets
18 that balance between the two of them.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if it's out of step,
20 what exactly is out of step and how would you remediate out
21 of step or what -- what happen?

22 MS. HATCHIN: So for a student who goes off
23 track.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Off track, excuse me.

25 MS. HATCHIN: All right. That's fine. I --



1 I use the stepping stone terminology, So out of step makes
2 sense too. So I think that, that is just sort of a student
3 who is not following the time line for progressing as -- as
4 we have a state have determined. I think that, that is
5 something that the -- the local ELP teachers would need to
6 provide, you know, additional instruction remediation
7 potentially to get the student back on track.

8 We do have limitations in terms of he -- the
9 number of years of funding that EL students can access for
10 the state. And then, we also just have reporting
11 requirements for the number of students who do not meet, we
12 have to report to the Fed, sorry the number of students who
13 do not at -- attain proficiency within our given time line.
14 There's no actual punishment for the child if they --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fine.

16 MS. HATCHIN: -- don't achieve this fair
17 goal.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So but the child will be
19 given remediation work in English.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know that I know
21 that. Actually, I'm not pretty -- I'm not -- I'm not the
22 content teaching expert on that but --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It means you're not on
24 step in English, then wouldn't the submission be to give
25 more work?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would assume that
2 there would be some kind of interventions that would be
3 appropriate.

4 MADAM CHAIR: No, it would be a district.
5 Mr. German.

6 MR. DURHAM: Yes, they would receive
7 additional support both in English and their native language
8 to move them to academic to get them to step.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we won't do what a
10 district that I'm close to does, which is provide all the
11 instruction in Spanish, and remember it's only the Spanish
12 kids that get this and they don't get the -- the English.
13 So we must provide -- we must provide the English if it's --
14 well if it's bilingual --

15 MR. DURHAM: So if they're not, excuse me, if
16 they're not on track for moving -- progressing towards
17 English language proficiency, that would be the support that
18 they would be given to move them more rapidly to English
19 proficiency.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, but we don't want
21 --

22 MADAM CHAIR: Are there some other questions?
23 I'll get back to you, if you not finished, but let me offer
24 it to other folks. Are there any other questions? Go ahead.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well I'm concerned that



1 -- that in a couple of districts we just don't provide
2 enough English language time -- time to learn English and
3 that we do it in another language which is fine as long as
4 we equal the amount of English and the other language. We
5 look at the data and we see that kids who are Somalian --
6 who are not provided the other language do better in -- in
7 learning English than do kids -- I mean, it looks as if kids
8 who are Spanish speaking are about the only kids who are not
9 doing well, and I guess what I'm asking is I hope they give
10 enough English so that they do, you know, get to that level
11 of English proficiency Spanish spea -- speakers as do all
12 the other languages because all the other languages do get
13 to proficiency.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Rankin.

15 MS. RANKIN: In my understanding that we're
16 gonna vote on -- we as a board are gonna vote on these
17 individual options as they come up or is it the whole
18 package? It's got to be right here on option one and option
19 two, correct?

20 MADAM CHAIR: So we -- this is the
21 information I didn't say. You all do not need to take a
22 formal vote. What we're looking for for me is just to
23 inform you of where we're going, get any feedback if you
24 feel like we're off track anyway before the draft plan goes
25 out, and then you all will vote on the whole side -- the



1 whole State plan when in March or April, is that the time?

2 MR. DURHAM: It will be presented as an
3 informational item in March and action item in April.

4 MS. RANKIN: Okay. I'm looking at both these
5 recomme --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes please.

7 MS. RANKIN: -- both these recommendations.
8 Do you see -- I look at those that are at a high level and I
9 see teachers that are doing recommendation one saying, this
10 is working for me. This is the way I've been doing it. I'd
11 like to continue.

12 Is recommendation two more rigorous or will
13 it require more of the teachers to implement recommendation
14 two from recommendation one? And if we do change, will we
15 have the right information on the students over time or
16 might that be disruptive?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. So there will be
18 no additional burden on teachers to implement recommendation
19 number two. It's already information that is captured when
20 they give the EOP assessment. So this would just provide
21 additional information for them. I mean, it also ties into
22 several other portions of the SS statute that require that
23 we create this time line for attaining proficiency and set
24 goals for students moving towards proficiency.

25 So I think that we have to -- we will be



1 communicating all of that with district folk and anyway, so
2 this is just kind of going to tie all of their work into
3 that.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 MS. RANKIN: So this isn't either one or two?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are both. They're
7 separate issues.

8 MADAM CHAIR: So one of the things that I've
9 spoken about with Mr. German is that some members of the
10 board probably really know a whole lot about WIDA, and some
11 of us know very little. So we're looking forward after the
12 new assessment has been looked at, that we might have a
13 short session for the board to get a better understanding of
14 what this is, how -- how it is scored and then how it's used
15 in the various districts, and perhaps different districts
16 have some different strategies based on scores. But it
17 would help us -- It would help me to have a little more
18 background about this because I'm just struggling.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So at this point two or
20 one, is that?

21 MADAM CHAIR: It's a new one.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a new one but is it
23 a Spanish?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's a English
25 language proficiency assessment, completely in English and



1 it's not just specific to Spanish students, from all
2 linguistic backgrounds are expected to take it when they
3 come to United States.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Golf.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's an ultimate idea.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

8 MS. GOFF: Hasn't Colorado been operating on
9 a standard six year stepping stone time line? And so within
10 the districts up to now, you can buy in the new -- Has there
11 -- is there an average amount of time for interim
12 checkpoints or is there -- is that a district decision?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right now the interim
14 checkpoints are really done at the District level. I mean,
15 CDE sort of does keep track based upon students as they take
16 the EOP assessment every year, sort of how much progress
17 students are making. But right now it is -- it's left to
18 the district to notice if students are on or off track and
19 take appropriate actions. So this would really just be sort
20 of a little bit of a formalization of that process, and
21 putting it in the accountability system.

22 So there would be a little more transparency
23 with the students who are on or off track.

24 MS. GOFF: So our plan or the expectation
25 even in the past has been that districts decide when they



1 will do their -- most have done an annual basis which is
2 natural tendency anyway, but I'm just curious as to how many
3 -- what kind of, I'm not going to say risk, but irregular
4 results among districts or within a schools in a district if
5 -- if everybody's not on a relatively similar time line, and
6 has the time line always been a part of UIP plan or will it
7 be? Is that part of the expectation?

8 MADAM CHAIR: Let me back up a little bit
9 because we've had a measure similar to this recommendation
10 number two in accountability, not this past year but the
11 year before we had and the year before that. And that is
12 called adequate growth, right? We looked at to see if kids
13 were on track and the way that we measured adequate growth
14 for English language proficiency was a little different than
15 how we do it for English Language Arts or math, right?

16 That in the law is really specific. Kids
17 need to be at this level in three years or stay above it for
18 the next three years. But it's more of the stepping stone
19 idea with English language proficiency because we see it,
20 you know, we watch kids it's very developed developmentally
21 as they gain English language proficiency.

22 So there is a set amount of time that vary
23 with a lot of stakeholders looking at our historical data
24 were able to say, kids generally take one year to get from
25 level one to level two, one another year from level two to



1 level three, and then two years from level three --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Four to level five
3 actually.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. So we had these kind of
5 expectations. What we need to do is now that we have a new
6 assessment is to start looking at that data to see if those
7 are still reasonable -- reasonable measures. Then where are
8 the feedback came for how the recommendation now is a little
9 different than it was before, is we looked at kids
10 individually every year.

11 So if you had been that level one, three
12 years in a row, that same expectation was just to get to
13 level two the next year. But what the recommendation from
14 the spoke is it's a little bit more rigorous than that it's
15 looking at, if you were at level one last year and you
16 didn't get to -- and you're still at level one this year --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're off track.

18 MADAM CHAIR: -- you're off track, right?
19 We're not starting again. So it really holds all of us to
20 that six year time line or whatever the, you know, where the
21 data comes out to show us the most appropriate time line to
22 say, no kids are off. And they may be off for a few years,
23 maybe they'll make a big catch up later on and, you know,
24 make a jump from level one to level three or four in a year.

25 Who -- we don't know because we haven't seen



1 the data yet but that's something we're looking at. I think
2 we're going to have to look and see if it plays out
3 differently in different districts with different
4 instructional models. That maybe some district's kids are
5 staying at level one a few years and then all of a sudden
6 they jump to level four.

7 So that's something we're going to need to
8 look at it in the data as we have it. Does that sort of get
9 up what you're asking in it?

10 MS. GOFF: It's a good re -- reminder. Tied
11 in with that, how is this related if it is to the exit
12 decision? Because I think, you know, in a way right now it
13 feels like there is -- there being -- there is a fence kind
14 of being put around the whole thing, and you either jump
15 over the fence to get out in the field or not, at some
16 point. But is that related to this as well?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. All of
18 these components are sort of intertwined in different ways.
19 So in theory the redesignation or exit criteria is the end
20 goal of fluent English proficient that students are shooting
21 for, and that we would have the time line moving up towards.

22 We -- I have worked extensively with Morgan
23 Cox and the culturally linguistically diverse educator group
24 here and their stakeholder groups, to have conversations to
25 make sure that we're all on the same page. And so that, we



1 are using all this information in a consistent way, so that
2 it can actually be a single system that, you know, we get
3 newcomers and we track them as they go forward.

4 Once we determine that they will be most
5 likely to be successful in mainstream classrooms, then they
6 will get redesignated and moved out and with the new
7 assessment data that we have. But that's the big holdup at
8 this point is we have to wait to see what the new assessment
9 looks like. So we can determine what is appropriate exit
10 points are, and then kind of backtrack for how long we
11 expect students to get there.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I might have changed my
14 question.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Fantastic.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Reading minds that's
17 what we -- we appreciate that.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then just --
20 actually, I will go back one. So really quickly just so you
21 know, so our plan right now, to the feds is that we are
22 going to make a plan once we have the available data to us.
23 So we have a -- a whole series of investigation steps to do
24 and once we get it, additional data that we'll come back to
25 you with actual recommendations for the time line and



1 trajectories.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, board member
3 officer.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I have a question.
5 Six years is a long time. I'm hoping that, if parents ask
6 to have a child in, and I mean a classroom that is not ESL
7 bilingual in say the third year, that they will be able to
8 do that, that they will not be --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, parents always
10 have --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, they can -- a
12 parent can opt into services or opt out of services. They
13 have to be informed of the availability of services and at
14 that time they can accept them or decline them for their
15 child.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to clarify on that
17 time line, that's a time line from a fully non -- English
18 proficient student. So a student who's coming in knowing --
19 having no experience with English at all, to a point of
20 being fully English proficient which is defined as also
21 content proficiency on the state content assessment.

22 So it's not, being able to get around and
23 speak English and function in a classroom. It's all the way
24 to being proficient or a benchmark. And So it's just -- I
25 know it sounds like a long time --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's because I know,
2 kind of it's based on comments in Montreal who's a --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, quite a few
4 sort of big name researchers --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: People.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's just say five or
7 seven years is about the average that it takes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, can we move
10 forward?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, it maybe -- all
12 I'm saying is that you may be able to read and do better
13 than them speaking. So reading proficiency is different and
14 meaning proficiency than say speaking proficiency.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Right.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So hoping we can --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hopefully, we'll get --
18 we will be able to get in the weeds a little bit more about
19 this in the future, and I think that will help all of us.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. We're gonna keep
24 moving you all. So the next big decision point was
25 desegregation of the minority group. The law says, here



1 help me if I get this, that we need to have accountability
2 by major racial and ethnic groups, the reg said by each,
3 right? They added in that word each.

4 Regardless of where the regs are, I think
5 we're the stakeholder group in community got was pretty
6 solid and pretty unanimous on this recommendation. So I
7 wanted to point out to you that this was an area where the
8 regs were a little bit different. But, I think probably
9 it's a recommendation that would still wanna stand. We
10 didn't hear a lot of controvers -- controversy around us.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

14 MADAM CHAIR: It's all right.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Madam Chair.

16 The board actually has a policy on this, that we reached
17 some time ago. Is that correct?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you mean about the
19 combined group?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. When --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was slightly
22 different, so relatively different. That was not talking
23 about the individual racial ethnic groups, it was talking
24 about reporting individually for minority students English
25 language learners. Students that are economically



1 disadvantaged, that are eligible for free or reduced lunch
2 and students with disabilities.

3 So it was talking about all those groups
4 coming together in a combined way. This is talking
5 specifically about those non -- white students and how we do
6 the accountability and reporting there.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So in the -- under the
8 law which doesn't require as much desegregation, we could go
9 back to simply one major, correct?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You could potentially
11 interpret --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or a few number of
13 majors?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I think you could
15 interpret the law to saying, that you could have a non --
16 white group of students.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think, I don't know
19 how it all go.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't remember -- I
21 don't remember that issue being all the interest groups
22 being in lockstep, I remember it to be significantly
23 controversial, and I thought it was relatively close rather
24 that on the board --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: With the combined group



1 previously?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. That was --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they still -- so
5 somehow, everybody is now in agreement on this or because as
6 I recall case has we did not like the board decision.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So that one.
8 That is something that to me is pretty clear in the law that
9 you would have. The law calls out each major or the major
10 racial ethnic groups. English Language Learners students
11 with I'm eligible for free reduced lunch and students with
12 disabilities, are within IAP.

13 That the way this ESSA is written, I don't
14 think we could go back and revisit that combined group
15 decision. I think it's really clear that those need to be
16 separate, and that --

17 MADAM CHAIR: And that's where the impetus
18 was for that discussion last summer because superintendents
19 felt that we were double counting and triple counting.
20 Which is different than the discussion we're having now
21 about racial groups.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, because there's no
23 double counting with the way the -- the proposal is with the
24 racial ethnic groups.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if it does eliminate



1 double counting --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It doesn't eliminate
3 that from -- if a student is both economically disadvantaged
4 and Asian, they will still gonna be counted in both those
5 groups. But the students' never going to be in multiple
6 racial ethnic groups the way that it's being proposed here.
7 So they won't get double counted in that way.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I know, they're
10 related and kind of a level deeper than last year when we
11 talked about. So after our last hub meeting, the hub had
12 some good suggestions about how to think about
13 disaggregating further and what to -- how to ensure we have
14 the maximum transparency, but also accountability for
15 students. Where the hub landed, we ran some different
16 numbers and I'll show you the impact of those in a minute.

17 But what the hub recommends is that we use
18 the individual disaggregated racial and ethnic groups.
19 However, like you do that first round, and then if there are
20 students that are in groups that are too small individually
21 to report, say you have five students that are Native
22 American, we can't report that individually. But if in a
23 combined way the students that aren't in their individual
24 groups meet that minimum end of 16, we report in a combined
25 way the students that are together.



1 So let me show you an example of it because
2 it's a little bit easier to see. This is option B, so on
3 all these slides where the hub landed is option B here. So
4 here's an example school. In this example school, there's
5 100 students that are not white and 100 students that are
6 white in the school. The way we currently are doing it,
7 we're reporting for in accountability these hundred students
8 altogether.

9 What option B would say looking at this
10 breakdown of students, there's 82 Hispanic students. That's
11 more than our minimum end size of 16 for achievement. So
12 we'll report Hispanic students individually like that group
13 not individual student, sorry, that group individually and
14 their performance there. There is 100 white students they
15 will be recorded and as an individual group, and then when
16 you add up the other students, that don't -- who's groups
17 don't meet the minimum end of 16, you end up with 18
18 students and that group together would be reported.

19 Doing this really maximizes the transparency
20 for individual groups where we can report, but then also
21 accountability for other students. So let me show you what
22 happens with the data if we look at it and these different
23 options. So option A which is over on this slide, is if we
24 only reported the individual -- the segregated groups,
25 didn't do anything else with students that didn't meet that



1 minimum end.

2 And you can see for the most part this is
3 three year data. So the numbers are much larger like divide
4 by three and those are our actual student counts, but we
5 were -- we're trying to get because we have frameworks to a
6 realistic number and impact there. You can see most
7 students that are non -- white are included. If you do the
8 disaggregated groups. If you go to option B, which is that
9 next column over, we -- we get 16,000 more students over
10 three years. So it has an impact, you look at the graph,
11 it's not a huge -- huge percentage but it's still an impact.

12 But where you see it really clearly is when
13 you look at some of the individual disaggregated groups, the
14 way our demographics are in the state and school enrollment
15 for American, Indian or Alaskan Native. Most students are
16 not in a school where there is 16 other students for
17 accountability. So you can see that most of those kids in
18 that first option, would be excluded from that disaggregated
19 accountability.

20 Remember all students are included in all
21 students group. We're not leaving kids out of our
22 accountability system. But just when we do that
23 disaggregated race and ethnicity categories what happens.
24 But if we go to that option B where we roll up, then you can
25 see that we have a large percentage of students that ended



1 up included, that we wouldn't have if we just use the
2 individual groups.

3 So that's where the hub recommendation really
4 came to as we see that by adding this next kind of level of
5 aggregation, and reporting that we get a little bit more
6 accountability for groups of students that we wouldn't have
7 otherwise. It looks like this data is similar for American,
8 Indian and Alaskan Native and also for Hawaiian Pacific
9 Islander. Those are the two groups of students that really
10 -- the inclusion increases based on.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So these are the number
12 of schools, right? These -- these numbers --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These slides right here
14 are actually the number of students.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Students?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are the number of
19 students include, because we really wanted to get at -- what
20 percentage of different student groups were included. Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is two or more
22 races, you will see some impact there too as well. In the
23 hub materials which we also sent you, if you all wanna dig
24 in, you can see the number of schools impacted and you can
25 see all the major racial ethnic groups as well. So you can



1 see all that impact. We're just -- we're trying to
2 streamline this along for today. Okay?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's very thorough,
4 thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have amazing stuff
6 that just jumped on this and were able to pull incredible
7 things together.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they are fantastic.
10 You guys ready to move on to the next one? Okay. I'm gonna
11 turn it back to Marie because she can explain this in the
12 best way most clear way possible.

13 MS. HATCHIN: So we gonna talk about long
14 term goals and interim targets. So SA is very specific and
15 that we as a State must set a long term goal and then do
16 sort of checks to determine how on track we are to achieving
17 that goal. And So the question that we've had is how will
18 Colorado measure -- measure interim progress and progress
19 towards long term goals? So we've had a whole bunch of
20 conversations about this, but the recommendation that has
21 come out is that we will base the targets for interim
22 progress and long term goals on the mean scale score from
23 our assessment results.

24 We will establish graduation rate targets
25 that consider the four year and extended year, adjusted



1 cohort graduation rates, and that we are going to base our
2 long term goals on cut scores informed by historical data.
3 So we definitely heard very clearly that's attainable and
4 ambitious is -- is our priority for our State.

5 So some of the questions around the time line
6 that we want to use for setting the long term goal, the
7 recommendation is a six year time line for that long term
8 goal, and then interim measures every two to three years.
9 Honestly, the recommendation five to seven, that six is the
10 one that is easiest to divide them all by multiple options.
11 So six it is. Then what interim targets should Colorado set
12 for student groups?

13 So the feds that offers two options for how
14 to do this. Option one, was that we could set the same
15 interim targets for all students and disaggregated groups,
16 and option two was that we could have different interim
17 targets based on starting point of the disaggregated group
18 performance. But in the end, all groups were expected to
19 achieve the same end point. These discussions
20 that we had with the hub, focused around the fact that you
21 get a lot of, I call them false positives, in the earlier
22 years, if you'd use different interim targets, and So sorry,
23 interim targets that are based upon the individual group
24 starting point. So we run some analysis for that meeting on
25 Monday to show the -- the hub members what it really looked



1 like in terms of what proportion of schools would be
2 identified as meeting their targets for -- the -- in each of
3 their individual students with economic or economically
4 disadvantaged students, students with disabilities and EL's
5 and then the -- the individual rate in these categories.

6 So for each of those categories, what
7 proportion their students would be on target, depending on
8 which methodology we used. The recommendation came was that
9 we should use the same interim targets for all students and
10 disaggregated groups because that does provide a consistent
11 expectation for all students every single year. And it does
12 not provide for sort of confusing false positives of schools
13 that would not initially meet the targets, sorry, would
14 initially meet the targets, and then over time would fall
15 out of the interim.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Here, let me just show -
17 - walk you through this data a little bit because I think it
18 helps give an example of what the differences are. You see
19 all the different -- the different groups that Marie ran the
20 date on -- on Monday right on the left, they're starting
21 percentile ranking just with their achievement percentile,
22 you know, a state we're at 50, clearly that's the starting
23 percentile rank for those different groups right now.

24 If we had differentiated targets in year two
25 and in year four to get to that same target in year six, so



1 what we're -- we are just proposing as we running an input
2 on it that the -- the long term goal would be at the -- what
3 is currently the 53rd percentile. That is ambitious looking
4 at historical data. But we think it's an attainable target.
5 At least overall, it's an attainable target.

6 So to get to that 53rd percentile, there's
7 two ways we could do that. We could do the same target for
8 each group and that's the green font on there, is that every
9 would be -- would be 51 in year two, everyone would be 52 in
10 year four. And then we would get to 53 in year six. The
11 other thing we could do is set differentiated targets. You
12 basically take starting point and point and divide it out,
13 so we have those way points in between.

14 So for example, students -- economically
15 disadvantaged students you'd start at -- your beginning
16 point is 18, at year two you'd go to 29, and year four you'd
17 go to 41, and then you'd end at 53. So it's kind of you'd
18 have a steeper trajectory but it would be based on the
19 starting point. Marie then ran what percent if the data
20 stayed exactly as it is today, I mean, clearly that is not
21 our goal.

22 Our goal is that we get better and we meet
23 these targets. But if the data stayed exactly as it was
24 today, she ran the percentages of schools that would meet
25 those targets as they're laid out right now, over two year,



1 four year, and six year. So you can see kind of the
2 differences of what happens. You all the way we have had --
3 we've set targets as a state. Historically, when the board
4 sets them, we've used the same targets for all disaggregated
5 groups. We haven't had separate targets for different
6 disaggregated groups.

7 So that's where the hub, I think, landed on
8 that recommendation is that we want that same high -- higher
9 expectation for all students regardless of starting point,
10 regardless of what group they may be a member of. The spoke
11 from the public comment was different than that. They
12 wanted the interim targets. I don't know if we framed all
13 of it as well as we could have around the different
14 decisions and kind of the impact of the different things.

15 But we did want to highlight that the spoke
16 in the public recommendations came out differently, that
17 they wanted those different -- differentiated interim
18 targets there. But the hub, I think, was pretty clear where
19 they landed and those of you there please wait until that --
20 the same interim targets make sense. Again, the inter --
21 these targets the federal law requires that we report
22 against them.

23 It doesn't require anything else beyond that.
24 So it will be up to you all and we'll have a conversation
25 once we get through ESSA on whether you want to use those as



1 the targets built into the State accountability system or
2 not. And So we can have that conversation another time.
3 Right now, these are just about reporting, and reporting
4 performance compared to what those targets are.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Would it -- would it work to
7 have the same growth -- growth targets but different
8 achievement targets?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You -- you could
10 absolutely do something like that. I think just the diff --
11 what you'll have is that same kind of differentiating impact
12 and what Marie's concern is -- is we're going from a place
13 where we have an expectation at the 50th percentile right
14 now, for diff -- for all disaggregated groups. If we drop
15 that, and this is only if you go used it for accountability
16 too because it could just be for reporting, but that you
17 would all of us saying to 43 percent of schools.

18 You're okay. You're doing okay for your
19 economically disadvantaged students because you're about
20 where everybody else is. But then come down to when you get
21 to your six, when we ha -- we end up with that same target
22 for everybody, only 14 percent of schools are making it. So
23 it's gonna kind of elevate the percent that are meeting that
24 target and then drop it down over time. It's you remember
25 like old AYP days of how we ratcheted up a hundred percent.



1 So everybody was doing fine. Then each year
2 we kind of got another like what was it? 15 percent of
3 schools didn't make AYP every time we ratchet -- ratcheted
4 up the targets until we got to this point where we got a
5 waiver. We weren't doing it anymore. But remote where
6 nobod -- no schools were making the targets. So it's just -
7 - it's kind of philosophical.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the discussion
9 did get philosophical and this chart continues to befuddle
10 me and I'm wondering if there's a school A, school B or some
11 -- yet some other way to work on explain this to us.

12 MS. HATCHIN: We can come up with some
13 additional visuals to help represent this information.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because I think what we
15 struggle with in the Hub community, correct me if I'm wrong
16 Steve, I can't remember if you were still there was the
17 message. It was the message of having different
18 expectations for different groups, meaning that you're
19 lowering expectations.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we don't.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we don't want that.
22 And yet there are certainly different expectations because
23 if you're near the bottom, the expectation is that you --
24 your growth is significantly higher because you grow faster
25 to get up to a common end point. So we --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For my concerns is it --
2 looks like the more disadvantage -- the more they have to
3 prove.

4 MS. HATCHIN: Right.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is the more we have to
6 help.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. An -- and that's
8 the -- that is the intent but, Board Member Durham.

9 MR. DURHAM: Well, thank you Madam Chair. I
10 think the -- this -- the issue is -- is -- is partly
11 philosophical and that we -- we -- we've built a whole
12 accountability structure -- have been forced to build a
13 whole accountability structure on the theory, by the way
14 theory, I don't sort of agree with, that if we simply raise
15 expectations, we'll get better results. So if you apply
16 that theory to this issue, you would not have separate
17 standards, but you would have high standards for all.

18 And I think that's going to be, at least from
19 my perspective, the core of the debate is to whether you
20 should have different standards for different groups. There
21 also is the perception question, which is real, but -- but I
22 think I'm -- I think that the reform community has convinced
23 me that if you just set higher standards, everybody will
24 meet them and form better result. I'm now for them.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well the other



1 philosophical piece of this is do we create a ceiling? I
2 don't think that's the intent of the higher standards.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And So that's why some
5 other examples, this one has me so far --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- befuddled. We can't
8 --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can't think about what
11 I want to say if --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- about my positions.
14 But there's some other way to look at this, so that we could
15 have that discussion. We want to bring all kids to a
16 certain minimum, and those are the -- our standards. We
17 don't want to say, that's all we're gonna do, because we've
18 got kids that are already there.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so then, is it
21 difference -- different expectations for different groups,
22 or not? And I --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think we have a
24 lot more flexibility in our state accountability system, to
25 have kind of those conversations and determine what we think



1 is the most appropriate methodology for setting targets, for
2 our different student groups. I think that the ESSA
3 legislation is a little bit narrow, but we -- since we also
4 are not required to use these ESSA targets for our state
5 accountability system, that gives us a little bit of
6 flexibility. So substantially for the moment, we can go
7 with this --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and then work on
10 what we think could be --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- more meaningful for
13 our schools, and Colorado students. internally.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. Any other
15 questions?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just the same, I mean in
17 reality --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A fast one. Good, go
19 ahead.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- in reality, what we
21 really want is kids to get to grade level, and grade level
22 is --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- is the minimum, and
25 if they get above that, that's great. And we know that in



1 reality, they do, and we know that some don't. But, grade
2 level is the measure by which we want all kids to -- to
3 achieve.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well that's the bottom.
5 We want our gifted kids to go off the charts.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But they will, and they
7 usually do, and we have to give --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we have the system
9 that provides that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right. We have
11 to provide that system for all kids to do as well as they
12 can, or better than they can.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we beat this one up a
14 little bit, but I really do need some help in figuring out -
15 -

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- being able to do a
18 picture of what I think I have in my brain.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. We've had a hard
20 time visualizing this one.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll go talk to high,
23 he's our visual (indiscernible) see if he could come up with
24 some good ideas for how to make this one.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, I don't feel quite



1 as bad. Thank you.

2 MR. DURHAM: (indiscernible) chart missing
3 that was in the original which's been taken out, or the --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was that the same in a
5 different targets?

6 MR. DURHAM: Right. It was in the --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, yes.

8 MR. DURHAM: I think it might be helpful to
9 put that back.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh that was the chart
11 that we all set trash.

12 MR. DURHAM: But I think it's the most
13 accurate.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, no.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well barely not all.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was the chart that
17 showed high achieving, made it look like we had high
18 achieving students that we were bringing down.

19 MR. DURHAM: Didn't it?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Steve, I swear. That
21 was so controversial, that's why.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Durham where's the
23 bag?

24 MR. DURHAM: You want a bag, so for the
25 record, I could have it next time.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll give you a whole
2 book, we'll make you like a picture book of different leads
3 and (indiscernible). Okay, yes. So we're gonna, we have
4 one last decision point that should be really quick. I'm
5 gonna skip through these slides. This was about the other
6 indicator, and the long -- term plan for it, we talked about
7 the short -- term already.

8 This slide, I know there's a lot of words on
9 there. This is the language that was drafted for the state
10 plan with our long -- term plan. But the hubs said to us,
11 it's not in this one. It's adds more detail around
12 stakeholder involvement and time line. So we've drafted
13 some more detail about what we can do this spring, next
14 fall. That a final set of recommendations which come to the
15 board by June of 2018, but you'd have kind of some way
16 points for conversation beforehand, and then talks about
17 stakeholder engagement, we'd use the accountability work
18 group, and we'd use the membership at the hub, to make sure
19 we vet some of those recommendations that are coming
20 forward.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's where we were
23 at -- where we landed on that. Again, that will be in the
24 draft language that goes out. We'll be able to take public
25 comment on it and make adjustments afterwards.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

2 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 MR. DURHAM: Just -- just -- very quickly.

5 I think I -- when I look at this, as I do have a lot problem
6 with this line, because I do not believe when you go down
7 the little bullet points at the bottom, but the first bullet
8 point or the last bullet point are quantifiable. And I know
9 there apparently some difference about that, but I'm not
10 sure I can be convinced to that. I think we need a, if we
11 have an alternative major -- needs to be major that has --
12 is testable, has specific scientific validity, and it's not
13 based on survey how I feel.

14 As I believe if you're asking me how I feel,
15 it varies from whether or not we have a board meeting that
16 day, or don't. So and -- and the social emotional things, I
17 just don't -- I don't believe those are quantifiable. I
18 believe they -- those can only be done on a survey basis,
19 and I think we -- I think we absolutely need -- I mean this
20 is a -- this is a way for schools to try and, with a soft
21 major, get out of a bad rating. And I don't think we ought
22 to allow that to happen. So I'd --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do think we should
24 decide that now? Or do you think we should let the kid -- I
25 mean this comes from our communities, this request.



1 MR. DURHAM: I think we -- I know exactly
2 where it comes from, and I think I know why. Is it's, It's
3 a way to dilute a hard core standard, and do we have -- are
4 gonna decide it today? No. But I suspect we're gonna have
5 significant debate and the questions are really going to be,
6 are we going to allow a soft standard, or are we going to
7 find a hard Major that can be tested and verified?

8 And I think -- I don't think this controversy
9 is gonna go away, and I don't think anybody ought to think
10 that -- that the -- in my judgment, these two are simply
11 soft Majors that have been included by all the people who
12 don't want to be measured, and in allowing them to escape a
13 bad rating.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not disagreeing with
15 you. I'm asking you do we -- do we have that fight now? Or
16 do we start this with an open mind and then move?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's nothing more to
18 say.

19 MR. DURHAM: Well I don't think, I think
20 we're gonna have a fight when we actually get to the state
21 plan, because if we don't include those, and we include a
22 hard Major for our long -- term, we're done with it and we
23 don't have to fight it for the next two years.

24 MS. FLORES: Can I ask a question?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you can. Board



1 member Flores.

2 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Mr. Durham --

3 MADAM CHAIR: You keep saying -- you keep
4 speaking about social emotional learning measures, and I'd
5 like to get an understanding of what exactly you mean by
6 social emotional learning, because I think you -- you give a
7 definition for that and it may be probably different than --
8 I -- I'm thinking you're speaking a completely different
9 thing than a point I'm thinking. So would you define that
10 for yourself.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can certainly Madam
12 Chair -- I can -- I can certainly give an example which is
13 in the kindergarten readiness, you have the works well with
14 other -- others major which is completely subjective and you
15 have no measurement or attempt to reward leadership or some
16 of those qualities. So I think first of all the standards
17 that are created are totally objective and whether or not
18 those standards are met, are also totally objective and it.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Objective? It's subjective.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Subjective, I'm sorry.
21 And So the practical side is, you know, I think in my --
22 because I always used to remember those on my elementary
23 school report card and somehow I never got the box check
24 (indiscernible) with others. And so --

25 MADAM CHAIR: What a surprise.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so I think that's a
2 matter of opinion.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Surprise. Surprise.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know it's hard for me
5 to this day. I think I've been traumatized. But that --

6 MADAM CHAIR: Look at what a failure you've
7 been.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So I just -- I
9 just don't trust these majors. They are subjective and I
10 think -- I do think you could quantify the one -- second one
11 there which is post workforce ratings, and I think there's
12 less room for subjective -- subjectivity in those and there
13 is any other two.

14 MADAM CHAIR: I think if we had waited -- if
15 you had waited another year in kindergarten, you might have
16 gotten (indiscernible) works well with others.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the thing.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just remember the
19 statute does not allow a student to be held back because
20 they failed to meet it, and knowing my father he would not
21 have tolerated my being held back.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I'm quite confident
23 my kindergarten teacher would not have said I worked well
24 with others and my first grade teacher would have said that
25 I was a model student.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there you go.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Subjective.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I never gotten --

4 MADAM CHAIR: So let's --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Really

6 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Rankin. Help us
7 out here, please.

8 MS. RANKIN: Because we would like for -- for
9 the records that are 76 percent of the people on the survey
10 said whatever. I'd like to know who -- how many people
11 would actually answer the survey? I mean 76 percent means
12 nothing to me unless we know how many. And I'd like you to
13 disaggregate it.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

15 MS. RANKIN: If there's 100 people and 50 of
16 them are principals, and 50 are school teachers, and nobody
17 is a parent, those are things that I would like to see.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. We'll send
19 you the link. We've got the results from that. We've got
20 the results from all the surveys. But from that one
21 specifically Dan has a PowerPoint on the Web sites will pull
22 it and send it to you and it's got the desegregation there.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Board member McClellan.

24 MS. MCCLELLAN: This is not so much a
25 question but I wanted to thank staff for making it obvious



1 where they helped us out with that item that I requested,
2 and I'm sure I'm not the only one knowing where -- where the
3 input was from the hub from the spoke, how you put it in the
4 little yellow graphic that's really helpful as we go along.
5 So thanks for doing that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah that is helpful.
7 Thank you.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Can we proceed.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we will make sure we
11 share the concerns. You all have more time because this
12 draft plan isn't going and but depending on where you land,
13 if you want the workgroups to move forward a little bit but
14 we can absolutely share the concerns and the conversation
15 from the board as they do the work, or if you don't want
16 them to do the work you can let us know in the future
17 meetings as well. So. Okay.

18 That last one from accountability, you guys
19 will be gla -- glad with this. We shared with the hub your
20 direction from the 26, the round participation, We didn't --
21 we got some -- we had some good conversation, not all of it
22 directly related to this decision point itself. We had some
23 questions around insufficient state data, well participation
24 ratings, and how does that fit in with the federal plan.
25 The numbers, like the relative numbers of schools and



1 districts that were decreased to the participation versus
2 having low participation, and a question about whether or
3 not we've been -- had thought about a tiered system about
4 looking at, you know, 93 percent participation rates
5 differently than 60 percent compared to 10 percent, and how
6 we look at that.

7 So those were some good questions that came
8 up there and then just general feedback that I think you all
9 heard and shared yourselves about assessments being
10 meaningful to kids and families and that being a key part of
11 all of this. If -- if like watching what happened with 10th
12 grade participation rates last year when it moved to the
13 PAST to a test that had meaning for students and their
14 families, this participation rates increased. So that's
15 what we heard back from them.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if there's -- you all
18 have any other input that you would like us to incorporate?
19 I don't think I heard anything today that says, change
20 anything right now, but if I misheard let me know. State
21 plan I'll go out later this week or Monday, and then we'll
22 work on incorporating and processing that public comment.
23 And Pat will talk more about that later.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. Next we move
25 on to the school improveme -- improvement spoke.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So this is the time that I
2 might suggest --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right. Thank
4 you.

5 MADAM CHAIR: We'll take five minutes and I
6 would ask you to especially this time we're stopping in the
7 middle of a presentation, so I think it's all the more
8 respectful to our folks here to come back in five minutes.
9 But I didn't wanna kill anybody this early in the day.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We still do have quite a
12 bit of ground cover.

13 MADAM CHAIR: I know, I know and only a half
14 an hour.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 MADAM CHAIR: I get it. Ladies and gentlemen
17 and staff we would like to mess with our agenda yet again.
18 We have a special guest here, and I think we would prefer to
19 recognize her at this time and then go back to that
20 scintillating topic of ESSA. Commissioner.

21 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you Madam Chair. We are
22 so pleased today to honor one of Colorado's most outstanding
23 educators Marie L. Greenwood. Marie is here today. Thank
24 you so much. With her son Jim Greenwood and Misty Oz to
25 support her in this wonderful recognition. Ms. Greenwood is



1 104 years old, and you certainly don't look it. You are a
2 living history and have been a trailblazer for all of the
3 great educators in Colorado who have walked in your path.

4 We must pay respect to Ms. Greenwood who
5 endured insults and bigotry growing up in Denver which is
6 documented in the book she published in 2007 called, Every
7 Child Can Learn. But she persevered. As a fourth grader,
8 she was Marie Anderson and the daughter of a railroad chief
9 -- chef, I'm sorry, and a domestic worker. In school, her
10 teacher refused to call on her but she almost always knew
11 the answers. As the only sophomore in East High School in
12 1929, a counselor told her not to worry about grades or
13 going to college because all she will end up doing is being
14 someone's cook someday, but she persevered.

15 Marie transferred to the more inclusive West
16 High School and graduated third in her class. At the time,
17 the state offered full ride four year scholarships to state
18 colleges for the top five graduates at each Denver school.
19 Marie took the opportunity and attended Colorado's teacher
20 college in Greeley. But she had to live off campus with
21 other minorities and could not participate in club
22 activities.

23 Still Mrs. Greenwood persevered. She
24 graduated college in four years, took the state's teaching
25 exam and accepted a job in 1935 to teach first grade at



1 Denver's Whittier Elementary earning just 1200 a year. It
2 was a mostly black school and the only place black teachers
3 could work. She taught for 10 years before starting a
4 family with her husband Bill Greenwood and moving out to
5 west Denver.

6 She raised four children. In 1955, she
7 returned to teaching when a principal of an elementary
8 school near her home asked her to come back to teach first
9 grade. At the time no black teachers were in classrooms
10 outside of north east Denver. Administrators worried about
11 the black teacher at Nolle Elementary, but she persevered.
12 Marie told the Denver Post in 2007, "By the spring of 1956
13 the administrator stopped calling and the door was wide open
14 for our minority teachers everywhere".

15 Marie continued to teach until 1974. In
16 retirement, she built a home in the mountains and continued
17 to read to children at libraries and schools. In 2001,
18 Denver Public Schools honored Marie by naming one of their
19 new schools after her, Marie L. Greenwood Academy at 5130
20 Durham court, is in far Northeast Denver.

21 The home page of it's website features a
22 photo of the DPF staff members surrounding a smiling Miss
23 Greenwood in front of a school, whose creed is for all
24 children to be driven by a passion for knowledge. Those
25 clearly also are values held by Ms Greenwood, who is an



1 inspiration to us all.

2 It is an honor for me and the Colorado State
3 Board of Education to recognize you, Marie L. Greenwood as
4 Colorado's outstanding educator. Mrs. Greenwood, would you
5 like to say a few words?

6 MRS. GREENWOOD: I really am honored,
7 absolutely with Denver Public School and the community of
8 (indiscernible) , and now the state. Teaching in the Denver
9 Public school was the joy of my life. In fact, it 's the
10 only, it is the only job I ever had, and unfortunately they
11 couldn't pass me on the first grade. I'm taught first grade
12 for 13 years. Three times they tried to get me to go into
13 administration.

14 That first grade was my joy, I was laying
15 that beginning foundation, because it's just as I have
16 always said, education is built on a beginning foundation
17 just like a house, if you don't build a sound foundation at
18 a house, you know that what it (indiscernible) but if you
19 have education that you get at the beginning, foundation
20 leave starting right there at first grade, then the children
21 have something to do about. The teachers that they will get
22 later have (indiscernible) so you don't have children always
23 trying to catch up, and everything in the second period that
24 I went into (indiscernible) teaching, you being a child
25 retains a routine in a class was no -- no. (indiscernible)



1 it was always (indiscernible) because socially, ooh, because
2 socially, they would be, oh probably either held back, or
3 they would feel bad.

4 Well forget that in first grade. I retained
5 many, even though, uh, children were not supposed to be
6 retained in that second area that, uh my first area, yes but
7 not the second. It was amazing when I had a principal who
8 had that, oh (indiscernible) you can't keep them, so I would
9 just work with the parents and explain to them what was
10 going on, and then when I'd tell the principal, what could
11 she do, the parent won't that child to stay with me to get
12 the foundation.

13 Now, I really don't know how
14 much you want to hear about me, since you have already read.
15 But I do want you to know that this is one of the greatest
16 honors I have had, and I have brought for the Colorado State
17 Board of Education. A little thank you over here. Yeah.
18 Who ever would like to have this, and I hope that when you
19 go through this that you will learn even more about me, my
20 family, the, my ch -- my everything that has happened to me
21 in my first 100 years.

22 Again, just thank all of you for inviting me
23 back.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Thank you, Mrs.
25 Greenwood, we're very honored to have you here today. Your
drive and dedication to see all kids succeed, regardless of



1 their background is second to none. I commend you for your
2 continued devotion to student achievement, and thank you for
3 trail blazing the way for many other passionate teachers.

4 Please join me again in honoring Mrs.
5 Greenwood, and then if you would come forward for a
6 photograph, or perhaps, we might go back to you to document
7 this special occasion. Yeah, and let's do the homework for
8 this one.

9 MRS. GREENWOOD: While you're there, don't
10 worry. (indiscernible)

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh wow! That really
12 fills your tank doesn't it.

13 MR. CHAPMAN: Then I guess (indiscernible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't know what the
16 gift because maybe it's her book. What do you mean back
17 peddle what?

18 MRS. GREENWOOD: No. She doesn't.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably because she's a
20 104 years old. You should do it now.

21 MRS. GREENWOOD: So folks, so I think we
22 have a book to share. She's given us a book and I'm gonna
23 guess (indiscernible) the book that she wrote.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Open it.

25 MRS. GREENWOOD: Yes ma'am. Every Child Can



1 Learn and By The Grace Of God The True Life Journey Of 100
2 Years.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wow!

4 MRS. GREENWOOD: Both of them
5 (indiscernible) books. So we'll fight over who gets to, me.
6 We'll pass it around but who gets to keep it first.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So why don't we have a
8 library (indiscernible) So take turns.

9 MRS. GREENWOOD: And you just volunteered
10 for that right?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You bet.

12 MRS. GREENWOOD: That's fantastic.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can be the librarian.

14 MRS. GREENWOOD: I have a lot of books I'd
15 like.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I'm gonna give you
17 all library cards.

18 MRS. GREENWOOD: Well that was really
19 wonderful Mr. Chapman. Top that.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hard act to follow.

21 MR. CHAPMAN: Set the (indiscernible) pretty
22 high.

23 MRS. GREENWOOD: Yes sir I did.

24 MR. CHAPMAN: Instead of trying to top that.
25 We will move to the school improvement Spoke discussion and



1 I'll kick it off at Brad (indiscernible) Medlar and Peter
2 Sherman and you guys go ahead.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks madam chair. I
4 do appreciate Mrs. Greenwood's approach of asking for
5 forgiveness afterwards, but we are asking for your
6 consideration of these decision points ahead of time. So
7 just to, I know we're short on time. So our school
8 improvement subcommittee has been working.

9 MRS. GREENWOOD: We are trying to make time
10 for you. So just proceed as you need to.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

12 MRS. GREENWOOD: Okay.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks.

14 MRS. GREENWOOD: Nine o'clock tonight we'll
15 adjourn

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that, just to remind
17 you we have three decision points from our Spoke committee
18 around ACA supports for identified schools around the
19 evidence based interventions and around the allocation of
20 school improvement resources. The first two decision points
21 we presented to you a couple of weeks ago and I think you
22 were supportive of the recommendations that we brought to
23 you, but we had agreed that we would come back with the
24 allocation of school improvement resources.

25 Since we last saw you we've had a Spoke



1 committee meeting, where we've worked through some of this.
2 We presented to the Hub just t -- two days ago and received
3 their record there well the have Hub voted with the
4 recommendations that we shared with them and we've also
5 built it up more some of the feedback that we'd heard was
6 were needing more -- more details. So we've done that and
7 we wanna share some of that with you today.

8 There was a minority vote a -- at the Hub
9 committee just so you know there wasn't a unanimous, but
10 some of the folks that we spoke with afterwards there were
11 five people that didn't vote in favor of the recommendations
12 that we offered on Monday. We spoke with all of those
13 people. Nina did as well and they were all generally very
14 supportive of the direction that we had headed.

15 They had just wanted some more detail and
16 they felt that there was some vague language between what we
17 had shared with them and what we had spoken about. So some
18 of the recommendations that we'll share with you today are a
19 revised recommendations so that we can -- we wanted to get
20 more detail there. Okay. We're gonna go very quickly
21 through these there are a couple of slides here just to --
22 to.

23 MRS. GREENWOOD: Sorry, we have a question.
24 (indiscernible).

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Were those five people



1 on the Spoke or was that the Hub? Because this is -- this
2 one graphic has it says hub vote to recommend but it doesn't
3 say the Spoke.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The Hub. Did I -- if I
5 said (indiscernible) spoke. I misspoke.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was going to ask since
7 we don't have the spoke recommendation here just for our
8 remembrance. How was the Spoke on this? Were they in
9 concurrence with the Hub?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was 100 percent in
11 favor, for those for the folks on the -- on the Spoke that
12 came to that meeting.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.

14 MRS. GREENWOOD: So the Hub, the Hub
15 negative votes were really just for modification not truly
16 against the recommendation.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I believe so.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So very quick reminder
20 of a couple of slides here we're talking about this. This
21 yellow slice of the pie which is seven percent of the entire
22 title funds that we are that -- that gets distributed to
23 schools for school improvement. These are estimates of
24 numbers of schools that we'd be identified as comprehensive
25 schools has targeted schools and as additional targeted



1 schools.

2 Again this is a lot of this work, these
3 numbers are dependent on the accountability committee. So
4 just to remind you we're working off of these assumptions.
5 This is our, the one of the decision point is how to
6 distribute those funds. Just a couple of points that the
7 awards must be sufficient size for an LEA to implement
8 improvement strategies so the amount of the words are
9 important that they have an impact and that they must
10 represent geographic diversity of the states.

11 So that such things that have been considered
12 a number of times. So this is our adjusted recommendation
13 and I'll talk you through some of the pieces here. So this
14 is really about supports and funding and when we talk about
15 resources we think about both because, supports don't
16 necessarily require dollars and the amount of dollars that
17 they do require are -- are we believe are variable and we
18 can we can adjust. So the (indiscernible) and grants will
19 be available to all identified schools and districts with
20 high quality plans.

21 So the schools that are identified as
22 comprehensive and targeted will have availability of those
23 funds. A larger portion of the funds we want to direct
24 towards comprehensive schools which are more intensive
25 schools that are needed. We've been playing around with



1 about 75 percent of the available \$9,000,000 to go to
2 comprehensive schools, but it's not set in stone but this is
3 a ballpark of how we're balancing.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.
5 Comprehensive, can you remind me again I'm -- I'm just
6 lapsing on comprehensive. What that means.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes So ESSA requires
8 that we identify schools. Comprehensive schools are both
9 the lowest five percent of the schools in the state and then
10 also high schools that have graduation rates lower than 67
11 percent.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So it's lowest 10
13 percent or lowest.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five percent

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five percent.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five percent?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then the high
19 schools that are not graduating kids.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Below a certain percent.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so we've identified
23 these -- these broad categories. About 30 about 36 schools
24 would be in that lowest five percent category and that's a
25 number that would say fairly accurate given the number of



1 schools in the state and five percent and in the high
2 schools high schools with low graduation rates would be
3 somewhere in that 50 to 90 range.

4 Thank you for the question. So supports and
5 funds would be matched and distributed through a single
6 annual application process that really seeks to match
7 identified needs with differentiated strategies as you know
8 now, we have a variety of different supports and a number of
9 different grants that are districts have to apply to
10 sometimes concurrently sometimes on different timelines.

11 We are really seeking to consolidate that
12 into a unified plan or excuse me into a unified application
13 process for them. The matching process would use some
14 consistent and really transparent criteria. We'll share
15 those with you in a few minutes but we, it's clear that we
16 want to be sure that these funds and these supports are
17 matched up with the needs of the districts and the schools
18 and that they have maximum impact. We really seek to invest
19 and to incentivize strategies for districts and schools that
20 array, allow for sort of an array of different kinds of work
21 from very intensive work to less intensive work to investing
22 in strategies that districts are already doing or that they
23 have planned for.

24 But we really wanna be sure that those are
25 going to create an impact, significant impacts on the



1 districts and have rapid change in those districts and
2 schools because we want to be sure that students have
3 demonstrated ways for their -- for their learning to improve
4 quickly. And then we also want that the strategies and the
5 supports are evaluated annually.

6 So we want to provide support and funding and
7 then be able to talk about the impacts that they have,
8 identify what those are and be able to look at that on an
9 annual basis and then we also wanna have ways that we can
10 evaluate our whole system of how we're doing things at CDE
11 and how we're providing supports out to schools.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So as you know, we have
13 a couple of diagrams that -- that -- that represent the work
14 that we're talking about. This is one that I believe that
15 you've seen. And so it's so -- it's an overview of that
16 annual cycle.

17 So just some highlights again there is a
18 single application process over in that -- that funnel area
19 where schools would be identified and they would -- they
20 would go through a single application process. The green
21 and the blue box down in the bottom left are as -- is our
22 process for matching and selecting supports and -- and
23 grants to schools and districts. That would also includes a
24 differentiated way that we're doing needs assessments and
25 diagnostics for schools, some have more intensive needs and



1 some have less intensive needs around figuring out what
2 their -- what their needs are.

3 And then, there's an implementation piece
4 that would include a performance management or progress
5 monitoring because we again we want to know that as these
6 supports and grants go out into the field that we wanna know
7 that there are ways to track how those are working and what
8 impact that they're having. And then, they'll be an annual
9 reflection, evaluation and public reporting process. So
10 again, we wanna be able to share with you, with the public
11 ways that these supports and funds are impacting and having
12 an impact. And then as we come back around to make
13 decisions about renewed, funding, or continued supports we
14 will have a cycle around that where with that looks at the
15 outcomes and the impacts that they're having.

16 It looks at the implementation and it looks
17 at ways that those districts are really engaging. Our goal
18 in many of our supports that we offer is to really build up
19 the capacity of the districts so that they have ways that
20 they can manage their local lowest performing schools on
21 their own.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Board member
23 Flores.

24 MS. FLORES: Just a suggestion and you
25 probably already do this. Having a report or just a little



1 report on things that really work that you found in the
2 schools that are doing well, or that have come up
3 significantly. What those things are that worked, we know,
4 with -- with that group. I think there would be very
5 important --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

7 MS. FLORES: And -- and to, you know,
8 disseminate that you know, to all parties in the state.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Thanks board
10 member Flores. We -- and we have done some of that and I
11 think it's part of our -- part of what we're continuing to
12 do certainly through conversations we've had with you all is
13 to really try to highlights some of the practices that are
14 working well in the schools that are working well.

15 MS. FLORES: And I think for our yearly
16 report to Washington that would -- that would be great and
17 also for districts to learn what others are doing.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. Thank you.

19 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this slide is -- it
21 goes into a little bit more detail around that matching and
22 selection process, those blue and green boxes that were on
23 the previous slide. So just to walk you through a little
24 bit, so that -- those blue boxes over there are -- are sort
25 of that matching process.



1 We're thinking that this will take some more
2 time, so typically when we have grants we review
3 applications and we sit down at an event on a day and review
4 those and make decisions. We know that as we're thinking
5 about doing this in a more -- in a more holistic way that it
6 will take longer time. So our time line is still to be
7 developed, but we're seeing this the -- the application and
8 review process as -- as spanning over a number of weeks and
9 potentially months.

10 But we think that -- that be a way that we'll
11 be able to really work with schools and districts to ensure
12 that what they need are ways that we can match them with
13 supports and the funds. The -- the -- the arrows over on
14 the right side of the slide just represent some of the
15 existing supports that we have some of the more intensive
16 ones at the top and moving to less intensive as they go
17 down. There are -- this -- this yellow one is sort of right
18 in the middle around specialized or customized supports.

19 We know that not everyone's needs fits neatly
20 into one of these supports. And so we think that there is
21 room and capacity at CDE to customize some of the sports
22 that we do. We also know the dash line below that arrow are
23 -- there are there are ways that we can support districts
24 and schools that we've not yet developed. So we're all very
25 open and we listen to the field quite a bit in terms of ways



1 that we can do that.

2 So there's room there for us to -- to build
3 on some of the -- some of the successful sports that we've
4 had and develop others as well. And then some of those
5 other arrows down at the bottom really represent those
6 schools or districts that -- that may say, "Hey you know, we
7 know that we wanna engage with CDE and we know that we need
8 some support but we're not quite sure what it is that we
9 need." So what are ways that we can have more a more in --
10 depth diagnostic process, a planning process, involve our
11 communities, work with our stakeholders and work with CDE to
12 -- to identify more of what those needs are.

13 And so in some cases that's some of that's a
14 process that can take a short amount of time sometimes
15 that's a whole year process. So we wanna create more space
16 for districts and schools to be able to receive supports to
17 be able to do that kind of planning. And then we also know
18 that there are districts that are -- that have some really
19 great systems of supporting their love for schools and
20 they're capable and able to do that very well without --
21 without plugging into the CDE supports.

22 And so one of the bottom green arrow is the
23 one that represents those schools and districts. We would
24 still ask that they submit an application to us and a
25 proposal to -- to tell us what they're doing because we



1 wanna have ways that we can ratchet up what they're doing.
2 But we also know that there are some districts that are --
3 that are doing some of this work and they don't necessarily
4 need us to be involved in.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Quick question. Does
6 everybody know what is our system of progress monitoring? Is
7 that clarified?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In this room or in the -
9 - in the states?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the state.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the room -- probably
12 not. (indiscernible) neither.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that something you're
14 working on --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's something that we
16 are work on.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and well to share
18 with --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- the district to the
21 school?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think we're -- I
23 think we're -- the answer to that is that there is yes and
24 no. So I think some of the support structures that we have
25 do have pretty clear ways that were progress monitoring, or



1 the way I think about that is like performance management
2 where it's sort of a much more active way that we're working
3 with folks. So -- so again, I think that that varies
4 according to the arrow.

5 And I think that -- that's appropriate, but
6 it's an area that across the department we're -- we're
7 continuing to work on and develop. In fact, we're working
8 with a national group for the -- through the center on
9 school turnaround to think about that and work with some
10 other states around that (indiscernible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good. That's great.
12 Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Please.

16 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. And -- and on top of
17 that -- of -- page 48 -- yeah, where it says turnaround
18 network, do you have situations in our state where school
19 that is not high achieving -- is low achieving comprehensive
20 and they do not apply for a grant, or -- or do they all
21 automatically apply. Are there some that say, "We -- we
22 don't want your help, we don't want your money just leave us
23 alone." Do -- do we have any of the state like that?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. I think we do.

25 MS. RANKIN: Just want to bring that



1 (indiscernible).

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But we also have
4 applicants that are turned down.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As well?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we'll be everything
9 in between.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Miss (indiscernible) I
11 know that was a previous question of yours from previous
12 meeting. We're just compiling that information now. I'm
13 sorry it's taking a little while, but we'll add our add that
14 on to some of the I gave you a spreadsheet I think in the
15 beginning of January that shared all of the low performing
16 schools across the state, and which supports state have been
17 connected to. So I will add another layer to that of those
18 that have applied. I think what you'll find though is that
19 there are actually not that many that have applied, and have
20 been turned down.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then we put together
23 this -- this slide just to give you an idea of the kinds
24 of -- of ways that some of these funds would be allocated.
25 So this is specifically around comprehensive schools. So if



1 we set about 75 percent of the nine million dollars, we set
2 about six and six and a half million dollars, being
3 allocated to comprehensive schools.

4 We wanna just give you an idea of some of the
5 big buckets. So turn around, network that connect for
6 success, and some of those other areas on the previous
7 slide. I will walk you through this but this will give you
8 an idea. But just to re -- remind you that we are
9 definitely moving towards using smaller grant amounts for
10 the our support structure.

11 So somewhere between \$30, and \$80, \$90
12 thousand per school, per year depending on the support
13 structure, and what's needed. But we're approaching this
14 very much that we're not just going to hand out checks, but
15 rather we're going to really try to align the needs of the
16 schools, and districts to them, and the amount of support an
17 (indiscernible) to accomplish what they wanna do. I'll
18 pause there, and see if there is discussion or any other
19 questions. That gives you a I think overview of what we've
20 worked on.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go right ahead.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No I don't -- I don't
23 see anyone asking questions.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just have a few more
25 slides. So those blue, and green boxes that we talked about



1 around the map the matching process, what does that look
2 like? We've not -- we've not figured it out in minute detail
3 yet, but the spoke, and have pushed us on that. And so as a
4 result we've developed some of what the criteria might look
5 like for comprehensive or targeted schools. I know the text
6 is small, but I'll just highlight that column on the far
7 left which are some of the elements that we would look for
8 that we believe would be important to consider.

9 So the first offer there is agreement between
10 the parties, between the state, the District, and the
11 school. We -- we this is not imposing support but it's a
12 matter of finding the right match for folks. That the
13 (indiscernible) capacity that they have capacity to do this
14 work also because we know that the districts have play a
15 really important part, and that they're really engaged to
16 think differently about their work, and think about how do
17 they what kinds of changes might they need to make to make
18 really dramatic improvements for their kids. That the
19 schools capacity and their willingness to engage as present
20 and exists. That certainly involves the leader, the school
21 leader in a big way.

22 That there'd be some self -- assessment data
23 and potentially da -- external diagnostic data, around some
24 of our turn -- around conditions that would align, that
25 would verify some of the things that the districts or



1 schools are saying that they need. That there is some
2 stakeholder, and community engagement process that's either
3 happened prior or during the application process or the
4 future but we know that -- that's critical. And then to
5 take into consideration in a local context So the geography,
6 the size, where they are on a state accountability clock.

7 What sorts of strategies have they done in
8 the past? If they attempted, what sorts of grants they
9 receive in the past. That's all relevant information. And
10 then also CDEs is capacity deliver. So the network for
11 example, we have limited number of -- of support in --
12 in the network just given the intensity of the staff demands
13 as we've talked about before. So those are all some of the
14 elements and the factors, that I think we'll consider, and
15 we'll get fit into this process as we developing.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That -- that we had a
18 couple of other slides of that -- that might provide more
19 detail if you wanted to go there. But I maybe I would like
20 to pause and see if there are questions.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are there any questions?
22 Colleagues?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) for us.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So would this be giving
2 money that I mean I know some decisions were made about that
3 seven percent. Does that take money away from the state to
4 give to the -- or had that -- or has this formula
5 already been made? And what does the state -- what -- how
6 much does the state get? I mean you -- you mentioned that
7 there were few people within the department to -- to do this
8 and, we know that I think I saw some statistics where when
9 the department went in, districts who got that help when one
10 level or two levels up. So that says that maybe we should
11 get resources for the state to -- to do that kind of work
12 we're getting that kind of results. I mean, that's
13 significant.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair. So we do
16 receive in that the pie piece that -- that pie chart at
17 the very beginning of the presentation kinda represents the
18 amount of funds that we get out of state which is
19 approximately \$150 million in title one funds.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. But I mean directly
21 to the to CDE.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. And then we must
23 So that we must set aside seven percent so that
24 (indiscernible) pie pieces is it's not enough. We must set
25 aside seven percent to -- to support this schools that



1 have been identified and then of that, 95 percent goes to
2 the schools that are under performing (indiscernible) those
3 schools. And then we retain a portion of that to support
4 program.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Is that enough?
6 To support the program? I mean --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the capacity is
8 -- is a bit of an issue. So we -- we have in the past
9 for certain portions of this fund this funds retain an
10 additional amount to support these (indiscernible)

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because if what Alyssa
12 showed me and that was significant, I mean if districts who
13 are low, can come up one or two levels I think that's
14 significant. And we should support more of your work if you
15 get you know that kind of wonderful result.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I appreciate that.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the question
18 delinquent allocation 1.5 Million is that for board?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh yeah. We can think
20 about that possible.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well we -- we will be
22 happy to be delinquent if for some members of the board.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a creative idea.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) work
25 well with others.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry that was an
3 irresistible impulse but what is the delinquent allocation?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For us?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you actually asking?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How I'm actually asking?

8 I am looking at 1.7 -- 1.5 Million dollars.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chapman.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of about title one
11 allocation. There are some sub allocations so there is an
12 allocation for Title one neglected or delinquent
13 institutions and those --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What does that mean?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- there are --
16 there are title services for students who've been
17 adjudicated and are in some correctional facility or in a
18 facility for neglected children.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Got it.

20 MR. CHAPMAN: So to maintain some educational
21 program for them while -- while they are while in that
22 institution where those funds they are provided. So that's
23 to say allocation and of the 150 million that we receive, we
24 set aside that amount to provide funding to those
25 institutions for Title one services.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does that includes
2 facility schools?

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Goff, did you have a
6 comment?

7 MS. GOFF: This is actually a it's not a
8 parallel version it's actually a an integrated body of work
9 along with what we already do when we have our
10 accountability decisions that we just made. So when you
11 talk about our state review panel and such and adjustments
12 to you UIP and all the parts of the normal process we have
13 networks that are available step in and so forth. So what
14 -- where we are now is -- that is part of and I hope I'm
15 not sounding like I'm just talking myself through the lesson
16 but I am, so thank you. That how we already do things is
17 what we're maintaining here as proceeding on with the new
18 school improvement plan.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I also share the concern
20 about staff capacity and how that relates to funds. It's
21 one thing but it's really, it's more than just the money.
22 It's how energies and it's just -- human beings do this
23 work. So I you know, I don't know whether the Hub committee
24 or this or the Spoke either has had any real time for real
25 conversations about what it means to try to do this on so



1 many levels. And, I don't -- I don't have the answer for
2 you right now. I just appreciate it.

3 And I -- I'm hoping that as time goes by and
4 more stakeholder engagement conversations happen, we can
5 really look at that and make it more of a statewide interest
6 as well. All kinds of friends, so thank you. And I'm all
7 right in the was it really it's the framework we're using it
8 seems to be effective if we have districts that are coming
9 up a level or two. Yes, it's money well spent. And I also
10 you know, I've been wondering for about seven years what the
11 rate is of district setting taking the initiative on a lot
12 of these things.

13 You know, not applying for a grant and not
14 getting it is one thing, but not even checking into the
15 essence and the nature of the program available is another
16 thing. You know what. But we can all do to possibly move
17 that in a more positive direction in the future because it's
18 unfortunate that if it's happening, that's unfortunate.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I -- can I jump in
20 and think answer some of what I think you're asking in
21 there. We, and that is so we have current practices in
22 place and I think what you're also trying to get is, so that
23 building on what we're currently doing and how is it
24 shifting and then some -- get at some of the concerns you're
25 bringing up, which I think we've been trying to consider as



1 well.

2 So I think the answer is yes, we're really
3 trying to take the best of what we're doing now and build --
4 build from there. So we've done a lot of work on on
5 planning, on doing grant, providing support. But not
6 everything is perfect and we're trying to align those much
7 more coherently for these, really, these systems that are
8 really struggling. They don't have time to navigate all
9 this, so we're trying to bring it together in a more
10 coherent way for them so that this federal law actually does
11 compel them to if they're identified they need to write a
12 plan. And there -- there needs to be some
13 interaction with the Department of Education. So we want to
14 leverage those requirements so that, that then we're --
15 we're -- we're offering them some opportunities if they do
16 not want to engage. They still need to follow these
17 requirements. They still need to do the plan and CDE still
18 needs to sign off of it with them. But in the meantime,
19 we're saying, "Hey, there are some resources available
20 whether it's through services or through funds."

21 So let's talk it through and then -- and
22 match it up. Whereas in the past, it's been we've got these
23 pots of money, we can do these competitive grants. You may
24 succeed, you may not. And then once it's done, it's done.
25 And now we're saying, if this one is not the right fit, then



1 we'll kind of, follow it through and figure out what's the
2 best bet. So we're, again, it's taking the best of what we
3 have and trying to make it -- reposition it.

4 So it's -- it's setting it up so that, that
5 identified school is actually once they're -- once they're
6 identified we're working with them. And it's not just left
7 to chance. I just -- I don't know if that helps to clarify.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It does. And
9 thank cause that makes me feel a little better.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Good.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think. But I do
12 hope at some point, we can -- we can talk about what is the
13 magic key or what are the tricks or the techniques that are
14 engaging on all kinds of levels. And one of them is there
15 is -- you know, it's one thing if we have assurances that
16 opportunities in the description of such, and our
17 communications methods are going beyond level one and --
18 and, you know, I think it's not a matter of really checking
19 on, watching people.

20 It's a matter of what are we -- what can we
21 keep plugging away at to get the word out there. So it's
22 that simple and make sure that there's understanding and
23 that communities have a chance to hear about it because I
24 know it's hard, when -- when you have a shortage of people
25 and resources, it's hard to do a lot of things. And that's



1 one of them.

2 But down the road, maybe we can all make it a
3 focal point for those conversations. I think you can
4 proceed. Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So back to our
6 recommendations. I think this is what we would share with
7 you today. Again, that the Spoke and that the Hub were
8 supportive of these and I think they summarized some of the
9 work that we've talked about today.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not doing that?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're doing that. Here
14 they come. Okay. All right. I believe we're coming to
15 part three.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hopefully, it's the
17 third one and final.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pardon?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's hopefully the third
20 and final.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Third and final.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually, we'll have a
23 little bit more on next steps for posting the plan and
24 soliciting feedback. So the -- the leads of Effective
25 Instruction and Leadership Spoke committee they have come



1 before you before, and are here again to work through one of
2 the issues where there was a division of opinion with regard
3 to out of field -- definition of out of field teachers. So
4 take it away Carline and Jennifer.

5 MS. CARLINE: Absolutely. Good morning,
6 Madam Chair, Commissioner Anthes and members of the boards.
7 I think of the boards. All the boards. I'm starting off
8 with a bang.

9 MS. ANTHERS: It's okay.

10 MS. CARLINE: Thank you very much for
11 entertaining us again. My colleague, Jennifer Simons and I
12 are here. I think this is the third time that we've been
13 able to present a few things to you. While, we have a 10
14 slide presentation, the majority of those slides are
15 refresher slides. We are coming before you today to give
16 you a quick overview of the work that is taking place but
17 really because we have a decision point that we would like
18 some formal guidance from the board on, and so we're going
19 to spend the majority of our time on that.

20 We have, as a quick overview, we have
21 reviewed these items with you. The state plan must describe
22 how we're going to use federal funds to support state level
23 strategies to improve the quality and effectiveness of
24 educators and to ensure low income and minority students
25 have equal access to effective educators. Additionally, as



1 we really look at this and -- and identify the plan, we must
2 describe how CDE will improve the skills of educators to
3 meet the needs of students with specific learning needs.

4 To this end, CDE must ensure that low income
5 and minority students are not taught at disproportionate
6 rates by teachers who are ineffective, out of field, or
7 inexperienced. The plan must actually define these terms
8 for us and that's been the vast majority of the work in this
9 Spoke. The plan must also identify how we calculate those
10 rates of disproportionality for our students and we must
11 also identify how this data will be publicly reported and
12 the root causes of disproportionalities, that's a harder
13 word.

14 Disproportionalities and strategies to
15 eliminate them. While we have already had some conversation
16 around those particular things, today, what we really want
17 to focus on are, is one kind of, single decision point and
18 that is our out of field definition. So I'm gonna move
19 through a slide here really quickly to get to this
20 particular slide that outlines the three definitions that we
21 are charged with to ensure that our low income and minority
22 students are not taught at disproportionate rates by
23 ineffective, out -- of -- field, or inexperienced educators.

24 Again, the decision point that we're really
25 seeking guidance from the Board of Education is indeed that



1 definition for out of field. This definition has definitely
2 been the one that we've had the most feedback on from our
3 stakeholders in the listening sessions. So for over a year,
4 in the listening sessions we have that, in our spoke
5 conversations and in our Hub committee conversations.

6 Where we have come to, is a little bit of a
7 50 -- 50 split around that and we're seeking some guidance.
8 Just to help us remember this folk committee made a mostly
9 unanimous -- there was one team member who did not agree
10 with this -- mostly unanimous recommendation for the
11 definition of infields so the opposite kind of, of what is
12 described as out of field but the definition of infield
13 educator.

14 As an individual that would demonstrate,
15 through the holding of a license and an endorsement in the
16 field in which the aduca -- educator is assigned to teach as
17 an infield educator. The Hub committee has recommended by a
18 vote of nine to six, the use of a definition that is similar
19 to the previous highly qualified definitions, which include:
20 demonstration of infield educator as a as a district or a
21 school determined rating that does not require a license but
22 does require the district to determine if the educator
23 demonstrates content knowledge by endorsement so it could be
24 licensed and endorsement, 24 credit hours in the subject
25 area in which they are assigned to teach, passing scores on



1 a state -- approved content assessment, or by degree.

2 To help facilitate the board's guidance around
3 this, again, because we have stakeholder recommendation, we
4 have spoke recommendation, we have Hub recommendation to
5 help facilitate the board's guidance. The Hub committee
6 members that did not agree with the hub's determination and
7 rather the spokes determination have prepared what is
8 considered a minority report for the board's consideration.
9 Today, that report is presented to you for your
10 consideration and guidance.

11 You have that document. And I think the
12 title of it was stated the minority rationale for adopting
13 spoke committee recommendation regarding definition of out -
14 - of -- field teacher. You have that document in your board
15 pocket. Because the recommendations from our stakeholders
16 have been somewhat mixed and very even, we are seeking that
17 direction from you today. With that, I'm going to stop and
18 make sure that you can point out the document for our
19 consideration and then starts taking questions and
20 discussion and Jennifer and I are happy to help answer any
21 questions.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Ms O'Neill, explain
23 to me why this is such a hot topic.

24 MS. CARLINE: Why this is such a hard topic.
25 Not just that.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have all been
2 lobbied. It seems to be one of lot of passion.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I haven't quite figured
4 out I haven't really not sure with the lines.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I think the reason
6 that has been presented to me, and I will welcome Pat or
7 Jennifer's comments as well, the reason that it's been
8 presented to me is there is a fundamental understanding with
9 license that is driving this conversation.

10 Can you be in field if you have no license?
11 And can you be in a field, if it is not the same across
12 districts and districts are allowed to demonstrate that at
13 the local level? It's a 50 -- 50/50 conversation. I think
14 it's a philosophical conversation which is why it's so hard.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do -- May I finish? Do
16 we have examples of dramatically different interpretations
17 of the 24 semester hours etc. between districts to be able
18 to use as an example that this is a highly inconsistent
19 measure and that's why folks are objecting to it?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would say, we can
21 produce examples. I would probably turn to Jennifer and
22 say, "The examples that we would have would be under the
23 highly qualified provisions."

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. That's one
25 that's I'm talking about.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where states, do.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That that's the question
3 right were the -- were they highly qualified, I mean highly
4 qualified is actually minimally qualified. That was a mis -
5 - Thank you mis --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) hours

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. That was a
8 misinterpreted, I mean that -- that's a term that's been
9 reinterpreted by educators, as saying this is really
10 minimally qualified. What I need to understand, is how
11 different are the interpretations by districts? Is there,
12 are they fairly consistent and so we're approaching
13 comparability other than the pedagogy piece or do we have a
14 basket weaving an acceptable course for math because you
15 counted the straw or something like that?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know that it is
17 as bad as the latter, fortunately, but in just my many
18 conversations with districts and guiding them on how to meet
19 the highly qualified requirements when we were still under
20 those oftentimes, they were looking at counting what was
21 relevant and applicable to precisely that course in grade
22 level the teacher was teaching.

23 So the most common example of where it might
24 be inconsistent is, if you think about middle school math,
25 for example. Calculus is always a point of contention. In



1 order to receive an endorsement in secondary mathematics,
2 you need to have calculus, and there are many districts.
3 People within these districts felt that maybe some one
4 teaching sixth grade or seventh grade mathematics didn't
5 necessarily need that. So they would look at course work on
6 a teacher's trans -- transcript and consider anything that
7 was mathematic in nature but not necessarily what would be
8 required to get an endorsement.

9 If you're looking at teachers who have that
10 endorsement on their license, we know based on the rules
11 that are in place by the state, what courses they have taken
12 in (indiscernible). So some inconsistency. I think we
13 would have to do a closer investigation of records to know
14 just how inconsistent but based on questions we receive, I
15 would say that that that's an example of where there are
16 some inconsistencies for sure.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Flores.

18 MS. FLORES: Well, I think we did. We didn't
19 know how the hub and the spoke were different and that is,
20 the spoke had more people that were teachers, that were
21 administrators, that were parents than we had in the hub. A
22 lot of the hub community people are, let's face it, I mean
23 they're lobbyists and they're not specialists as we have
24 specialists in the, in the spoke committee.

25 There were a lot more specialists and that's



1 one. So we need to take their recommendations seriously.
2 The spoke committee, also the spoke committee, I guess i --
3 it was one of the people who wrote a very, a letter I think
4 that represented you know, that spoke committee that talked
5 about that you really needed to have, you needed to be
6 trained, and training is important. If not, why should
7 people go and spend all that money at a university, at
8 universities that they spend to be trained? We, it is a
9 profession.

10 They need training, and we know that there is
11 a body of knowledge that teachers need to know to go and
12 teach or else, let's forget about the area of calling it a
13 profession. Lawyers need a body of knowledge. Doctors need
14 a body of knowledge. Teachers need a body of knowledge and
15 we know, kind of, roughly what that means. Should we say
16 that, teachers ar -- are not part of a profession and
17 anything goes, we then I think, we're in deep trouble.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member McClellan.

19 MS. McCLELLAN: Thank you. Thank you Madam
20 Chair. I wanted to say thank you to Colleen O'Neill for
21 taking so much time yesterday to answer all my many
22 questions on this topic and for helping me to understand
23 that gap that exists for the middle school math teachers.
24 Do I understand correctly that this is something that maybe
25 is being worked on or could be worked on by the legislature?



1 I know the deadline has passed four bills and
2 we never know exactly what will pass and what will not, but
3 in order to have a more appropriate designation for those
4 years where calculus is not required but it's not really the
5 same as the lower grades before middle school. Is this
6 something that we anticipate being fixed? That would help my
7 understanding. Thanks.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you representative
10 from (indiscernible) I appreciate it where our conversation
11 yesterday did focus for the for the rest of the board. Our
12 conversation focused about that middle grade something that
13 Jennifer had talked a little bit about here a few minutes
14 ago with regard to licensing and that gap that exists
15 because we have a seven to 12 math license and not a middle
16 school math license which is something that we have been
17 asked from stakeholders on several occasions to investigate
18 whether we can add a middle school math endorsement.

19 And part of the conversation was,
20 potentially, if there was a middle school math endorsement
21 that really addressed the need at the middle school could
22 that help alleviate some of the concerns around the local
23 decision making for infield educators. And I -- I think the
24 answer could go both ways. It really could. I think the
25 recommendations from the spoke, if you take it just straight



1 as is under the former highly qualified provisions, it would
2 not because you'd still have to have a math 712 license and
3 that would not help in that situation.

4 The recommendation from the Hub because you
5 do not have to have a license and you can demonstrate or an
6 endorsement, a license with endorsement and you can
7 demonstrate that through content knowledge could help with
8 that situation. So that's one of those situations at the
9 Hub recommendation may help solve not in a formal way but in
10 an informal (indiscernible) .

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I didn't finish.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Proceed.

13 MS. FLORES: I think that 24 hours is a
14 minimum. I mean, it's minimum. It's usually 36 hours to be
15 -- to be considered at a university level for a field.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolute. Thank you Dr.
17 Flores for that clarification. Our requirements for
18 endorsement under state statute is 24 credits, semester
19 credit hours --

20 MS. FLORES: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- from an institute
22 of higher education or college university level, most of the
23 time a minor degree runs at the 36 semester credit hours.
24 So there's a little discrepancy between those two things.

25 MS. FLORES: 42? So it's not?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 32, 36, somewhere in
2 there.

3 MS. FLORES: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 MS. FLORES: So you know, as far as that
6 calculus class, I know, that you know, some universities --
7 or ask people to take -- to take that on line, a calculus
8 course. I think U -- UC asks people to take it on --
9 online, because they don't, at least for people who are
10 going into engineering and such. We're talking about
11 teachers here and certainly we need people to teach
12 calculus. But I think for -- if you're thinking about
13 calculus in K through -- K through seven, maybe that's not
14 very important but we do need to have people in the area.
15 Now, I have -- I have a problem with 64 hours of education
16 courses.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could -- could you
18 just bring it to a close?

19 MS. FLORES: Well, there's several. I am
20 trying to.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Good.

22 MS. FLORES: So 64 hours in education, when
23 maybe some of that could be at -- in class teaching a five
24 year program where a full year. I know that I've taught at
25 another university that had a five year program whereby the



1 fifth year was spent in the classroom, and you got enough
2 hours to work on a Master's. So I think, you know, we need
3 to think of other ways, but we do have the capacity right
4 now through licensing to do -- to do alternative licenses.
5 But I don't think that just because you have a PhD, you can
6 go in and teach any course. I am -- I'm not of that
7 belief. I think that you do need some training in the area,
8 but I don't think we need 64 hours in education.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So I appreciate
10 what you think and I -- but I wanna clarify there is
11 nothing, should the board take a different position than the
12 hub majority did and choose to require licensing, there is
13 nothing that says a district can't hire an individual to
14 teach math who has a PhD. This is -- my understanding is,
15 this is only about reporting and ensuring that our poor
16 students don't have less qualified teachers than all other
17 students. So could you go through that piece because this
18 is where I think folks got lost in the hub, simply because
19 they've --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What did you just say?
21 That this is just about making sure --

22 MS. FLORES: This is only about reporting.
23 This is not about --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But if you're reporting
25 license as --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Reports have
2 consequences.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- as in subjects,
4 yeah.

5 MS. FLORES: Reports have consequences but a
6 district has the option. If district has a group of
7 students that are unsuccessful, they -- there is the
8 expectation then, that they distribute their teachers in
9 such a way that the most highly qualified teachers are
10 teaching them.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bingo, exactly. Reports
12 have consequences.

13 MS. FLORES: They do.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Reports, the district
15 sends boxes and they may not be able to fit in
16 (indiscernible).

17 MS. FLORES: Well, I don't -- I don't know
18 that. But that's -- does not say that you cannot hire
19 someone who has just a PhD. Am I right? Could you just --
20 could you just let her finish? Just --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct, so that --
22 the -- clarification around that is under the former
23 provisions you were required to ensure they were highly
24 qualified or you had to move them, period no questions
25 asked. It did not matter whether there was achievement or



1 not. Under these provisions, you do not under the ESSA
2 provisions, you do not have to move them.

3 You can hire, you can place, you can put them
4 in. If there is academic achievement, there is no
5 discrepancy or disproportionate rate. This is really about
6 the definition under ESSA for what we would consider an out
7 of field educator. That you can still hire, place,
8 consequences aside, the answer is yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be very helpful
10 to have some examples.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll get that. I have
12 some.

13 MS. FLORES: Go for it, board member Durham.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
15 I think the best example was brought up at the hub committee
16 was the PhD in Mathematics candidate that if you take a
17 minority recommendation if hired to teach mathematics, would
18 be considered out of field and should that -- that teacher
19 then with the -- with the -- almost -- with almost a
20 PhD be teaching kids who are underprivileged in some
21 fashion, then that would be a black mark against the school
22 that employed or the district that employed that teacher and
23 --

24 MS. FLORES: If the kids were not succeeding.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, if -- no, I



1 think under any circumstances.

2 MS. FLORES: Well, that's what we need to
3 clarify.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think under any
5 circumstances. But I would -- I would like to go back to
6 the -- kind of the guts of the debate that went on in the
7 hub committee which has won the majority recommendation is
8 the most similar to current practice and the least
9 disruptive to the majority recommendation, is the most
10 supportive of local control and allowing districts and
11 particularly since, presuming there is a teacher shortage,
12 it is apparently most acute in rural districts.

13 So I think, it really handicaps the rural
14 districts the most, and I think it does expose anyone if we
15 -- if we take the minority recommendation, I think it
16 increases the state's exposure and those districts exposure
17 to litigation and penalties, which I don't think in the
18 environment we're in is particularly good idea and finally
19 ESSA has provided the state with some flexibility and we're
20 declining to take advantage of it which I do think is a
21 mistake. And I'd go one step further I think, the vote was
22 extremely confusing when you see 96.

23 At least two people, as I follow the vote, I
24 think voted against their own best interests including the
25 representative for the voices. He could have only been



1 voting for urban voices and not rural voices. So it was
2 extremely confusing to me. I think the majority of the hub
3 committee reached the right conclusion, and that if you
4 adopt a minority view, you're going to limit, perhaps not
5 the ability to hire, but you're most certainly going to put,
6 you're going to discourage the hiring of otherwise qualified
7 teachers who can't check all the boxes, and I think in the
8 environment we're in, that's a serious mistake.

9 So I think, this does make a difference and I
10 -- I do think it has a lot more to do with potential
11 litigation and other issues, because they --

12 MS. FLORES: What are they gonna litigate?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, they're gonna --
14 they're gonna litigate whether these kids are discriminated
15 against because they have a PhD teach -- some of the PhD
16 teaching math but not a teacher's license. And I think you
17 see that in every -- in every -- you see it in a number
18 of aspects. You've got an attorney, I'll use my daughter as
19 an example, business attorney couldn't go into a school and
20 teach business law.

21 MS. FLORES: Of course, they could. This
22 does not say they can't come in.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They can.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well --

25 MS. FLORES: That's the -- the part that I



1 -- I think would be helpful --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be high --

3 MS. FLORES: -- to clarify.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be high risk
5 for the district to do it. The district would be
6 discouraging that, and I think, and I would just say before
7 Dr. Flores. I'll just give my rebuttal in advance, I think
8 of all the courses that are of the least value, it's --
9 it's the methods courses that at least in my history
10 provided the least value.

11 So if we're -- if we're going to emphasize
12 content competency over -- over methodology, then we ought
13 to take the minority opinion. Otherwise, I believe we
14 should stick with the majority opinion.

15 MS. FLORES: In that -- in that -- in that
16 example that you gave, I would agree. I think that a math
17 person could do that, and we give special licenses. In
18 fact, we just had special licenses to about five or six
19 people because I couldn't find the people. So it's in
20 there, to do that, but I don't think we should -- one thing
21 we should do, I'm going to put it in the positive, we should
22 place teachers K through second, K through third and I think
23 there is a division right now in pre -- K through second
24 grade, where reading is honed on teaching math and reading
25 are honed on. So we get teachers in those areas that really



1 are trained in those very impor -- important early years,
2 to teach those concepts and those skills that are needed so
3 that they can do better once they get to middle school or
4 upper elementary middle and high school. We need to get
5 people who know how to teach reading in those years. And I
6 know that bless the -- bless their hearts, those Teach for
7 America people come in and they -- they've got good
8 intentions, they have a lot of energy, but a lot of the time
9 these people don't know how to teach reading, and I saw that
10 in the schools where I taught and I just hope that we do
11 right by those kids, especially in those poor, low economic
12 schools that we get those teachers first into those areas
13 where they're really needed, and -- and then, you know,
14 think about the others.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So we can --

16 MS. FLORES: I'm not opposed to what -- what
17 you're saying, Steve, but -- and there is --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So can when we get some
19 examp -- examples please. I know you have the flowcharts,
20 and there are flowchart people, for whom that works. How
21 about school ABCD?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Certainly, we can do
23 that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And some different --
25 some different options I want to include what board member



1 Durham is including, as an option. What are the
2 consequences? What are the decisions? Because the reality is
3 not all, not all rural schools are opposed to option one.
4 So it is -- it is not I mean it is kind of a mixed
5 perception. The one being, are we going to have a high
6 standard for our teachers in Colorado, and that seems to be
7 one of the compelling arguments in favor of licen -- of the
8 licensing. Only peace and not going to the highly
9 qualified. So I think it would serve the board for us to
10 have -- be able to clearly understand the differences. I
11 like your example about the math.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to clarify so --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chapman.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You would like something
15 in addition to the flowcharts, that sort of lays out
16 describe to real life example --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to the same thing
18 with the flowchart does.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Just a different
20 kind of visual.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is what -- this is
22 what the school did. This is where the teacher is teaching.
23 These are the -- you know, if the kids are fine, there's no
24 issue. If the kids are not fine, where does that leave the
25 school in terms of responsibility?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Certainly, we can do
2 that. And I think in an additional illustration, what we
3 would need to include is, what this looks like as far as
4 concentrations, and how we calculate disproportionate rates.
5 I would actually, if you wanna --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- go to your next
8 slide, I can show you how we do this at the state level, and
9 it might give you also an idea of what it would look like.
10 We would do it the same way for a district as well. So
11 there wouldn't be reporting on individual teachers,
12 consequences on individual hires. We -- we look at the rate
13 at which students and -- whether it's in the district or the
14 state are taught by teachers in each of these categories, so
15 I think that's important context as well in considering
16 these implications.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) ask you
18 a question.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of course.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When I look at that 6.15
21 percent, would that -- is -- my reversal of that to say
22 93.45 percent of low income students are taught by teachers
23 who are just as qualified, as those who teach middle in inco
24 -- middle and -- a middle in high income students. Is that
25 fair statement or not?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: "Cause that's where --
3 you know, I -- I --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have to process that
5 for a minute.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I've had common
7 (indiscernible) , so I may not be competent to -- to reach
8 that conclusion.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The -- the rate at -- so
10 actually, the -- the rate at which low income students are
11 taught by ineffective teachers, you wanna to look at the
12 8.56 percent below. So the gap between the two is the 6.1
13 percent.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that'd be 91.44?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. We're --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So 99.44 would be taught
17 by the same. So i -- is that correct?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is like -- this is
19 like eyes glaze over --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- analysis. That's
22 what I'm -- I'm asking for --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why? I agree it's eyes
24 glaze over but it's important. It's important because if
25 you have 90 percent plus of the students being taught with



1 the same quality, that -- I would state that in the
2 affirmative as opposed to -- you know an 8.5 percent, five -
3 - five -- 6 percent gap means less to me, and you've got to
4 actually -- is that -- was that a real problem? Well, maybe.
5 But it certainly appears to be a bigger problem than you --
6 if you state it the way I stated it, and so the question is,
7 am I stating it correctly? Am I missing something here?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I would not say
9 that you're stating it in -- incorrectly. I think that --
10 So by comparison you would also have to say that the middle
11 and high income students are taught by e -- e -- effective
12 teachers that are (indiscernible) of 97.5, whatever that be.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the -- so bottom line
14 here is, we're going through all kinds of machinations, all
15 kinds of headaches, all kinds of debate over something that
16 is a difference of less than 5 percent of the students, if
17 you -- my math thinks slightly more than 5 percent. Five
18 point whatever it is, 111 -- 5.15 percent. So when you look
19 at it and put it in that perspective, it -- I would say,
20 we're -- we're searching for a problem here. We haven't
21 made a case there's a problem, but we're trying to solve
22 what someone perceives as a problem, and if in fact that 5.
23 -- call round numbers 5 percent gap is a problem, somebody
24 should just say so. If it's a big problem that demonstrates
25 discrimination or something else, then let's just say so. I



1 have a hard time believing that you can make that case. And
2 I think we ought to not focus on it if my interpretation of
3 math is correct.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can certainly provide
5 more examples. Thank you. (indiscernible)

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I -- I appreciate
7 it. Point well taken. And -- and this is merely just you
8 know, a part of our requirement to track this and make sure
9 that there's not a problem, that -- and so I've -- you know,
10 popping up. I think there's probably different definitions
11 of problems. But -- but yes, this is just merely a
12 requirement. We need to report some of these things to --
13 in our teacher equity plan. And So this is just how we
14 define it and how we report it.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

19 Dr. (indiscernible) , I understand that, but I -- I don't
20 think it's being used that way. It's being used to support
21 the minority opinion that there's a problem, and that --
22 that this can solve a problem. So I don't think it's just
23 an innocent, we have to report this. I mean, we're -- we're
24 -- we've already spent as far as I'm concerned of 5 percent
25 gap. This board spent more time than we ought to. We ought



1 to be focused on how -- how we raise achievement generally
2 speaking in my -- in my judgment, but because of the way
3 this is presented, and I think presuming my math is correct,
4 I think this tries to create a problem that begs a solution
5 when in fact, if there is a problem, least doesn't beg a
6 comprehensive solution, and certainly, it doesn't beg
7 changing existing practice, because you can't demonstrate
8 existing practice has result in any significant
9 discrimination or difference.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, existing practice
11 has been that poor children are taught by less qualified
12 teacher.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not very often.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, across the country
15 -- across the country, I -- I would need to differ with you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But not here.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't know.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A -- and --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We -- and then our job
20 is to monitor that. To ensure that kids get a quality
21 teacher. And that's our -- that's the board's goal, I
22 believe also.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I absolutely agree.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are those numbers are
25 simply eyes glaze over? I'm not sure exactly they mean to



1 me.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I thought -- I thought
3 (indiscernible) pretty well.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I've al -- I've -- I've
5 premised every -- I've premised everything on presuming my
6 interpretation of numbers is right, and I would agree that
7 we should monitor and continue to monitor it, but the
8 question is, should we change existing policy in a
9 disruptive fashion, to deal with this problem?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Madam Chair,
11 I'm just gonna --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- interrupt really
14 quickly, because this is the ineffective data. So this is
15 actually our definition of ineffective, so I apologize that
16 --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's not the out of --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it's not the out of
19 field's criteria.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I apologize for not
22 having that focus. So we -- we are more than happy to help
23 provide what you will see, because we have used the highly
24 qualified provisions, and have not looked at licensure.
25 What prompted this to be perfectly honest and this in --



1 depth conversation, was that there was a report about
2 licensure and the inequities for our minority students, that
3 was issued outside of the highly qualified provision
4 reporting, that their demonstrated discrepancy between the
5 two of those, and that's been the crux of the conversation
6 with our spoke and with our board, I'm sorry, and with our
7 hub over the course of the last couple of months, that
8 demonstrates a disparity because in one way, we're looking
9 at it on a national level as licensure and endorsement, and
10 those criteria were very different that demonstrated that
11 discrepancy between our high minority schools and the
12 licensing criteria, and then our highly qualified data that
13 because licensure is not a consideration in those data, did
14 not identify that discrepancy, so the concern was there.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So excuse me. So we
16 don't have any data, is that correct? You have s -- a report
17 done by whom?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He -- help me to find
19 that Mr. Durham. The report done by whom that was --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did we do it?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We submitted the data
22 for the report.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To whom?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I should rephrase that



1 and bring you that data.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To whom did we submit
3 the data?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I -- I think you
5 might have heard the reference to the Learning Policy
6 Institute report that highlighted that gap in unlicensed
7 teachers in Colorado, but also -- so this data comes from
8 data that we annually collect and submit to the US
9 Department of Education have publicly post. We and -- what
10 calling this referencing, we have not found a
11 disproportionate rate as far as out of field teachers in the
12 data we have so far, and that's why it's not here and I
13 apologize. Perhaps, we should have just included that. So
14 there is not a difference in the rate in -- in which low
15 income and non low income. The minority and non minority
16 students are taught by out of field teachers, because highly
17 qualified has been our definition of that, and there's been
18 a mandate around highly qualified. So we're -- ineffective
19 and inexperience is where we have found those gaps in the
20 data which is what's here.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I (indiscernible) May I
22 ask --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Board member McClellan.

24 MS. McCLELLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 Following Mr. Durham comments, I want to just revisit my



1 understanding, because I know he mentioned a concern about
2 staying away from changes that might be disruptive. Do I
3 understand correctly that the minority recommendation, does
4 not impact schools ability to exercise their waivers? This
5 isn't a road map in terms of who you can and cannot hire.
6 This is simply for reporting purposes. Do I understand
7 correctly?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I would say that
10 given the confusion we've had up here even amongst ourselves
11 regarding how much of a problem this is or is not, it seems
12 to me that shedding light on that with the most high degree
13 of transparency might be a great idea, and I would also note
14 that this is an opportunity for schools that are taking
15 advantage of their ability to use waivers, and who may have
16 higher numbers of inexperienced teachers or out -- of --
17 field teachers that are working for example in charter
18 schools, in the event that they are getting great results,
19 that's a wonderful opportunity for them to illustrate that
20 with the public having that information, and it allows the
21 public to have not only the ability to see who their
22 children are being taught by, but it -- and their level of
23 experience and qualifications, but it also allows them to
24 look at the results, and then be the judge themselves. So I
25 see this as largely a transparency issue and not necessarily



1 disruptive, provided that it doesn't limit their ability to
2 hire.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I? Just a moment.
4 Board member (indiscernible)

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Different question for a
6 moment. Do we have any numbers on how often -- Well, I
7 guess, where the big challenge is? Is there some number
8 difference in elementary versus secondary? Is there -- is
9 there a particular level, where this happens more often?
10 Which means, I would think -- I would ask questions, does
11 that relate to the subject matter being taught or the
12 content area needed? You know, I'm -- I'm hearing all of
13 this today and we -- we -- there's the charter schools,
14 there are elementary and middle level and high school
15 chartered schools. So even within that family of schools,
16 we also have them of course across the board. That --
17 that's kind of what I would like to know. And that maybe,
18 part of our separate from ESSA planning is, I've taken a
19 look at -- can we focus in on a particular need and, you
20 know, without disrupting fairness and -- and job
21 qualification standards and all of that. But I'd like to
22 know that because if we have more of a -- of a challenge on
23 this in the elementary level than we do at high school, that
24 tells me -- that puts me in a -- automatically in a
25 different direction of thinking about this.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Certainly we could put
2 that together.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Florence?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that she's next.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It seems to me in the
8 last week, there's been a report about effectiveness of
9 teachers, I mean, highly effective -- was it close to -- was
10 it 89 percent or something like that?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. It was 88.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was 88, the educator
13 effectiveness.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that was tough,
15 those two tiers.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. I suppose.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we those numbers now,
18 couldn't we have more current data on this?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For our effective
20 definition, yes. I mean, we can certainly provide more data
21 around the effectiveness. That definition has not
22 necessarily been in contest, as we've had conversations. It
23 has gone to the center -- 191 definition that we use but we
24 would be happy to provide updated data and information for
25 our ineffective educators.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Then we should be able
2 to see where they're teaching, shouldn't we? I mean -- I
3 mean, don't we have that information because we always talk
4 about the -- well, five percent. We should be able to
5 manage those two things, with the ineffective?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we did just release,
7 yes. The Public Educator Effectiveness Metrics that talk
8 about the effectiveness at the district and school level.
9 We could be happy to pull that together.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's not where the
11 controversy is, right? It's -- it's --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the definition

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's the definition of -
14 -

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For the definition of
16 ESSA. We have definitely not had any controversy around
17 ineffectiveness --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's definitely been the
20 out -- of -- field, in -- field controversy and a -- yes.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. We -- we do -- we
22 do have a problem though, if we look at all those charter
23 schools and I reference here, Denver, who were over 50
24 percent of the schools are charter schools and then we give
25 dispensation to those schools, where they don't have to have



1 licenses. They don't have to, you know, be evaluated. They
2 don't have to, there's a whole list of things that we allow
3 charters not to be able to do like a regular public school.

4 And in Denver those charter schools hold a
5 large number of ESL kids for instance, poor kids, kids that
6 are not doing well, but especially ESL kids that are --
7 where we don't have ESL trained teachers. And so when you
8 have a large school that has -- that large number of kids
9 900 -- is it 900,000 kids in Denver?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the state of
11 Colorado.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the state and then we
13 have 90,000 in Denver. That's a large number of kids, where
14 most of them -- and they are minority kids and they are ESL
15 kids, and we're not providing the teachers that are trained
16 for -- for that area and for the surrounding districts in
17 this large urban area. So you know, we are -- we do have
18 teachers that are not trained to teach the kids that we have
19 in these -- in these large metropolitan areas.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chapman would like
21 to try out on this.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, just to -- to
23 maybe clarify and frame the issue, a little bit more. So
24 under No Child Left Behind, we had highly qualified
25 provisions, so we had to come up with a definition and apply



1 that definition at the district level across the state, and
2 under ESSA it does away with that provision, but it does --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not talking about --
4 Excuse me -- I'm not talking about how you qualify --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you let him
6 finish?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For this ESL trained.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So under -- under
9 ESSA, it does away with a highly qualified provision and
10 instead reverts to what the state has in place, state
11 licensure and certification requirements. But we do have to
12 report on the -- the proportion of students who are being
13 taught by inexperienced, out of field, ineffective teachers
14 because we have a definition, we can go to Colorado statute
15 and define what we mean by inexperienced for the most part
16 and ineffective for the most part.

17 We aren't able to do that for out of field,
18 and so the -- the work of the spoke has been to arrive at a
19 definition of out -- of -- field because we do have to
20 report those numbers. The idea being that, you know, if --
21 if the data that are reported suggests there's an issue that
22 -- that we would, you know, work with that school district
23 to -- to correct that issue. So we would be collecting that
24 information, reporting that information, and in cases where
25 there does seem to be disproportionality, we would work with



1 the school district to address it, as part of it's unified
2 improvement plan.

3 So there is a consequence. There -- there's
4 the consequences that the reporting -- so the public -- this
5 information is made public, and that if there's an
6 expectation, if disproportionality exists, that they would
7 take -- make attempts or develop a plan to correct that
8 disproportionality. The -- the spoke committee and
9 everybody seemed to be comfortable with inexperienced, how
10 we were gonna be handling that, and in -- ineffective the
11 controversy arose in how we define out -- of -- field.

12 There's a little bit of a split from spoke to
13 hub and within the hub as to the best way to define out --
14 of -- field. But there was -- there has been a
15 recommendation made where there wasn't a majority opinion,
16 and so the -- the work today is to hear from you, if you are
17 comfortable with the recommendation that's been made, and if
18 not, then we would go back and try to find some more
19 information to you as soon as we can. So we can certainly
20 do that.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a way to -- to
22 define a highly qualified -- a little more tightly? Would
23 that be an option?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well I think --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that -- would that be



1 a compromise?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of the
3 recommendation was sort of to maintain some notion of highly
4 qualified and apply it in this case with -- throughout the
5 field -- the definition of out -- of -- field.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But highly qualified
7 itself is no longer a requirement in the federal?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So one of the concerns
10 as due -- is exceeding federal -- federal and state
11 requirements and how we apply this law, and with --
12 historically we've tried not to do that. We've -- if there
13 is flexibility we try and take a plan and chop it.

14 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

16 MR. DURHAM: I think that's a good point,
17 that the plan should give us maximum flexibility. If we
18 wish to enact other policies relative to license and
19 reporting, were not prohibited from doing so. Once you put
20 it in a -- once you put it in the plan, you've tied our
21 hands from making other decisions.

22 So I think you have to separate board policy
23 from this plan, and the bad news is, you may give us the
24 opportunity to debate it twice. But the good news is, at
25 least we have the opportunity to discuss it in a -- in a --



1 in a forum and trying to lead to a decision that might make
2 a difference.

3 So there's -- there's just no reason to put
4 things in this plan that limit our options if we can take
5 advantage of the options in other places, and I would would
6 simply disagree with Ms. Clawing that in reports, you do
7 have consequences, they do drive behavior, and -- and what
8 is trying to be driven by the minority report is a behavior
9 that I don't think will serve us well if we're trying to
10 have the best teachers we can get under the tough
11 circumstances that some districts face.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. McClellan?

13 MS. MCCLELLAN: I would simply say that I
14 don't want to limit transparency because we are afraid of
15 decisions that might be made should we have the bright light
16 shown. I think we should operate in an environment where we
17 have the least amount of ignorance and the highest amount of
18 information and transparency so that then, we can go forward
19 and legislators and this body can make good decisions with
20 the full depth and breadth of information. And I think the
21 minority recommendation is the pro transparency
22 recommendation.

23 MR. CHAPMAN: And just to note, I'm sorry.
24 But we will include, So even if we go with the
25 recommendation (indiscernible) today. We certainly will



1 include and address those areas where there has been a
2 minority opinion captured and we're doing our best to
3 capture all of those and those would be included as part of
4 our plan. Just, sort of, "Here is our recommendation, we
5 want you to know that we did. There were those who
6 disagreed." So that. That helps in anyway.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I am certain of
8 that Sir. I'm certainly certain and give everybody the
9 opportunity in this board, as often as possible, to vote to
10 as much transparency as possible. So I -- I look forward to
11 your support on that.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) Board
13 member Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: I just want to, sort of, firm up a
15 wrap up to that past 10, 20 minutes. What can -- how do we
16 message this to the community? This part of our plan means.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This part of our plan
18 means that we have a definition under which we can identify
19 if students are being taught at a disproportionate rate by
20 what our definition of ineffective, inexperience.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How do you feel?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Inexperienced and at the
24 field educator needs. So it's really the messaging to the
25 field is that we have a clear plan that demonstrates that



1 our students are or are not being taught at a disproportion
2 rate.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: And to a certain extent, it's
4 part of like listening to and so forth. We're, sort of, the
5 context we provide -- we provided was our students should
6 have an equitable opportunity to receive instruction from a
7 teacher who is able to meet his or her needs.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I -- I'm
9 just thinking down the road here, and when it comes time for
10 us to help -- help people get it -- get aware -- get it --
11 get it going, that they're ready to do that with clarity.
12 And I agree with everything everybody said here today. I
13 understand. It makes me appreciate why it's so hard.

14 I just think if we -- if there are
15 opportunities for people who are experienced and they want
16 to bring something to the profession, and that -- there
17 needs to be, "Here's the consequence." One of them, you need
18 some very specialized training that is absolutely vital to
19 some success in this profession. So people want to -- want
20 to continue in it. You got to the content, you've got to
21 have the special -- you've got to have skills in some kind
22 of a -- a -- a way and basically, a commitment to contin --
23 to get the training somehow, somewhere, some way.

24 But I -- I know I identify with a lot of
25 these, both sets of options about what it means to -- and



1 then the hiring bit is the other part of it. I just -- I
2 agree. I appreciate it. I think that sounds like a good
3 plan, the point.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we finished? We've
5 gone way off schedule but I think it's really important for
6 us to have an opportunity to -- let's hash this up.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- thank you
8 very much. I think we don't have clear direction as to what
9 to put in --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're right.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- but I think what we
12 will do is provide responses back to the questions that have
13 been presented to us so that we can have a little bit more
14 clarity going forward with --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm in favor of
16 recommendation too.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At this point I --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not taking a vote
19 though, right?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible) to let
21 vote and So I think --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not a voting item
23 anyway, right?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. It's not a voting
25 item and I think it might -- we might be in a lot of



1 different places. So --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We will provide, kind
3 of, both contexts in the draft plan which will be open for
4 public feedback and with you. Again, it's still in the drop
5 phase. We have lots more conversations to be able to be
6 heard but we will go forward with that information.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chapman.

8 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes, as a follow up, we can get
9 you some additional, sort of, in addition to the flowcharts,
10 sort of, real life examples and to help you understand the
11 issues. We will get that to you as soon as --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We want to see what the
13 consequences are to school, the consequences are to kids.

14 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As best as we can figure
16 out.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, I think we
18 understand but I -- I think we have different opinions. And
19 we're giving we --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have no idea where we
21 are.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- we're giving
23 different opinions on -- on -- you know, what was --

24 MR. CHAPMAN: This is the one that's closest
25 to what we already have.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's not lunch.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Lunch already.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sadly, it's not lunch.

5 So --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- we don't have anyone
7 signed up for public participation. But --

8 MR. CHAPMAN: Do you want me to go through
9 the la -- and I could do --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's more?

11 MR. CHAPMAN: Just two minutes just to lay
12 out the --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead, Mr. Chapman.

14 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, George.

16 MR. CHAPMAN: So I won't -- I won't go
17 through all of this, in any kind of detail. Just want you
18 to know that we are gearing up, we hope to post and send out
19 a first draft of our ESSA state plan this Friday. So day
20 after tomorrow, we're going to be attaching a survey to it
21 and inviting as many folks as we can -- as we can, to review
22 our plan and provide feedback to us.

23 That -- that process will begin on February
24 10th, we'll close on March 10th. As we receive comments,
25 we'll be compiling them and trying -- doing our best to



1 incorporate them into a revised draft of the plan, as
2 appropriate. We will also be meeting with the -- the
3 governor's office in the next couple of weeks to talk about
4 the plan, the review of the plan. Governor's office has had
5 representation on spoke committees and up committee.

6 So they're pretty well aware of what's in the
7 plan. And then we'll be coming to you in -- in March with
8 the -- the revised draft of the plan as an information item
9 and hope to get approval to submit it in April. that's
10 where we're at. And So this is, sort of, the third and
11 final stage of all this public comment process.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Mr. Chapman
13 and all the rest of you wonderful folks who have been --

14 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you very much.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- working on this. So
16 the next item is public comment. We have one speaker.
17 Three minutes, please.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And for the record, I
19 think it's an absolute disgrace that after an all night
20 session and our new secretary of education had to be
21 confirmed by, the first time, our vice president
22 (indiscernible) . And there isn't anyone signed up to speak
23 to our elected board, other than an 81 year old man, who
24 Monday before last, the House Education chair, who I've
25 known and tried to be a mentor to for five years, basically,



1 said, "You're not talking the way I want you to talk. We've
2 had enough of you." I got over here late.

3 I have a Latina great granddaughter, first
4 generation, in community College. I have a great
5 granddaughter, first grade Latina and a two year old, smart
6 as they can be. I don't know how they test but
7 they're smart and I'm not going to stop. After I left
8 medical school, my test scores were too high according to
9 the Assistant Dean John (indiscernible) to go to CU's med
10 school. So I passed for white. So I didn't go to
11 University of Minnesota.

12 He looked at my test score and his eyes
13 popped out. He said, "With test scores like that, we will
14 admit you here immediately." And they did. My test scores
15 were the second highest (indiscernible) when I was working
16 on the doctor at the University of Connecticut and I didn't
17 finish. They were so high that Nobel laureate, William
18 Shockley, commented them at Yale. That's why I keep talking
19 about tests, what they are.

20 And keep in mind, about several years ago I
21 wouldn't identify the person, the Senate president said,
22 "George, I don't think you really mean what you say about
23 test scores. You just like to mention, talk about it so you
24 can impress people with your high test scores." I was never
25 turned down from any teaching job in Connecticut, except by



1 an old superintendent in Brooklyn Connecticut who said, "I
2 will not hire a man to teach second grade because no man
3 will repeat the things the second graders should."

4 And he kept it temporary and kept his word.
5 Every thing I read, 99 percent, second in the
6 (indiscernible) . My test scores were so high, the Black
7 Student of Alliance said, "Let's go in Hartford and get a
8 Frode. What kind of black man are you? The highest test
9 scores.

10 George, will you take the Chitling test?
11 Let's see how high your score on that." That's one of the
12 reasons I'm asking about alternative tests, because at 81
13 years old, I'm so tired. I've seen tests scores year after
14 year, where people of color score low in angles. People of
15 color are not stupid or inferior. It's time to stop these
16 scores.

17 And I've been reading through the Great
18 anthropologist, Adam Kleinberg, that was mentioned to me by
19 CU as the longest serving Professor, Richard Yassar in 55,
20 where he pointed out that Mexican -- American, Indian
21 students, one of the reasons they score low, is they don't
22 want to compete against their buddies. Keep in mind that
23 Donald Trump, when he announced without a field, all of
24 those governors and senators and house representatives
25 people, they were in the field, "What are you doing here



1 Donald?" He's president now. There are complaints about
2 Bet's Cousin, Betsy.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Point of order, these three
4 minutes have expired.

5 MR. GEORGE: Sorry, let me finish please.
6 I've said, let me finish please.

7 MR. CHAPMAN: No.

8 MR. GEORGE: Okay, you're on the -- you're on
9 the board, I'm not. I defer to you, respectfully.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: Respectfully, you're already
11 three minutes.

12 MR. GEORGE: Did you hear what I said?
13 Respectfully. Betsy (indiscernible) got an invitation
14 yesterday. She's on her way, hopefully, to Colorado first
15 time. She's out of field too. That was the criticism. You
16 don't have the credentials.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18 MR. GEORGE: You're out of field. So we have
19 a president who's out of field and a secretary of education
20 out of field. We need to discuss that and George Walker had
21 the highest test scores in Connecticut and he was not the
22 greatest teacher, I've self -- selected out.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Walker.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because I didn't have
25 materials and material and classroom management was a



1 nightmare to me. Thank you for listening.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I say that
3 respectfully to all of you, you're a good board.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. And we have
5 some staff folks waiting to speak to us, I believe. So our
6 next item is, the solicitation process for kindergarten
7 school readiness assessment.

8 I believe that our staff person went home
9 ill, and so I'd like, if I may, to ask you all if you had
10 comments that we could pass on to staff? If you didn't get a
11 chance to read it, etcetera, please contact Melissa by --
12 actually as soon as possible. What she told us, is that she
13 needs to be able to submit the request, our (indiscernible)
14 , our -- I'm sorry. Request for information, is that the
15 right term?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Thank you, Madam
17 Chair.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is -- this is a
20 information item that we were bringing to you all on -- we
21 have to come to you by statute and update our list of
22 approved school readiness assessments. And so we provided
23 you some information we wanted to -- since this has been
24 such a hot topic in the few -- in the past.

25 We wanted to give you all time to give us



1 input on what would go into that sort of RFI or RFP, and so
2 we'd be happy to take that feedback now, or we can also
3 schedule individual meetings with you, or phone calls, and
4 so that you could talk to Dr. Colesman and -- and Nancy
5 Linville.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham.

7 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have
8 just a couple of things that I -- I caught during the --
9 that concern me when I read through this. Apparently under
10 the statute, everybody would have to re -- apply.

11 When I look at the criteria on page -- I
12 don't know exactly what page it is, I guess page four. The
13 -- I can't -- I don't know if -- if those criteria listed
14 top the page have changed any since -- since the last time.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't believe they
16 have.

17 MR. DURHAM: And if that's the case and we
18 have people who have appro -- who are already approved, I
19 would hope we would have kind of a paperwork bureaucracy
20 reduction act, and simply allow them to state that they
21 haven't changed because they were approved before.

22 They should, by definition be approved again,
23 and I would just like to make sure that we -- we streamline
24 this as much as possible, because I don't think there's any
25 point in burdening our staff w -- with reviewing things that



1 we know already comply, or making the private sector provide
2 things that are redundant. So I just -- that's the one
3 request I'd have related to this.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I would add in
5 there though the question, have you made any changes to your
6 assessment, since it was first approved by us? Because I
7 think we need to capture -- potentially capture that.

8 MR. DURHAM: I agree and I -- but I -- as I
9 recall, any changes they made have been approved. And if --
10 if they haven't been, you're correct. If they have been,
11 then they would fit in the already approved category.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll ensure we check on
13 that. Thank you.

14 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member, Rankin.

16 MS. RANKIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. On --
17 on the PowerPoint, mine says 11.01 and then it's changed to
18 12.01. So --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've had a little -- we
20 had some scrambles.

21 MS. RANKIN: It's -- it's says current
22 approved kindergarten school readiness assessments. One is
23 the teaching strategies gold. The other is Teaching
24 Strategies Gold kindergarten entry. Desired results,
25 develop a profile, DRDP, and Riverside Early Assessment of



1 Learning, REAL.

2 I -- I did have some time to go online, and
3 actually read through the whole Riverside and -- and looked
4 over the desired results, and I know many of my
5 superintendents really like Gold, but I was told that the
6 Riverside Early Assessment of Learning is no longer
7 available. So that just gives us those two in. And I also
8 would like to make the recommendation of when people put it
9 in a program that they would like to have us review, that
10 they also align it with some of our standards, or anything
11 that we have in place in the state, to allow the people that
12 apply to do some of that leg work, and then it can be
13 reviewed by our department.

14 Because they can pick out, you know, where
15 there may be some discrepancies. But I -- I really like to
16 align all of these things together, so that we're all going
17 down the same track, and I -- I think that would be a -- a
18 good recommendation.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

20 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other further input
22 to staff? Thank you. And I appreciate that we need to skip
23 that one, and if there's a lot of -- there are a lot of
24 concerns, we can bring it back next time.

25 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. And we are happy to do --



1 have staff do in -- individual calls if there are additional
2 recommendations or thoughts on this. Thank you for -- we
3 had kind of a last minute sickness.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. The next
5 item on our agenda and the last before lunch, folks, is the
6 contingen -- contingencies or request information. Do we
7 have the --

8 MS. RANKIN: I'm not sure where are we on
9 this? On this one? MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Should we scramble that
11 for another time?

12 MS. RANKIN: Do you want us to do that after?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, maybe. If she's
14 not available.

15 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that okay?

17 MR. DURHAM: Yeah, I think it's relatively
18 self-explanatory.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, yeah. Are there
20 questions of board members? I sort of -- Rebecca did you --
21 are you comfortable with that particular area, or do you
22 wanna have a presentation? The contingency reserve. Okay.
23 Then maybe we'll take that off the agenda. Yeah, let's do
24 it real fast.

25 MS. RANKIN: So Ms. Emm is going to just give



1 us a very brief rundown of this.

2 MS. EMM: Thank you, Madam Chair,
3 (indiscernible) and Deputy Commissioner. I'm going to be
4 very brief and not go through the PowerPoint. Basically, we
5 have had six districts come forward.

6 We've had six districts put forward a request
7 from the contingency reserve to -- to receive emergency
8 grants, to help them with the impact of their total program
9 funding being reduced as a result of their assessed values.
10 I am not bringing this forward for action today, but just a
11 -- a notification that they have put forward those, that it
12 is dependent upon what the legislature does with the final -
13 - with the final supplemental appropriation, and also the
14 supplemental appropriation in order to refill the state
15 board's contingency reserve.

16 So this is just an information item. We'll
17 bring this back, once we find out what the final numbers
18 are.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we get a million a
20 year for that?

21 MS. EMM: It has --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, if it has to be
23 used.

24 MS. EMM: It has been right about a million a
25 year. And the state board did approve a disbursement from



1 that fund back in July to Southbound County, and that is
2 been --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But they paid that back,
4 right? Or mostly?

5 MS. EMM: About half of it has been paid
6 back, and then we will wait and see if they pay back. If
7 Peabody pays their taxes this spring, and then they will pay
8 us back the full amount, and then we would also be able to
9 disburse funds to these --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not expecting this
11 money to come back?

12 MS. EMM: No.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Kind of what I thought.

14 MS. EMM: Correct.

15 MS. FLORES: Excuse me.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Questions?

17 MS. FLORES: I -- I noticed something, and
18 that is that -- that this is the only case I guess where the
19 le -- the negative factors factored in. So if they ask for
20 the money, then we would not make them pay a negative
21 factor. So is this the only instance where if they asked
22 for money, then we just say, "Well, let's have the negative
23 factors that we wouldn't have given you anyway, and let's
24 add it in there for -- "

25 MR. DURHAM: It's a debit.



1 MS. FLORES: It's still a debit even though -
2 -

3 MR. DURHAM: It's -- it's a debit.

4 MS. EMM: I think the easiest way to do this
5 question would be to show one of the slides. We walk
6 through that, but I know you're short on time. So the only
7 thing we could do is, at the next -- when we come back, we
8 can go through that information.

9 MS. FLORES: Or we come back to the real
10 thing? How's that sound? Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member, Goff.

12 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Has it always been the
13 -- the cap -- available is half of the -- has it always been
14 the half? So --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go ahead.

16 MS. EMM: Madam Chair, this was actually a
17 provision put in statute last year, that allows them to
18 receive 25 percent of the negative factor.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

20 MS. EMM: But I -- I -- I think it would be -
21 - it would be much better to go through the whole thing next
22 time, when we brief that for approval.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree. It's an eyes
24 glaze over kind of a thing.

25 MS. GOFF: Yeah. I just felt like something



1 was different.

2 MS. EMM: You're right from -- from what
3 we've talked about (indiscernible) .

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other questions,
5 folks?

6 MS. GOFF: I'm done asking questions forever.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Ms. Emm. I
8 appreciate it.

9 MS. EMM: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. I believe
11 our next activity is to go into exec session. Do I have --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do I have a motion to
14 convene into exec session?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May -- may I read the
16 executive session before a motion to convene?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you have to, yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do. Sorry. I know, I
19 know. I -- I didn't look on my script.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Yeah, I
21 know.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: An ex -- an executive
23 session has been noticed for today's state board meeting in
24 conformance with 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS, to receive legal advice
25 on specific legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(ii)



1 CRS. Matters required to be kept confidential by federal
2 law or rules or state statutes, pursuant to 24-6-
3 402(3)(a)(iii) CRS.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Now?

5 MR. DURHAM: We move for the executive
6 session.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Second? Anyone
8 opposed to executive session? Thank you folks. Who would do
9 that?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How far off are we?

11 MR. DURHAM: 30 minutes.

12 (Executive Session)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24



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

2 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Electronic
3 Transcriber, for the State of Colorado, do hereby certify
4 that the above-mentioned matter occurred as hereinbefore set
5 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